Mr. President, if there is anything we need to do to supplement our great investments through the Inter-American Alliance, which we are making by the hundreds of millions, and by the billions, it is to have more friendship and complete understanding with those people who are our neighbors. Our future and their future is going to depend more on the building of better understanding and more on the better appreciation, each for the other, than any other factor and not on the fact that we contribute heavily to the building of a system of highways. We contributed two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway through Central America which has a rugged terrain, and small populations or assets of their own upon which to draw.

That is fine, but nothing will be done to make a greater impression than will be created by a great continuing institution where we may have exhibits of their activities which show their culture as we display ours.

I do not know how many of us know that in the city of San Jose, in Costa Rica, there is a beautiful grand opera building similar to the one in Monte Carlo. I happen to have been in both places. It has a fine company playing there a large part of the year.

I can cite instance after instance of things which they are developing in their culture which we would admire and which we would love to have the chance to enjoy and which our people, if they have the chance to enjoy, would better understand why we are spending these many millions of dollars in the inter-American program and the Inter-American Alliance.

I shall not weary the Senate further by speaking on this subject. I wish, however, to remind the Senate that the community of Miami has responded nobly to the crisis forced on it by the policy of our Nation as a whole by the welcoming of Cuban refugees. They have received in that one city better than 200,000 refugees, many of them now resettled.

The Federal Government has done a fine job there. My hat is off to it. Nothing, however, can compare to the tremendous impact on the Miami people themselves of that invasion of refugees, many of them arriving without anything except the clothes they had on their backs. The impact has fallen most heavily on the city of Miami and its people have responded in perfectly noble fashion.

So far as I am concerned, I feel that they are entitled to some credit for having done that. We are now entering into this new program which we say will bring 15,000, 20,000, 25,000 new refugees, who for the most part will be there; although some will resettle elsewhere.

Mr. President, the city of Miami is doing its part. The county of Dade is doing its part. The State of Florida is doing its part. We believe that this meeting place between the cultures of Latin America and our own, which is almost the exact center of the geographic Western Hemisphere and of the population of the Western Hemisphere, is an ideal and unique spot in which to set up a place where the cultures may meet, where people may meet, where acquaintances may be made, where we can learn the good things about them, and where they can learn the good things about us and about our people.

I am sorry that this matter has gotten into controversy, and that some of our very able friends have seen fit to make it the subject of delaying tactics in our committee. I close by reminding our good friends that, after serious debate and full discussion on the floor of the House following hearing and report, and a good record of both of the hearing and the report, the House passed this legislation by a majority of better than 2 to 1 on a rollcall vote.

I hope that we may give equally careful, equally patriotic, equally generous, equally prompt consideration to this matter in these closing days of the session, when it will be difficult to get matters up for consideration, because the interest on the bonds is being paid, and it is costing money, and the continuing expense of the whole project is something that must be considered. Therefore, the Federal Government ought to move ahead without further delay.

After all, 15 years is a good, long time for even the Federal Government to consider a project, particularly when it involves so little money as this, which will go to those who have so highly lived up, I think, to the test of Americanism as have the people and the governments of Miami and Dade County, and of the State of Florida as a whole.

I thank the Senate for yielding me this time, which does not count as time upon the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

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 recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, October 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: II Timothy 2:14: *Of these things put them in remembrance.*

Almighty God, we celebrate these many days in our national history as a time of high and holy remembrance; days that bring back a medley of memories, exaltations, regrets, and dismay.

Help us to call to mind in our prayers the heroism of the men and the fortitude of women in the days of terror and trial—those who endured with valor; those who suffered with patience; and those who gave their all, even the very blood of their bodies for the dawn of a better day.

We beseech Thee to stir our minds and the minds of men everywhere that a nobler spirit and wiser vision may rule our thoughts and ways.

May we humbly acknowledge that we are not praying for the peace of ease but for the peace of righteousness and good will and the moral law that fulfills itself in fellowship and guides humanity out of chaos and confusion into brotherhood.

Enlighten our darkness; may ignorance, poverty, oppression be done away. May the Prince of Peace reign supremely everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 8, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up bills from his subcommittee.

PROVIDING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR MAKING CERTAIN TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10497) to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

(b) A violation of this section shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place at which the telephone call was made or the place at which the telephone call was received.

(c) Whoever violates this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or

to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(d) Any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section shall be requested by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the government.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the application of section 927 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with the violation of this section.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10497 is to provide criminal penalties to persons found guilty of making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia for the following purposes:

First. For an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons;

Second. For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or

Third. For any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

The bill further provides that a violation shall be deemed to have occurred either at the place where the telephone call was made, or at the place where the call was received.

The bill subjects violators to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. The laws of Maryland and Virginia impose similar penalties.

Present law in the District of Columbia provides a maximum penalty of a $10 fine for disorderly conduct for so-called prank telephone calls.

The bill further provides that a pretrial mental examination shall be requested by the court of any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the above provisions, such examination to be at a mental hospital designated by the court, and the cost thereof to be paid by the government.

Finally, provision is included in the bill to assure that nothing in the enforcement of the bill will affect the application of the provisions of the District of Columbia Code with respect to insane criminals and to the commitments thereof.

There is hardly a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints from his secretary or staff members who have been the victims of obscene, annoying, or harassing telephone calls at some time or other.

According to information filed with your committee, an increasing number of perverts, burglars, and just plain cranks are using the telephone to plague Washington area residents—particularly women.

Police and prosecutors throughout the area report hardly a day goes by without at least one complaint of an obscene call, some of them involving obscene messages to women, others decoy calls by burglars.

Between 35 and 40 cases a month are under active investigation by the telephone company's security force. Counted as one case is the caller who has given the same shockingly indecent spiel to a hundred or more women.

Washington residents, unprotected by any kind of law against telephone harassment, face this pattern of cases:

A pervert posing as a doctor was believed to have made more than 50,000 calls throughout the area over a period of several years before his recent capture, in nearby Maryland. His spiel: Telling women that their husbands had visited him for delicate medical help and asking them numerous intimate questions.

A university's telephone switchboard was tied up so completely that all school business came to a halt because of one family's domestic crisis. The man got 20 of his friends to keep calling the university where his wife worked. They said nothing, simply breathed into the telephone, but no other calls could come through.

Two District firms—a moving company and a barbershop—nearly went out of business through telephone harassment directed not at the firms but at some employee. In both cases, calls swamped telephone facilities.

A current trap for the unwary is the telephone survey. It is used by both burglars and perverts in the District.

The perverts use the survey to entice the housewife into carrying on an innocent conversation before the caller moves into obscenity.

Police believe burglars are employing the survey technique to "case" a house without running any risk of being spotted. Cited as a typical example is the housewife's responses to the seemingly innocuous qustions of a caller posing as a TV market analyst.

The bill has the support of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Metropolitan Police Department, the local telephone company, and other groups.

Your committee has not heard of any objections to this legislation, and recommends its approval by the House.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and commend the Committee on the District of Columbia for the expeditious manner in which they responded to this legislation.

I particularly would like to commend my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], for his knowledgeable advice and counsel. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN]. for their splendid support and assistance to me in bringing this bill to the floor and assuring its passage.

The residents of the Nation's Capital are really unprotected by any effective law against persons making obscene telephone calls. The present penalty upon conviction of such a charge is a $10 fine for disorderly conduct and a defendant can go scot free simply by forfeiting collateral. My bill would boost these penalties to $500 and imprisonment for up to a year. This is the same maximum penalty provided by the neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland.

The police tell me that some of these persons make literally hundreds of calls over a short period of time. The mental anguish they cause is tremendous. They pretend to be doctors, marriage counselors, survey takers, and a number of other things. The police have a difficult time tracking down the perverts who comb through telephone directories to find the numbers of women they can harass with indecent remarks.

Because of the difficulty in enforcement and the present small penalty, many—if not most—obscene telephone calls go unreported to the police. They should be reported. The police and the telephone company want them to be reported. Sometimes, just a fragment of information can be the needed clue to to provide identification of the caller.

I can also report to the House that telephone experts are currently perfecting devices which are going to make it much easier to track down persons who make obscene telephone calls. So it is important that action be taken now to make certain that tougher penalties are enacted into law.

I believe adoption of this bill by Congress would serve as a greater deterrent to the commission of such crimes. And it would give the Metropolitan Police Department a much stronger weapon of enforcement. The overall effect should be a greater peace of mind for the thousands of women in this city who have received such calls. One can just imagine the fear an obscene telephone call strikes in the heart of a woman living alone. Washington has a larger number of single women and widows than most cities because they come here to work in Government agencies. I do not think there is a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints of this kind, in many cases from women on his own staff.

I must point out also, Mr. Speaker, that this strengthening of the law is not without compassion. I am fully aware that many of the persons making obscene telephone calls are mentally ill and need psychiatric attention. This bill contains a provision for voluntary pretrial mental examinations of persons charged with violating this law. If such an individual is mentally ill, the court should have that information available at the time the case comes to trial. In that event, treatment can be required.

It makes little sense to bring such persons to justice and levy fines and imprisonment if nothing is done to remedy the cause of such antisocial behavior. If a defendant refuses to take such an examination, my bill specifically provides that the judge can still order an examination if he believes the defendant is mentally unsound.

Mr. Speaker, there has been great concern in Congress over crime in the Nation's Capital. This bill makes an attack on one aspect of that problem. The Police Chief, the U.S. attorney, the telephone company, the staff of the District of Columbia Crime Commission, and the

victims of such calls are all agreed that legislation is needed. I ask you to respond to their plea for action.

The following article on this subject from the August 18, 1965, Post follows:

LAYTON ENDORSES BILL ON OBSCENE PHONERS

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

Police Chief John B. Layton said yesterday he would like to see a House bill, stiffening penalties for obscene telephone calls, become law.

The legislation, by Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, would provide a $500 fine, a year's imprisonment, or both, for a person convicted of making an obscene telephone call—an offense now punishable in Washington by a $10 fine for disorderly conduct.

Layton said the obscene telephone caller is a hard man—only rarely a woman—to catch and the thousands of complaints registered here annually soak up a lot of police man-hours—most of them fruitless. The Gallagher bill would bring the Washington penalty for the offense more in keeping with those in suburban jurisdictions, and in some instances beyond them.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. also would like to see the Gallagher bill become law, and for much the same reasons Layton cites—its deterrent effects, and the possible easing of the workload on its investigative force.

The obscene phone caller's voice takes many forms. Sometimes he poses as a marriage counselor; sometimes as a physician; sometimes as the just plain nut he usually turns out to be.

Because of him, the phone company advises single women to list their phone number only by their last names and a couple of initials, and in any case to avoid the listing of the more exotic first names and the designation, "Miss." Once their listing has been discovered by the obscene phone caller, about all the phone company can do is advise a new nonlisted number, or if that is not feasible, its call-screening service.

Nor is the unwelcome phone caller always sexually oriented. Sometimes he or she has no voice at all and his target hears nothing but deep breathing at the other end of the line. Sometimes, too, his target is known to him personally and will be called regularly at 3:37 a.m. each day in vindication of some real or fancied mistreatment the caller has received at the target's hands.

Difficult as they are to catch, once an obscene phone caller is identified, dozens of complaints are cleared up, police explain.

Alexandria police records on the offense probably are typical of those in surrounding jurisdictions. There were 118 of them recorded in the year ending last July 1, but each complainant probably received a series of the calls, so the figure is not indicative of the number of such calls. The obscene phone caller is not a seasonal operator, nor does he annoy any special section of the city, the figures show.

Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from the broadcast interview program of John Schaefer, "Talk of New York," WCBS–Radio, July 30, 1965:

Dr. Emanuel Hammer, a psychoanalyst with the National Psychological Association for psychoanalysis and the head of the psychology department of the New York Criminal Court's Psychiatry Clinic, tells of some of the reasons people make obscene or nuisance calls:

"They fall into a category very similar to the exhibitionist. If they prove by terrorizing the woman that they can be taken seriously as a man, then they are reassured. Mostly what is behind it is a sense of inadequacy as a male, and so by talking dirty on the telephone or saying, 'look at me, boy, can I talk it up; can I be a man with words,' while preserving the safety of distance. If you do recognize they are sick people, it is enough merely to not satisfy the desire, to not answer, if the person begins to talk obscenely, to merely hang up—to not reward it by response, is the best way of combating it."

Dr. Hammer goes on to describe possible treatment for these people:

"The only treatment which society has devised which has any chance of working is psychological treatment. We find locking these people up does absolutely nothing. When they are released, the same needs are existent which drove them to the symptoms to begin with. They need the same solutions, and nothing within the person, has changed. He doesn't feel any more manly; in fact, being locked up, he is apt to feel less manly. It depends on the age of the person suffering the impulse to call people on the phone and talk in an obscene manner. It depends on how long it has been going on and his own motivation for treatment."

Dr. Hammer then tells of ways to handle unwanted calls. "Not answer, put the phone receiver into the drawer, and go back to sleep. What the guy does want is a response from a female to reassure him that he is impressive as a man, that he can elicit a response from a woman with words. The best response is really nothing. There seems to be a personalized relationship, at least in the mind of a caller. It may be a victim he has seen passing across the street many times or coming down the block—here I would change the number, and somehow if the person does get hold of the new number then I think it is something more serious, and I would inform the police."

In answer to the question "Is there an accurate way of finding out whether a telephone survey is on the level?", Dr. Hammer answers, "ask what concern he is calling for. Take down the name of the concern; say you will call him right back. Look up the concern in the telephone book, and then call back that number."

When asked what people in public positions should do when they bring down the ire of extremists and are called at all hours, Dr. Hammer replies, "I think to make the phone call as brief as possible, to have a private number, invite them to put it in a written form so that you can read it at your leisure. And that way you find you discourage a certain proportion of those who are merely trying to let off steam, and those who have something to say are more prone to sit down, think it through clearly, and sometimes to some constructive advantage."

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

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately preceding the passage of the bill H.R. 10497, I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] be permitted to extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR POLICE AND FIREMEN

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1719) to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide a five-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force and the White House Police force", approved August 15, 1950, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4–904), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) for purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply, unless the context requires otherwise:

"(1) 'Authorizing official' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the cases of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, and the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the White House Police force.

"(2) 'Administrative workweek' means a period of seven consecutive calendar days.

"(3) 'Basic workweek' means a forty-hour workweek, excluding rollcall time, in the case of officers and members of the police forces specified in this Act; a forty-hour workweek in the case of officers and members of the District of Columbia Fire Department other than those in the Firefighting Division; and an average workweek of forty-eight hours in the case of officers and members of the Firefighting Division of the District of Columbia Fire Department.

"(4) 'Basic workday' means an eight-hour day excluding rollcall time in the case of officers and members of the police forces specified in this Act; an eight-hour day in the case of officers and members of the District of Columbia Fire Department other than those in the Firefighting Division; and an average twelve-hour workday in the case of officers and members of the Firefighting Division.

"(5)(A) 'Off-duty days' means the nonwork days which, when combined with the basic workdays, make up the administrative workweek.

"(B) 'Off-duty time' means the time in any basic workday outside the regular tour of an officer or member's duty.

"(6) 'Rollcall time' means that time, not exceeding one-half each workday which is in addition to each basic workday of the basic workweek for reading of rolls and other preparation for the daily tour of duty.

"(7) 'Rate of basic compensation' means the rate of compensation fixed by law for the position held by an officer or member exclusive of any deductions or additional compensation of any kind.

"(8) 'Premium pay' means compensation not considered as salary for the purpose of computing deductions for life insurance or for computing annuity payments under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

"(9) 'Officer or member' means any employee in the Metropolitan Police force or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

"(10) 'Court duty' means attendance by an officer or member in his official capacity, excluding his appearance as a defendant, at court or at a quasi-judicial hearing.

"(11) 'Special event' or 'special assignment' means any planned activity or function which the authorizing official designates in advance as such.

"(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, is authorized and directed to establish a basic workweek of forty hours to be scheduled on five days for the respective police forces referred to in this Act: *Provided,* That rollcall time shall be without compensation or credit to the time of the basic workweek.

"(c) All officially ordered or approved hours of work (except rollcall time) performed by officers and members in excess of the basic workweek in any administrative workweek, shall be considered as overtime work and shall be compensated for as provided by this Act.

"(d)(1) Whenever the authorizing official designates in advance an activity or function as a special event, or special assignment, all overtime work in connection with such special event, or special assignment, shall be compensated for by payment, as follows:

"(i) For each officer or member who receives compensation at a rate provided for in class 1 through class 4, in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, the overtime work shall be compensated for by payment at one and one-half times the basic hourly rate of such officer or member and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(ii) For each officer or member who receives compensation at a rate provided for classes 5 and above, in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, the overtime work shall be compensated for by payment at the basic hourly rate of such officer or member's basic compensation (except as otherwise limited by subsection (h) (1) and (2) of this section) and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(2) An officer or member may elect to receive compensatory time off as provided in subsection (f) of this section in lieu of payment for overtime work as provided in this subsection.

"(e) Each officer or member who on any off-duty time performs court duty (excluding the first appearance in court on each case), or who performs work, as ordered or approved, on any off-duty day shall be compensated in accordance with subsection (d) of this section.

"(f) Overtime work, other than that for which compensation by payment or time off is provided by subsections (d) and (e) of this section, shall be compensated for by compensatory time off at a rate of one hour of compensatory time for each hour of overtime work performed. Such compensatory time off shall be granted in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) The authorizing official, or such person as he may designate to act in his place, may, at the request of any officer or member, grant such officer or member compensatory time off from his scheduled tour of duty in lieu of payment for an equal amount of time spent for overtime work, including the first appearance for court duty in each case, if to grant such leave would not unreasonably diminish the number of officers or members available to maintain law, order, and public safety.

"(2) Any officer or member who is eligible for compensatory time off and has made application for such compensatory time off, which application was denied, may within thirty days of such denial make application for compensatory pay at his basic hourly rate of compensation and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(3) Such compensatory time off shall be used within such period of time as the authorizing official shall prescribe. If such officer or member fails to take such compensatory time off within the prescribed period, he shall thereby waive all right to such compensatory time off, unless his failure to take such compensatory time off is due to an official denial of his request for such compensatory time off. Such overtime work shall be credited for purposes of compensation in multiples of one hour, rounded to the nearest hour in case of fractions thereof. Thirty minutes or more of any such hour shall be credited as one hour.

"(g)(1) Whenever any officer or member is authorized or directed to return to overtime duty at a time which is not an immediate continuation of his regular tour of duty, such officer or member shall receive credit for not less than two hours of overtime work for purposes of compensation under this Act.

"(2) Overtime work resulting from the immediate continuation of an officer's or member's regular tour of duty which, excluding rollcall time, is thirty minutes or more in excess of the basic workday shall be credited for purposes of compensation under subsection (f) of this section.

"(h)(1) No premium pay provided by this Act shall be paid to, and no compensatory time off is authorized for, any officer or member whose rate of basic compensation equals or exceeds the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for service step 1 in class 10 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

"(2) In the case of any officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is less than the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for service step 1 in class 10 of the Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, such premium pay may be paid only to the extent that such payment would not cause his aggregate rate of compensation to exceed such minimum scheduled rate with respect to any pay period.

"(3) Each authorizing official is authorized to promulgate such regulations and issue such orders as are necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this Act, and to delegate to a designated agent or agents any of the functions vested in the authorizing official by this Act."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (6) of section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Act entitled 'An Act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 498), as amended (sec. 4–404a, D.C. Code), is repealed.

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working holidays", approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 607), as amended (sec. 4–807, D.C. Code), is amended by striking the last two of the three provisos thereof, and by inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "*Provided further,* That, when an officer or member is authorized or directed to work on a holiday and such officer or member is required to work longer than his regular tour of duty he shall be compensated for such overtime in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of the first section of the Act approved August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4–904(e)).

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than thirty days after approval of this Act.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 1719 is to authorize compensation for overtime work in excess of the basic authorized workweek performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. This legislation implements one of the President's eight major emergency programs to fight crime in the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The major provisions of S. 1719 allow overtime compensation for members of the Metropolitan Police Department, the White House Police, the Park Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Overtime compensation is payable for all ordered or approved hours of work performed by officers or members of the various forces in excess of the basic workweek, which is stated at 40 hours for all except those in the Firefighting Division of the District of Columbia Fire Department, for whom the hasic workweek is 48 hours. The basic workday for all except those in the Firefighting Division of the Fire Department is 8 hours. For those in the Firefighting Division, the basic workday is 12 hours. Rollcall time is without compensation or credit to the time of the basic workweek.

For overtime worked in connection with first, special events and special assignments—when designated as such in advance by the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be—second, second appearances in court on a given case on off-duty time, or third, specifically ordered or approved overtime work performed on an off-duty day, a member of the force is to receive compensation at a rate 1½ times his basic hourly rate of compensation. Officers—class 5 of the Salary Act of 1958 and above—are to receive compensation in such circumstances at a rate equal to their basic hourly rate of compensation, which is known as straight time.

Overtime work not pursuant to a special event, special assignment, second appearance in court or ordered or approved for performance on an off-duty day is to be compensated by compensatory time off. Accordingly, overtime work performed by an officer or member of the force consisting of a first appearance in court, or an activity requiring him to extend his regular tour of duty on a duty day, would entitle that officer or member to 1 hour of time off for each hour of overtime worked.

Under the terms of the bill, however, the officer or member is not allowed an unbridled election to take time off, but must first clear his request for time off with his supervising officer, who may deny such request if to grant it would unnecessarily diminish the strength of the force.

If a request for compensatory time off is denied, the officer or member is then entitled to apply for compensation pay at straight time rates, but he must make such an application within 30 days of the denial of his request for time off. The initial request for time off must be made within such period as the Board of Commissioners or the Secretaries of Interior or Treasury shall prescribe.

Similarly, an officer or member entitled to pay and one-half for overtime worked may elect instead to take compensatory time off, but must do so on the same basis as other applicants for compensatory time off and at a rate of 1 hour off for each hour of overtime worked.

When an officer or member is authorized or directed to return to overtime duty at a time which is not an immediate continuation of his regular tour of duty, he is to be allowed at least 2 hours credit toward overtime. Overtime work performed as an extension of the regular tour, which, excluding rollcall time, is 30 minutes or more, shall be credited toward compensatory time off, unless such overtime work is performed in a second or subsequent appearance in court for which pay and one-half is allowed.

Finally, the Board of Commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act. Previous laws relating to holiday pay are coordinated with this act, and the act is to go into effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than 30 days after approval of this act.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time, the act of August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended—District of Columbia Code, sec. 4–904(f)—provides that officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, White House Police force, and U.S. Park Police force may be compensated at the basic daily rate for each day of duty performed by reason of the suspension and discontinuance of their days off for emergency purposes. A similar provision relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia appears in the act of June 19, 1948, 62 Stat. 498, as amended; District of Columbia Code, sec. 4–404(a). Also, the act of August 15, 1950, as amended—District of Columbia Code, sec. 4–904 (e)—provides that for each day a vacancy in a particular rank exists in the personnel strength of any of the police forces or of the Fire Department, an officer or member of such rank may voluntarily perform duty on his day off and be compensated at a rate equivalent to his daily rate.

However, these provisions do not cover the numerous special events and special assignments which require large details of officers and members of the various forces for crowd control. These special activities include parades, demonstrations, and traffic control at District of Columbia Stadium and other places of large public gatherings. During a typical year these details require approximately 140,000 man-hours of duty which, on each particular occasion, must be drawn first, from the strength of the patrol forces, thereby depleting them and weakening their effectiveness in crime deterrence, or second, from off-duty men, who are later unavailable for patrol duty when they are given compensatory time off. This drain of manpower from the normal patrol force would be relieved by using men working overtime for cash compensation to furnish manpower for these special events and special assignments.

An indication of the impact that special events have on the Metropolitan Police force is illustrated by the opening day baseball game on April 12, 1965, when details for traffic control and for movements of the President required a total of 370 privates and 65 uniformed officials and detectives; and by the demonstrations on April 17 against Vietnam policies when it was deemed necessary to require details of 551 privates and 54 uniformed officials and detectives.

During the fiscal year 1964, the U.S. Park Police engaged in approximately 18,000 hours of overtime work. Of this amount, about 40 percent resulted from six major details which include Cherry Blossom Festival, Independence Day Celebration, Pageant of Peace, President's Cup Regatta, Press Club Family Frolic, and Schoolboy Patrol Parade.

The remaining portion of overtime worked by the Park Police was incident to court duty and demonstrations that required adequate police supervision and control.

The officers and members of the District Fire Department, in fiscal year 1964 worked approximately 6,300 hours of extra duty on multiple alarms, emergency communication facility repairs, and special investigations. In addition, approximately 600 hours of work were performed in excess of regular tours of duty for fire inspections, security matters, and related department activities.

Statistical data regarding the overtime pay practices of other major cities disclose that the enactment of S. 1719 will bring the District into conformity with many of the other major cities that already compensate their law enforcement employees for duty in excess of the regular workweek. Of 20 municipalities having a population in excess of 500,000, all provide some form of compensation for overtime worked; and 11 of the 20 cities provide for monetary compensation at a straight time rate or at time and one-half.

The committee felt there were urgent and compelling reasons for adoption of a program of overtime compensation measured in terms of 1½ times basic compensation. First, such a program is not wholly without precedent but has been instituted recently in one of the most significant police systems in the country, the New York City Police Department. Second, and most important, is the longstanding disparity between objectives and attainments in the strength of the police force in the District of Columbia.

Since 1961 the District of Columbia has been striving to bring the force up to the authorized strength of 3,000 men. It is currently 109 men shy of full strength. An additional 100 positions have been appropriated for fiscal 1966. Nearly 240 men will retire or resign from the force in the next year. The Police Department will have to recruit a total of 449 members for the force within the coming year exclusive of any needs the tactical force may generate if continuation of that program is authorized in March. In the meantime crime rates are on the rise. Accordingly, your committee felt that every effort should be made to assist the chief in developing recruitment incentives, and views the enactment of S. 1719 as a concomitant part of strengthening the Police Department's personnel efforts.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter relating to S. 1719, highlighted the competitive disadvantage in recruitment facing the Police Department in an area where the vast majority of employees were eligible for and received compensation for overtime work at a rate 1½ times normal compensation. The Comptroller General remarked:

> One difference between the benefits provided by S. 1719 and those provided for Federal and District of Columbia employees by section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, approved June 30, 1945, chapter 212, 59 Stat. 296, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 911, is that overtime compensation at 1½ times the normal rate of pay is provided by that section, whereas S. 1719 provides for payments equal to the normal rate of pay. We believe that the committee should consider the fact that the practice of paying 1½ times normal compensation is a widely accepted practice both in the Government and outside, in connection with its consideration of the proposed legislation. Also, section (g) (2) of the proposed amendment provides for the grant of compensatory time but not for overtime compensation when overtime results from the continuation of an employee's tour of duty.

While the Chief of Police has indicated headway is being made by the recruitment programs for the Metropolitan Police Department currently underway, your committee felt every effort should be made to bring the force to full strength as soon as possible, and, accordingly, reports this bill with the heightened incentive of time and one-half for overtime in the hope and anticipation that by making police recruitment procedures more competitive with prevailing private and governmental employment practices, more qualified young men and women will be inclined to participate in one of the highest callings and become respected law enforcement officers.

The committee feels further that it would be inappropriate and unfortunate to continue to provide a smaller measure of overtime compensation to a man who risks his life daily for the public good, than is provided for a worker in the comfort and security of his office. Only by paying a police officer time and a half for overtime work can this disparity between police and nonpolice Government employees be avoided. Obviously, such a measure as the committee now recommends will be of inestimable value in heightening police efficiency and morale.

Finally, and most important, this measure is the second point of the President's eight-point emergency crime fighting package for the District of Columbia. The committee feels that by

broadening its benefits, this legislation will have a greater impact on the fight against crime.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Based on the figures for fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that the annual cost to the District government for overtime pay under the provisions of S. 1719 will be approximately $697,500 for the Metropolitan Police Department, and $43,500 for the District of Columbia Fire Department. The cost for the White House Police will be $39,000 and $105,000 for the Park Police. The total cost would amount to approximately $885,000 per annum, of which $741,000 would be the annual recurring cost to the District government.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to endorse to my colleagues in the House the bill S. 1719, which is designed to provide extra compensation for overtime duty performed by the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force.

My interest in this legislation, which in my opinion is urgently needed, is of long standing. In fact, I introduced H.R. 10697 on August 26 of this year, to accomplish this purpose. While my bill would have provided somewhat more liberal benefits to the members of these vital forces, which I would have preferred, as a matter of expediency I am happy to endorse the bill S. 1719 which will give a considerable measure of relief in this area.

Briefly, the major provisions of this proposed legislation are the following:

First. Overtime compensation for all ordered or approved hours of work performed by officers or members of the various forces in excess of their basic workweek.

Second. The basic workday is established at 8 hours, and the basic workweek at 40 hours, for all except those in the firefighting division of the Fire Department. In that division, the basic workday is 12 hours and the basic workweek is 48 hours.

Third. Rollcall time, which consumes approximately one-half hour per day, is not credited to the time of the basic workweek.

Fourth. For overtime worked in connection with, first, special events and special assignments; second, second or subsequent appearances in court on a given case on off-duty time; or third, specifically ordered or approved overtime work performed on an off-duty day, a member of one of these forces—class 1 through class 4 of the salary scale—shall receive compensation at the rate of 1½ times his basic hourly rate of compensation. Officers—class 5 and above in the salary scale—shall receive compensation at their basic hourly rate of compensation, which is known as straight time. The chief of any of the forces is not entitled to any overtime compensation of any kind.

Fifth. An officer or member entitled to such compensation for overtime work may elect instead to apply for compensatory time off, but at a rate of 1 hour off for each hour of overtime duty performed.

Sixth. Overtime duty other than in the three categories described above, such as a first appearance in court on a given case on off-duty time, or an activity requiring an extension of a regular tour of duty on a duty day, shall entitle an officer or member to apply for 1 hour of compensatory time off for each hour of such overtime duty performed.

Seventh. If compensatory time off, as described above, cannot be granted because such permission would undesirably diminish the strength of the force at the time in question, the officer or member will then be entitled to extra compensation at straight time rates.

Eighth. Whenever an officer or member is directed to return to overtime duty which is not a continuation of his regular tour of duty, he shall be allowed a minimum of 2 hours' credit toward overtime.

Present law provides only that officers and members of these police and fire forces may receive compensation at their basic hourly rate when emergency situations necessitate their being called to duty on their normal off-duty days, and that whenever a vacancy exists in the personnel strength of any of these forces, an officer or member may voluntarily perform duty in that capacity on his day off, and be compensated at his regular daily rate.

These provisions, however, are by no means adequate to compensate the officers and members for the great number of extra-duty hours they are required to perform, not only in emergency situations but upon such special occasions as parades, demonstrations, traffic control at large public gatherings, and so forth, which in a typical year require a total of some 140,000 man-hours of duty.

In many instances under present circumstances, these special events and assignments necessitate the draining of police manpower from the normal patrol force on duty at the time, thus weakening their effectiveness in the extremely vital work of crime deterrence. The appalling crime rate in the Nation's capital eloquently points up the seriousness of this problem, which will be relieved to a considerable degree by the use of men working overtime for salary compensation to supply the manpower needed in these situations.

I am informed that of the 20 U.S. cities of population in excess of 500,000, all provide some form of compensation for overtime duty on the part of their policemen and firemen; and 11 of these cities presently provide monetary compensation for such duty, either at straight time or at the rate of time and one-half.

With only a single exception, all the other jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area provide the officers and members of their police and fire forces compensation plans for overtime duty which are considerably more liberal than the meager and inadequate benefits afforded District of Columbia policemen and firemen under present law.

I am reliably informed that this present inequitable situation is causing a serious morale problem in the District of Columbia police and fire forces; and this problem is reflected in growing difficulties of recruitment and retention of personnel in these forces which are so essential to the life of the city.

For the past 4 years, the District of Columbia has striven unsuccessfully to build up the metropolitan police force to its authorized minimum strength of 3,000 men. At present, the force is more than 100 men short of this minimum strength, and it is anticipated that approximately 240 men will retire or resign from the force during the coming year. These facts, together with the appropriation of funds to add another 100 new men to the police force during the present fiscal year, mean that the metropolitan police department will be faced with the task of recruiting about 450 new men during the coming year.

In the face of these facts, and in view of the keen competition for high caliber recruits for the police departments in the entire metropolitan area and in all large cities, I feel that it is absolutely essential that the bill S. 1719, which will at least place the District of Columbia on an equitable footing with other municipalities from the standpoint of providing adequate overtime compensation for the members of these forces, is overdue and must be enacted without delay.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks with reference to S. 1719 immediately before the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASING PENSIONS FOR RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 21 and 22 of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers

in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, secs. 31–739a—31–739b), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. (a) Effective the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date not later than such effective date shall be increased by (1) the per centum rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum, determined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the basis of the annual average price index for calendar year 1962 and the price index for the month latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment, plus (2) 6½ per centum if the commencing date (or in the case of the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) occurred on or before October 1, 1956, or 1½ per centum if the commencing date (or in the case of the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) occurred after October 1, 1956. The month used in determining the increase based on the per centum rise in the price index under this subsection shall be the base month for determining the per centum change in the price index until the next succeeding increase occurs.

"(b) Each month after the first increase under this section, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall determine the per centum change in the price index. Effective the first day of the third month which begins after the price index shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum for three consecutive months over the price index for the base month, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date not later than such effective date shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index (calculated on the highest level of the price index during the three consecutive months) adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(c) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 9(b)(3)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(2) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 9(b)(3), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 9(b)(3) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section for employee annuities which commenced after October 1, 1956, and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 9(b)(3) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death.

"(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar, except that such installment shall after adjustment reflect an increase of at least $1.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'price index' shall mean the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The term 'base month' shall mean the month for which the price index showed a per centum rise forming the basis for a cost-of-living annuity increase."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–722), is amended by inserting immediately after "this Act" in the third sentence the following: ", and for payment of administrative expenses incurred by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in placing in effect each annuity adjustment granted under section 21 of this Act".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11439 may well be referred to as a housekeeping bill. It carries forward, as we have done many times in the past, an equitable treatment of schoolteachers in the District of Columbia insofar as their retirement annuities are concerned.

The sole purpose of the bill is to afford these teachers the same increase in annuities as were provided for all civil service retirees under Public Law 89–205, which we recently enacted. It has no other purpose.

The legislation is necessary, in my opinion. It will serve to meet a clear and convincing obligation of the Congress to deal equitably with our teacher force in Washington as we have done with others in the Government service nationally and in the District.

I urge immediate approval of the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11439 is to afford teachers of the District of Columbia public schools the same increase in annuities, based upon increases in the cost of living, which were provided for all civil service retirees in Public Law 89–205, enacted recently.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The major provisions of this proposed legislation are the following:

First. Change the definition of the term "price index" from the annual average of the Consumer Price Index over a calendar year to that published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Further, the bill defines the "base month" as the month used in determining that the price index warrants a cost-of-living adjustment.

Second. Fix the effective date of the adjustments provided as the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment. The bill preserves the cost-of-living adjustment principle established for District of Columbia teachers and for all civil service retirees in 1962, but which has never resulted in any increase in annuities, but amends the plan to gear it to a more sensitive monthly indicator in lieu of the existing unrealistic average calendar year indicator. The increases provided are made up of two components which are applicable to different categories of annuitants in varying total percentages as follows:

In the first component, all existing annuities which commenced on or before such effective date would be increased by the percentage rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent, computed on the annual average index for 1962 and the monthly price index most recently published on the date of enactment. This component will accelerate the cost-of-living adjustment and provide timely adjustment of annuities. It will give to all annuitants an increase of at least 3.7 percent, effective the third month which begins after enactment.

The second component grants additional increases effective with the first component, in percentages which depend upon the commencing date of annuity payments. All annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, including the survivor annuities deriving from retirement annuities which so commenced, will be increased by an added 6½ percent. All annuities which shall have commenced after October 1, 1956, and up until the effective date of the increases, will be increased by an added 1½ percent.

The total effect will give a combined increase of at least 10.2 percent to those whose annuities are based upon the law in existence on or before October 1, 1956, and not less than 5.2 percent to those whose annuities were computed under the liberalized formula made applicable after October 1, 1956, by the 1956 retirement amendments.

Third. The bill also establishes the month used in computing the first component of the increase as the base month for determining the percentage change in the price index until the next succeeding increase may occur. It requires the District of Columbia Commissioners to determine the percentage change each month after the date of enactment. Effective the first day of the third month beginning after the price index shows a rise of at least 3 percent for 3 consecutive months over the base month, an automatic increase will become payable. All annuities which commence on or before such effective date will be increased by the percentage rise in the price index. Such an increase will be computed on the highest percent of the 3 consecutive months, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent. The month forming the basis for such future increase will then become the new base month for determining the next cost-of-living adjustment.

Fourth. The bill retains the usual language precluding an increase on any additional portion of annuity that was purchased by a retiree by voluntary contributions.

Fifth. The customary requirement is retained that the monthly annuity, as increased, be adjusted to the nearest dollar. It provides, however, for reflecting an increase of at least $1 per month wherever an increase would not otherwise cause a small annuity to be adjusted to the next higher dollar.

Sixth. The Commissioners are authorized to use moneys to the credit of the retirement fund to cover the administrative cost they will incur in putting the increases provided in this bill into effect, and particularly those Consumer Price Index adjustments that may occur at indeterminate intervals in the future. The Commissioners would not be in a position to anticipate, for budgeting purposes, the frequency in which the proposed adjustments may occur during the course of any fiscal year.

Inasmuch as all the classified employees of the District government have been provided these same annuity benefits in Public Law 89–205, and since legislation for the teachers of the District of Columbia has always kept pace with that for civil service retirees, the provisions of this bill are now necessary to provide an equitable situation for these teachers.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Pension plans are long-term financial operations, and the basic purpose to be served is to enable an employee to enjoy freedom from want and a measure of economic security upon the expiration of active employment and throughout his declining years.

The unprecedented expansion of our economy is a serious problem to active workers, but a far greater one to elder citizens who are caught between the rising prices and fixed incomes. The impact upon these senior citizens, in many cases, is critical.

At a time when $3,000 yearly income is considered the borderline below which a married couple is deemed to be in the poverty class, a great many retired District of Columbia teachers and their survivors are receiving annuities of much less than that amount. It is a fact that medical costs, for example, have risen more than any other single item in the Consumer Price Index. Medical studies disclose that approximately one-third of persons 65 years of age or older are chronically ill, and that they have twice as many disabling illnesses of considerable duration as do persons under that ago. Moreover, the average disabling illness of the aged lasts twice as long as that of younger persons. During the past decade, the cost of medical services has increased more than 40 percent; doctors' fees more than 35 percent; hospital expenses more than 85 percent; hospital insurance rates in excess of 95 percent; and prescriptions and drugs over 10 percent.

As older people require more medical care, these cost items are particularly difficult for them to meet. They are confronted with reduced income, impaired health, depressed living standards, and in most cases with increased medical expenses as well.

H.R. 11439 provides fair, moderate, and direly needed adjustments designed to increase annuities for retired District of Columbia teachers where the greatest relief is needed—approximately 10.2 percent in those annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and 5.2 percent in those which commenced after that date. This difference in treatment is designed to close approximately one-half of the present lag in annuity improvements for those who retired prior to 1956 as compared to improvements benefiting those who retired after 1956. Teachers who retired on or before October 1, 1956, are approximately 10 percent behind those who retired after that date. H.R. 11439, while it will not completely close this gap, will provide a much more equitable relationship than presently exists between the two groups.

The automatic cost-of-living feature, contained in the 1962 amendments to the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act, has not operated effectively, as it had been expected to do. H.R. 11439 modifies this feature, in fairness to the annuitants, by providing that whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for a full calendar year above its average for 1962, a comparable percentage increase shall become effective on April 1 of the following year. It provides further for similar increases when a like increase in the Consumer Price Index occurs after any increase predicated upon this feature.

The rise in the Consumer Price Index over 1962, although averaging 2.6 in 1964, reached 3 percent in November 1964 and has steadily risen to 3.7 percent at present. However, under the existing formula, annuitants will receive no adjustment until April 1, 1966. To correct this obviously disappointing result, the bill proposes to accelerate the effective application of the cost-of-living principle to a more sensitive monthly price index indicator. The substantive policy will not be changed, but the revision will provide for reflecting any such increases more currently, or whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months after any previous increase resulting from this feature.

It is the opinion of our committee that the increases provided in H.R. 11439 will substantially benefit all retired District of Columbia teachers, and particularly those retirees and survivors facing the greatest need. Further, inasmuch as these same increases have recently been provided for all the District of Columbia government retirees and survivors who are under the civil service system, and since retired members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments enjoy an equalization feature which the teachers do not have, we feel that the Congress cannot, in good conscience, fail to provide the benefits of this bill to the teachers of the District of Columbia public school system without delay.

The committee is informed that the additional cost to the District of Columbia resulting from this legislation will be approximately $525,000 per year.

At present, we are advised, there are 1,612 retired teachers who would be affected by the provisions of this bill.

I am pleased indeed to have introduced this legislation for the benefit of the excellent and hard-working teachers in the District of Columbia public school system, and to recommend its enactment to my colleagues in the House.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill H.R. 11439.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

EXTEND PENALTY FOR ASSAULT ON POLICE OFFICERS TO ASSAULTS ON EMPLOYEES OF PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND PLACES OF CONFINEMENT OF JUVENILES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1715) to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia, and ask for its present consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 432 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 22–505) is amended by inserting after "District of Columbia" the following: ", or any officer or employee of any penal or correction institution of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia charged with the supervision of juveniles being confined pursuant to law in any facility of the District of Columbia, whether such institution or facility is located within the District of Columbia or elsewhere,".

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (S. 1715) is to amend existing law—District of Columbia Code, title 22, section 505—in order to make applicable the so-called assault on a police officer criminal statute and the penalty prescribed therein, to employees of District of Columbia penal and correctional institutions, and other persons responsible for the confinement of juveniles under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia.

Under District law at the present time, persons who, without excusable cause, assault, resist, oppose, impede, or interfere with any officer or member of any police force in the District of Columbia while engaged in the performance of his official duties, shall be fined $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. In instances where a dangerous weapon is used, the penalty is increased to a term of imprisonment of not more than 10 years.

Although police officers of the District of Columbia are included within the coverage of the above statute, District correctional officers, and persons charged with the supervision of detained juveniles, are not included. Consequently, whenever correctional officers are assaulted, without a weapon, by inmates of District of Columbia penal institutions at Lorton, Va., and Occoquan, Va., as well

as the District of Columbia jail, the only charge that can be brought against such inmates is simple assault, a misdemeanor, the maximum penalty for which is a prison sentence of not more than a year.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are of the view that assault on a correctional officer of the District should be a felony offense for the reason that such increased penalty could help to maintain more effective discipline in District penal and correctional institutions.

Moreover, extending such coverage to District correctional officers would conform to Federal law which at present provides that assault on Federal penal and correctional officers is a felony offense—18 U.S.C. 111–1114.

Also, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are of the view that an assault on an employee of the Department of Public Welfare charged with the supervision of juveniles under detention at the Children's Center, Laurel, Md., or the Receiving Home in the District of Columbia, should be raised to the level of a felony offense, as provided by the bill. A juvenile being brought within the jurisdiction of such charge would permit judges of the juvenile court, in appropriate cases, to waive jurisdiction over an offender so that he could be tried as an adult. The Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia—District of Columbia Code, title 11 section 1553—provides that if a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult, the judge may waive jurisdiction to the appropriate adult court. The Commissioners feel that this provision would be a desirable means of aiding in the maintenance of discipline at the Receiving Home and Children's Center and of empowering the juvenile court judges to take appropriate action where a felonious assault has occurred on supervisory personnel.

A public hearing on this bill was conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 on October 5, 1965. At this time, approval of the legislation was expressed on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare. No opposition to the measure was expressed.

This bill was approved by the Senate on August 25, 1965.

Following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under date of March 18, 1965, requesting this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, March 18, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith a bill to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles in the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill, as indicated in its title, is to extend the penalty contained in section 432 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (District of Columbia Code, sec. 22–505) to assaults on certain District of Columbia employees. This provision of law imposes a penalty of not more than 5 years imprisonment or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both, for assaults and related actions against any officer or member of any police force operating in the District of Columbia while engaged in his official duties. If a deadly weapon is used, the maximum prison term is 10 years.

The Commissioners believe that this statute should also cover employees of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections in their supervision of prisoners, and employees of the Department of Public Welfare in their supervision of juveniles confined to their custody pursuant to provisions of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

When, from time to time, correctional officers are assaulted by inmates of District of Columbia penal institutions at Lorton and Occoquan, Va., as well as the District of Columbia jail, the only charge that can be brought against such inmates is simple assault, a misdemeanor. However, in the case of Federal penal and correctional officers, such an assault is a felony under the United States Code (title 18, sections 111 and 1114). The Commissioners believe that assault on a correctional officer of the District of Columbia should also be a felony, not only to harmonize with the Federal statute but as a means of helping to maintain discipline in District penal and correctional institutions.

Similarly, the Commissioners believe that an assault on an employee of the Department of Public Welfare charged with the supervision of juveniles being detained at the Children's Center, Laurel, Md., or the Receiving Home in the District of Columbia should be a felony. This would permit judges of the juvenile court, in appropriate cases, to waive jurisdiction over a juvenile who has committed such an assault so that he could be tried as an adult. (Sec. 13 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia [District of Columbia Code, sec. 11–1553], provides that if a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult the judge may waive jurisdiction to the appropriate adult court.) The Commissioners believe that this provision would be desirable means of aiding in the maintenance of discipline at the Receiving Home and Children's Center and of empowering the juvenile court judges to take appropriate action where such an assault has occurred.

Therefore, the Commissioners strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

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

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the passage of S. 1715, and all other bills which I call up, all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1320) to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 848 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–403), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 848. Whoever maliciously injures or breaks or destroys, or attempts to injure or break or destroy, by fire or otherwise, any public or private property, whether real or personal, not his own, of the value of $200 or more, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or shall be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both, and if the value of the property be less than $200 shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property in the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–3112), is further amended by striking out "destroy, injure, disfigure, cut, chip, break," and inserting in lieu thereof "disfigure, cut, chip,".

SEC. 3. Section 812 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2101), is further amended by striking out "for ransom or reward", and inserting in lieu thereof "for ransom or reward or otherwise, except, in the case of a minor, by a parent thereof,".

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, assignation, and prostitution; to declare the same to be nuisances; to enjoin the person or persons who conduct or maintain the same and the owner or agent of any building used for such purpose; and to assess a tax against the person maintaining such nuisance and against the building and owner thereof," approved February 7, 1914, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2721), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. In any prosecution for violation of this Act or so much of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the police court of the District of Columbia in certain cases', approved July 16, 1912 (37 Stat. 192; D.C. Code, sec. 22–2722), as relates to the keeping of a bawdy or disorderly house, the court, upon application of the United States attorney made after such attorney has given notice thereof to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, may order any witness to testify or to produce evidence, or both. Upon such order of the court, such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any act, transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he has been ordered to testify or to produce evidence after having claimed the privilege against self-incrimination, nor shall testi-

mony or other evidence ordered to be given or produced under the provisions of this section be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed in connection with giving testimony or producing evidence under order of the court as provided in this section."

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 46 of the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2–137), is further amended by striking out "by said United States District Attorney when instituted on behalf of the Commission, and" and by striking out "when instituted on behalf of the Commissioners of said District or by the major and superintendent of police of said District".

SEC. 6. The fourth sentence of section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia", approved February 9, 1907, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2–407), is amended by striking out "United States Attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

SEC. 7. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia", approved May 28, 1924 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–502), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel."

SEC. 8. Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 17, 1923 (D.C. Code, sec. 2–909), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel.".

SEC. 9. (a) Sections 425 to 428, inclusive, of the Act entitled "An Act to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, relating to the District of Columbia, in force on the first day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three", approved June 22, 1874 (D.C. Code, secs. 4–168—171, inclusive), are hereby repealed.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall by regulation require that bonds in the amount of not more than $25,000 shall be furnished and kept in force by all persons licensed as private detectives in the District of Columbia. Bonds required by this section shall be corporate bonds and shall run to the District and shall be conditioned upon the observance by the licensed private detective and any agent, employee, or person acting in behalf of the licensed private detective of all laws and regulations in force in the District of Columbia applicable to the conduct of persons licensed as private detectives. Such bonds shall be for the benefit of any person who may suffer damages as a result of violation of any law or regulation by or on the part of any licensed private detective or any agent, employee, or person acting on the behalf of any private detective. In addition to any right to any other legal action, any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation by a licensed private detective may bring suit against the surety on a bond required by this section either alone or jointly with the principal thereon and recover damages for such violation of law or regulation in an amount not to exceed the penal amount of the bond.

SEC. 10. The last sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the conservation and settlement of estates of absentees and absconders in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 8, 1935, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 20–701), is amended by striking out "The United States attorney in and for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

SEC. 11. Sections 5 through 8, inclusive, and section 10 shall take effect thirty days from the approval of this Act, but shall not in any case apply to proceedings instituted prior to the approval of this Act. Section 9 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first full license year for licensing of private detectives and detective agencies prescribed by section 7 of the Act approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622, ch. 1352), as amended (sec. 47–2301, et seq., D.C. Code), which begins at least ninety days after approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 14, immediately after the period insert the following:

"The provisions of the second, third, and fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820, sec. 1–244(b), D.C. Code), shall be applicable to each bond authorized by this section as if it were the bond authorized by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b): *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of S. 1320 are first, to strengthen certain laws of the District of Columbia; second, to broaden the immunity statute of the District of Columbia so that it will conform with other Federal statutes; third, to provide for certain technical and procedural changes in matters essentially local in nature; and fourth, to permit the substitution of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia as the moving party rather than the U.S. attorney in prosecutions involving violations of various acts relating to licensing and regulation of certain professions.

This bill is a continuation of the committee's efforts to clarify and improve the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia.

Sections 1 and 2 of this bill are designed to deal with the problem of vandalism by bringing the District statutes, dealing with the injury or destruction of property, up to date and make them more effective. In brief, the first section of the bill amends existing law (sec. 22–403, D.C. Code) relating to the crime of malicious injury or destruction of property by broadening it to cover real as well as personal property. This section increases from $50 to $200 the line of demarcation between misdemeanors and felony offenses. It also revises the penalties established for felony offenses involving malicious destruction of property by eliminating the mandatory minimum and maximum sentences of not less than 1 nor more than 10 years' imprisonment and substituting a term of imprisonment of not more than 10 years or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both. In addition the section increases the maximum fine for misdemeanors from the present $200 to a maximum of $1,000 and provides that imprisonment may be imposed along with a fine up to a maximum of 1 year.

As a complement to the change provided in the criminal code by section 1 of the bill, section 2 of the bill removes language from the disfigurement of property statute of the District of Columbia Code—section 22–3112—so as to make that statute relate specifically to offenses involving disfigurement of real property, and not operate as a general statute for the prosecution of offenses involving the willful destruction of real and personal property.

The third section of the bill broadens the existing kidnaping statute which now makes it unlawful only to hold a person for ransom or reward. This bill would make the statute applicable to those kidnapings in which the motive is lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or some other motive not involving ransom or reward. In addition, this section would make the statute inapplicable to cases involving the taking of a minor child by one of the parents of such child. The committee has been informed that these proposed changes in existing District of Columbia law will bring its statute into closer conformity with the Federal statute on kidnaping.

The bill also will broaden the immunity privilege now granted to witnesses in civil cases relating to the abatement of disorderly house nuisances. It would authorize the granting of similar immunity in criminal prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses. Under this bill, the courts could, upon application, compel a witness to testify in a criminal prosecution, notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment. Witnesses who have been granted this immunity would remain subject to prosecution for perjury to contempt of court in connection with their testimony, but they could not be criminally prosecuted for any substantive offenses included in such testimony. This section will materially aid the prosecution of criminal charges for keeping bawdy or disorderly houses.

Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 amend four acts regulating the practice of professions or occupations by substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for the U.S. attorney to prosecute criminal violations of certain of such acts and as the attorney to institute certain civil actions authorized by the Healing Arts Practice Act and the Registered Nurses Act of February 9, 1907, as amended. The committee is of the view that it is more appropriate for an official of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, rather than a Federal official, to perform these functions. For the same reason, section 10 transfers from the U.S. attorney to the Corporation Counsel the right to be a party to court proceedings seeking to subject the property of an absconder to the support of the absconder's wife and minor children, and to pay debts proved against him.

The amendment made by section 9 is designed to restate in existing law a requirement that private detectives be bonded. Such a provision existed in District law for many years and has been held to have been repealed by implication in 1932—47 Stat. 559, ch. 366. It is the view of your committee that the public should be entitled to some indemnification against damages resulting from improper activities on the part of private detectives. In accordance with a recommendation by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, your committee added new language to section 9(b), to provide that the bond requirements for private detectives will conform with the presently existing requirements for bonding of automobile dealers and of persons engaged in the business of home improvement in the District. This language assures, however, that no liability in excess of the total amount of such bond, or of the amount remaining therein after any prior recovery, shall impose upon the surety of any such bond as a result of the provision cited above.

A public hearing was conducted on October 5, 1965, by Subcommittee No. 4. Approval was expressed on the part of the Department of Justice, the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. No opposition was expressed from any source.

A similar bill (S. 468) was approved by the Senate in the 88th Congress. The subject bill was passed by that body on August 20, 1965.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Destruction of property: This section would amend section 848 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1327, ch. 854), as amended by the act approved August 12, 1937 (50 Stat. 629, ch. 599) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–403), by—

First. Removing the language which restricts the application of the section to property which is movable.

Second. Broadening the section to cover the malicious destruction of any property whether personal or real.

Third. Increasing the value line of demarcation between misdemeanors and felonies from $50 to $200.

Fourth. Increasing the maximum fine for misdemeanors from $200 to $1,000 and changing the penalty for felonies from the present mandatory minimum of 1 year and maximum of 10 years to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both.

The effects of the change would be to simplify prosecutions for malicious destruction of property and, by the change in penalties, to provide a more effective deterrent.

Section 2. Disfigurement of property: This section would amend section 1 of the act approved July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 322, ch. 320), as amended by the act approved July 8, 1898 (30 Stat. 723, ch. 638), and by the act approved April 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 126, ch. 1647) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–3112), by—

First. Striking out the language which permits a defendant who has willfully or wantonly destroyed, broken, or injured property to be prosecuted under this section which relates principally to disfiguring of property and which subjects the offender to relatively minor punishment.

Second. Conforming the coverage of the section to the expanded coverage of section 1 of this act.

Section 3. Kidnaping: This section would amend section 812 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1322, ch. 854), as amended by the act approved February 18, 1933 (47 Stat. 858, ch. 103) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2102), by—

First. Conforming the existing local law relating to kidnaping, to the Federal statute applicable in all other Federal jurisdictions.

Second. Excepting parents, as regards their minor children, from the coverage of the statute.

Third. Broadening the local kidnaping statute which now makes punishable only a holding for ransom or reward to include instances where no ransom or reward is demanded but where the motive may be lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or any other nonmonetary motivation.

Section 4. Immunity: This section would amend section 9 of the act approved February 7, 1914 (38 Stat. 282, ch. 16), as amended by section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2721), by—

First. Broadening the coverage of the section, now applicable only to civil actions relating to the abatement of the nuisances of disorderly houses to include criminal prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses.

Second. Granting authority to the courts upon application of the prosecutor to compel a witness to testify in a criminal prosecution for keeping a disorderly house notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment.

Third. Granting witnesses immunity from prosecution on the matters on which testimony was compelled, after a claim of privilege against self-incrimination.

Fourth. Subjecting such witnesses to whom immunity is granted to the ordinary possibilities of prosecution for perjury or contempt of court committed in connection with their testimony.

Fifth. Harmonizing this local immunity statute to comparable Federal law.

Section 5. Healing arts practices: This section would amend section 46 of the act approved February 29, 1929 (45 Stat. 1340 ch. 352), as amended by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–137), by—

First. Substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for the U.S. attorney as the party who shall conduct certain proceedings relating principally to the suspension or revocation of doctors' licenses; this follows naturally from a recent change effected by the District Commissioners in the composition of the District Commission on Licensure by which the Corporation Counsel was substituted for the U.S. attorney.

Section 6. Registered nurses: This section would amend section 6 of the act approved February 9, 1907 (34 Stat. 888, ch. 913), as amended by the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1521, ch. 540), and the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804), and the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 991, ch. 646), and the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 107, ch. 139) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–407), by—

First. Substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, for the U.S. attorney as the party who shall conduct certain proceedings relating principally to the suspension or revocation of nurses' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7. Optometry: This section would amend section 2 of the act of May 28, 1924 (43 Stat, 177, ch, 202) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–502), by—

First. Designating the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia specifically as the prosecutor for misdemeanor violations of provisions concerning optometrists' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 8. Accountancy: This section would amend section 9 of the act approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1263, ch. 94) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–909), by—

First. Designating the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia specifically as the prosecutor for violations of provisions concerning accountants' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 9. Private detectives: Subsection (a) of this section would repeal sections 425 and 428, inclusive, of the act approved June 22, 1874 (R.S.D.C., secs. 425–428), as amended by the act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 107, ch. 180) (D.C. Code, secs. 4–168 to 4–171, inclusive), relating to the appointment and bonding of private detectives. This amendment would not change existing law. The sections expressly repealed by the amendment have been given no effect since 1932 when they were repealed by implication and superseded by the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 559, ch. 366) (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2341).

Subsection (b) of this section will require that all private detectives and detective agencies licensed by the District of Columbia must furnish bonds for the protection of the public. Such bonds would be in the amount of not more than $25,000, as the Commissioners might, from time to time, establish by regulation. It is provided further that these bond requirements for private detectives shall conform with those existing in present law for automobile dealers and for persons engaged in the business of home improvement. However, this conformance cannot be construed to impose upon the surety of such bond a liability in excess of its total amount, or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery.

Section 10. Estates of absentees and absconders: This section would amend section 1 of the act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 111, ch. 46), as amended by the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804), and the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 991, ch. 646), and the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 107, ch. 139) (D.C. Code 20–701). This amendment would

have the effect of transferring what is essentially a local government function to the local government through its attorney, the Corporation Counsel. Under existing laws it is the District of Columbia, not the United States, to which estates normally escheat and by which support payments are made. The amendment would grant specifically to the District of Columbia the right to be made a party in every proceeding where one seeks to place in receivership property of absentees or absconders who—

A. Have left the District without making provision for the support of their dependents, and

B. Whose assets are treated under certain circumstances as if the absentee had died intestate.

Section 11. Effective date: Sections 5 through 8, inclusive, and section 10 shall take effect 30 days from the approval of this act, but shall not apply to proceedings instituted prior to the approval of this act.

Section 9 shall take effect on the first day of the first full license year for licensing of private detectives and detective agencies prescribed by section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902.

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

WATERFRONT PRIORITY HOLDERS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11428) to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11428

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the first sentence of section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District", approved September 8, 1960 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–723), is amended by striking out "by reason of the enactment of the joint resolution approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983; Public Law 85–821),".

(2) The second sentence of section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "by reason of the operation of such joint resolution approved August 28, 1958,".

(3) The last sentence in section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that if after the end of such one-hundred-and-eighty-day period the Agency shall change the terms under which real property is to be leased, or the redevelopment plan for the area described in the first section of this Act is changed so as to affect the economic value of the leasehold, the Agency shall in writing notify each such owner of the change or changes so made and give to such owner so notified a period of sixty days within which to advise the Agency in writing of his intention and to demonstrate his ability to proceed as aforesaid."

(4) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever, pursuant to subsection (b), the Agency offers leaseholds to persons entitled to a priority of opportunity to lease under the provisions of this section, the rent per square foot prescribed in such lease shall not be greater than 6 per centum of the residual value of the land for the prescribed use to which any owner of a displaced business concern shall put such land under such lease; and the residual value of such land (1) shall make due allowance for the cost to the owner of the displaced business of all improvements and public charges on such land, and (2) shall not exceed the maximum fair use value economically feasible to permit him to reestablish his business."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "the rent" and insert in lieu thereof "the annual rent".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 11428, is to amend the act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 871), relating to the Washington Channel waterfront, by providing supplementary directives to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia for the relocation of displaced businesses in conformity with the urban renewal development plans for the waterfront portion of area C, urban renewal project in Southwest Washington.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

The Washington Channel waterfront of the Potomac River, title to which area was in the United States, was included within the boundaries of the project area C of the urban renewal redevelopment plan for Southwest Washington. This area, owned by the Federal Government, had, for a long period of years, been under the jurisdiction and control of the government of the District of Columbia. In 1913, on part of the waterfront area, the District of Columbia erected a fish market building and leased the market stalls to the fish dealers and to restaurant operators.

As a part of the redevelopment program for Southwest Washington, the Southwest Freeway was to run through the project area, and one of the approaches to the freeway was to pass over Maine Avenue at 11th and 12th Streets and part of the supporting structures would have to be located on the land occupied by the market building.

ACTION IN 55TH CONGRESS

To facilitate this redevelopment, legislation was introduced and passed in the 85th Congress—House Journal Resolution 630, 72 Stat. 983—to authorize the use of the land and the removal of the market facilities. At your committee hearings on this legislation, the representatives of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Redevelopment Land Agency presented testimony as to the need for the legislation. At the same hearings, the owners of small businesses which had occupied the market building, in some instances for more than a generation, testified concerning the effect of the legislation upon their businesses. These lessees of the market building proposed amendments to the pending legislation which would have provided for their relocation and continuation in business on the Washington Channel waterfront. The suggested amendments would have required the government of the District of Columbia to build facilities for lease solely to those displaced by the freeway construction or the urban renewal plan. In view of the testimony and a commitment by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced, your committee did not approve the proposed amendments and observed, in its report accompanying House Joint Resolution 630 (H. Rept. No. 2525, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) as follows:

The committee was convinced from testimony given to the subcommittee by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia that a sincere desire existed to take every possible step to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced by this legislation.

The committee feels that this objective can be best obtained if a spirit of cooperation is manifested between the Redevelopment Land Agency, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the tenants who might be involved.

The committee urges all concerned to deal in the spirit of cooperation. If the committee feels that this is not being done it will take the matter up subsequently for consideration and possible legislation.

Following the enactment of this legislation in 1958, the construction of the approaches to the Southwest Freeway began and the Redevelopment Land Agency thereafter undertook the demolition and removal of the facilities in the project area.

In order to exercise full authority over the Washington Channel waterfront and to redevelop it according to the urban renewal plan, it was necessary for the Redevelopment Land Agency to secure authority transferring title to the waterfront area from the Federal Government to the Agency before it could legally proceed with redevelopment.

ACTION IN 86TH CONGRESS

Accordingly, legislation was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting for the U.S. Government, to transfer and donate to the Redevelopment Land Agency all right, title, and interest to so much of the area as was necessary to carry out the urban renewal plan. Such legislation—S. 3648; 74 Stat. 871—was first passed by the other body and came on to your committee for further action.

During hearings on the above bill, testimony was again received from the District of Columbia officials, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the owners of displaced businesses in the waterfront area. Witnesses testifying before your committee indicated clearly that essentially nothing had been accomplished since the enactment of House Joint

Resolution 630 in 1958, for the permanent relocation of the businesses displaced from the waterfront area and only one had been provided with a temporary location. The Redevelopment Land Agency advised your committee that negotiations were in process with some businesses. These businesses were identified as the Flagship Restaurant and Hogate's Restaurant.

Since no relocation was in prospect for the waterfront displacees pursuant to the statements of the Redevelopment Land Agency, your committee amended the terms of S. 3648 to provide that displacees from the waterfront area would be given a priority of relocation with the understanding that the priority would likewise extend to the Flagship Restaurant and to Hogate's Restaurant.

That bill, S. 3648, as amended and enacted, provided that displaced businesses would receive priority of opportunity to lease land either individually or as a development company solely owned by the owner or owners of one or more of such business concerns. The displaced businesses were to be entitled to facilities at least substantially equal to the facilities from which they were displaced and to be in conformity with the urban renewal plan for the area. The Redevelopment Land Agency was to notify each of the displaced business concerns of an opportunity to lease a parcel of land within the waterfront area. Each business was to be allowed 180 days within which to indicate its intent to relocate in the area and to demonstrate its capability to establish facilities in accordance with the development plan.

The purpose of directing the Agency to provide such priorities was to make effective the previous pledges of the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the acceptance of those pledges by the Congress, that those businesses displaced from the area would have a reasonable and first opportunity to reestablish their businesses. The priority right was provided solely for the benefit of displacees who were ready, willing, and able to reestablish their business, and such right was not to be available for transfer, sale, or disposition otherwise in full or in part to other persons.

WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

Development of urban renewal plans for the Washington Channel waterfront dates from the original commitment in 1954 of the waterfront area to the Webb & Knapp Co., which later completely defaulted in its performance. After several attempts, a plan for the waterfront was approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Commissioners. The execution of the plan then become the obligation of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Early in the 88th Congress your committee held hearings on the waterfront plan. Testimony taken by the committee at that time created substantial doubts as to the feasibility and desirability of the plan. Owners of displaced businesses presented specific criticisms although none of them, at that time, had been informed concerning the probable nature of any leases which might be offered to them.

About 1 year later, in February 1964, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency issued notice to business displacees having priority for relocation. This notice advised the holders of priorities that they would have a period of 180 days within which to indicate their purpose to exercise their priority and to demonstrate their capacity to reestablish their businesses and construct facilities in accordance with the waterfront redevelopment plan. Priority holders were also notified concerning the terms of leases and other performances to be required of them by the Agency.

On examining the terms of the leases offered, the priority holders found themselves presented with an economic impossibility. The leaseholds offered to displacees were essentially "air rights." They were required to construct parking facilities underneath the business area, and such parking facilities were to be available to the public.

Thus, individual businesses, while providing parking space, could not reserve such space, limited as it was, for its own customers. The building, which must conform to the waterfront plan, had to be financed and built by the owner and was to be occupied for a limited period of years, at the end of which time the property right in the building rested with the Redevelopment Land Agency. The nature of the use of any structure was strictly limited to the purposes of the displaced business. Substantial setbacks from the boundaries of each parcel were required. The height of the building was limited to two floors.

The land values established by the Agency, as a basis for determining the lease rental rates to priority holders, was set by the Agency at a level far exceeding that set for most other parcels in the Southwest urban renewal project area. When this land cost was added to other charges placed on a priority holder, it appeared conclusive that no displaced business, regardless of its financial strength, could hope to operate at a profit.

After a record on these matters had been established with the Agency, the Agency reduced the land costs to the displacees by approximately 10 percent. This action proved to be a gesture since most, if not all, the displacees found the Agency's proposal economically impossible, regardless of the financial abilities of the displaced businesses.

During the 180-day period beginning in February 1964, displacees who were interested in relocation on the waterfront so notified the Agency. Thereafter, conferences and discussions between priority holders and the Agency were held. At the expiration of the 180-day period, no lease contracts had been executed, and, in fact, the priority holders had not been offered any specific parcels for relocation.

Thereafter, your committee held additional hearings in connection with the waterfront relocation problem, the latest of which were in March, April, and May of this year. At these subsequent hearings, further testimony was received from displaced businesses. Your committee also took the testimony of banking officials and private appraisers with relation to the valuations placed upon the waterfront land and the economic feasibility of financing a structure under the terms of leases proposed by the Agency.

The banking representatives advised the committee that such a lease as proposed by the Agency was wholly unsuitable as a basis on which to grant financing to displacees for the construction and equipment of the necessary buildings.

Testimony by expert appraisers indicated that the land prices established by RLA were probably at least double any reasonable appraisal under the limitations imposed as to land coverage, parking requirements, floor area, and usage.

The Redevelopment Land Agency, in the face of expert testimony showing that the terms of the lease were economically impossible, initiated a review of the land appraisals for possible further adjustment. Such appraisal was completed in May 1965, but the priority holders have received no further word from the Agency indicating the possibility of further negotiations.

Since the 180-day period provided by statute had run out and no contracts had been completed, some question appeared as to whether priority rights might be extinguished or otherwise lost in the event the Agency were to make a change in the waterfront plans or a change in the land price or conditions of lease. To avoid such possibility and to further supplement the already abundantly expressed intent of Congress as to the relocation of displaced waterfront businesses, your committee recommends approval of this legislation.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

Briefly, the bill provides for equal priority rights to all businesses displaced from the waterfront area, some of which were inadvertently not included in Public Law 86–736. Those previously not entitled to notice are to receive notice of an opportunity to exercise a priority right for reestablishment of their businesses.

Your committee considers that no priority right of any displacee who has, pursuant to notice, indicated his desire to reestablish his business has been extinguished.

Further, in the event of any change in the waterfront plan or in the land price or other matters which affect the economic values of a lease, each priority holder must be notified and given at least 60 days within which to exercise his priority rights.

In view of the problems which have been described heretofore, your committee is impelled to deal, at least generally, with the matter of setting for displaced businesses some criteria to be followed by the RLA in the appraisal of parcels of land made available for relocation. Because of the numerous requirements and limitations placed upon the use of the land and upon the waterfront priority holder, this becomes essential.

Accordingly, in section 4 of the bill, the Agency is directed to use specific procedures for the establishment of land values in the waterfront area, and it must take into account the limitations and make proper allowances for improvements and any public charges placed upon the land which must be assumed by the priority holder. Further, it is provided that any valuation placed upon the land shall not exceed the maximum fair use value which is economically feasible and which will permit the reestablishment of the business. These elements are essentially those used by competent appraisers. The principles are found in standard appraisal reference publications under the heading of residual appraisals—Real Estate Appraisal and Investment, Kahn, Case, and Schimmel, page 146; McMichaels Appraising Manual, 4th edition, 11th printing, page 4223.

Your committee also observes that residual appraisals have been used elsewhere by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency in its disposition of urban renewal lands. It is felt that such appraisal methods, if not the only suitable methods, are certainly one of the best and fully justifiable in connection with relocation of small businesses on land on the Washington Channel waterfront.

The bill specifies an annual lease rental at the rate of 6 percent of the residual value of the land. Your committee is aware of instances where the lease rate was less than the rate of 6 percent of the fair value and is unaware of any instance where the rate has been in excess of 6 percent. If such rate is adequate for purposes of the Agency elsewhere in the District of Columbia, then it should be an equally suitable rate in the waterfront channel area. Since the parcels of land are to be leased to waterfront displacees and must be developed according to the waterfront plan with the usage controlled by the Agency pursuant to such plan, your committee believes that the lease rates proposed and the appraisal methods called for are fair and just to the public interest and the displaced business concerns.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] who will call up a revenue bill.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill—H.R. 11487—to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1965".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

SEC. 101. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 331; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION AND RATES OF TAX.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"Two and one-half per centum on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Five per centum on the taxable income in excess of $10,000."

SEC. 102. The amendment made by section 101 of this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

SEC. 103. Effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1961, section 4 of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1551c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(aa) Notwithstanding subsection (m), any distribution in liquidation of a regulated public utility (as defined in section 7701(a)(33)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) which, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, is treated as in part or full payment in exchange for the stock in such utility, shall, if for purposes of this article the stock is a capital asset, be treated as in part or full payment in exchange for the stock."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX

SEC. 201. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1901), as amended, is amended by striking "6" and inserting in lieu thereof "7".

SEC. 202. The amendment made by section 201 of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

TITLE III—ABATEMENT OF TAXES

SEC. 301. The Commissioners are authorized to abate the unpaid portion of the assessment of any tax, or any liability in respect thereof, other than taxes on real property, if the Commissioners determine under uniform rules prescribed by them that the administration and collection costs involved would not warrant collection of the amount due.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Subsection (a) of section 402 of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 110; D.C. Code, sec. 7–133((a)) is amended by striking "$50,250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof $85,250,000".

SEC. 402. As used in this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, the word "Commissioners" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or its designated agent.

SEC. 403. Any word or term used in any title of this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, shall have the same meaning as that applicable to such word or term in the Act to which such title applies.

SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 405. The Commissioners are authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 406. The Commissioners are authorized to enter into such agreements with the States of Maryland and Virginia and with political subdivisions of such States as may be necessary to develop a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region for the purpose of complying with the requirements of section 134 of title 23, United States Code, except that no such agreement shall require the District of Columbia to pay more than its pro rata share of the costs of such planning process. In developing such transportation planning process the Commissioners shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. For the purpose of this section, the term "National Capital region" shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 103 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 537; D.C. Code, sec. 1–1401).

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 11487 are as follows:

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

First. To increase the District of Columbia income tax revenues.

Second. To increase the District of Columbia tax on motor vehicle fuels from 6 to 7 cents per gallon.

Third. To increase the borrowing authority of the District for highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000, an increase of $35 million.

Fourth. To authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax when, in their judgment, the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of collection.

Fifth. To authorize the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to participate with Maryland and Virginia authorities in comprehensive planning for transportation facilities for the National Capital region.

NEED FOR INCREASED REVENUES

The revenue increases provided in H.R. 11487 were requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In making their request, the Commissioners stated that increased expenditures will be necessary in many fields if the District is to maintain the level of services and the facilities needed if the city is to fulfill its function as the Nation's Capital.

It is estimated, for example, that by 1971 some 167,000 children will be enrolled in the public school system, which is an increase of 18 percent over the present enrollment of 142,000. Thus, in addition to eliminating part-time sessions and providing suitable physical facilities in the years ahead, it will be necessary to provide a considerable number of new teaching positions in the years ahead so as to maintain approved pupil-teacher ratios throughout the system.

The operating costs per year of public education in the District rose $28.6 million over the period 1959–65. Aside from general actions on personnel which accounted for $15.9 million of this increase, two other major factors led to higher costs for education. The first of these was the necessity to provide 1,035 additional teachers to educate 29,000 more pupils in 1965 than in 1959. The second was the city's effort, supported by the Congress, to achieve a relationship of pupils to teachers in regular classes of 30 to 1 in elementary schools and 25 to 1 in secondary schools. It is apparent that an additional increment in these costs for purposes of improving education will be needed for the years ahead.

Your committee is of the opinion that the District of Columbia school administration's efforts in the matter of school operating costs have been highly effective, in keeping the Nation's Capital abreast of other cities of comparable size in this very vital respect, as is indicated in the following chart:

Current (operating) expenditures per pupil in average daily membership in school years 1956–57 and 1962–63, in public school systems of U.S. cities whose populations in the 1960 census were between 500,000 and 1,000,000; and relative rank of District of Columbia in each

City	1956–57	1962–63	Increase
District of Columbia	(No. 6) $328	(No. 2) $459	(No. 1) $131
Baltimore	281	409	128
Cleveland	311	388	77
Houston	228	326	98
San Francisco	410	516	106
New Orleans	242	269	27
Boston	326	407	81
St. Louis	332	411	79
Milwaukee	321	386	65
Cincinnati	320	[1] 401	81
Pittsburgh	358	403	45
Buffalo	364	447	83
Dallas	324	313	89
Seattle	[2]	445	
San Diego	307	430	123
San Antonio	205	[3] 270	65

[1] Expenditure is for school year 1961–62.
[2] Not available.
[3] Based on average daily membership for school year 1961–62.
Sources: "Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Public School Systems," by U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Selected Statistics of Local School Systems, 1962–63," by Research Division, National Education Association.

The Commissioners also pointed out that the District must go forward with necessary health and welfare programs, and that matching funds will be essential in order that the District may utilize many such programs as approved by Congress. The need for these extensive health and welfare services arises in large part from age and income characteristics of its citizens, just as does the need for expenditures for educational facilities and services. Your committee was advised that the major rise in costs of public health in the District since 1959 was due to increased costs of patient care. The care of District mental patients and the indigent sick, for example, account for a $6.6 million increase in the public health budget during the past 6 fiscal years. We are told that in District of Columbia General Hospital, the cost per patient-day rose from $24.04 in 1959 to $45 this year because of increased staffing, higher salaries, and increased costs of medical supplies and other materials. Because of this continued sharply rising cost of care per patient-day, a further increase of $2 million is projected for the care of indigent sick at contract and Freedmen's hospitals over the period from 1966 to 1971. In addition, it has been necessary to increase the public health budget by $1.7 million since 1959 to accommodate the increase in workload and to improve services in all phases of this activity.

Your committee is informed that the District of Columbia projects its financial plans ahead for 6 years. It is of interest, therefore, to note that the District of Columbia general fund operating budget is $100.3 million higher in 1965 than it was in 1959, and the general fund capital outlay budget was $10.5 million greater in 1965 than in 1959.

Of the $100.3 million increase in the operating budget during this 6-year period, $56.6 million can be attributed to general personnel legislation such as pay raises and step increases. Without counting a single additional employee, your committee is told, payroll costs rose by $38.4 million as a result of salary increases. Within-grade promotions raised personnel costs by $7.7 million, and the extension of greater employee health benefits and other costs further increased the budget by $2 million. The cost of funding retirement systems for policemen, firemen, and teachers rose $8.5 million. The District of Columbia Commissioners state that they have supported these actions in the interest of attracting and maintaining high-caliber personnel in District government service.

The District of Columbia Commissioners are of the opinion that the future portends a continuation of this trend of the past. By 1971, therefore, they predict that District government expenditures will be about $70 million higher than the estimate for fiscal 1966.

The following are two charts, the first of which shows the number of authorized positions in the District of Columbia government for each fiscal year from 1954 through 1965 and also the total gross payroll for each fiscal year. Also shown are the numerical and percent increases in each of these figures during this period of 11 years.

The second chart indicates the total percent increase in salaries for the several types of personnel in the District of Columbia, for the same period of time.

These figures reveal an increase of 47.5 percent in the number of authorized positions, and an increase of 132.5 percent in the total gross payroll, over this period, with the greatest percent salary increase being 53.1 percent to teachers.

District of Columbia government employment statistics, fiscal years 1954–65

Fiscal year	Number of authorized permanent positions	Total gross payroll
1954	19,818	$82,575,105
1955	20,686	89,673,840
1956	21,181	97,094,671
1957	21,995	102,558,852
1958	23,127	[1] 116,688,138
1959	23,794	[1] 124,672,939
1960	24,479	[1] 134,610,294
1961	25,363	143,611,577
1962	26,229	149,014,318
1963	27,253	156,985,278
1964	28,430	168,581,746
1965	29,242	[2] 192,000,000
Numerical increase	9,424	109,424,895
Percent increase	47.5	132.5

[1] Calendar year figures.
[2] Estimated.

Salary increases authorized by Congress for District of Columbia government personnel since 1954

Type of personnel	Percent increase
Classified personnel	38.8
Police and firemen	49.3
Teachers and school officers	53.1
Wage board personnel	43.3

Source: District of Columbia Personnel Office; District of Columbia Budget Office.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have advised your committee that the increase of $35 million in the borrowing authority for highway construction purposes provided in title IV of this bill, and the estimated annual increase of $2 million in revenues to the highway fund which would result from the increase of 1 cent per gallon in the gasoline tax provided in title II, are essential to meet the immediate financial requirements of the District's program of highway construction and maintenance. Further, they advise that after fiscal year 1968, even these sources of increased funds will cease to be adequate.

The following letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under date of February 3, 1965, requesting these provisions of the bill, and the ensuing exhibit submitted to your committee from the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, present this situation in detail.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 3, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to increase the loan authorization for the construction of District of Columbia highways and to increase the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax. This draft proposes that the motor vehicle fuel tax be increased by 1 cent per gallon and that the existing ceiling on the loan authority for highway construction be increased by $35 million for the purpose of providing the revenues necessary to continue the urgently needed highway construction program in the District of Columbia.

The increasing volumes of traffic and the resulting congestion in the city are critical,

and require continued large-scale construction. A major factor in the solution to this problem is the proposed Interstate Highway System in the District of Columbia. The system has been planned on the assumption that the complete areawide transit system proposed in the November 1962 Report of the National Capital Transportation Agency will likewise be constructed and utilized to the full extent predicted by the National Capital Transportation Agency. Both systems are urgently needed.

The review of the District's proposed Interstate System cost estimates this past summer, as required by section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, indicate that the entire cost of the program will be in excess of $600 million, rather than the $500 million in prior estimates. Right-of-way costs are rising. Certain additions have been made, such as a 40-percent extension in the length of the center leg tunnel under the Mall. Construction costs have been rising at the average rate of 3 percent per year, and certain sections of the system were estimated in initial studies on the basis of 1960 costs.

The District of Columbia costs for the proposed Interstate System, financed from the highway fund, will be approximately $60 million. Additional expenditures from the highway fund will also be needed to complete the supporting and connecting thoroughfare work necessary to make the Interstate System effective. In addition, local streets and facilities need to be constructed and rebuilt.

The estimated total cost during the next 6 years of constructing, maintaining, and operating the road system in the District, including related activities such as motor vehicle administration and payment of debt, is $528 million. This requires local funds totaling $182 million, of which an estimated $36 million are required for the proposed interstate program. Capital improvements on the continuing primary and secondary Federal-aid system (the so-called A–B–C program), participated in on a 50–50 basis, will require approximately $22 million of the District of Columbia highway funds during the same period. Also included is a capital improvement program for local streets not on the Federal systems, totaling $22 million during the 6-year period.

It is estimated that $68 million in addition to funds now anticipated from present sources will be required during the next 6 years for these programs, as shown in the 6-year financial plan attached. Existing legislation falls $4.7 million short of providing the funds necessary to continue these programs in fiscal 1966. In order to meet the immediate financial requirements for carrying out these programs, the Commissioners recommend that there be an increase in the existing loan authority from the present ceiling of $50.25 million to $85.25 million. At the same time, the Commissioners recommend an increase in the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax from the present 6 cents to 7 cents per gallon, which would increase the annual revenues of the highway fund by an estimated $2 million annually. The proposed fuel tax increase would make the District of Columbia tax equal to the motor vehicle fuel taxes presently in effect in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland.

With this additional revenue from the fuel tax, the highway fund will be able to meet current operations and debt service, as well as a portion of the capital improvement program. The major portion of the local funds needed for capital outlays, however, would come from the proposed loan. After fiscal 1968, the increased current revenues and loan authorization would again cease to be adequate. Current plans and estimates indicate a deficit of approximately $4.9 million in fiscal 1969, of $8.6 million in fiscal 1970, of $7.7 million in fiscal 1971, and of about $6.5 million subsequent to 1971.

The Commissioners recognize their responsibility to propose measures to the Congress to deal with these anticipated deficits. In their opinion, however, these longer term solutions can be more appropriately adopted at a later date in order that new taxes or other proposals be most appropriate in the context of the conditions that may then exist. Appropriate solutions, taking into account the capacity of the District to support additional taxes or additional borrowing, can be developed to bridge the gap between needs and resources as the critical time approaches. By way of example, an increase in motor vehicle registration fees and a further increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax can perhaps be considered. This, as well as other possibilities, will be carefully examined by the Commissioners with a view to presenting recommendations to the Congress in ample time to meet anticipated highway fund revenue needs for fiscal year 1969 and later. The solution proposed will necessarily consist of additional tax revenues as well as a balanced borrowing program to assist in financing capital costs.

Meanwhile, the Commissioners strongly urge enactment of the legislation submitted with this letter, since the early provision of adequate new revenues is essential to continuing these programs.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Department of Highways and Traffic—Projection of revenues and charges reflecting proposed increases in gasoline tax and loan authority, 1966 through 1971, highway fund, May 18, 1965

[In thousands of dollars]

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	6-year total
Revenues and balances:							
Balances:							
Unappropriated surplus	1,228	114					1,342
Lapsed balances, prior year appropriations	270	150	150	150	150	150	1,020
Total balances	1,498	264	150	150	150	150	2,362
Revenues:							
Gasoline tax (6 cents per gallon)	13,600	13,700	13,800	13,900	14,000	14,200	83,200
Registration and weight tax	2,600	2,600	2,700	2,700	2,800	2,900	16,300
Motor vehicle fees	970	980	980	1,055	1,055	1,100	6,140
Miscellaneous	467	470	470	545	545	550	3,047
Federal-aid reimbursements (E projects)	1,298						1,298
Total revenues	18,935	17,750	17,950	18,200	18,400	18,750	109,985
Federal loan (present authority)	3,912						3,912
Total available funds	24,345	18,014	18,100	18,350	18,550	18,900	116,259
Estimated funds required:							
Operating expenses:							
Department of Highways and Traffic	6,841	7,100	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,750	43,891
Metropolitan Police	3,576	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	21,576
Department of Motor Vehicles	1,965	2,000	2,000	2,150	2,150	2,150	12,415
Miscellaneous expenses	608	500	500	500	500	500	3,108
Total operating expenses	12,990	13,200	13,300	13,650	13,850	14,000	80,990
Capital outlay:							
Major improvements projects	9,390	13,850	13,707	8,715	6,773	5,860	58,295
Street improvements and extensions	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	22,200
Total, capital outlay	13,090	17,550	17,407	12,415	10,473	9,560	80,495
Repayment of loan and interest (present authority)	2,151	2,623	2,932	2,932	2,922	2,932	16,502
Total funds required	28,231	33,373	33,639	28,997	27,255	26,492	177,987
Deficit (present authority)	(3,886)	(15,359)	(15,539)	(10,647)	(8,705)	(7,592)	(61,728)
Additional loan repayment			118	905	1,709	2,060	4,792
Adjusted deficit	(3,886)	(15,359)	(15,657)	(11,552)	(10,414)	(9,652)	(66,520)
Additional gasoline tax (1 cent per gallon)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Additional loan authority	2,000	13,359	13,657	5,984			35,000
Additional funds proposed, total	4,000	15,359	15,657	7,984	2,000	2,000	47,000
Surplus/deficit	114			(3,568)	(8,414)	(7,652)	(19,520)

In presenting legislation to accomplish needed revenue increases in the District of Columbia, your committee has striven to select taxes which may be increased with the least detrimental effect upon the long-range economic well-being of the District and its taxpayers. It is our studied opinion that these are the personal income tax and the present levy upon motor vehicle fuel. Although the increases in these taxes here proposed will result in a heavier tax burden on District of Columbia residents, these higher taxes will be generally in line with similar tax burdens imposed by surrounding jurisdictions.

These increases, together with $7 million available from the presently authorized Federal contribution of $50 million—of which only $43 million has been appropriated this year—will provide a cushion to absorb any further immediate expenditure needs the District government may be able to justify before the Committee on Appropriations. Also, the District thus far has used only $128.7 million of the $175 million borrowing authority authorized by the Congress for public works construction purposes.

In the course of hearings on the bill, your committee received detailed testimony in support of and in opposition to

title IV, which provides increased borrowing authority for the highway fund. The approval of this title by your committee is made because of the importance attached to the measure by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the President. No attempt is made to determine the relative merits of the differing views expressed during committee hearings. Rather, your committee considers this bill as a revenue measure and not an authorization for any specific project included in estimates for capital outlay.

The action by your committee is premised on the expectation that those officials and agencies which bear the responsibility for the planning and construction of highways in the District of Columbia will consider most carefully the many elements presented during the committee hearings. No presumption is to be drawn that the approval of the borrowing authority means that it must be used, or that present authority or limitations applying to the planning and construction of highways is changed in any way. In the event any additional legislative authority may be required, beyond that provided in the District of Columbia Code, for the execution of meritorious projects, your committee expects that proposals requesting such authority be transmitted to the Congress for consideration.

Your committee again confirms its support of a balanced transportation system for the Nation's Capital. It is likewise recognized that determination of the element of "balance" between the diverse interests—within the city of Washington—calls for the highest good faith, forthrightness, and cooperation between the various officials and agencies charged with such responsibility and duty in the Nation's Capital and to its citizens.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Following the completion of hearings on this bill, your committee was advised that the Board of Commissioners had approved a resolution calling for participation by the District of Columbia in a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region. Although, for several years, the District of Columbia has cooperated with officials of State and local government jurisdictions of the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland on matters related to transportation planning, Congress had given no legislative authorization to the Board of Commissioners to engage in or secure appropriations for the activities called for in the resolution.

Because of the stated need for participation by the District of Columbia in such planning processes to comply with the provisions—section 134 of title 23, United States Code—relating to interstate planning on Federal-aid highway projects, section 406 was added by your committee to the reported legislation. This section approves the action previously taken by the Board of Commissioners and authorizes appropriations to the District government for its pro rata share of the costs of such transportation planning process. This is to avoid any question as to the eligibility of the District of Columbia for Federal highway aid.

Under the agreement between the District of Columbia and the surrounding jurisdictions, a Transportation Planning Board is established. The voting membership of this Board, established prior to the approval of the resolution by the Commissioners, is composed of the three area highway directors, three elected officials from suburban Maryland, three elected officials from suburban Virginia, three representatives selected by the District Commissioners, and one representative of the Federal Government appointed by the President. Nonvoting members represent the Bureau of Public Roads, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

Since the Congress will not have had any opportunity to review either the adequacy and balance of the representation for the Federal and District interest on the Transportation Planning Board or to review the agenda of the Board established in advance of the District becoming a party to the agreement, it is the intent of the committee that the authorization provided in section 406 shall not be construed as approval of any plans which may be developed by the Planning Board or as any limitation on or repeal of provisions of previous enactments by Congress for comprehensive transportation planning in the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, and the Highway Extension Act of 1893, as amended.

COMMUNITY DISLOCATIONS

The committee strongly urges that maximum effort be made to minimize the hardship of families displaced by highway construction. The Central Relocation Service must redouble their efforts to help displaced families. District officials must encourage the development of housing units for lower and middle income families. Full authority must be exercised to alleviate the current crisis situation that exists with respect to housing in the District.

The location and design of future highways must minimize the impact on homes and residential communities whenever feasible. Imagination and innovation must be the watchwords of the highway planners. Maximum use of tunneling and utilization of airspace above highways for playgrounds and schools should be encouraged if feasible.

A poorly planned freeway can be a terribly disruptive factor in a local community. Use of existing rights-of-way, locations of routes beside and over railroad tracks and along natural boundaries, such as rivers must be given first priority by highway planners. Construction of freeways or highways in industrial or commercial areas, particularly those past their economic prime, should be actively considered as an alternative to locations in residential areas.

Full consideration must be given to alternative routes which would minimize the impact of construction on residential communities. Federal officials are urged to cooperative fully with District officials and, to the extent possible, make federally owned land available if it is not in use.

Finally, in view of these deep concerns of your committee and other related issues which bulked large in committee hearings, there are indications of a real need for restudy and reevaluation of the highway program of the District of Columbia. Your committee has found that projections for highway needs for 1965 developed in the Mass Transportation Study of 1959 substantially exceeded actual traffic counts. Similarly, the projections of the National Capital Transportation Agency surpasses actual experience.

Analysis of traffic counts of crossing to and from the District of Columbia in recent years shows a declining ratio between population growth and daily trips. The forecasts and projections presented by highway officials cannot be reconciled reasonably with other information available to your committee. The projections and forecasts of future needs made by highway officials show trends contrary to actual experience and do not seem to justify some of the proposed program. Accordingly, a careful, objective review and reappraisal is desirable.

Such restudy should result in a highway system abundantly adequate for the needs of the Capital City and at the same time preserve as much as possible of the original character and beauty of the city with a minimum of inconvenience and dislocation to its citizens and its businesses.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

TITLE I

The effect of section 101 of title I is to increase District of Columbia income taxes. While the present rates of taxation are retained, the minimum levels of taxable income at which these several present rates apply have been reduced, as follows:

	Present	Proposed in H.R. 7066
2.5 percent on first	$5,000	$2,000
3 percent on next	5,000	2,000
3.5 percent on next	5,000	2,000
4 percent on next	5,000	2,000
4.5 percent on next	5,000	2,000
5 percent on all in excess of	25,000	10,000

While this legislation will bring the level of income taxes in the District of Columbia in general more nearly equal to the levies in Maryland and Virginia, they still will remain slightly lower in most instances, as the following table, submitted by the Finance Office of the District of Columbia Department of General Administration, will indicate.

Income taxes for a family of 4 owning a residence and a car in the Washington metropolitan area, at various levels of income

Income	District of Columbia		Maryland	Virginia
	Present	Proposed		
$5,000	$38	$38	$39	$47
$7,500	94	102	114	112
$10,000	155	180	189	225
$15,000	310	400	339	475

The District of Columbia Commissioners estimate that this new schedule of income tax would yield approximately $4 million of additional revenue annually. However, inasmuch as this provision would not become effective until January 1, 1966, it is estimated that the increased revenue would amount to only about $1 million in fiscal year 1966. These revenues are paid into the general fund of the District of Columbia, from which most appropriations are made.

Section 102 makes the income tax increases provided in section 101 effective beginning January 1, 1966.

Section 103 provides an amendment to the income tax laws of the District of Columbia. The need for the amendment arises under the following circumstances.

Under existing law, there is a disparity of treatment between the District of Columbia taxing statutes and the Internal Revenue Code on capital gains. Because of the peculiar wording of the word "dividend" in the District of Columbia statutes, transactions which are capital in nature have been classified and taxed as dividends. In many instances, shareholders of companies are required to conduct business affairs in a manner to suit the convenience of the purchaser in that they are unable to sell their stock interest directly but are forced to liquidate the company and sell the assets instead. Under the Internal Revenue Code, the tax treatment of each transaction is identical, that is, it is a capital gain. Under the District of Columbia statutes, the sale of stock is a capital transaction, while the sale of assets and the resulting distribution of the proceeds to the shareholders is a dividend.

In the case of a regulated public utility, the stock of the utility is not as valuable as the underlying assets. Because of the complexities of licensing, permits, and franchises by various State regulatory bodies and the Interstate Commerce Commission, the purchasers of such businesses generally insist on acquiring the assets rather than the stock. The proposed amendment is intended to put the stockholders in such instances in the same position taxwise as if they had sold their stock, which is the treatment accorded them by the Internal Revenue Code.

TITLE II

Title II provides for an increase in the District of Columbia gasoline tax, from 6 to 7 cents per gallon. This will put the District of Columbia tax on gasoline at the same rate as in Maryland and Virginia, and will produce an estimated increase of approximately $2 million per year, which would go into the highway fund. This increase is to become effective as of the first day of the first month which begins more than 30 days after the approval of this act.

TITLE III

Title III authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax or assessment when they have determined under prescribed uniform rules that the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of administration and collection. Your committee is advised that the District actually has been following this practice for some years as a practical matter. Thus, the only effect of this provision of the bill would be to require uniform rules for determination of these cases of abatement, and to lend the color of legal authority to a procedure which has long been utilized as a matter of commonsense.

The following letter from District of Columbia Commissioner John B. Duncan under date of May 25, 1965, and the accompanying exhibit from the District of Columbia Finance Office, present this situation in detail.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, May 25, 1965.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: This is in response to your request of May 12, 1965, for an explanation and justification of title III of H.R. 7066, 89th Congress, authorizing the Commissioners to abate the unpaid portions of any tax, or any liability in respect thereto, other than taxes on real property, where administration and collection costs would not warrant collection of the amount due.

This title is patterned after section 6404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and requires the Commissioners to establish uniform rules for the abatement of tax balances. It would permit the Commissioners to prescribe tolerances for processing tax returns so as to avoid preparation of numerous tax bills and the maintenance of accounts receivable records for minor amounts of tax which cost more to collect than the tax liability involved.

The Internal Revenue Service and several States, including New York and Maryland, provide explicitly in their income tax returns and instructions that an amount due of less than $1 need not be remitted, and that an overpayment in like amount will not be refunded unless the return is accompanied by an application requesting it.

Section 12.11(c) of the District's income and franchise tax regulations provides: "If the final return shows an overpayment of less than $2 it will be refunded only upon application to the assessor." There is no similar basis, however, for advising a taxpayer that he is not required to remit a balance due, no matter how small, because at the present time there is no legal authority to abate small tax balances.

Many taxpayers send coins or stamps for trivial amounts, the processing of which is more expensive than the tax involved. Also, it is required that bills be rendered for any small balances not paid with returns. Failure to pay after billing then results in followup notices and collection procedures. If uncollected after the 3-year period of limitations has expired the items are included in "writeoff" lists which require approval by the Commissioners, based upon a positive showing of the reasons for uncollectibility.

In answer to your request for a tabulation showing what taxes were assessed and unpaid in various categories over the past 6 years, I am attaching a statement summarizing the writeoff lists approved by the Commissioners during this period. The items contained in the lists reflect all accounts which had been billed and generally subjected to every available collection procedure, including levy and distraint, and the filing of a lien, but which nevertheless proved uncollectible. These lists are regularly reviewed and audited by both our own Internal Audit Office and by the General Accounting Office.

The authority requested in title III of H.R. 7066 is not intended to deal with this entire category of accounts, but rather to avoid the assessment in the first instance of small amounts which would not warrant the expense of billing and collection.

A tabulation of the 1963 District of Columbia individual income tax returns disclosed that 2,567 returns had amounts due under $2 aggregating $1,958.03 (an average of 76 cents each). It is estimated that with the authority in title III, using a tolerance of $2, the annual amount of taxes abated would be less than $3,000 for individual income taxes and $1,000 for all other taxes.

It is of interest to note that there were 15,397 individual income taxpayers who overpaid taxes in the amount of $14,706.37, an average of less than $1, which was not refunded because refunds were not requested by such taxpayers.

You are correct in your assumption that unpaid taxes on real property are collected by taxes sales of said properties and that this is the reason for excluding real property taxes from the abatement section.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. DUNCAN,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Department of General Administration, Finance Office—Summary of approved writeoff lists of uncollectible District of Columbia taxes, fiscal years 1960–65, inclusive [1]

Type of tax	Fiscal year 1961		Fiscal year 1962		Fiscal year 1963		Fiscal year 1964		Fiscal year 1965	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Personal property	11,482	$516,066	3,347	$104,025	895	$26,173	1,495	$64,545	1,072	$41,435
Inheritance			54	6,635	3	173	14	27,261		
Corporation franchise	158	57,954	36	31,583	18	6,424	22	22,287	29	64,208
Unincorporated franchise	42	8,925	44	30,830	30	57,714	34	26,205	16	16,338
Individual income	5,968	281,705	4,921	107,469	5,963	109,251	6,859	177,501	7,135	181,919
Employer's withholding			150	6,907	85	6,603	166	6,030	230	10,905
Sales and use	775	45,649	356	31,140	185	24,044	386	18,260	329	20,601
Total	18,425	910,299	8,908	318,589	7,179	230,382	8,976	342,089	8,811	335,406

[1] In fiscal year 1960, no accounts were written off.

TITLE IV

Title IV is devoted to general provisions, as follows:

Section 401 amends section 402 of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954—68 Stat. 110; District of Columbia Code, section 7–133(a)—by increasing the authorized limit on borrowing for the purpose of highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000. This limit has remained unchanged since the authority was first established in 1954. The basic act provides that any loan from this source must first be specifically requested

of the Congress in connection with the District of Columbia budget submitted for that fiscal year, with a full statement of the work contemplated to be done and the need for such work, which must then be approved by the Congress. It is further stipulated in the basic act that these loans, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be repayable from the District of Columbia highway fund, over a period of 30 years.

Section 402 defines the word "Commissioners" for the purpose of this act in its usual context.

Section 403 states that any word used in any title of this act shall have the same meaning as that applicable to such word in the act to which that particular title applies, unless the context requires otherwise.

Section 404 is the saving clause.

Section 405 authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Section 406 authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the States of Virginia and Maryland, and with certain political subdivisions of these States, for the purpose of developing a comprehensive and continuing process of planning for transportation for the National Capital region. It is further stipulated that no such agreement shall require the District of Columbia to pay more than its pro rata share of the costs of such planning process.

Finally, it is provided that in developing such transportation planning process the Commissioners shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia for highway construction by $35 million. But its total impact on the District highway program is far greater than that. The committee, while approving this additional borrowing authority, has made its approval contingent on certain reforms of the highway program and its impact on the people and neighborhoods of the District.

While I support this bill because it is good business to do so, indeed it is the only thing to do under the circumstances only after the committee has put on record its conviction that future highway construction in the District must be planned to minimize community dislocation and to meet actual transportation needs. My support of future highway projects, and I believe the support of many Members of the House, will be contingent on the implementation of the committee's intentions with respect to disruption of residential areas and destruction of family dwellings.

I call to the attention of the House the following statement from pages 9 and 10 of the committee report:

COMMUNITY DISLOCATIONS

The committee strongly urges that maximum effort be made to minimize the hardship of families displaced by highway construction. The Central Relocation Service must redouble their efforts to help displaced families. District officials must encourage the development of housing units for lower and middle income families. Full authority must be exercised to alleviate the current crisis situation that exists with respect to housing in the District.

The location and design of future highways must minimize the impact on homes and residential communities wherever feasible. Imagination and innovation must be the watchwords of the highway planners. Maximum use of tunneling and utilization of airspace above highways for playgrounds and schools should be encouraged if feasible.

A poorly planned freeway can be a terribly disruptive factor in a local community. Use of existing rights-of-way, locations of routes beside and over railroad tracks and along natural boundaries, such as rivers must be given first priority by highway planners. Construction of freeways or highways in industrial or commercial areas, particularly those past their economic prime, should be actively considered as an alternative to locations in residential areas.

Full consideration must be given to alternative routes which would minimize the impact of construction on residential communities. Federal officials are urged to cooperate fully with District officials and, to the extent possible, make federally owned land available if it is not in use.

Finally, in view of these deep concerns of your committee and other related issues which bulked large in committee hearings, there are indications of a real need for restudy and reevaluation of the highway program of the District of Columbia. Your committee has found that projections for highway needs for 1965 developed in the mass transportation study of 1959 substantially exceeded actual traffic counts. Similarly, the projections of the National Capital Transportation Agency surpasses actual experience.

Analysis of traffic counts of crossing to and from the District of Columbia in recent years shows a declining ratio between population growth and daily trips. The forecasts and projections presented by highway officials cannot be reconciled reasonably with other information available to your committee. The projections and forecasts of future needs made by highway officials show trends contrary to actual experience and do not seem to justify some of the proposed program. Accordingly, a careful, objective review and reappraisal is desirable.

Such restudy should result in a highway system abundantly adequate for the needs of the Capital City and at the same time preserve as much as possible of the original character and beauty of the city with a minimum of inconvenience and dislocation to its citizens and its businesses.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to support fully that part of H.R. 11487 which contains the 1-cent motor fuel tax increase for the District of Columbia and the authorization for an additional $35 million borrowing authority in order that our Nation's Capital may be able to build its segments of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. My colleagues will recall that this Congress launched the building of this great nationwide freeway system in 1956 and the 41,000 miles of the new network are scheduled to be built by 1972. As all of you are aware from seeing the building of the Interstate System back in your home districts, the system is about half completed throughout the country. However, there are few, if any, large cities in America that are as far behind schedule in building the interstate freeways as is Washington.

There are 29 miles of interstate routes designated for the District of Columbia, and only 8 miles have been opened to traffic in Washington. Most of these 8 miles are east of the Anacostia River so that they hardly serve the majority of the residents, commuters, tourists, buslines and trucking services.

For comparison, the city of Chicago has built 52 miles of interstate freeways within its city limits. In fact, that includes most of Chicago's Interstate System, and that city is planning many more expressways in addition to the interstate routes. The job has been done in Chicago, a city that already had every type of rail rapid transit except a monorail. Chicago, of course, had the problem of relocating the people who formerly lived in the path of these expressways. One method that they used was to build many new high-rise public housing apartments setting in wide lawns and gardens alongside the Dan Ryan Expressway throughout the length of the South Side. Thus, new housing was provided at the same time the freeway was built.

I mention this because most of the people fighting freeways in Washington have seized the relocation problem as a method of trying to turn the public against these modern facilities that are so badly needed. Usually the positions of opponents of any issue are much more vociferous than the testimony of proponents with the result that a layman here in Washington normally only hears from the groups fighting our long-planned freeways. Those who favor freeways and other public projects normally sit at home quietly confident that their representatives will move ahead in the best interest of the community, while the opponents swarm into the hearing rooms and voice dissents far out of proportion to their actual numbers. Fortunately, commonsense generally prevails and we continue to improve our cities despite these vocal outpourings. Much of this opposition has been organized by an attorney for the antihighway lobby. The articulate minority which has been fighting the badly needed highway improvements and bridges in Washington are not likely to convince this House that modern highways are appropriate for every other city in America except our Nation's Capital.

For example, recently four of Washington's leading business organizations went on record publicly, strongly in favor of completing the highway system and supporting the 1-cent gasoline tax increase and the $35 million borrowing authority. These groups are Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, the Federal City Council, Washington Real Estate Board, and the National Capital Downtown Committee. Jointly these groups represent the economy of the Washington region and the sound men who lead these groups know that Washington's future prosperity is dependent upon completing the freeway system. They know, for example, that if free-

ways are not provided to relieve traffic conditions in Washington that the $400 million tourist business may decline. All future tourists will be freeway oriented and Washington surely will want to be in line with the rest of the Nation. Each of these groups strongly supported the badly needed subway for the District of Columbia, but they and we know that, as helpful as the subway will be, it does not in any way reduce the necessity for the freeways. All of the cities that currently have rail rapid transit are further ahead with their freeway programs than is Washington.

Therefore, let us pass H.R. 11487 so that Washington may have a balanced transportation system.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 360]

Andrews, George W.	Fulton, Pa.	Mize
Andrews, Glenn	Gilligan	Moeller
Ashbrook	Goodell	Morgan
Aspinall	Griffiths	Morrison
Bandstra	Hagan, Ga.	Nix
Baring	Hagen, Calif.	O'Brien
Bates	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Battin	Hanley	Olson, Minn.
Bingham	Hardy	O'Neill, Mass.
Bonner	Harsha	Pepper
Brock	Harvey, Ind.	Philbin
Buchanan	Hébert	Pickle
Cahill	Hicks	Pool
Cameron	Holifield	Reinecke
Carter	Holland	Resnick
Casey	Hosmer	Rivers, S.C.
Celler	Howard	Roberts
Clancy	Irwin	Rogers, Colo.
Clawson, Del	Jennings	Roncalio
Clevenger	Keith	St Germain
Cramer	Kelly	Saylor
Culver	Keogh	Slack
Curtis	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Dague	Landrum	Staggers
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Stephens
Delaney	Lindsay	Sullivan
Dickinson	Lipscomb	Taylor
Diggs	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Dingell	Love	Thomas
Donohue	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Dulski	McVicker	Toll
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald	Tuck
Fino	Marsh	Waggonner
Foley	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
	Matthews	Wright
	Miller	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "AND OPTOMETRY" and insert "OPTOMETRY, AND PODIATRY".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "AND OPTOMETRY" and insert "OPTOMETRY, AND PODIATRY".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "and optometry" and insert: "optometry, and podiatry".

Page 2, line 24, strike out "or optometry" and insert: "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 3, line 23, after "applicable." insert "The Surgeon General is authorized to waive (in whole or in part) the provisions of this subsection if he determines, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric, and Podiatric Education, that the required increase in first-year enrollment of full-time students in a school cannot, because of limitations of physical facilities available to the school for training, be accomplished without lowering the quality of training for such students."

Page 4, line 15, strike out "or doctor" and insert "doctor".

Page 4, line 16, after "degree" insert ", or doctor of podiatry or an equivalent degree".

Page 4, line 22, strike out "or optometry" and insert: "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 5, line 5, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric".

Page 5, line 24, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 6, line 24, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric".

Page 7, line 9, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 8, line 10, strike out "and optometrists" and insert "optometrists, and podiatrists."

Page 8, line 12, strike out "and optometric" and insert "optometric, and podiatric."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric."

Page 8, line 22, strike out "and optometric" and insert "optometric, and podiatric."

Page 9, line 21, strike out "or Optometry" and insert "Optometry, Podiatry, or Pharmacy."

Page 10, line 1, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, poditary, or pharmacy."

Page 12, line 12, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric and Podiatric."

Page 15, line 3, after "dentistry," insert "optometry,"

Page 15, line 5, strike out "authority" and insert "authority, in accordance with regulations provided by the Secretary,"

Page 15, line 6, strike out "physicians" and insert "physicians, optometrists."

Page 15, line 11, strike out "physicans" and insert "physicians, optometrists."

Page 15, line 23, strike out "each of"

Page 17, after line 13, insert

"(g)(1) Subsection (e) of section 741 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the rate of interest determined in accordance with such provisions for the first loan obtained by a student from a loan fund established under this part shall also apply to any subsequent loan to such student from such fund during his course of study.'"

Page 17, after line 13, insert

"(2) Paragraph (5) of section 823(b) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided,* That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the rate of interest determined in accordance with such provisions for the first loan obtained by a student from a loan fund established under this part shall also apply to any subsequent loan to such student from such fund during his course of study.'"

Page 18, line 8, strike out all after "following:" down to and including "agency"," in line 15 and insert "any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, or a program accredited for the purpose of this Act by the Commissioner of Education",

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of our committee explain the changes that were made in the other body.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to explain them very briefly.

The Senate passed the bill, H.R. 3141, after we had passed it in the House by an overwhelming, almost unanimous, vote.

The Senate passed H.R. 3141 with several amendments.

First, the Springer amendment requiring an increase in enrollment for schools to qualify for improvement grants was modified to permit the Surgeon General to waive the requirement if he determines that limitations of physical facilities of the school would cause such an increase to lower the quality of training.

Second, Mr. ROGERS' amendment on accreditation of baccalaureate and associate degree schools of nursing was modified. As passed by the House the Rogers amendment provides that accreditation of these schools shall be by regional or State accrediting or approval agencies; as passed by the Senate, this provision was deleted and the provisions of existing law were retained, with the addition that the Commissioner of Education is given authority to accredit programs in this area.

Third, basic and special improvement grants are extended to schools of podiatry.

Fourth, scholarship grants are extended to schools of podiatry and pharmacy.

Fifth, the loan forgiveness feature of the bill is extended to optometrists, and

Sixth, the provisions of existing law on interest rates for student loans are modified to provide that the interest rate a student pays will be the same on every loan he gets. This will make the administration of the loan program simpler.

Only two of the amendments are controversial to any extent.

One of them is the Springer amendment which the gentleman recalls very well, he having sponsored it. That amendment would require an increase in enrollment for schools to qualify for improvement grants. The amendment was modified to permit the Surgeon General to waive this requirement if he determines that limitations of physical facilities of the school would cause such

an increase as to lower the quality of training. As the gentleman knows, there are a few medical schools that would have problems with the amendment as it was proposed by the gentleman from Illinois and as it was adopted by the House.

The Senate amendment would permit that kind of situation to be taken care of.

The second of these amendments had to do with accreditation of baccalaureate and associate degree schools of nursing. The amendment to the bill offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and as agreed to, was modified by the Senate in an effort to meet the problem and still permit the purposes and objectives sought to be carried out by the Rogers amendment.

As the Rogers amendment was agreed to in the bill approved by the House, it provided that accreditation of these schools shall be by regional or State accrediting or approval agencies; as passed by the Senate, this provision was deleted and the provisions of existing law were retained, with the addition that the Commissioner of Education would be given authority to accredit programs in this area.

I have discussed this subject with the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], who is concerned with it. In view of the discussions that have occurred, the Senate amendment appears to be a satisfactory arrangement.

A third amendment had to do with the extension to schools of podiatry of basic and special improvement grants. The gentlemen recall the discussion we had on this subject in our own committee.

The fourth Senate amendment had to do with extending scholarship grants to schools of podiatry and schools of pharmacy. The pharmacy schools are tremendously concerned—and I think with merit—about being included specifically in the program, and the Senate included them. I know that the pharmacy schools will be very happy over this arrangement.

The fifth amendment relates to the loan forgiveness feature of the bill, which would be extended to optometrists.

We had thought that that provision would be included in the bill as it passed the House. Now that is cleared up.

Finally, the sixth amendment of the Senate simplifies existing law on interest rates for student loans by providing that the interest rate a student pays would be the same on every loan he would get.

I agree with these amendments. I think they probably will resolve some of the controversy raised on some of these questions, and I believe that the bill is a better bill. As the gentleman knows, this program is one of the major and most outstanding of the programs we have considered in this or, in fact in any, Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, which we approved in the 88th Congress, contained a provision which I sponsored and in which I still have great interest. The purpose of that act which we now amend was to create more health profession manpower. Particularly we have discussed here on the floor the need for many more doctors in the next few years. Certainly we are all aware of the need and are determined to do what we can to overcome the present and prospective shortage. My amendment to the original act required any medical school applying for grants under the act to give positive assurances that the enrollment would be increased by 5 percent or five students, whichever was the greater.

In the present bill we have added to the grants for building and expanding medical schools and other health profession schools a scheme to provide general and special improvement grants. These would make it possible for the schools to obtain special equipment, attract faculty, and generally upgrade curriculum. Here again we provided, wisely I think, that schools hoping to be recipients of these grants make it clear that they will produce more graduates. The bill as it passed this House provided that these increases must be 2.5 percent or three students, whichever is greater. Such increases, added to those already assured by construction grants, would go far to meet our doctor shortages. It is a good provision and I feel that we must insist that its purpose be served in any measure we finally approve here today.

After the House had acted and sent the measure on to the other body for its consideration I had occasion to talk with officials of the various professional associations concerned with health professions education. Their study of this particular requirement convinced them that a few schools, already in being and struggling desperately to survive, could not honestly make the assurances we desired. Their situations were and are such that the general and special purpose grants will, at the moment, barely save them. It is most desirable to rescue institutions now extant, rather than go through the costly and extended process of organizing and building a brandnew medical school. So it appeared that there were special problems. No one could argue that the requirement was too harsh or undesirable. I was rather inclined to let the chips fall because the long-range good might be better served by keeping the requirement intact than by trying to work out exceptions and I indicated that I would await the final action of the other body before committing myself to any change.

As amended by the other body, provisions are made for those exceptional cases of which I am aware. The language added for this purpose is thus:

> The Surgeon General is authorized to waive (in whole or in part) the provisions of this subsection if he determines, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric, and Podiatric Education, that the required increase in first-year enrollment of full-time students in a school cannot, because of limitations of physical facilities available to the school for training, be accomplished without lowering the quality of training for such students.

Because I have talked with most of the people concerned with this problem, I am sure that their intentions are the best and they wish to accomplish the goals which the House version set. But I am also sure that the language I have just read to you could lead to a complete runaround of our restrictions if the administrators of the act felt so inclined. For that reason I insisted upon some positive assurances by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which I could bring to this House, as to the manner in which these special cases will be handled. The result was a letter from the Secretary of that Department as follows:

> In response to your oral request, this morning I discussed with the Surgeon General the effect of the Senate amendment waiving, under certain circumstances, the provisions of section 771(b) of H.R. 3141.
>
> Dr. Stewart assures me that he is in full agreement with the purpose of section 771 (b), as it was approved by the House of Representatives, to increase the output of the schools that are aided by this program. He sees the Senate amendment to that section as authority for a waiver which he would, after consultation with his advisory council, use only infrequently and only when he is convinced that expansion of enrollment in a particular school would definitely jeopardize the quality of the training at that school.

In addition to this fairly generalized statement of the intentions of the Department, I received oral assurances that the new Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, visualized no more than three situations in the country which would require the invocation of this exceptional machinery. That is about right. There are probably two such cases which have been brought to my attention, where strict adherence to the additional enrollment criteria would make it impossible for these established medical schools to participate. I recognize the desirability of keeping these schools and go along with the amendment for this restricted purpose, but, even here I am serving notice that we expect them to improve to the extent that they can later increase their enrollments in compliance with the basic amendment and in the same manner as the large bulk of the schools must now do.

The record should be clear, as we accept these amendments, that our purpose has not changed. We shall watch carefully the application of this exception and the schools to which it is applied. You may be sure that the committee will follow through in its determination to achieve the basic purposes of this important legislation. The Surgeon General should expect to document thoroughly all cases considered for waivers under this amendment and to be called upon to justify his determination in the light of congressional intent.

Although I am aware of the other changes in the legislation and agree to them, I feel that the increased enrollment amendment is far and away the most important and have therefore taken the time of the House to make this record clear to all who will be involved in the administration of this act.

I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—gentlemen, as you are aware, I have been concerned about the problems of accreditation of programs of nurse training in junior colleges. Training programs for nurses in junior colleges date from 1952 and have grown rapidly over the past few years so that an increasing proportion of the supply of new nurses now entering the labor market comes from these schools. In addition, the potential for development of programs in junior colleges is great and I sincerely believe that these colleges will serve as a major resource for substantially increasing the quality and quantity of personnel in this critically short area.

As you know, under the Nurse Training Act of 1964, Federal grants may be made only to schools of nursing accredited by—or for which there is reasonable assurance of accreditation by—a body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education. The only body approved by the Commissioner of Education for such purposes has been the National League of Nursing. Yet, the National League has not encouraged the development of junior college schools of nursing and, in my opinion, has failed to carry out its responsibility to assure the rapid accreditation of these schools in order to enable them to receive Federal support.

The purpose of the Nurse Training Act, in part, is to get money to schools to enable them to upgrade their teaching and to assure better quality of nurse graduates. I do not believe we should restrict these funds only to those schools which have been accredited by the National League and thereby deny those schools which need the funds for the purpose of being upgraded.

Our committee, in its deliberations, added an amendment with respect to collegiate or associate degree programs of nurse training which would enable either a regional accrediting agency or a State-approval agency to provide the accreditation which is a condition precedent to the receipt of Federal assistance under the Nurse Training Act. Our amendment reads as follows:

> Any program of nurse education, offered by a diploma school of nursing, means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner or Education and, when applied to any collegiate or associate degree program of nurse education, means a program provided by an educational institution approved or accredited by either a regional accrediting agency or a State-approval agency.

This then would enable States or regional bodies to provide the accreditation needed. In my own State, for example, our junior colleges have done a magnificent job in training associate degree nurses. To substantiate this, I submit the fact that the rate of failure on examination for licensure in nursing in our State discloses that graduates of junior colleges do better than those in the other schools of nursing. Yet none of the junior college programs in Florida had been accredited by the National League of Nursing. I think this is sufficient evidence to show that accreditation by the National League is an unnecessarily restrictive and undesirable requirement.

The Senate has struck the amendment added by the House and substituted instead the following:

> Any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, or a program accredited for the purpose of this act by the Commissioner of Education.

This language obviously does not require the use of the National League for Nursing; on the other hand, it does not assure that alternatives will be found.

I have had extended discussion with officials of the Department about my concern. I have found these discussions informative and rewarding, and I have been assured by the Department of its concern in this matter. I am aware that they feel the need to assure that adequate professional training is being provided. Their chief objection to regional accrediting bodies has been that this accreditation is a general one to the school and does not examine the separate programs such as nursing to assure that they, too, are adequate. The regional accrediting bodies have not had a mechanism to try this out as a general and regular matter.

I am sympathetic with their concern and I am now assured that they understand mine. They, too, wish to seek alternative methods of assuring the proper professional quality in nursing training. To this end, Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen has sent a telegram requesting representatives of the American Nurses Association, the National League for Nursing, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Joint Commission on Accreditation to discuss this matter on October 19 with representatives of the Department. The telegram states:

> Health professions educational assistance amendments includes important amendment relating to accreditation of nursing programs. Would appreciate if representatives of your organization could meet with department officials and representatives of other interested organizations on Tuesday, October 19, beginning at 10 a.m. In room 5542, Health, Education, and Welfare Building at 3d and Independence Avvenue SW., Washington, to discuss this legislation and necessary steps to implement it in accordance with congressional legislative objectives.
>
> WILBUR J. COHEN,
> *Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.*

The Department has assured me that these discussions will be directed toward the development of alternative means of accreditation which will continue to assure the proper qualifications of nurse training programs and at the same time assure that junior colleges are adequately provided for in order that they may continue to increase the number of nursing graduates and thus assist in alleviating the severe shortage of nursing personnel. The Department has told me that they hope to establish an alternative accreditation program on at least a 6-month trial basis in selected areas to determine the best way to solve this problem.

I believe the assurance that the Department will undertake such a study and attempt new approaches to accreditation may have many benefits. Further, I believe that the language of the Senate amendment provides the necessary flexibility to the Department to carry out such a program. I support, therefore, the action of the conference in accepting the Senate position.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection 0 of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARMATZ, ASHLEY, DOWNING, MAILLIARD and PELLY.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I wish to call up several resolutions.

First, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 593 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 593

Resolved, That, for the purposes of the studies and investigations specified in clause (1) and clause (7) of H. Res. 19, Eighty-ninth Congress, approved by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to send fifteen of its members and six of its employees, three from the majority staff and three from the minority staff, to be divided into three special subcommittees: to investigate refugee matters, to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and to attend the Fourteenth Session of the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and to attend the Twenty-sixth Session of the Executive Committee and the Twenty-fourth

Session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operation of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. Each subcommittee is authorized to sit and act whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary: *Provided,* That the subcommittee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation, if furnished by public carrier; or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 596 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 596

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee, not more than one majority staff assistant, and not more than one minority staff assistant to such foreign countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study of the operation by the Federal Government of elementary and secondary schools, with a view to determining means of assuring that the children of civilian officers and employees, and of members of the Armed Forces, of the United States will receive high quality elementary and secondary education.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 594

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee, to majority staff assistants, and one minority staff assistant to such European countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of public works in various European countries, which would include mutual problems involving rivers and harbors, flood control, highways, water pollution and related subjects.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 595 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 595

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 245, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to send not more than thirteen members of such committee, not more than two majority staff assistants, and not more than one minority staff assistant to such European countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting studies with respect to the policies, operations, activities, and administration by the governments of such countries of matters in the following fields of activity of such governments: postal rates, postal operations, postal facilities, and modernization of postal service, including research and development programs.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the U.S. Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST, PETERSON AGAINST GROSS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 602) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 602

Resolved, That the election contest of Stephen M. Peterson, contestant, against H. R. Gross, contestee, in the Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa, be dismissed.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield half the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] if he requests it; and pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, in the Peterson-Gross election contest we find first of all that the returns, when canvassed from the Third Congressional District in Iowa, show that Mr. GROSS, the contestee and the sitting Member, won by a majority of 419 votes. Consequently, under the law, the Governor of the State of Iowa issued a certificate to Mr. GROSS. That certificate was sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Speaker administered the oath of office to Mr. GROSS when Congress convened in January of this year.

Since that date the sitting Member has performed his duties as required under his oath of office. So, as a result of these events, he has established a prima facie right to the office.

Some time after the election on November 3, 1964, the contestant, Mr. Peterson, of the Third District of the State of Iowa, made numerous and various charges against the election officials in that district. He charged many violations of the rules and regulations and even the laws of the State of Iowa in regard to the election of Mr. GROSS.

Some of the more serious charges made by Mr. Peterson, the contestant, are as follows:

He made an issue of the fact that certain ballots were burned the day after the election. When you use that phrase, of course, it sounds bad. But his petition did not go into detail and tell the Congress what sort of ballots these were. Of course, the Committee on Elections in our investigation were interested in determining what he meant when he charged certain ballots were burned.

Well, the record shows as a result of our investigation—and it was admitted by all who knew anything about the facts of this charge, that these were unused ballots; they were not ballots which had been voted by anyone. They were the ballots that were left over as a surplus after the election polls or precincts were closed on election day.

Mr. Speaker, it was further found that the custodian of the courthouse in this particular county where these ballots were burned had burned the ballots and that prior to this occasion he had done so. The auditor in the office of the county courthouse admitted that she had used the back side of some of the ballots for scratch paper. It was nothing secretive or nothing unusual to these people to do what they had done with these ballots. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was testified before the committee that this practice had gone on for many years in this particular county and no one thought anything about it, and that is in the record.

Another point in addition to this one was that more ballots were cast than there were names listed on the polling books.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the elections subcommittee for many years in the House of Representatives I have found, and other members of the subcommittee have found, that this is not as bad as it sounds. This charge or allegation is often made in petitions for election contests. And it is not infrequently true that election judges or managers or clerks, or whatever you might call them in your particular State, sometimes do inadvertently and unintentionally fail to record the name of some voter on the poll list when they are busy about their duties and the crowds are there and everyone is wishing to vote as soon as possible.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the evidence in this case shows that such errors were wholly insufficient to change the results of the election, even if the excess ballots about which we speak here in this particular instance should all be added to the total of the contestant. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we assume that all of those ballots that were not recorded on the poll list were cast for the contestant this still would not have changed the results of the election.

Mr. Speaker, there is a case directly in point, the case of Brooks against Fay, from the State of Iowa, in which it was held by the Supreme Court not too long ago that a contestant, like Mr. Peterson in this case, has the burden to show that misconduct or errors on the part of election judges or officials must be sufficient to change the results of the election. In this case the committee is of the opinion that no alleged misconduct or error on the part of the election judges, nor a combination of all such errors by any and all officials in the entire Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa, would be sufficient to change the results of this election.

Mr. Speaker, we have many authorities on that point including the case of *Eggleston* v. *Strader,* 2 Hinds' 878, and others confirmed by this House.

Mr. Speaker, another charge was to the effect that absentee ballots were recorded in a back room by one election official of a precinct when other people did not know what she was doing. Well, when we got into this charge and read the testimony, we found that it was not exactly like it had been alleged in the election contest papers. We found that at one polling place one lady, a judge or clerk, went into the voting booth, threw the curtains up over the top of the voting machine, stood there and recorded the ballots, the absentee ballots, as another lady, an officer of the precinct, read them out to her—nothing secret about it; no one contested or protested or challenged what the good lady was doing. It was just her way of doing it. This lady who testified and who tried to make something out of this affair, stated she was behind the lady doing the recording and could not see exactly what she was doing.

But it later developed on cross-examination that she could have seen if she had wanted to, and she made no protest of this procedure. The same lady protested later, after some people said it should be contested, but when the election was closed at the end of the day this lady signed all of the election returns and forms without any hesitation whatsoever. She thus certified to the fairness and correctness of the election at the precinct where she was an officer.

There was another charge of a serious nature, or more serious than some of them, and that had to do with one of the machines. It was disclosed that one of the voting machines had a certain number of votes already tabulated thereon when the machine was opened in the morning at the beginning of the voting; in other words, some official, an auditor, or somebody who was in charge of the voting machines, had not cleared it. The auditor of the county was called about that, and he instructed the voting officials to take down the total figures then on the machine, keep them, and to subtract therefrom the number that was there in the morning, when the votes were all added up at the closing of the polls. The lady complained she did not know where the sheet of paper got to that contained the figures.

The attorney for the contestant wanted to make it appear that somebody was holding out votes, or that they were not giving the proper returns from this machine. However, the record shows that the election official to whom these returns were sent had affixed the aforesaid disputed paper to the polling book, and it was still so attached when the votes were added up at the end of the day.

The attorney for the contestant admitted during the hearings this entire proceeding was launched with the hope that a recount would disclose enough errors to change the results of the election. The attorney admitted they knew of no fraud on the part of Mr. GROSS, and no fraud on the part of a single election official in the entire Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa. It is, therefore, evident from the record, and from all of the facts, this contest was simply in the nature of a fishing expedition so that they could turn something up that would be justifiable grounds for the subcommittee to go to Iowa to look over these records.

All of the evidence shows that no one protested to any of the election proceedings during election day and all of the officials signed the papers, the forms and the returns, and there was nobody who testified on election day that the results were anything but proper. Apparently it was after it was found that Mr. GROSS won by a margin of only 419 that somebody decided they should make

a contest of this matter. So the contestant suggested then that the committee recount the ballots. It is the judgment of the committee that he has not made a showing which would justify any such action, because there is no evidence that if a recount were ordered by the subcommittee the outcome would in any way change the result as previously certified by the Governor of the State to the House of Representatives of the United States.

We quote a series of decisions in the committee report sustaining the committee's finding in this regard. The committee emphasizes that in all elections conducted under the laws of the State of Iowa, or any other State, the returning officers are presumed, as a matter of law, to have done their duty, and their returns to be correct.

This is a presumption that can only be removed by convincing evidence and we cite cases to so show.

The burden of proof, my friends, let us not forget, rests upon the contestant. It is squarely on his shoulders to show sufficient grounds to justify a recount or to unseat a Member of this House. He must meet this obligation. It is not the committee's duty to prove his case for him. The contestant must prove not just irregularities—and not just violations of the Iowa election laws, but also that if such irregularities had not existed the results of the election would have been different.

A contestant, in the opinion of the committee, should not be permitted to come to this House with a shotgun approach, criticising everything in general but proving nothing of any consequence. Any such vague and unwarranted challenge falls far short of the evidence necessary to unseat a Member of this House, and it is likewise inadequate and insufficient grounds to even support a recount.

Therefore, the subcommittee voted unanimously, 8 to 0, to dismiss this contest, and the full committee approved and confirmed the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee. I trust you will so vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very unusual type of election contest. I say it is unusual because nowhere in the record is there any allegation of fraud on the part of anybody. As a matter of fact, in a letter sent out by the contestants under date of October 5, addressed "Dear Congressman"—and which I presume is similar to letters received by many, if not all, of my colleagues—the contestant says in one of the paragraphs:

> I am not asking the House to unseat the present incumbent. I have no personal animosity toward him, nor have I alleged fraud on his part or on the part of any election official or supporter of his.

Now we have a situation, ladies and gentlemen, where, on election day and prior to election day, no allegations of fraud or irregularities were made by anybody, in any of the precincts, in this election district. As a matter of fact, when the polls were closed and after the ballots were counted, every election district official signed the necessary returns and the necessary forms without any objection being raised by anybody. Then, after the totals were tabulated, and it became obvious that it was a rather close election—as a matter of fact there was a difference of 419 votes—then and at that time efforts were made to find irregularities. A contest notice was filed alleging irregularities which, as I say, were all determined upon after the polls were closed and after the returns were in. During the election, no objections were raised.

Now what is the nature of these irregularities? The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] has indicated what several of them were, and has shown, when we looked into the record, and when we talked with and questioned the attorney for the contestant, that the reasons were rather flimsy. I will just repeat one or two of them. For example, as to the allegation of the burning of the ballots. The record discloses that the custodian of one of the courthouses who, incidentally, happens to be a member of the Democratic Party, had burned unused ballots. But there is no evidence that this is an unusual procedure at all at elections in Iowa. It was developed in the record that this happened year after year after election day and that is what they always did with unused ballots.

The record of the contestant also indicated, or tries to show, that there were refusals—repeated refusals—to let him or anybody representing him, appear and look at and examine the records. But if you examine the record which was filed in this case, you will see it is replete with numerous instances where these records were offered to the contestant or his representative.

I will just refer to one or two of them. For example, looking at page 20 of the record, we see that in Hardin County, the testimony is as follows:

> Mr. BUTLER. Now, let the record show Mr. Reed will now give you permission to see it.

He was speaking of the polling place. Continuing to read from the testimony:

> He refused you permission to remove those records from the auditor's office. That was your threat. But he will personally take you up there and let you see them at this time.

Again, a little later and on the same page:

> Mr. BUTLER. I think this has been designated the place of the hearing and this is the place we were required to attend and this is where we are present for attending. If you wish to examine the books which you requested to do, you may do so, Mr. Ballard.
>
> Mr. BALLARD. Mr. Redfern, do you have any objection to our adjourning this hearing up to the actual office of the auditor?
>
> Mr. REDFERN. No; I have no objection.

That is what happened in Hardin County.

In Bremer County—again referring to the record—page 49, the following appears:

> Question. As a matter of a clarifying question, Mrs. Slemmons, did Mr. Peterson have an opportunity to examine this particular book that Mr. Ballard is now looking at?
>
> Answer. He certainly did.
>
> Question. And did he have anyone with him at that time?
>
> Answer. Yes, he had a worker with him.
>
> Question. Do you remember the name of that worker?
>
> Answer. I believe the name is Kirk Boyd.
>
> Question. And how long did they have to examine these various records, including this book?
>
> Answer. Well, they came at noon and I think they were in the office until around 3 o'clock that afternoon, maybe a little longer.

I could go on to other counties. There are all kinds of references in the record to this effect of willingness to show the election records. So there were opportunities for the contestant to examine the records after the contest notice was filed.

So we have a contest in the nature of wishful thinking that if the subcommittee will recount all of the ballots, possibly the result of the recount would be to change the totals. But nothing fundamentally wrong has been shown at any place in the proceedings. Furthermore, nothing wrong in the nature of fraud has been alleged. Fraud is said to be a very important ingredient in all contests of this type. Therefore, it is quite obvious that this whole proceeding is nothing but a "fishing expedition." It seems to me that the action of the subcommittee in dismissing the proceeding is definitely justified, and I trust that the House will confirm the action of the subcommittee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it should be noted that the report accompanying this resolution does not include a minority report. As a member of the Committee on House Administration at the time that disposition of this matter was made, I reserved the right to file a minority report. I did not do so for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was the amount of confusion involved.

As my neighbor and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, has just emphasized, in the contestant's brief there is no ill will toward the incumbent and, indeed, I have none. I might note, however, he and I consistently disagree in philosophy. There is no allegation of fraud or any act of dishonesty on the part of the incumbent or on the part of the election officials. There is a thread running through this argument which, if one were to accept, one would say that there can be no valid contest for a seat in the House of Representatives unless fraud is alleged.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke on the absence of fraud. The gentleman from South Carolina also noted the absence of fraud. I submit, as a crucial matter of record, that the

precedent in this case is every bit as important as the precedent in any other case we have had before the House, and that under no circumstances should the precedents establish the need for fraud in an election.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has made a point which I consider involves one of the great difficulties in election contests. I have never quite agreed with the apparent philosophy of the gentleman from South Carolina, because I come from a State where one does not have to prove anything to have the ballots recounted. One only has to say that he believes there could have been a mistake. He has to put a little money behind his thoughts. He has to put up a bond, and if there is not a percentage of error, he forfeits the bond.

I come from a State where a recount can be had if anybody is dissatisfied; and we often have them.

I will say, in the interest of accuracy, in the majority of cases the result is not changed, but sometimes the result is changed, because of the hurry and hectic atmosphere which surrounds an election. The people have been there all day, in our State, for 12 hours before they start to count the ballots. Sometimes they make honest mistakes.

This is one of the philosophies in which I have never been able to concur. That is not particularly so in this case, because, like the gentleman from New Jersey, I have no personal animosity against the seated Member. But I come from a State which has a tradition that one can look at the poll books and can have a recount if he wants. Therefore, I cannot quite subscribe to this philosophy that somebody has to prove fraud before anybody can take a look at the ballots.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

The one thing which I want to establish here as a matter of record—I believe this body should establish it, rather than set down a precedent which could affect all of us, each and every one of us—that there can be all sorts of mistakes; there can be all sorts of errors, there can be all sorts of human faults involved; not one of which need necessarily involve fraud. The establishment of any precedent that fraud need be shown is something this body should reject unanimously. I am sure even the contestee would agree.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I should like to get the record straight. I have not stated, I do not contend, and it is not my philosophy that one must prove fraud in order to contest an election. I say that if fraud is not proved then there is more evidence required.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not mean to bicker with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I just wanted to emphasize that in his remarks, as in the remarks of our colleague from Pennsylvania, there was some emphasis on the absence of fraud.

We acknowledged the absence of fraud, but in no circumstances should we establish as a condition precedent to a contest that there be fraud.

Mr. ASHMORE. I mentioned that there was no fraud because of its absence, which I believe is worth noting—the fact that there was no fraud.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We will concede there was no fraud. Will the gentleman concede that it is not a condition precedent to an election contest for a House seat?

Mr. ASHMORE. Absolutely it is not.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. Let me get the record straight on one other statement, as to a recount. The law in the State of Iowa does not provide for a recount, and that should be stated. Of course, we could order one, if we felt there were sufficient evidence.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As a matter of fact, there are only two States in the Union—Iowa and Texas—which have no provision for handling contested elections and which do not provide for recounts in cases involving candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives or for the U.S. Senate. The laws of the State of Iowa are, in my judgment, nothing short of absurd on the question of election to the House of Representatives or to the U.S. Senate. There is a complete absence of any reasonable provision or protection for the incumbent or for the contestant.

The Supreme Court of the State of Iowa would take cognizance of this matter no further than to say in effect, "We ask that everything be impounded until February 1 when the Subcommittee on Election meets, at which time we have no further jurisdiction." The Federal court in the State of Iowa, through a U.S. district court judge, said that "In this case I have no jurisdiction." The gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee here, sent a telegram on January 28 to the county election officials in the 16 counties herein involved saying:

> Pursuant to authority vested in the election committee of the House Administrative Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, under the contested election statute and in connection with the election contest now in progress in the Third Congressional District of Iowa, I request that you preserve intact until further notice for possible use by this committee all ballots and voting machines together with all other election paraphernalia used in connection with the election.

In other words, "Hold your records intact." By this time the Federal court had said that it had no jurisdiction. The State supreme court said it had jurisdiction only until the subcommittee acts. The auditors in the 16 counties whom I do not accuse of partisanship, but the fact is that they are almost all Republicans, interpreted the word "intact" to mean that they were not able to show the records to anybody.

In other contested cases, the Subcommittee on Elections has acted. After all, we must recognize the constitutional responsibility of this body to judge its Members and their seating in view of the complete vacuum created by the Federal district court and the State supreme court where the contestant was not able to see the ballots. Now, it is perfectly well to say that the laws of Iowa are so utterly absurd that they deliver a stack of ballots, several hundred of them, to each precinct and in effect say, "Use as many as you want boys; count as many as are used and burn the others. They are not numbered." There is a complete paucity of any control. The fact is, also, that some of those who are Democratic members of election boards are not in fact Democrats or are not in philosophy Democrats. We do not accuse them of any fraud. I do not. I just think that Iowa ought to do a complete revision of its laws, but until it does this body has the constitutional responsibility. I mean no personal criticism by this whatsoever, because I have the highest regard for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] and I have been a member of the Committee on House Administration for 11 years and have seen him handle brilliantly a number of contested cases. In this case I really do feel sincerely that the subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration should have moved in this case, and should absolutely in the future move into any existing vacuum. If the State legislature or the State government of the State of Iowa does not want to establish the procedures for a contest or if that is the case in Texas or any place else; then in order to preserve the integrity of this body with respect to any contest, the responsibility must be assumed, in my judgment, by the Committee on House Administration and its Subcommittee on Elections.

Now, I am not going to ask for a recommittal here or have a vote on this, but I simply want to make a record involving three things:

One, in my considered judgment this contestant did not have available to him all of the records which should have been made available; two, in the absence of any State law providing for a recount, this subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration should and must assume the responsibility and count all of the ballots, if necessary. Three, we must find some procedural means, as busy as we are—and all of us on the Committee on House Administration belong to other major committees—we must find some means or we must provide the staff to undertake more expeditiously the disposition of contests. It is really nothing short of ridiculous to be considering a January contest in October.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, since the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Committee on Administration unanimously voted to dismiss this election contest for the Third District of Iowa, an effort has been made, apparently, to impugn the subcommittee and to mislead

the Members of the House as to what occurred there.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey did not mean to impugn the subcommittee in the slightest. I would like the record to show that that was absolutely unintended.

Mr. DEVINE. In order that the record will be made clear——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. How anyone could possibly interpret what I have said in that way is beyond me.

Mr. DEVINE. My reference was not to the gentleman from New Jersey but to the memorandum circulated by the contestant.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is not a part of the record and that does not disturb me in the least.

Mr. DEVINE. The memorandum circulated by the contestant, Mr. Peterson, is little more than a rehash of the allegations that were submitted originally. There is not one shred of evidence to support the allegations made in the memorandum. The record of the case is devoid of any evidence to support the ridiculous charge of "gross irregularities." There is no pun intended there. Although the contestant in his notice and petition of contest alleged that there were irregularities in each of the 16 counties involved in the Third District of Iowa, he took testimony only in 6 of those 16 counties, and in those 6 counties he failed to produce one witness who would testify that a single vote was improperly counted.

Something has been said here about the burning of unused ballots. The evidence is clear that that did occur in just one instance in the entire 16 counties involved and that this was done by, if you please, a Democratic justice of the peace; and as a matter of custom or practice he has done this year in and year out over the years. And it relates not only to the congressional election but to all candidates, Republican and Democratic alike.

There is no evidence of violation of the mandatory Iowa election laws, as was alleged by the contestant—no evidence whatsoever. The contestant was not denied access to pertinent election records as charged. For example, Mr. Peterson stated in his brief that he was denied an opportunity to examine the records in Bremer County. But the testimony—and it is clear in the record, and the subcommittee had this available and that means access to it—that the Bremer County auditor did in fact make the records available to Mr. Peterson and to his assistant and provide him a place to work and to go over these particular records.

During the course of the hearings conducted in the six counties by the contestant, Mr. Peterson, Democratic and Republican witnesses alike testified that no complaints were made or filed about how the election was conducted; that there was no reason to believe the election results were not accurate and that Mr. Peterson was not treated just as fairly as was Mr. GROSS. It is important to bear in mind that every single witness called in this election contest was a Peterson witness. Mr. GROSS called no one. The entire case was based on evidence that could be produced by the contestant. And, he completely failed to produce anything that would substantiate the charges made, as was unanimously agreed to by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this contest was totally without merit. Giving the contestant the benefit of the doubt, the best that could be said is that it was merely a fishing expedition based upon the slim hope that in the event there would be a recount, perhaps, he might have won rather than the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who did win by a total of 416 votes.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the long line of precedents in the House, in my opinion there can be no other decision by this body than to dismiss this particular contest.

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

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have not been a direct participant in any way in this contest. I considered it to be a contest between Mr. Peterson and Mr. GROSS. I am not a member of the committee. But, after all, I am from Iowa and so I have been interested in following the procedures very carefully in this case.

I would vote in any election contest to seat whoever I believe actually received the most votes. Unfortunately, we cannot vote on that basis on this resolution today because I do not and other members do not know who received the most votes in the Third Congressional District of Iowa in 1964. All we are voting on today is to get rid of the case because so much time has elapsed, the committees have done so little to process the case, and in the closing days of the session it would be difficult to correct for the shortcomings of the procedures of the House of Representatives and the committees which were entrusted with the primary responsibility.

This is another case which spotlights the subject failure of the House of Representatives and its committees to perform the duties thrust upon it by the Constitution of the United States and we can use the case as an example to determine what reforms should be made. Therefore, the principal purpose of my remarks is to urge reform.

The facts I am stating were related to me or in the contestant's record and they must be true for they never were answered and denied.

Immediately after the election, the contestant Peterson or his attorney made several attempts to get the Special Elections Committee of the House to determine and preserve certain facts and evidence. That committee has been set up by each Congress to function during and after the election and to report to the new Congress. It has subpena powers and if it functions, I do not believe most contests would be filed because the parties would know who received the most votes before some local election officials could do anything to change the result or hide errors.

In this case, the Special Elections Committee, with a retiring Member of the House as chairman, completely failed to function. The two or three appointments made by the contestant to discuss the case were canceled. The failure to assume the responsibility that had been entrusted to that committee was total and complete.

Because evidence was being hidden and the attitude of election officials in some counties indicated they would destroy more evidence, the contestant went to both the State and Federal courts. In each case the contestee claimed the courts did not have jurisdiction and the courts said the jurisdiction is in the House of Representatives except that the State supreme court did order the voting records held until the 89th Congress had a chance to convene and organize. I do not criticize those court opinions but they do completely undercut the claim of some that the committee should not assume full jurisdiction or that the contestant should have used court procedures instead of expecting the committee to perform its duties. Only Iowa and Texas have no provision of law for a recount in a congressional contest and although the House of Representatives has primary responsibility in all States, there is less excuse for passing the buck in Iowa and Texas where State law does not give anyone authority to receive it. When the committee insisted upon passing the buck in this case, it was refusing to perform its duty.

When the 89th Congress convened and organized, and the contest had been filed, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ASHMORE] properly sent a telegram asking election officials to hold election material. Some of them used this telegram as an excuse not to permit inspection of it subsequently at a time when they could be put under oath and examined concerning it.

Then the contestant started through the lengthy, expensive, frustrating obstacle course laid down by the rules of procedure of the committee for these cases. Under these rules, the Elections Subcommittee passes its responsibilities off onto the contestant but without enough power to overcome delays and obstacles that can be presented when the contestee and some local election officials resist uncovering evidence.

When election officials resist producing pertinent documents upon which they should be examined, it would take more time to go through court procedures for each official involved than is allowed under committee rules to complete discovery and anyway court opinions have indicated lack of jurisdiction for supervision. Under these procedures, it costs a contestant from $10,000 to $30,000 to run through the obstacle course. Few, if any Democratic candidates for Congress in Iowa have ever had $10,000 available to spend in a general election campaign, let alone a contest, and to force a contestant to raise that amount of money for a contest while the contestee is

drawing his salary and furnished a staff and office is in and of itself a very unfair practice.

All procedures were apparently followed until the contestant filed his printed brief. Then suddenly the subcommittee disregarded its own rules and let the contestee answer orally and denied the contestant the right to see a printed brief before the hearing and to have time to research and rebut contentions raised in the contestee's brief.

The procedures and practices in this case were very unfair to the contestant, as they have been in many previous cases.

Is it any wonder this House has a reputation that it is some kind of a private club which will not let outside have an equal chance to get in?

It does not help either when no member from the majority side of the subcommittee is from north of Virginia or west of the Mississippi River. No one section should have a monopoly, and especially not the section which has the least experience with general elections, for, after all, this committee deals with general elections.

I kept hearing all year that the contestant would not be given a fair chance because the Elections Subcommittee was stacked with the old coalition in full control.

I refused until recently to believe that would make any difference but the least that can be said is that the reputation of the House is clouded by appointing a subcommittee that way.

In this case the buck was passed back and forth and election officials have still been able to avoid opening pertinent records. The fact that they resisted raises the question that if they were not hiding something bad, why did they resist? If an election official did not commit irregularities for the purpose of stealing votes, I would think he would want everyone to see the pertinent records.

In one county, absentee ballots were burned. The quality election official naturally said they were unused ones and that he had done that before. The fact that someone has broken the law before does not make him immune thereafter. The only way anyone could know whether they substituted ballots and burned the ballots that were replaced would be for the committee to have a handwriting expert look at those ballots that were left.

With the adoption of this report, without pertinent records having been inspected, the officials who committed irregularities will be free to finish destroying evidence without anyone but those election officials knowing whether irregularities were committed for the purpose of stealing votes.

This report finishes the whitewash and coverup of the results of the irregularities alleged and itemized. Whether they were intentional irregularities or not is immaterial and I specifically reject and object to the assumption of the committee that fraud or intentional irregularity must be shown. All that is important is "for whom were the most votes cast." It is immaterial where the change in the totals result from fraud, or just mistakes and errors.

The procedures of the subcommittee in this case, when viewed as a whole, were such that in my opinion they imprint even more deeply and more indelibly into history the impression that the House of Representatives is a private club which will unfairly protect incumbents if possible. This image is strengthened by the fact that no incumbent contestee has been unseated in the 20th century.

The failure of the elections subcommittee to perform its duties, its operation under rules designed to pass the buck, its abject failure to remove clouds over the seating of incumbents, and its raising obstacles against contestants, in my opinion have been so evident as to constitute a bad reflection upon the reputation of the whole House of Representatives.

I strongly urge that the bad procedures and practices used in this case be turned to some good by using the case as an example of why jurisdiction for election contests should be removed completely from the House Administration Committee and placed in a special committee which is broadly representative of the Congress, will also operate during election years and especially immediately following elections, and that it be given a mandate to clean up the rules under which these contests are processed with a view to both speed and fairness and that instead of trying to follow precedents from cases wherein the responsibilities of the House have been avoided, that they begin performing the duties assigned to us by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record be made crystal clear on this election contest, I would like to read an insert which appears in the election contest testimony that has been filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

> In the Clerk's Office on July 30, 1965, during the course of the opening of the testimony in the contested election case of Stephen M. Peterson against H. R. GROSS, the contestant asked for additional time for filing depositions taken in Bremer County, Iowa. The contestee agreed to allowing additional time for filing of the deposition from Bremer County provided that a deadline be set. The contestant and the contestee agreed to the date of August 10, 1965, as the deadline for receipt of said deposition and that the copy be noted as to the date of filing.
>
> It was noted that the notice of contest was not filed with the Clerk's Office. It was agreed that the notice of contest be noted as to date of filing.

That is the end of the quote in this record of testimony, and I read that just in order that the record may be made clear that there was no obstacle of any type thrown in the way of the contestant so far as the contestee is concerned in this overall matter.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. As a member of this committee, I heard some of the arguments when the committee considered this matter. Much has been made in the committee and again on the floor of the House today of the fact that the contestant was not given an opportunity in some of these counties to physically examine the ballots and election materials. Is it not true that no attempt was made by the contestant to obtain a subpena from this committee or from any court of record but that he merely walked in with his attorney and asked that he physically be able to examine the ballots?

Mr. DEVINE. The chairman of the subcommittee is in a better position to answer that. I know of no such effort on the part of the contestant.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I have any time left; will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield 2 minutes?

Mr. CURTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman if he has any other speakers?

Mr. CURTIN. I have no other speakers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa did not intend to infer that by design the people of, we will say for the lack of a better word, conservative persuasion or from the South, have intentionally been assigned to the Subcommittee on Elections. As a matter of fact, the members of this subcommittee have been chosen because they are lawyers. Or like myself—they were lawyers. I usually speak of myself in that respect in the past tense. But they were put on that committee for that reason. Also they were recognized according to seniority, a consideration which is always given in these things.

There has never been any attempt to stack the committee and I am sure the gentleman would not intentionally make that as an accusation, but I think he did infer it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not intend to reflect upon any one section of the country. I just want to say, if any one section of this country has every member on an election subcommittee, it gives a general image that is not good, no matter what section of the country they are from.

Mr. BURLESON. It may appear that way but the subcommittee and the full committee in handling these matters, during the 19 years that I have served in this capacity, have always tried to be as judicial and as analytical and objective in these matters as it is possible to be and as our capacities permit us to be. I have never seen a partisanship angle which I thought overcame or prejudiced an objective decision in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, there are two things that the gentleman from South Carolina has emphasized and he has done that, I think adequately. But I think they should be reemphasized.

Number one, as to the burden of proof—the burden of proof is on the contestant always in these matters just as in any case at law that is being tried in a court of competent jurisdiction. The burden of proof is on the one who is bringing the action. That is the way it should be and it cannot be transferred to one who is brought into a contest against his will. That is number one.

The point was made by my able friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that in cases where there is not provision for a contest to be brought in a local jurisdiction this Congress should go into the matter on its own initiative more or less. If that were the case, Mr. Speaker, we might as well set up a rule that any of us who did not win our elections by a certain number of votes, let us say a thousand votes or five hundred votes or whatever it might be—would automatically be entitled to a recount. This committee would have to investigate the case, impound and count the ballots, and all that sort of business because that is exactly what that would mean—that there is to be a limitation upon what number of votes would be necessary in order to have a recount.

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

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, of course, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HAYS. I pointed out, without going into detail, that a person who brings a contest in Ohio must assume some financial responsibility. I was interested to note that in his remarks the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] gave some figures as to what this cost the contestant. In Ohio, one can have a complete recount in a congressional district for a maximum, I should think, of $5,000 because you are required to put up $10 per precinct, and you get a refund if more than a 3-percent error is shown.

I certainly would not advocate that we go into any and all cases. Perhaps we should have some sort of financial responsibility on the part of the contestant so that frivolous counts would not be had. There are not many in Ohio because of the fact that they have to put up the money.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wish to emphasize that the gist of my discussion was the complete absence in the State of Iowa of adequate statutory authority for a recount. That vacuum exists in Iowa, Texas, and perhaps other States. I believe constitutionally, it is our responsibility.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman will remember a case in Texas which was contested. It has been mentioned that my State of Texas has no provision for recounts in election contests. Contests can and have been brought. Local remedies in any State are available through proper avenues of legal procedure.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious that certain misconceptions concerning this case be set to rest. First, I do not believe that the dismissal of this contest has any bearing on cases which involve allegations of illegal denial of the right to vote or to appear on a ballot. In fact, there have been no claims of such wrongdoing in this situation. Second, I think that many of us are unhappy that Iowa provides no method for securing a recount of disputed congressional election returns and that the committee did not examine the returns. However, there is no requirement that a recount be made and, in the absence of a demonstration that there was fraud or wrongdoing which could have affected the results of the election, we cannot impose such a requirement.

Finally, several of us are distressed at the knowledge that some State election officials apparently declined to furnish information to Mr. Peterson because the committee requested the officials to maintain the records "intact." Unfortunately, some Iowa officials interpreted this request to mean keeping the records secret, even from the challenger. This was not what the committee sought. However, there is no showing that the denial of access to the information prevented Mr. Peterson from perfecting a claim which would have affected the committee's decision.

I believe that this case is unique and should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the future. If anything, it should be a guide to State officials and underscore the desirability of establishing a procedure for recounts in close elections. A State does have responsibilities which it, alone, can discharge.

I think that if Mr. Peterson was denied a reasonable chance to resolve questions concerning his election contest it was due to State processes which, under the circumstances, do not constitute grounds for us to act further in this case.

Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] has authorized me to say that he agrees completely with these remarks and associates himself with them.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with House Resolution 602.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE FRANK HURBURT O'HARA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for myself and other Members of the Illinois delegation, I extend my deepest sympathy to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died at Phoenix, Ariz., on the night of October 8. The brothers were closely bound together. Although retaining his residence in the Second Congressional District of Illinois that he might continue to vote for his brother, Frank until recent months had maintained an apartment at 1 Scott Circle in Washington and here every Sunday afternoon the brothers would spend together. Frank had many friends on Capitol Hill.

Among the first telegrams of sympathy to BARRATT was one from Senator and Mrs. Douglas reading:

We share your loss because we loved Frank.

President Beadle of the University of Chicago wired:

Mrs. Beadle and I are sorry indeed to learn of the death in Phoenix, Ariz., of your brother, Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who served on our English department faculty for nearly three decades. He was intensely interested in undergraduate life on our campus and contributed greatly to the development of a creative interest in drama. Among the young men and women in our college he was a very special kind of teacher, whose retirement inspired the Alumni of the University of Chicago Dramatic Association to publish a special appreciation on his work as an expression of their gratitude to him. We regret his passing. Please accept our condolences.

Sincerely.

Vice President Charles U. Daly of the University of Chicago wired:

Please accept my condolences on the death of your brother, who acquired so many friends during his three decades of teaching and leadership in dramatics for the University of Chicago. I know that all of the university community joins me in mourning his loss.

BARRATT always took pride in saying his brother Frank, although 6 years younger, made Who's Who in America many, many years before he did. That was when, as a young man, he had been voted the leading short, short story writer of the United States. He was so affected by the death of his father in 1919 that he gave up fiction writing entirely and abandoned a field in which he had gained preeminence at an early age. Thereafter he devoted himself to the drama.

Here are quotes from the announcement of the second printing of one of his books, "Today in American Drama":

A generation of students know Mr. O'Hara's courses in 20th century drama, play writing, and play production at the University of Chicago—courses which have, incidentally, merited praise from "critics" as varied as Beatrice Lillie, Alfred Lunt, and Whitford Kane.

Sterling North, Chicago Daily News says:

Frank O'Hara was always a creative teacher of the drama.

Lloyd Lewis, Chicago Daily News says:

Somehow Frank O'Hara's classes in drama are always staging plays that reveal, in one breath, awareness of dramatic tradition and originality of viewpoint—a combination rare indeed.

The Christian Century says:

Frank O'Hara is one of the ablest and most creative teachers of drama in this country.

Here is the sketch of Frank Hurburt O'Hara's career as it appears in the 1964–65 edition of Who's Who in America:

O'Hara, Frank Hurburt, writer, university professor; born: Berrien Springs, Mich., February 2, 1888; son: Judge Thomas and Mary (Barratt) O'Hara; graduate Chaffee-Noble School of Detroit, 1909; postgraduate work same school, 1910–11; Ph. D., University of Chicago, 1915; graduate work in English, same university, 1915–17; L.L.D., Shorter College-Jackson Seminary, 1962; unmarried. Began writing for newspapers in boyhood and has served as reporter, dramatic editor, and special writer for metropolitan newspapers and magazines. Principal high school, Dearborn, Mich., 1908–11; member faculty, Chaffee-Noble School of Detroit, 1909–11, University of Chicago High School, 1914–17, University of Chicago, 1917, University of Illinois, 1917–24; also extension lecturer in English, Indiana University, 1922–24; member faculty University of Chicago, since 1924, director undergraduate activities, 1924–27, director of drama, 1927–38; John Hay Whitney, New York Foundation visiting professor, College Idaho, 1953–54, summer, 1956, Fisk University, 1954–55; visiting professor at Hiram College, 1957–59. Editor: "University of Chicago Plays," 1936. Author: "A Handbook of Drama" (with M. H. Bro), 1938; "Today in American Drama," 1939; "Invitation to the Theater" (with M. H. Bro), 1951. Member Phi Gamma Delta. Democrat. Clubs: University Quadrangle. Contributor: short stories to magazines. Address: The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

While Frank was a visiting professor at Hiram College in Ohio, Frank E. Samuel and William M. Kloss collaborated in the following article in Patterns, the student magazine:

(By Frank E. Samuel and William M. Kloss)

Frank Hurburt O'Hara, two u's in Hurburt and don't forget to capitalize the H. "Don't ever give your child a middle name. He'll have to drag it around all his life." Precise dark suit, brown hat with brim up all around, white hair, periodic spectacles. The barbed understatement. Tickler of the intellect, unassuming, curious, sympathetic, self-effacing. "You will find this to be true, I think."

His books sensible, lucid. The gilded assumption when addressing the class: "You all know, don't you * * * ." Simplicity, charm. Appreciative hand on the shoulder. Undivided attention. Gentle, expressive voice and face and hands and body. The realization of the infinite capacity of man to create and understand.

University of Chicago, Hiram College. Sympathy, empathy. The theater comes alive, but "nobody on God's earth speaks that effectively." Discrimination, tolerance. Myriad facets of mind and expression. Fantastic memory for friends, fantastic capacity for friends. When before has one man known so much about so many and they known so little about him. "I've said before but I like to say it."

The ritual drink of water at the break. The insistence on attention to others though not necessarily to himself.

"Whenever I have guests in my classes I expect them to contribute." "Would you like to have our little game postponed from Monday to Tuesday?" "I make quite a distinction between things you ought to know and things you ought to read."

On literature and drama: "There are few books about Barrie because those who liked him didn't need to say anything and those who abominated him couldn't bear to." "Conrad is a dish of artichokes. Artichokes you like or you don't like. Artichokes you know how to eat or you don't know how to eat." "Latin America has not distinguished itself in literature that has reached us as it has distinguished itself, for instance, in statesmanship of various kinds."

Youthful, effervescent. Simplicity, clarity. Duty to students. Pursuit of thinking, not necessarily of knowledge. How can one capture the essence of greatness (is this greatness) beneath the appearance of—what? He is one of those whom G. B. Shaw meant who is uneasy "in the presence of error." He knows of comedies without a laugh, and refers to the future time "when you write your first novel" and then class is over: "Go thou and sin no more."

"This is a pretty swell play."

The death of Frank Hurburt O'Hara followed by 2 years the death of Mrs. Isabel O'Hara—Benjamin—Yaeger, of Phoenix, Ariz., the oldest of the three children of Judge Thomas and Mary Barratt O'Hara.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Congressman O'HARA in this hour of grief.

May God see fit to give him the fortitude to accept his great loss.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely sorry to learn of the passing of Dr. Frank Hurbert O'Hara, the distinguished brother of our dear friend and eminent colleague, BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois.

I have long been aware of the outstanding contribution to the American way of life of Professor O'Hara. He not only distinguished himself in academic life as one of the foremost university professors, but also became famous as a writer and dramatist. The dramatic world and academic life have both lost a truly gifted and great man, and I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his brother and my personal friend and colleague, BARRATT O'HARA.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for myself and the Delaware delegation, I extend my deepest sympathy to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, upon the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died in Phoenix, Ariz., on the night of October 8.

To know our colleague, BARRATT, and then to know how close was the relationship to his brother would be to realize the loss and sadness that has come over his life. The two brothers had so much in common. They were scholars, educators, journalists, students of the drama. The brothers were closely identified with the educational and cultural life of the great city of Chicago, where they resided for so many years. As the author of many books on the drama, as well as numerous magazine articles on this subject, Dr. Frank O'Hara had become well known in the universities through the Midwest.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote that the true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out.

Mrs. McDowell joins me in prayer and in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Congressman O'HARA in this hour of grief.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to my good friend and colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, last Friday, October 8. Although he had a full life he will be sorely missed and only time can lessen the grief sustained in BARRATT'S loss.

Dr. O'Hara was a noted educator and writer whose contributions to education and the literary world have not gone unnoticed. He will long be remembered for his teachings in 20th-century drama, playwriting, and play production at the University of Chicago as he was considered one of the ablest and most creative teachers of drama in this country.

His thirst for knowledge was one of his greatest attributes and he made good use of his education by teaching others. He was a very special kind of teacher revered by his students for he excelled in creative thinking.

It is always difficult to accept the loss of such a good man for I am sure he had much more to contribute to the world. But let us not be overcome by the sorrow of his death but rejoice in the memory of his contribution in the art of drama. Were Judge Thomas and Mary Barratt O'Hara with us today they would be extremely proud of their son, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the other Members of this great body in expressing my sorrow to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who passed away on October 8, 1965.

Professor O'Hara, who served the English department of the University of Chicago for nearly three decades, made it evident that an author and teacher has many facets, and that among these, humility, understanding, and devotedness hold equal importance with dedication and ability. The field of education lost a greatly talented and humble man.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to my colleague BARRATT O'HARA in this hour of grief.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, on the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died last week in Phoenix. The O'Hara brothers have been an ornament to our national life. It is indeed a rarity when two men born of the same seed make such magnificent contributions to their country as the two O'Hara brothers.

While BARRATT, the elder, has ably served his fellow citizens from Illinois, Frank has enriched our cultural life with his short stories, his drama productions, his literary criticisms and his creative teaching of literature at the University of Chicago.

Congressman O'HARA'S loss is a bereavement for the country. I join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy for the country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the late Frank Hurburt O'Hara.

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

There was no objection.

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER CARRIES THE STORY OF CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN'S EXPOSÉ OF $210 MILLION RUMANIAN COMMUNIST SHAKEDOWN RACKET

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, "People for Sale," a documentary of ransom, Iron-Curtain style—the inside story of a $210 million Communist ransom ring—appears in the national publication This Week magazine which was distributed by the Sunday edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, October 10, 1965.

This venal shakedown racket was first brought to my attention by some of my constituents who paid the ransom for the release of their relatives and who were incensed because others would not be fortunate enough to have relatives with ransom money and would be required to remain in the Communist dungeon. I personally investigated this matter abroad and verified the statements by interviewing witnesses under oath. The feature story in This Week follows:

PEOPLE FOR SALE

(By Arthur and Norma Woodstone)

In 1962, Robert Martinu, a Rumanian expatriate who is now a wealthy New York businessman, bought a family of four, trapped behind the Iron Curtain, from a cartel that sells people the way a supermarket sells meat.

This produce, however, is not butchered. It arrives in the West alive, plucked, processed and priced not by the pound but according to the buyer's wealth and the emigrant's value—old men and women cheap, skilled technicians and well-educated youngsters expensive and subtle fluctuations matched to rich friends or family abroad. Average price, about $3,000 per head.

Martinu may have gotten a bargain. His four friends cost him only $10,000.

Their story of ransom—Rumanian style—began in 1961, a year when Rumania, fed up with Russian equipment and domination, began eyeing Italian, West German, British, and United States machines, tools, and production processes. But no Rumanian product would attract the lira, marks, pounds and dollars needed to pay for such machinery.

The Rumanian solution was simple: sell oppressed human beings.

In that same year, 1961, Mario Karil, Martinu's friend, had been serving at hard labor in a Rumanian political prison for more than a year. And a Rumanian prison, Karil recalls, was a vile place to be.

"They were created for only one purpose—to destroy you. One more year and I would have been dead. We got up at 5 and were made to stand until 10 at night. We had to tell the guard that we were exhausted before he would permit us to sit down for a short time, but if we stayed on the bed too long—he would look through the place in the door—we would be punished. They lived to punish us, to beat us, to humiliate us.

"I was in a cell with four, then with 20, then with 80. We were put in tiers. * * * There were 80 men in the room but only 40 bowls and spoons and just one toilet. At least eight of the men were consumptive; eight others were syphilitics."

While Rumania was suffering trade problems and Karil was enduring prison, Martinu went to Paris on a visit. There, he says, a stranger, "a man who pretended he had recently come out of Rumania," telephoned Martinu's suite at the Hotel George V.

"He said," Martinu relates, "he wished me to intercede in behalf of mutual friends still in Rumania. So I let him visit me at the hotel, where he asked me, point blank, if I was interested in getting Mario Karil out of Rumania. I said yes, but how? Would I have to pay?

"This man said, of course. How much would I pay? I threw him a figure, arbitrarily, of $7,000. He said he'd work on it—and went away."

Shortly after this, the stranger called again and said that if Martinu would pay $10,000, he would get out Mr. Karil, his wife, and his two children. Martinu agreed.

Karil's "friend" was actually an agent from the sordid ransom cartel. He instructed Martinu to put the ransom on deposit in a numbered Swiss bank account. But Martinu hadn't gotten wealthy by being a fool. He insisted the money be placed in escrow with his accountants in London. When the Karils wired their safe arrival outside of Rumania, the ransom would be released.

Several months later, Karil was instructed to gather all his personal belongings (a second shift), and to appear before the prison commandant, who smiled and asked superstitiously, "Did you have a dream last night?"

"I said no," Karil recalls. "He said, 'How long have you been in prison?' I told him 2 years and he said, 'How long were you supposed to be in prison?' 'Fifteen years,' I said."

Karil will always remember what came next. "Well, Karil, the party, in its magnanimity, is offering you amnesty. You can go home at once."

"LIKE A DEAD BODY"

The sick, emaciated man was given enough money, the commandant assured him, to reach home several hundred miles away. Actually, it covered only third-class train fare. In its magnanimity, the party let him starve for the next 24 hours. He reached home wearing the clothes he'd been arrested in 2 years earlier. His wife, who hadn't even been sure he was alive, fainted. His daughter remembers how he smelled. * * * "It was like they took a dead body out of the ground."

Karil was out of jail—but not yet free. Every day he had to report to the police for another interrogation, and, each time, his wife expected never to see him again. The entire Karil family underwent constant surveillance.

The day Karil was arrested, the security police had confiscated everything he owned. Nevertheless, after his release, they exhaustively reexamined his finances, making sure the cleanly plucked family would take nothing with them.

Eventually, the Government ordered Karil to buy airplane tickets to Paris. Two tickets. The children, they were told, must stay in Rumania.

Karil and his wife talked it over, decided to chance it. Once outside, they agreed, they could perhaps negotiate for the children.

Finally, after 67 days of harassment and doubt, Karil and his wife were abruptly ordered to the airport in Bucharest. There they were led into a barren room, stripped and searched. There was a 9 a.m. plane for Paris but at 8:55 the Karils were still isolated from other passengers.

"Would we leave or not? It was torture * * * that's the way they often worked."

NOT EVEN BUS FARE

When the engines had started and the other passengers were aboard, the security police led the Karils to the plane and gave them their visas, one nearly empty suitcase—and no money. When they landed at Paris they had to walk several miles from Orly Airport to a friend's apartment in town. There they learned that Martinu, whom they had not seen in 25 years, had paid for their freedom and for their children's.

Their children. Karil called Martinu in New York, and Martinu counterattacked. His accountants in London wrote two new checks, each for $5,000. The first was for prompt payment to the cartel; the second would be paid only when Karil's children came out.

The Karils stayed in Paris 6 months with aid from an emigree welfare agency and the ever-diminishing hope that their children would be freed. As a last resort, Karil promised to borrow $3,000 and add it to the $5,000 already on deposit for the cartel. Finally, in the fall of 1962, with the despondent senior Karils trying desperately to begin life anew in New York, the cartel quit haggling. At a cost of $8,000, the young people were permitted to leave Rumania.

The four of them, $13,000 worth of Rumania export, are now reunited in New York.

Today Karil is certain his children were retained by the security police as hostages. "They wanted to wait and see how I would act on the other side, once I was free of them," he explains.

The real names of Martinu and Karil (which are on file with a congressional investigating committee) have been changed here—but their story is true. It is not even unusual.

It is estimated that between 5,000 and 10,000 Rumanians have been ransomed since 1961. The cheapest price was purportedly a flat $1,000, set before the traffic became sophisticated. The highest was $20,000—paid, ironically, for an important Rumanian Communist who was suspected of being a double agent and finally shipped to Paris.

As much as $20 million may already have been made by the cartel. Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, said during hearings by his House Subcommittee on Immigration, that the ransom potential is 10 times that. There was, he says, "a plan to take out 70,000 persons at an average of $3,000."

A $210 million plot.

Actually, the man in the Western World most likely to know the exact count of ransomed Rumanians and the exact price their freedom has cost is one named Heinrich (Henry) Jacober. And the only nation likely to know the total ransom potential is the Rumanian Government itself.

Last year, testimony before the Feighan subcommittee disclosed that Jacober, described as a Rumanian Jew of Hungarian ethnic background, "has considerable knowledge of persons who have been arrested and incarcerated in Rumania on political charges * * * and has a considerable number of runners (agents) throughout Western Europe, South America, and the United States."

Jacober, who used to live in the fashionable Mayfair section of London, poses as a

businessman, a dealer in lumber and grain, and he gets around. FEIGHAN says that twice Jacober passed through the United States on a circuitous route to Lima, Peru. Each time he returned via the United States.

American authorities were well aware of his activities and his only reason for being here. For actually, he is the cartel's "sales manager." From a list of Rumanian prisoners who have relatives or close friends "outside," which could not be obtained without cooperation by Rumanian officials, he picks a likely name and puts a runner on the case. The runner approaches the relative or friend and tells them that, for a price, an exit visa can be secured.

These runners are well trained; sometimes they toy with the ransomer for weeks until they determine exactly how much money they can extract from him. Ten percent goes to Jacober as commission; the rest goes into a fund to be used to buy machinery in the West.

One buyer thinks Jacober is venal and callous. But a U.S. clergyman who has worked through Jacober to free several Rumanians feels Jacober is a realist. Karil himself says, "It's a shame but without his help we'd be dead."

ISRAEL A GOOD CUSTOMER

Indirectly, Israel is one of Jacober's best customers. The Israelis have a great stake in the ransoming because an estimated 50 percent of the ransom victims have been Jews. About 350,000 Rumanian Jews survived nazism—Rumanian as well as German—and they are a bother to the Communists because they resist the teachings of Marxism in favor of the Talmud. But the Rumanian racketeers hit a bonanza when they found Zionist agencies anxious to help their coreligionists out of bondage and into the Promised Land.

Once the fee is agreed upon, the money is deposited to one of Jacober's numbered Swiss bank accounts. This constitutes a signal to the Rumanian Government to let the man, woman, or family out—after he (or they) have been forced by the secret police to sell everything in order to pay them off. "By the time a prisoner leaves he has nothing but the clothes on his back," says Congressman FEIGHAN.

By 1964, the system was operating so efficiently that the Rumanian Government was releasing innumerable prisoners through Jacober and receiving from him a steady supply of freshly purchased Western machinery in return.

Then on June 1, 1964, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Deputy Premier Gheorghe Gaston-Marin signed a United States-Rumanian trade agreement pledging liberal long-term credit from the West and closer diplomatic relations.

With this treaty, the United States hoped to gain a new outlet for exports, secure liberalization of human rights within Rumania, and further undermine the struts of world communism.

Rumania had it even better. By treaty, the United States was not only supplying machines and tools, but also money, or at least credit, to buy them.

PARADE OF VICTIMS

After Gaston-Marin finished trade talks in the United States, he went to London, where it is believed he gave new instructions to Jacober because, shortly thereafter, Jacober's ransom channels were closed. The Feighan committee believes he is now operating out of Morocco. But not before several of his victims had risen in cautious testimony to the heartlessness of his ransom ring.

One of the most touching cases is that of two sisters. One worked for the British Embasy and one for the U.S. Information Service in the American Legation in Bucharest. Both were arrested, charged with being agents for those two countries and held in torture chambers.

After 12 years the women were let out of prison and runners contacted an American relative. The relative was forced to pay $6,000 apiece for the women. The one who had worked for the British was then given citizenship by Britain.

FEIGHAN currently is seeking to help the other woman, who is still stateless. Her name is Nora Isabella Samuelli, and she is hiding out somewhere in this country waiting for a bill, introduced by FEIGHAN but not yet passed, to permit her to become an American citizen.

Another man came before Representative FEIGHAN'S subcommittee in closed session, and told the following frightening story. He was, he said, a graduate of a college in Rumania, a scientist. He had a wife and one child with him, a girl of 10. They had been bought for $3,000 a head. "The party told him," reports FEIGHAN, "that if he would become a member they would give him a better job. He refused, pretending that as a scientist he didn't want to mix in politics.

"After that he was treated as a low grade person, and his family was deprived of the ordinary necessities. He feared for the physical health of his wife and child and was horrified at the materialistic, Godless attitude that was instilled in his child at school.

"He now is working in the United States and he came to the committee despite his fear that he might be discovered. But he said, 'Even if they kill me, it is all right. I have given my child a chance to live in freedom.' "

Another person who was "bought" for $2,500 had to sign a statement that he had no claim against the Rumanian Government or any person in Rumania, and a second statement that he was very grateful to the Rumanian Government for all that it had done for him. And one victim told the committee he hadn't been allowed to leave Rumania until he'd found two persons who would agree in writing to stand responsible for any of his debts or obligations which might come to light afterward.

All the cases mentioned in this article are Rumanian. However, FEIGHAN says, "A similar-type racket seems to be opening up now in Bulgaria. And also in Poland. The American public has the right to know about this shameful shakedown and how American citizens are being victimized. * * *"

Is the Rumanian Government actually involved? Obviously, yes.

Does the U.S. Government know of this? Flatly—yes. Aside from the Feighan committee's work, there is Martinu's story of how, after turning over ransom arrangements to his people in London, he returned to New York and "told an FBI man the whole story as I now tell you. He did not offer any response as to whether I should give the money to Jacober or I shouldn't. He merely said that the FBI knows of many such cases. That was in 1961."

WHY DO WE PLAY BALL?

A third question is more complicated. Is the United States putting up with Rumanian ransom and, if so, why?

Are we, perhaps, willing to let the ransom trade continue as the only way of rescuing prisoners and Jews from behind Rumania's Iron Curtain—like one Orthodox Jew, who compares the urgency to the days of nazism? "We failed," he says, "when we did not give the Nazis 10,000 trucks for the lives of 250,000 Jews. We can never let that happen again."

Or do we feel the broad goal of peace might be jeopardized if the U.S. administration were to take a position on Rumanian-style ransom? The administration is pleased that the recent trade pact has helped Rumania move that much further outside the sphere of Soviet influence and some 19 million persons are being helped to prosper. A pleased, prosperous nation, the United States believes, ceases to be an enemy.

One wonders. With friends like Rumania?

NEWS REPORTERS AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has a special attraction for well-paid reporters holding full-time positions with newspapers.

To combat their own poverty situation, three reporters for the Washington Daily News have been doubling their regular salary by "moonlighting" down at poverty headquarters, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

George E. Clifford, Jr., makes $240 per week at the Daily News. At poverty headquarters, he made $3,900 between March 15 and July 31, 1965. That should put Mr. Clifford ahead of the poverty game.

Likewise, Mr. Hugh D. MacLean is not letting poverty catch up with him. His salary at the News is $13,000 annually. Between March 24, 1965, and July 15, 1965, the taxpayers subsidized him to the extent of $3,040—a tidy moonlighting sum. Mr. MacLean quit the Government on July 15, 1965.

Mr. Thomas V. Kelly worked for the Daily News at the annual salary rate of $12,600. He fought poverty from March 24, 1965, to July 31, 1965, and the taxpayers awarded him $3,600 for this period. I understand he has quit the News but I am not certain of the date.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand how news reporters can fulfill the requirements of their regular employment during a week in which they work up to 56 hours for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Can they do a creditable job for the taxpayers? Can they do an honest job of reporting while receiving a Government salary of $350 per week?

For the week ending April 3, Clifford was paid for 56 hours of work against poverty. He was paid for 56 hours of work for the week ending June 12 and again for the week ending June 19. His column appeared during that time in the Daily News. OEO was so happy with Mr. Clifford's services that he was paid $50 for a day he did not work but the Comptroller General caught it and the $50 is being recovered.

Mr. MacLean was paid for 56 hours' work by OEO for the weeks ending April 3 and June 12. He reportedly worked 56 hours the week ending July 10 but was paid for only 40 hours under an agency directive issued on July 1. I do not know whether this had any bearing on his decision to quit OEO the next week but I am pleased to note for the record that Mr. MacLean contributed 16 hours of his time that week to the war on poverty. Perhaps it could set an example

for other $40-a-day consultants who simultaneously hold full-time positions outside Government.

The Washington Daily News is a Scripps-Howard newspaper. The chairman of the board of Scripps-Howard newspapers is Mr. Charles E. Scripps in Cincinnati. I asked Mr. Scripps whether he thought it is good public policy for working news reporters to hold simultaneously a compensable position with the Federal Government.

Mr. Scripps gave me a candid reply. He shares my misgivings over reporters working in a sideline capacity for the Federal Government.

Mr. Scripps said:

Your letter of July 29 asks my opinion as to whether it is good public policy for working news reporters to hold simultaneously a compensable position with the Federal Government.

In my opinion, it is not good public policy. I believe that this applies not only to news reporters but to anyone else who works in the editorial department of a newspaper and is in a position to influence the content or the makeup of the newspaper. Also, it should apply to jobs in any level of Government.

My reason for this position is that I believe a newspaper should be as independent as it is possible to make it. You understand, of course, that one of the important functions of a newspaper is to report on governmental activities and to provide comments and criticism that may be favorable or unfavorable. Also, there is the function of providing active support for, or opposition to, candidates for office, legislative programs, and other governmental functions.

As you no doubt know, a news reporter doing his very best to be objective sometimes is accused of slanting a story.

I don't believe the problem is so much that journalists would lose their integrity or objectivity if involved with Government. Any journalist worth his salt is fully aware of his own personal leanings or sympathies and does a good job of keeping these disassociated from his professional work. The main problem is that when it is known that someone working for a newspaper in a journalistic capacity also holds a government job, the reader, rightly or wrongly, may have doubts about the objectivity or integrity of that newspaper.

It occurs to me, too, that a journalist holding a Government job might have his effectiveness on the Government job impaired if it were felt that he or his department were receiving undue support, or opposition, from his newspaper. It could be said that he got the appointment in order to buy the newspaper's support, or it could be said that if his own paper would not support him, he could not be much good.

If the compensation for Government work is important, the situation would be doubly dangerous. If the journalist is motivated only by a desire to perform public service, then the newspaper should offer ample outlet. In addition, there are many service organizations in every community which can use all the help they can get.

I feel that the people will be best served if Government and the press remain as separate as possible, maintain a mutual respect, if possible, and coordinate their efforts whenever possible.

Only in a democracy can Government and the press coexist as two separate power centers. Any intermingling of the two is done at a risk.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Scripps' reasoning is sound. He is interested in protecting the integrity of the press. He is interested in protecting the integrity of Government. I hope his thoughts on this subject will receive the careful consideration of the House.

There are a growing number of consultants in the various agencies of the Federal Government. I have no doubt but that most perform a useful function but I question the necessity of employing the large number that are found on the payrolls. There are inevitable conflicts of interest. There is the problem that information not available to the public can be used for personal gain. I am not accusing anyone of acting in any way but honorable; however, there is always suspicion which can handicap the vital work of the Government.

IMPROVING VISITORS' GALLERIES IN CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a proposal recently that a visitors' center be established for the purpose of greeting and informing people who visit Capitol Hill. I fully support such a center, since I feel that Congress must concern itself more with the educational aspects of a visit to our Nation's Capitol.

My concern about Congress goes beyond the establishment of such a center, however. It seems to me that we must give more consideration to those who visit the public galleries to attend the sessions of Congress. Frequently those who come to see the House in session go away disillusioned by the noise, the apparent inattention, of the few people who may be present on the floor during their visit. But most particularly, I believe they are disturbed by their inability to understand what is going on before them. Lacking understanding, their impressions of the group are worse than if this element of frustration were not present. For these reasons I believe we should provide better facilities for the citizens who visit the sessions.

A great improvement could be made by glassing in the galleries and installing a multicourse earphone set at each seat. Over one course a taped discussion about the House and the Chambers could be presented for those visiting the galleries for the first time. Over the second course, to which a visitor could switch at will, a current commentary could be made by a trained observer who could report the significance of what is going on as it happened.

For instance:

This is a call for a quorum, being made by Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa. The speaker will now count to see if 218 Members are present, and, if not, the majority leader will request a call of the House. Congressmen will then be summoned from their offices and other points on Capitol Hill by a bell system with which they are familiar.

Or:

The Congressman now speaking in the well is Representative BOB SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, a member of the Committee on Appropriations which is responsible for the legislation now being considered. He has been granted 5 minutes by the chairman of the committee. This 5 minutes will be deducted from the 2 hours of debate remaining to the majority.

Much additional information could be offered, of course. The commentary should be provided by representatives of both parties, or, at least, some safeguard should be adopted against biased commentary.

Much House debate is at microphones and, in any event, there would be no difficulty in piping all floor debate directly to the galleries over such an electronic system. The effect of glassing in the galleries would greatly reduce the noise problem in the House Chamber itself, and would make it easier for visitors to hear what of significance was occurring on the floor.

By using thick glass, a much higher degree of security also could be granted to those on the floor against possible intrusion or interruption from the gallery. We have had another example in recent weeks of the need for this.

Press galleries would not need to be enclosed in this manner.

An alternative to a multicourse earphone system would be to divide the gallery so that the earphones in one small part were providing the historical and statistical discussion of Congress and the Chamber, and people could be moved in and out of this section regularly. The rest of the galleries could have the current debate and commentary only, and could be reserved for longer periods for those interested in seeing what goes on with respect to specific legislation.

Although the beauty of the Chamber would be somewhat diminished, I am convinced that this loss would be more than offset by the increased understanding of the institution by those in the gallery. For many people, a visit to Washington is the high point of their political consciousness. The White House appears distant and austere to them, the Supreme Court dignified and beautiful. But Congress, the one representative branch of Government, is, in many ways the branch which should receive the most sympathetic interest of the citizen. Yet, it appears to many an indifferent and unruly group, following incomprehensible rules, and unaware of its need to be understood. Improved amplification and an explanation of the debate on the floor would make a visit more interesting and also give the visitor a better understanding and appreciation of the important work of Congress.

I do not believe that this improvement of the galleries would be of great expense. The executive branch probably spends as much every day to explain its activities to our citizens. Certainly, if these improvements have the effect of better informing our visitors and casting representative government in a better light, it would be well worth the investment. The representative legislature is the keystone of our system of government. There is great concern today that its role is waning. It seems to me more important than ever that we endeavor to have its role and responsibility more

thoroughly explained to the American people. Where better to start than on Capitol Hill itself?

Mr. Speaker, I feel this proposal which I am submitting in detail at this time would help a great deal in the image that Congress presents to the public at large.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECOVERY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the feelings of the people of Washington State and all Americans in saying how grateful we are at the successful conclusion and speedy recovery of the President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

He is the President of all of us, of Republicans as well as Democrats, and all of us are indeed happy that he is doing so well.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION DISREGARDS PRESIDENT'S SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROJECT MOHOLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, according to Daniel S. Greenberg, writing in the October 8 issue of Science published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the President's Science Advisory Committee voted against the proposed construction of the platform for Project Mohole. Nevertheless, the National Science Foundation decided to proceed, apparently on the theory that the project had advanced so far that it would be politically embarrassing to stop it.

Serious questions have been raised about the wisdom of committing so much research funds to this project. There are other areas of earth science research which scientists feel should have greater priority. In view of the doubts which have been expressed, a fresh look should be taken at Mohole.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article by Daniel S. Greenberg:

[From Science, Oct. 8, 1965]

MOHOLE: LAST-MINUTE OPPOSITION TURNED ASIDE

The National Science Foundation last week announced plans to commence construction of the Mohole platform, but it did so only after an extraordinary closed-door meeting that was hurriedly called to quell a sudden outburst of opposition among some of the country's leading earth scientists.

With cost estimates for construction and 3 years of operation of the deep-ocean drilling platform now totaling $110 million—more than double the figure cited a few years ago—some researchers expressed fears that Mohole would restrict the availability of funds for other research in earth sciences. The response from the National Science Foundation and the White House science office was that Mohole is now so far along that it would be economically and politically infeasible to delay or cancel it; and it was also suggested that the earth sciences would be able to ride the coattails of Mohole and attract expanded support.

The outburst of opposition occurred in August during a summer study on Federal support of science, convened at Woods Hole, Mass., under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee. In the course of a meeting of a panel on solid earth geophysics, two votes were taken on the subject of Mohole. In the first, the panelists were asked to predict what they thought would happen (as distinguished from what they thought desirable): "Mohole, Slow-Hole, or No-Hole." The outcome, according to persons present, was a 7-to-2 prediction of "Slow-Hole," meaning, apparently, that NSF would proceed with the project, but at a slower pace than had been announced. The second vote was to determine preference, and on this ballot several participants associated with the project did not vote. The ontcome in this case was a unanimous vote for "No-Hole."

When word of this vote reached Washington, several of the panelists, as well as a larger number of persons prominent in the earth sciences, were asked to meet in Washington during the following week with Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation. Also present at this meeting was Donald F. Hornig, director of the Office of Science and Technology, and several NSF staff members. According to several persons who were present, Haworth indicated that the commitment to Mohole has proceeded to a point where it would be politically embarrassing and financially wasteful to turn back. When it was suggested that perhaps the pace of the project could be reduced to stretch the costs over a longer period, the response was that it would be most economical to get the platform built and out of the shipyard as quickly as possible. This conclusion was accompanied by the prediction that while Mohole would take a large portion of funds going into research in the earth sciences, it could also serve as a device for bringing greater attention and support to the entire field. No votes were taken at this Washington meeting, and it concluded with what was described as a consensus that, under the circumstances, the only choice was to proceed.

NSF, which is providing all the funds for the venture, has now gone ahead. Last week it announced that it was authorizing the award of a contract for construction of the platform to the National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego, Calif., on a bid of $29.9 million. This was the lowest of four bids, which ranged up to $45.09 million. NSF had originally estimated that construction would cost approximately $18 million. The prime contractor for Mohole remains Brown & Root, of Houston, which, in addition to compensation for its design efforts, is receiving a $1.8 million management fee for supervising the project. It is expected that the shipyard will complete drawings within 90 days, and that construction, now estimated to take 2 years, will begin in January.

D. S. GREENBERG.

THE SUGAR SCRAMBLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when the sugar bill comes to the floor, I hope all Members of the House will thoroughly examine this special interest legislation.

The bill provides for an increased allocation for domestic producers which will encourage further protection of an industry that requires raw sugar prices to be maintained at close to 7 cents per pound, whereas foreign producers can produce profitably at 4 cents and in some instances at 3 cents a pound. The implications of this protection for the American consumer are obvious. He pays higher sugar prices.

Furthermore, the foreign allocation is to be made on the basis of country-by-country quotas. The Committee on Agriculture carved up the U.S. market among 29 foreign countries. What criteria were used to decide the allocation among various countries? No one seems to know. If a country-by-country allocation is to be used, it would seem that clearly defined foreign policy objectives should guide the determination. And the Committee on Agriculture is certainly not the proper body to make such evaluations.

Sugar quotas are a highly desirable source of income leading to the lucrative activities of lobbyists. The lobbyists have been swarming over the sugar plums to such an extent that there is a legitimate public outcry. Today's New York Herald Tribune in an editorial points out that it is the American consumer who suffers. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 11, 1965]

THE SORDID SUGAR STORY

There must be a limit to which we permit our sugar to be politically polluted and morally corrupted, and it would seem that the limit has now been reached with the bill which Representative COOLEY and his friends and trying to put through Congress and to put over on the American public.

The existing Sugar Act, which cost U.S. consumers an estimated $700 million annually in hidden subsidies, is bad enough; and its entire philosophy can be seriously challenged, as PAUL FINDLEY, Republican Congressman of Illinois, has done. But the bill advanced by Congressman COOLEY and his Democratic-controlled House Agriculture Committee, amending the act and extending it another 5 years, has brought the manipulators of the foreign sugar quotas into still greater disrepute.

The different treatment accorded two South American Republics illuminates the sordid sugar story being written in Washington. Argentina, though importuned to hire a Washington lobbyist to secure a fat slice of the sugar quota, refused to do so. Accordingly, the 63,000 tons allocated by the Johnson administration's bill as Argentina's annual quota was slashed by COOLEY and company to 21,500 tons.

Venezuela, however, having offered lobbyist Charles Patrick Clark $50,000 annually for 2½ years as his prize for delivering a good chunk of the sugar pie, got its proposed quota, fixed by the administration at 2,676 tons annually, increased to 30,809 tons. Mr. FINDLEY estimates that the increased portion of the quota landed by Mr. Clark will be worth more than $9 million over the 5-year period of the bill.

All this may be a good deal for the foreign sugar producers, their Washington lobbyists, and the Democratic Party's treasury, but it's an outrageous and shocking deal for the American taxpayer who is paying the bill. He can break the back of the lobby and those involved in it by simply insisting that Congress clean up his sugar. Mr. FINDLEY's

proposed amendment to bar a quota to any foreign country which employs a lobbyist would be a good beginning.

WATER AND AMERICAN-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative TUPPER, of Maine, has introduced into the RECORD the thoughtful report by Dr. Bailey on United States-Canadian relations. Appropriately, this report dealt at particular length with water problems related to the Great Lakes, which are of increasingly widespread concern to both nations. Once the Great Lakes seemed the exclusive treasure and charge of our States and the Canadian Provinces bordering on them. Recently, however, the water shortages felt in this country, due to an unprecedented drought, expanding population and industry, and rampant pollution of our rivers, have focused attention on the Great Lakes system as a water resource of the entire continent.

Water is a resource less local than many others because it does not remain in one place. Economic development, however, sometimes leaves the natural routes of streams and lakes inadequate to our needs. Water is always indispensable for agriculture and industry, and we have moved water hundreds of miles to offset its unequal natural distribution. We have moved the Colorado River to Los Angeles. We are going to build a canal to bring good quality water to Mexico. New York City ferries water down from the Adirondack Mountains so that its citizens will not be endangered by the polluted Hudson. In other countries the courses of major rivers have been altered. It is essential to continued economic development that we use our engineering skills to redistribute water resources in the most productive way. Within this country there is still resistance to this concept, and there will no doubt for some time continue to be those who feel that because they live on a river it is theirs. There has been something of this feeling in Canada in response to various proposals for the purchase and movement of Canadian water to the United States. It is natural to desire to protect one's local resources, but in time it will be realized that the world's water supply, well distributed, is ample.

One of the most interesting proposals for continental redistribution of water is NAWAPA—the North American Water and Power Alliance. NAWAPA would construct a 900-mile "Rocky Mountain trench" to bring water from the Arctic to the Western United States through the Canadian and Purgatoire Rivers to the Midwestern United States, and through the Peace River Reservoir outflow to the Canadian-Great Lakes Canal. Over 40 million acre-feet of water a year would reach Lake Superior and provide water for Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and western Ontario. The plan also includes several canals which could bring the extra water all the way to the eastern seaboard.

Unfortunately, the Canadian Government has thus far resisted bilateral talks on this or any similar water distribution plan, preferring to complete a reevaluation of national water needs first. Canadian reluctance to give up water resources to its more arid neighbors is understandable. Certain States in this country have been similarly resistant to surrender water to drier States. But water resources, like all other of the world's raw materials, must be shared. The United States has sold and given away its more plentiful natural resources. We expect merely the same willingness to share from others.

A logical organization to initiate discussions of the NAWAPA plan is the International Joint Commission, a bilateral United States-Canadian organization for safeguarding boundary water quality, established in 1909 by treaty. Unfortunately, as Dr. Bailey's study pointed out, the IJC has not been as effective as it should be. It has been without a chairman on the U.S. side for over a year. Its total appropriation is only $356,700, and requests for its enlargement in fiscal year 1966 were rejected by the House Appropriations Committee. The Commission operates by appointing advisory boards to study specific bodies of water. Seven advisory boards are in operation, on the Red River of the North, the St. Croix River, the Rainy River and Lake-of-the Woods, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and on the connecting channels of the Great Lakes. These boards have power to make recommendations to the full Commission, which itself has only recommendatory power. The occasional recommendations issued by the Commission have not been notably successful in stimulating action to correct problems in resource development. Our national experience in conservation has been that firm regulatory powers are essential to protect resources from destruction or contamination. Without such powers, the IJC cannot be expected to be an effective policeman.

In recent years the IJC has been most concerned with water pollution. In this area much greater progress has been made by the United States acting unilaterally than by either the IJC or Canada. On the Red River of the North, for example, which flows northward from Minnesota and North Dakota into Canada, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently held an enforcement conference under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The Federal Government and the two States concerned agreed upon a detailed schedule for pollution correction which will guarantee excellent water quality as it flows into Canada. In the much more significant problem of pollution in the Great Lakes, when the water generally flows from Canada into the United States, the Canadians have not shown as much zeal as I had hoped for in ending their contribution of pollution. The report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tactfully omitted mention of this problem, since it has no jurisdiction over international pollution problems. Scientists who have studied Lake Erie and its inflow route, the Detroit River, know that the water contains many pollutants before it gets to the United States shores. The Federal Government and the Great Lakes States have committed themselves to a comprehensive schedule for ending pollution in the Detroit River, Lake Erie, and the southern end of Lake Michigan. The pollution problem will remain even after this program is accomplished, however, unless the Canadian Government puts into effect a similar corrective program.

The Canadian Government has apparently been less alarmed about the pollution problem that about reputed damages to the Great Lakes water levels from the small diversion through the Chicago sanitary and ship canal. Dr. Bailey's report, repeats the common fallacy that the Chicago diversion adversely affects the entire Great Lakes system. In fact, the Chicago diversion is negligible in the problem of the Great Lakes. A variety of natural and manmade factors, principally precipitation, influence lake levels vastly more than any diversions, present or contemplated.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has determined that the total impact on Lake Michigan of all the artificial diversions from it, which includes not only the Chicago diversion but three others as well—Long Lake, Ogoki, and Welland Canal diversions—is to reduce its level approximately 2⅝ inches. The corps has also pointed out that water levels vary naturally as much as 7 inches. Claims that the Chicago diversion could lower water levels enough to reduce the loads that freight ships could carry and reduce electric power production are also in error.

The Bailey report, on the basis of these groundless fears, recommended that Lake Michigan, which lies wholly within the United States, should be defined as "boundary waters" for the purposes of our treaty with Canada.

Mr. Speaker, such a revision of the treaty would be absurd. To classify a body of water or piece of land as part of a boundary when it is in fact entirely within a single country is meaningless. To call Lake Michigan "boundary waters" because it eventually flows into boundary waters would also be absurd. Eventually all the water on the earth is interconnected. Nevertheless, we continue to consider the Missouri River distinct from the Mississippi, the Mississippi distinct from the Gulf of Mexico, and the Gulf of Mexico distinct from the Atlantic Ocean.

The recommendation that Lake Michigan be included in the "boundary waters" is obviously directed at interfering with the Chicago diversion. The 1909 treaty, negotiated by Chandler Anderson for Secretary of State Elihu Root, was amended by the Senate specifically to exclude Lake Michigan so as not to interfere with the Chicago Canal diversion. Even at that time it was

recommended that the diversion was essential to protect the health of the lake and those who live along it. It is equally true today.

The city of Chicago has led the country in the development of efficient sewage treatment. In March of this year the city of Chicago, in connection with a Federal conference on the pollution of Lake Michigan, pledged itself to further expansion of its sewage treatment facilities, making them among the most advanced in existence for a city of such size.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we want to cooperate with Canada in the distribution of water resources. Cooperation is a two-way street and we look forward to mutuality in our relationship. Canada has not looked upon Chicago's problem with nearly the friendliness or the understanding which we believe is essential to our city's survival, let alone her progress. We hope for a greater understanding in the future.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 26, 1965]

LAKE-LEVEL MYTH DOWN THE DRAIN

(By Richard Lewis)

Recent studies of Great Lakes water levels have exploded the notion that they are significantly affected by Chicago's diversion of Lake Michigan into the Illinois-Mississippi Rivers and Gulf of Mexico.

For that reason, claims by other Great Lakes States and Canada that diversion lowers levels enough to reduce loads that ships can carry on the lakes and electric power production has become increasingly tenuous.

Such claims are involved in a half century of litigation in Federal courts and the U.S. Supreme Court. In the pending case, other Lakes States want Chicago to return to Lake Michigan the 3,200 cubic feet of water a second the sanitary district now flushes down the Illinois Waterway for sanitation and navigation purposes.

From a modern engineering and meteorological point of view, this is a drop in the bucket.

Studies by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and meteorologists show a variety of natural and manmade effects influencing lake levels far more than Chicago's diversion.

The principal one is precipitation—rain and snow—on the lakes and the land which forms their watershed.

Curiously, the land area from which precipitation drains to the lakes is relatively small, compared to the vast watersheds of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Because of this, it takes a great deal of rain falling directly into the basin to maintain lake levels.

When it rains in Chicago and north shore suburbs, for example, only a fraction of the rain drains into Lake Michigan. Runoff that finds its way into Chicago sewers empties into the Illinois Waterway and ultimately flows into the Gulf of Mexico.

In addition, the drainage west of Ridge Avenue and Green Bay Road flows naturally into the Mississippi watershed, not into the lake.

Next to the icecaps on Antarctica and Greenland, the Great Lakes contain the largest supply of fresh water on the planet. The water surface is 95,000 square miles in a basin of 295,000 square miles, gouged out of ancient sedimentary rocks by the last ice age.

Much of the land surface in the basin consists of glacial gravel and sand. Water is held by this porous mixture and may not reach the lake system for months or years.

Ivan W. Brunk, supervising public service meteorologist for the U.S. Weather Bureau here, has pointed out that there is a time-lag in the flow of precipitation into the lakes on this account. Some of it may take several years to move through the subsoil into the lakes and runoff from rainfall in 1 year may not reach the lakes until the next.

Despite exacting studies, like Brunk's, which show the relationship of rainfall to lake levels, no one has been able to demonstrate cycles of high and low water.

There are seasonal fluctuations, with the lakes tending to be higher in early summer and lower in winter. But no long-term ones have been detected despite popular notions there are 7- and 11-year cycles, according to John E. Hanna, chief of publications for the Corps of Engineers' authoritative Lake Survey at Detroit.

The lack of lake-level trends is not remarkable in view of the fact that lake-level records have been kept only since 1860. Because of the apparently random fluctuations, levels cannot be predicted over the long term any more readily than the weather.

However, one trend has appeared in another of the natural forces affecting the lakes, the force called isostasy. That is the mattresslike tendency of the earth's crust to bounce back to its original shape when depressed by a heavy load, such as a sheet of thick ice.

The entire Great Lakes Basin still is bouncing back from being pressed down for many thousands of years by the great Wisconsin ice sheet which retreated out of the basin about 11,000 years ago.

At the present time, the land is rising more rapidly in the northeast of the basin than in the southwest, where Chicago is located. This causes the water level to fall in comparison to the land in the northeast and appear to rise in the southwest. The effect can be demonstrated by tilting a dishpan full of water.

The effect of this tilting of the earth's crust in this region has been measured by American and Canadian experts. On Georgian Bay, north of the St. Clair River, the water level is falling 10 inches a century with respect to the land, because the land is rising.

Around Chicago, the water level is rising with respect to the land at the rate of about 6 inches a century. While this effect is masked by lake level fluctuations, it ultimately will change present shorelines.

Brunk has pointed out that a major factor in the levels of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron is their rate of outflow through the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers into Lake Erie. This is affected by depth of the channel.

All five Great Lakes flow toward the sea. Lake Superior at 600.4 feet above sea level has its outflow via the St. Marys River into Lake Michigan-Huron at 578.8 feet. Hydraulically, engineers consider Lakes Michigan and Huron one lake because their broad connection through the Straits of Mackinac keeps their levels the same.

From the Michigan-Huron system, water flows through the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River into Lake Erie at 570.4-feet elevation.

From there, the flow is through the spectacular Niagara River and over Niagara Falls, through the gorge and into Lake Ontario at 244.8 feet. And from there the outflow is to the mighty St. Lawrence River descending to the sea.

Lake levels are determined by their elevation above sea level, as measured at a landspit on the Gulf of St. Lawrence called Father Point. It is just about where the continental shelf begins a gradual slope into the Atlantic Ocean.

Once the flow of lake water across a third of the continent is visualized, it is easy to see how the depth of an outflow channel could affect lake level. The deeper the channel the greater the flow.

Brunk proposes that natural and artificial deepening or "downcutting" of the 84-mile St. Clair-Detroit Rivers channel into Lake Erie has lowered the Lakes Michigan-Huron level at least 18 inches in 68 years.

This is the principal reason the Michigan-Huron level has not in this century reached the peaks it did in the 19th century, according to the meteorologist.

The highest levels in the last century came during the decade of the 1880's, in the 10-year period which ended in 1887, when the water surface averaged 580.5 feet above sea level.

In the decade when the lake reached a peak level so far in this century—the 10 years ended in 1955—it was 1.61 feet lower than 68 years ago.

During this span, Brunk calculated that isostatic rise of the land from relief of the glacial ice load reversed the downcutting of the channel by .08 inches.

Part of the downcutting was artificial. The St. Clair and Detroit Rivers were dredged to make them navigable between 1885 and 1897 and after 1909 a good deal of commercial sand and gravel was scooped out of the channel.

In addition to the 18-inch drop in 68 years, the Michigan-Huron level has been lowered about 3.12 inches by dredging the St. Clair River since 1955 to assure a channel 27 feet deep.

The sum of these channel changes which, of course, increase the rate of Michigan-Huron flow into Lake Erie has been to reduce the level of the double lake by more than 21 inches since the 1880's.

While the drop does not hinder power projects downstream on the Niagara River, it affects lake freighters bound for Milwaukee, Chicago, and Calumet ports by reducing their draft and hence the amount of cargo they can carry during low water seasons.

By comparison, Chicago's diversion of 3,200 cubic feet of water a second has lowered Michigan-Huron about 2.75 inches and Lake Erie 1.6 inches, according to the lake survey. It has had less effect on Michigan-Huron than the dredging of the St. Clair River.

Moreover, Chicago's diversion is more than compensated for by the channeling of water from the Hudson Bay watershed into Lake Superior which has raised the Michigan-Huron lake level 4.5 inches.

This would give Lakes Michigan-Huron a net increase of 1.75 inches if it were not for the fact that the Welland Canal which increases the flow of water out of Lake Erie also affects Michigan-Huron. The effect is to lower the double lake about 1.25 inches.

Thus, when all the diversion, in and out, is balanced, Michigan-Huron shows a net increase of a half inch.

If there was doubt about the effect of rainfall on lake levels, it should have been dispelled this year. The rains came and the level of Lakes Michigan-Huron went up.

At the end of August, the lake which had dropped to an alltime low last year, reached 576.8 feet. This level is called low water datum by Army Engineers. It is a baseline from which the ups and downs of all the Great Lakes are computed.

The level this August was a good 10 inches above that of a year ago. Still, it was a foot below the 10-year average.

The lake survey expected a fall of 1 inch in September, but with heavy rains this month the seasonal drop may be reversed.

In spite of the evidence that natural forces affect the lake level much more significantly than diversion, the effect of litigation over diversion has been to retard the piping of lake water to communities beyond the Chicago area.

But as the population of northern Illinois rises and ground water supplies become less

and less adequate, more communities will be compelled to turn to the lake for water.

Historically, the relationship between the lake level and rainfall is illustrated dramatically by the Chicago fire of October 8 and 9, 1871. Records of the newly established weather bureau were destroyed, but the journal of the bureau in that year observed that the fire followed a prolonged drought.

Between the summer of 1871 and the spring of 1872, the lake level dropped 2½ feet—the largest fall ever recorded.

TAX CREDITS FOR TRAINING

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Human Investment Act of 1965—a bill which has been sponsored by some 100 Republican Members of Congress—has been receiving tremendous support from all parts of the Nation. Especially rewarding to those of us who are sponsoring this bill is the high quality of newspaper editorials expressing approval of the bill's goal, which is to complement the manpower training programs under Government supervision by offering a 7-percent tax credit to employers who train workers in new job skills.

On Friday, October 8, 1965, Chicago's American published an editorial which ventures the view that Congress ought to hurry the Human Investment Act of 1965 along the legislative trail. I include the American editorial at this point in the RECORD:

TAX CREDITS FOR TRAINING

Columnist Jack Mabley called attention in yesterday's Chicago's American to an excellent measure now before Congress: A bill that would allow tax credits for employers who start their own training programs for the unemployed. As Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois, told Mabley, the idea is so good that people keep asking why no one thought of it before.

The bill, whose sponsors include MCCLORY, would apply to training and apprentice programs the same 7-percent tax credit now allowed to companies for investments in new plants and machinery. The tax credit is intended to stimulate industrial growth and produce more jobs; the new bill would apply the same stimulus more directly still to efforts against unemployment. It would enlist private industry in attacking a root cause of unemployment—the inability of many workers to find jobs because they lack the skills needed in today's automation-conscious job market.

Another great point in favor of this approach, as Mabley emphasized, is that it wouldn't require hiring more Federal personnel and setting up another cumbersome piece of Government machinery. Private firms which took advantage of the program would do all the work of hiring, screening, and training people for jobs; the Government role would be largely limited to checking more tax forms.

The leading complaint about Federal manpower programs—about the administration's whole approach to the Great Society, in fact—is that their first effect is to increase spending and multiply redtape. This program is admirably designed to get an important job done without the unpleasant side effects, and we hope Congress hurries it along.

APPLE-PICKING TIME IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a vast amount of discussion and debate concerning the use of foreign labor in the harvesting of crops in various States. I believe that the Department of Labor has undertaken commendably sincere efforts to increase the employment of domestic labor at adequate wages, and accompanied by decent working conditions.

The implementation of the policy has in many respects been a frustrating one. West Virginia's experience has been watched with interest. I believe that Secretary of Labor Wirtz made a very wise decision when permission was granted to the applegrowers to utilize Bahamians in harvesting the apple crop.

In evolving new policies, there are inevitable headaches and difficulties. I know not what ultimate conclusions can be drawn from the experience with the beginnings of a new policy. I believe, however, that it is necessary to weigh the facts objectively in attempting to point the way toward a constructive future policy. I have always found Charleston, W. Va., Gazette Reporter Harry Ernst to be an objective writer, and it is for this reason that I believe his on-the-spot report may be helpful to my colleagues:

FRUSTRATION BLIGHTING APPLE ORCHARDS—ALL-AMERICA PICKER GOAL BREEDS CRISIS

(By Harry Ernst)

MARTINSBURG.—The U.S. Secretary of Labor's black limousine drove into an orchard near here and one potential apple picker stepped out.

Untrue, says the U.S. Labor Department. But, if only a folk tale, it does reveal a truth about the unhappy affair involving West Virginia's applegrowers and the Labor Department.

No one can knock the Department's goal, which was to encourage unemployed West Virginians and other Americans to take the apple-picking jobs that have been filled by British West Indians since 1953.

The Labor Department labored hard to achieve that goal although its recruiting efforts were considered frustrating and naive by growers in the Eastern Panhandle, where the $20 million apple industry does more than keep the doctor away.

"We can't say it's bad because we had exactly the same results when we tried to recruit Americans ourselves," commented C. A. Hehle, manager of the Tri-County Labor Camp near here. "The recruiting effort was a failure, a flop."

RELENTED

Just before the fall harvest began to escalate last month, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz relented and permitted the apple growers to import 270 Bahamians (they had 364 last year).

The growers insist that they don't care who picks their apples as long as they don't rot or fall off the trees. But they also admit a preference for the experienced Bahamians who work fast and don't bellyache.

A young Bahamian, wearing a beret and boots, demonstrated why his countrymen are held in such esteem. With both hands moving faster than the eye, he hurried up and down a ladder with a 40-pound sack of apples slung over his shoulder. He picked an incredible 230 bushels in one day (100 bushels is considered a good day's work).

"It's a habit (using the Bahamian pickers) more than anything else," observed a Labor Department official. "The growers are accustomed to using them and other domestic farmworkers go elsewhere to harvest crops."

But kicking the habit, even under continuing pressure from the Labor Department, may prove to be as difficult as the ordeal of a cigarette smoker who tries to quit.

The 150 growers in Berkeley, Jefferson, and Morgan counties need about 1,500 pickers for 6 weeks each fall to harvest their apples. About a fourth of them usually are Bahamians.

Virginia, however, imports 700 to 1,000 British West Indians who crisscross the State boundary line picking apples for the area's biggest grower, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and others.

PLENTY

There were plenty of desperate men available to pick apples at practically any wage during the depression. Prisoners and German prisoners of war later were used when manpower became scarce.

Postwar prosperity brought new plants into the area, encouraged growers to expand their orchards, inspired citizens to migrate and financed a welfare system that soft Americans prefer to the rigors of apple picking (according to the growers).

So during the Korean war, with Washington's help, growers began recruiting the additional pickers they needed in the Caribbean where tourists are big spenders but the natives are often unemployed.

Meanwhile, the plight of America's migrant farmworkers had begun to seep into the national conscience. The availability of foreign workers depressed their wage rates and last year Congress all but closed the floodgates.

The Labor Department's first attempt this year to recruit enough domestic workers proved that the growers are right about the dismal chances of recruiting enough unemployed coal miners and city slum dwellers to pick their apples.

CONDITIONS

On September 29, only 16 of 125 pickers recruited elsewhere in West Virginia remained at the tricounty labor camp near Martinsburg. And at least half of those who were still there said they probably wouldn't return next year even if they were assured higher wages and better living conditions.

Why?

"This is nothing to make a living at," explained 21-year-old Kermit Blair, of Williamson. "You can't get ahead."

He and others from the southern West Virginia coalfields complained bitterly that Labor Department recruiters misled them about the life awaiting them after traveling more than 300 miles to pick apples 10 hours a day, 6 days a week.

Ezekiel Burger, 29, of Vivian, McDowell County, said $60 worth of his clothes were stolen because the camp doesn't provide lockers in which to keep them. Burger said he was told to report the theft to police when he returned home.

"We get grits and rice with every meal and once we were served meat that must have been alligator," commented Wilson Conley, of Chapmanville, Logan County. "It's food we're not used to eating.

"You don't eat grits unless you're in the jailhouse," he quipped. Conley said he is a mine foreman with three sons in Vietnam.

He charged that the camp is disorganized (he cited pushing and shoving in the chow line as an example) and the growers aren't patient enough with inexperienced pickers who should be given more training.

And Conley complained that the Labor Department charged him $20 for a seat on a chartered bus from Logan to Martinsburg which would have cost him only $15.50 on a regular bus line.

If he stays on the job for half the season, the growers will pick up the $20 tab. They also will pay for his bus ticket home if he remains until the end of the harvest about November 1.

WAGES

The pickers are guaranteed at least $1.15 an hour for their first 64 hours on the job. After that they are paid 15 cents a bushel and a 2-cent bonus for each bushel they have picked when the harvest ends.

If they fail to pick enough bushels to make $1.15 an hour, they are either fired or required to sign a waiver that they will continue working even if they can't earn the minimum wage set by the Labor Department.

Deducted from the picker's paycheck is $2.25 a day for food and $2.30 a week for hospitalization-sickness insurance.

So the 8 southern West Virginians, who were picking from 60 to 80 bushels a day, can expect to clear about $55 a week for their exhausting 6 weeks of work. (An experienced picker can clear $85 a week or more.)

The prospect of such meager returns for their labor explains why many of the West Virginians deserted the harvest. Others found the work too hard or just didn't want to work.

Some weren't physically able to pick apples and shouldn't have been signed up by the Labor Department in the first place. They included a preacher who was afraid to climb ladders and a 240-pound man who fell off a ladder and was hospitalized.

Others looked upon the recruiting program as a poor man's expense account. They simply signed up to get a free bus ride (at the growers' expense) to Martinsburg, which is conveniently located near the Washington-Baltimore area where they either had jobs or planned to seek them.

INJUSTICE

Trying to make migrant farmworkers out of coal miners and unskilled city laborers, who are accustomed to working for higher wages in a radically different environment, is obviously an injustice to them and the growers.

When they enlist as apple pickers, they in effect join an army that offers only a lifetime of basic training. They live in drab barracks without women (apple picking is too hard for migrant families) and bitch about the food.

Their tour of duty as pickers lasts only 6 weeks and they are lucky if they return home with $200 because of their inexperience. Even if they become experienced and earn more how are they expected to make a living the other 10 months between apple harvests?

It is unlikely that they will abandon their homes and become migrant farm workers. They know that life can be better. Apple picking to them is a one-time, desperate effort to make some money and, if society offers them nothing better to do, then a life on welfare with a guaranteed annual income is certainly more appealing.

None of the pickers brought golf clubs to take advantage of the Tri-County Labor Camp's location on a knoll overlooking Golf Club Road near Martinsburg.

Hehle, the camp manager, said 26 growers spent about $100,000 building and equipping the five heated, cinderblock dormitories with shower rooms that provide free housing for 426 pickers.

The camp, which is rated as a Hilton among farm labor camps, also includes a kitchen-dining room and a recreation room with a canteen, benches, and TV set (several pickers were watching teen-age dancing that appeared to be good training for apple picking).

FUTILITY

Hehle estimates that the Labor Department's Hire American Campaign has cost the 26 growers about $18,000—$15,000 to build a family housing unit for 80 that only 10 persons are using and $3,000 in bus fares for men who took President Johnson's advice and toured America but didn't stay to pick apples.

The growers would be delighted if the Labor Department would forget the whole thing and let them import as many British West Indians as they need to help harvest their apples.

But there is every indication that the Labor Department will be more determined than ever next year to achieve an all-American harvest.

Critics of the growers ask why the Federal Government should help them import foreign workers. Why shouldn't they compete on the open market for labor like any other employer?

The theory is that such competition would force the growers to increase the pay of the apple pickers so they could attract enough of them. It also might encourage the growth of unions for migrant farm laborers, with hiring halls assuring an adequate supply of pickers.

Some growers, however, insist that they can't afford higher labor costs because the chain stores determine what the processors will pay for their apples and the best ones already have become luxury items.

But a Government economist said if the piece rate for picking apples was raised from 17 to 30 cents a bushel, it would result in only a half-cent increase in the price paid for 3 pounds of apples.

The West Virginia and Virginia growers now pay the lowest rate for picking in the Nation, which is highest at $1.37 an hour in the State of Washington.

They argue that pickers can earn as much money by picking more bushels in the Virginias because a larger proportion of their apples are used to make cider, apple juice and apple sauce and thus don't have to be picked as carefully as eating apples.

Apple growers in Washington, Michigan, and neighboring Pennsylvania didn't have to import foreign workers to harvest their fruit this year. New England growers needed Canadians and New York also used some British West Indians despite their higher wage rates.

CONVINCED?

This year's experience should convince the Labor Department that hit-or-miss recruiting of miners and slum dwellers is costly and won't achieve its goal even if higher wages are offered.

Higher wages, however, might attract enough migrant American farmworkers to harvest the Eastern Panhandle apple crop.

"If they paid more money, they would get more pickers," said Herbert Mathews 32, a crew leader of 10 Florida workers who are helping harvest Eastern Panhandle apples for the first time this year.

"A lot of the time a penny raise will make a difference," he commented, pointing out that there weren't enough watermelon pickers until the growers raised their pay from $1.50 to $1.75 an hour.

Another possibility is recruiting and training unemployed, able-bodied fathers who now earn their welfare checks by working for $1 an hour on Government projects in West Virginia.

But first Government regulations would have to be waived so their families could continue receiving welfare checks while the fathers were picking apples to supplement their meager incomes.

Some economists think automation in our largely unplanned economy will leave West Virginia with a permanent pool of unskilled, unemployed fathers on welfare.

If they could become 6-week apple pickers without losing their welfare checks, they could earn additional income to help keep their children in school while providing the growers with a stable labor force.

There also is an ultimate solution to the problem of finding enough Americans to pick apples—a mechanical apple picker that several universities are trying to develop.

Hehle, the Martinsburg labor camp manager, became angry when asked about automation's potential impact on apples. "What are men going to do to make a living when machines do all the work," he asked.

It's a good question. So far the Great Society hasn't made any serious effort to answer it.

CENTENNIAL OF WEST VIRGINIA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a former schoolteacher, I am proud to note the observance of the 100th anniversary of the West Virginia Education Association this week. To honor this event, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette on October 10 carried a series of articles on the work of the West Virginia Educational Association, and the progress of education in West Virginia, which under unanimous consent I include with my remarks:

EDUCATION SUFFERED BEFORE STATEHOOD

(Dr. Charles Lord, a Martinsburg native and now professor of history at Millersville State College in Pennsylvania, began work on a history of the West Virginia Education Association in 1954. The study was part of his work for a doctoral degree. The West Virgina Education Association has now published the history in book form, "Years of Decision." The following is a condensation of the association's history taken from the book.)

The area that became West Virginia suffered considerably, educationally and otherwise, largely because the constitution of Virginia failed to mandate a permanent system of free schools.

It was not until West Virginia became a State and formed its own constitution that a strong position on education was taken.

When West Virginia became a State in 1863, a strong statement on education was adopted.

This first legislature also gave its official sanction to teacher organization for it urged the State superintendent of schools to aid the teachers to improve themselves whenever possible and, "For this purpose he shall encourage the formation of county associations of teachers for mutual improvement."

It was because of this mandate by the legislature that Superintendent W. R. White called a meeting of teachers at Fairmont in the summer of 1865.

Superintendent White was elected president of this organization at Fairmont; thus

began a long period during which the teachers organization was under the influence of the State superintendent.

It didn't take long for the question of salary to come into the picture at these meetings for as early as 1867, meeting in Wheeling, Superintendent White charged that the teacher should have the "missionary spirit and should follow his vocation whether or not he made any money at it."

An upcoming constitutional convention in 1872 had the concern of the teachers of that period for the fear that the convention might abolish the free school system altogether.

This was a busy session for delegates to the convention in 1872. Beside the problems coming up in the constitutional convention called for later in the year, they also concerned themselves with textbook concern over an official educational periodical.

Delegates at the Clarksburg meeting in 1874 renamed their organization the Educational Association of West Virginia and set up some hopeful objectives for the association.

Annual meetings of the organization, always held during the summer months when the weather was hot and interest in education at its lowest ebb, excited few educators to attend.

During this period, the relations of the association with educational publications had its ups and downs. It was not until 1881 when State Superintendent B. L. Butcher founded the West Virginia School Journal at Wheeling that the association was able to retain a continued interest by editors in the work of the organization.

During a period beginning in about 1876 certification of teachers and examinations for teachers comprised a great deal of the interest and discussion at the summer meetings. The legislature got into the fight and passed measures detrimental to educational progress. Most of the time these acts were without the support of the teachers or the State superintendent of schools.

All through its early history the association fought for the strengthening of the county superintendent's position in the school system. Also during the period the State legislature threatened to weaken it.

Textbook selection seemed to plague both the association and administrators alike during this period. As early as 1882 the question of free textbooks arose but apparently got little serious consideration.

Compulsory school attendance had not reached a point where it was an issue, but as early as 1877 the association had created a committee to consider its advisability.

The evils of tobacco and alcohol created much more of a furor. In 1884 agitation began for the adoption of textbooks illustrating the effects of alcohol, tobacco, and narcotics on the human nervous system. This proposal received the endorsement of the association again in 1886 and the following year this agitation bore fruit.

Teachers apparently were reluctant to bring up the subject of their own salary for the subject arose only twice in this 17-year period. The first time was in 1882 and again in 1885 although interest in tenure came as early as 1878.

In the late 1890's and early 1900's the West Virginia Educational Association grew slowly and haltingly," Dr. Lord said.

The meetings were oftimes held in for two of the annual sessions that were held at Mountain Lake Park and at White Sulphur Springs. But indications soon appeared that many were ceasing to regard the association meetings as a pleasant summer interlude and were beginning to think of them as a means whereby teachers might "protect themselves against unjust treatment and advance their own interests."

During this period county organizations seemed to strengthen themselves.

Before the county organizations became firmly established a new type of local organization appeared: the round table, an association of teachers from several adjoining counties. Area after area formed round tables until the entire State was covered.

In this period some effort was made to break down the conventions into areas of interest. In 1904, four sections were established: county superintendents, city superintendents, normal school principals and primary teachers.

Teacher qualification, by examination, still caused much discussion and as one writer of that day put it, "many certificates were issued for 'love and affection' and perhaps a 10-dollar bill."

Educational opportunities varied from county to county and from magisterial district to district. The legislature further complicated the situation through the creation of independent districts. This condition existed until the creation of the county unit system.

Compulsory attendance came into being in 1897 and although this increased school attendance and enrollment, counties were hard pressed to put it into effect.

Agitation for a teachers' retirement system appeared in 1898 and the association went to work on the idea but it was several years before a full-fledged system became a reality.

The year 1904 marked the end of an era. For the first time the association elected a man as president who was not the State superintendent of schools.

The early 1900's to the end of World War I marked a period of membership growth and financial stability for the education association. The first step toward divorcing membership from convention attendance was achieved during these years and consequently both grew.

Although the membership in the organization grew, the financial condition did not improve quite so rapidly.

A new constitution adopted in 1909 had set up a permanent executive committee with a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and two members of the committee elected for a 2-year term.

The need for a breakdown of special interests at convention time had become obvious with the county superintendents association being the first to actually hold meetings apart from the business of the convention. Other such groups began to hold sessions during convention separate and apart from the business of the convention.

County education associations were still in their infancy but the round table, an organization of several counties which formed into regional groups, was probably at its greatest strength.

That the association was a working organization is evidenced by the fact that no longer did the group meet at resorts, take sightseeing trips and vacation during the convention.

During these years the school journal, not yet an official organ of the association, was experiencing a "checkered career." State Superintendent of Schools W. T. Miller had sold the publication to two West Virginia University professors and a rival educational publication had been started by Morris Shawkey, who was to be later named State superintendent.

As the association grew so did its effectiveness. It was beginning to be looked upon as the voice of the teaching profession.

The association sought to have the long-standing "institutes" improved and was joined in this effort by the State superintendent T. C. Miller.

It took the leadership in liberalizing the entrance and graduation requirements at West Virginia University.

The association sought to increase the school term of the public schools which in 1905 was still only 5 months. By 1906 they had gained the support of Gov. W. M. O. Dawson and the term increased to 6 months. Other efforts to increase the minimum school term were thwarted for one reason or another and it was not until 1919 that the legislature provided for an increase of 10 days each year until a total of 160 days, or 8 months of school, would be reached in 1923–24.

The first serious thoughts of making the county the basis for taxing, as it might apply to the school system, was taking place during this period. As usual, the teachers' organization favored the broader tax base but was met with considerable opposition by those who favored the district units. Well within the memory of many teachers today is the final and ultimate success of the county unit in 1933.

Salaries, although frequently mentioned, had never played an important part in the objectives of the association. With the coming of World War I, and the accompanying high cost of living, the need for improvement in salaries became urgent.

The 1913 convention at Parkersburg urged the establishment of a sick leave program and soon afterward a permissive retirement act was enacted by the legislature.

Between 1923 and February 1926, about 3 years later, the question of the need of a full-time secretary occupied the discussion of practically every executive committee meeting and every convention. On that date, the executive committee, meeting in Washington, D.C., employed W. W. Trent, who had been serving for several years on a part-time basis, as editor and full-time secretary.

Headquarters of the association had been kept at Elkins, where Secretary Trent lived, but in 1926 office space was rented in Charleston and headquarters moved to that location. In 1929 property was purchased at 1816–18 Washington Street and the association most frequently referred to now as the SEA, had its first association-owned home.

Spurred by the activity of the association officers, the employment of a full-time secretary and purchase of headquarters, membership grew from slightly more than 2,000 in 1920 to nearly 7,000 by 1931.

As the 1920's came to an end, and with the coming of the great depression, one issue above all others came to be the center of attention: that was the financial support of education. Financial support had never been satisfactory and the real crisis came to a head with the passing of the tax limitation amendment in 1932.

This was truly a period of decision as one crisis after another occurred. County school boards were unable to secure needed finances to carry on an adequate school program due primarily to the depression and to the ratification of the tax limitation amendment approved by the voters in the fall of 1932.

Incoming Gov. Guy Kump had expressed doubts about the soundness of constitutional limitations on levies but promised State assistance if the schools would put into effect economies in line with reductions commonplace in other fields at this critical time. The salaries of teachers for a period of 4 months was assumed by the State with the local districts responsible for the balance of the months, either seven or nine, whichever they could afford.

Promised State aid was slow in coming because the legislature was unable to pass a budget bill due to the difficulties in interpreting the new amendment. Before the end of the term more than 4,000 schools were forced to close their doors early.

The legislature, meeting in March, adjourned after only being in session a few days but knowing full well they would be called back to Charleston. This took place in April when Governor Kump issued a call

for a special session and included in the call were two items of considerable importance to the schools of the State.

The county unit proposal went before this group of legislators amid opposition, much of it within the ranks of the association. By the time it was passed, in May of that year, sentiment had begun to change in favor of the bill. State aid to schools was set at $5,500,000 that year, the largest ever allocated to schools up to that time.

Another extraordinary session of the legislature was called by Governor Kump in December to find a solution to the school problem. This crisis was finally solved by a levy adjustment and the State assuming the payment of salaries for a period of 8 months instead of only 4.

The most important association developments during the 1930's were the growth of the county associations, the employment of an executive secretary and the constitutional provision authorizing five statewide affiliates.

The duties of the Journal editor and the secretary were divided in 1936 when R. B. Marston was named the first executive secretary and J. H. Hickman, former secretary, accepted the post as full-time editor.

The move for reorganization, which consequently led to the formation of the affiliates, came about as a result of the large attendance at the Charleston convention in 1935.

Differences in school philosophies developed early between Superintendent of Schools W. W. Trent and Governor Kump. These differences continued under Kump's successor, Homer Holt, and the association had a decision to make: to support the State department's legislative program and be out of favor with the Governor; to support the Governor or to develop their own program. The legislative and executive committees felt the latter was the wise choice rather than take sides or a middle-of-the-road policy.

By convention time, 1938, the rapport between the association and the Governor's office had considerably improved. Governor Hold addressing the convention that year proposed the foundation program in which local effort in support of schools would be rewarded. This and a number of other recommendations made by the Governor closely paralleled the SEA program.

Wartime restrictions aided indirectly in strengthening the county association. Legislators were informed of the SEA program at a local level prior to the session instead of waiting to hear about the program after they got to Charleston.

M. M. Neely succeeded Homer Holt as Governor and the relations between the association, the State department of education, and the Governor's office was peaceful and tranquil. This "honeymoon" feeling extended into the legislature. But this era of good feeling would only last during the tenure of Neely. With the election of Clarence Meadows in 1945 the end was in sight.

Because State aid to schools had increased over the years, and especially during Neely's administration, the school became the target of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce who opposed higher State taxes and expenditures.

In 1943 Phares Reeder had succeeded R. B. Marston as the association's executive secretary and he took up the battle against the chamber, a battle that continued through the years until the retirement of the chamber's longtime director, Harry Stansbury.

Although the Governor severely criticized the association as having the "heaviest and most effective lobby I have ever witnessed," a $30 salary increase was put through in addition to a $3 increment.

Membership activities of the association centered around attempts to institute the unified dues plan—a plan whereby members joined national, State and local associations rather than select a single organization. Membership in the SEA was already high but the national (NEA) was barely half that of the State organization. By 1950, however, spurred by the election of Corma Mowrey as NEA president and the hard work done to bring about unification, NEA membership was about equal to the State association.

In 1949, because the title, State Education Association, was frequently confused with the State Department of Education another constitutional amendment changed the name to the West Virginia Education Association, dropping the word "State" from the title.

Higher salaries continued to be the No. 1 objective of the WVEA especially in the light of the higher cost of living that ensued following the war. In 1947, when a proposed salary bill already passed by the house of delegates became bogged down in the senate, threats of "strike" and "walkout" were heard throughout the State. The association leadership, under the direction of Reeder and President Rex Smith, continued to press for passage and in the closing days of the legislative session a bill increasing the base pay and adding $3 to the experience increment went to the Governor for his signature.

The need for new headquarters became apparent as activities increased. The executive committee, in 1951, after consideration of several sites, recommended to the delegate assembly the purchase of property at 1558 Quarrier Street. This was done and the 1952 delegate assembly authorized the start of construction in line with the specifications of a Charleston architect.

Ground-breaking ceremonies were held on March 6, 1954. In December of that year the staff started moving into the building and the building was officially dedicated the following spring.

The WVEA and the State teachers association, a Negro education organization, completed details for unification into one organization after years of working on the problem.

Gains in retirement and sick leave, plus social security coverage for teachers through county referendum, were made during this crucial period of history. As for salaries, Gov. Okey Patteson, in his message to the legislature in 1951, simply indicated that if funds could be found, the teachers should receive a raise.

Despite pessimistic reports from legislative leaders, the teachers received a salary boost, although the cigarette tax had to be increased to do it.

Incoming Governor, William Marland, in 1953 recommended the extension of the employment term from 9 to 9½ months. To finance this and other educational measures, he proposed a "severance tax" on exportation of natural resources. Although supported by the association and various labor groups, the fight over this measure was one of the most severe the association has ever experienced.

The world was changing at breathtaking speed and the Russian achievements only served to pinpoint this change. Schools were called on to help meet this rapid advancement in practically every phase of our life. If West Virginia was to share in the industrial development move, certain to come about in the next decade, then educational development must take place also.

It was during this period that the association nearly got into politics * * * that of endorsing candidates. After several setbacks in the legislature, particularly in the senate, a policy was set by the executive committee that the association would evaluate candidates for Governor, legislature, and Congress and make this material, with the candidates voting record, available to local associations. No funds were ever involved and the hesitancy of local leaders to meddle into politics kept the association leaders from making a big issue of this decision.

Most notable was the effort of the association to make the selection of the State superintendent appointee rather than elective. The 1957 legislature put it to a public referendum and it was adopted effective in 1958.

A State constitutional amendment to permit the laying of levies at 100 percent for 5-year periods instead of 3 failed in 1956 largely because of its unfortunate title, "Taxation and Finance Amendment." The amendment, in practically the same form, passed in 1958 under the title of the "Better Schools Amendment."

Efforts were made in the latter part of the fifties to steer the emphasis for improved education to the pupil instead of the teacher.

Efforts in the 1959 session to pass an income tax had the support of the association and for their support of this measure were censored again, severely, by the Charleston Gazette. 1960 was not a major legislative year, a regular budgetary session, but the association pushed for a stronger property appraisal act. With senate help, this time, a bill was enacted requiring county courts and the assessor to use new appraisal values, as a result of the reappraisal program going on, and to assess at not less than 50 percent of these values.

The 1961 year ushered in the first term of W. W. Barron as Governor and a period of good relations with the Governor's office and the legislature. Superintendent of Schools Virgil Rohrbough died in office and was succeeded by Rex Smith. Both public schools and higher education fared well under the Barron administration and, despite association efforts, West Virginia still lagged in the amount of money spent on a per pupil basis, and teachers' salaries were still short of the national average by about $1,000.

COMPLEX—YEAR-OLD GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL MUST HAVE COMPUTER TO COMPLETE SCHEDULES

The services of an electronic computer are needed to keep things straight at what is probably West Virginia's most complex innovation in education.

The computer is used to complete class schedules and keep them from conflicting for the students at Charleston's year-old George Washington High School.

When it opened last year, county school officials said George Washington contained little that was actually new but, rather, represented a pooling of a number of new educational practices that had been developed in recent years.

The South Hills school's curriculum represents a whole new structure and the heart of the program is a complex but seemingly smooth-working scheduling system.

Utilized are such techniques as team teaching, large and small group instruction, independent research and seminars.

The school's schedule is tailored to the requirements of each teaching team and to some extent can be modified to accommodate individual differences among students.

Each school day is divided into modules of time—a 10-minute module to start the day with routine activities and then 20-minute modules from then on. A class or study period may last for one or several modules. Some students change classes every 20 minutes but only about one-third of the student body is on the move at any one time.

Students spend from 10 to 30 percent of their time in individual study. This may be either scheduled or unscheduled, depending upon the responsibility of the student.

George Washington had the advantage of having its building and educational program planned simultaneously. Without the specially designed building, the school's new

curriculum would have been difficult, if not impossible, to institute.

The library is the center of both the building and the educational program. It is nearly surrounded by a cluster of small rooms called academic laboratories where individuals and small groups of students can meet in faculty offices and conference rooms.

There also is flexibility in four classrooms which can quickly be turned into eight seminar rooms by extending folding walls.

Principal Gene E. Stanley believes that while all parts of the school's program are important, the small group seminar is where the learning really takes place.

"Teachers are sold on it," he said. When we started, the teachers felt large group instruction was most valuable. Now they consider it almost a necessary evil."

STATE EX-TEACHERS HOLD POSTS IN NEA

Two West Virginians, prominent in educational circles, hold responsible positions with the National Education Association headquarters, in Washington, D.C.

Miss Corma Mowrey, for 20 years a classroom teacher in Harrison County schools and a former staff member of the West Virginia Education Association, was recently named the director of the Dvision of Organization Relations for the NEA. Prior to this promotion she served for several years as the assistant to the director of the Office of Lay Relations.

Sam Lambert, also a former West Virginia teacher and former WVEA staff member, who has been with the NEA since 1950, was recently named an assistant executive secretary in charge of informational services for the NEA. For several years Dr. Lambert has been the NEA's director of research.

While a teacher in West Virginia Miss Mowrey served 1 year as president of the WVEA and in 1950 was honored nationally by being selected president of the NEA.

Dr. Lambert is a native of Bluefield and prior to joining the NEA held a number of important posts in the education field in West Virginia. He was the director of school transportation and director of surveys and planning with the West Virginia department of education; served as the deputy director of the war finance division with the U.S. Treasury, chief statistician and research associate with the George Strayer Research Group in New York City and a specialist on school finance with the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. He served as the WVEA director of research and public relations from 1946 to 1950.

EDUCATION BUSINESS GROWING

Public education in West Virginia is a big business and its getting bigger all the time.

A total of $132 million was spent last year for public schools in the State's 55 counties. For the current school year, appropriations have jumped to $145 million.

During the past 30 years, the State has assumed a large responsibility for financing public education and today State aid provides county school boards with more than half of their operating funds.

An increasingly important factor in school finance in West Virginia and elsewhere is the role of the Federal Government.

Relatively small amounts of Federal aid have been received by the school systems for years. Federal funds for education shot up in 1958 with passage of the National Defense Education Act.

Public education got its biggest financial boost from the Federal Government earlier this year with passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This legislation will provide about $18 million for West Virginia's public schools this year.

During the 1964–65 school year, West Virginia received a total of $6,381,426 in Federal funds through the State department of education.

TECHNICAL—WOOD, WETZEL COUNTIES MEET CRUCIAL TRAINING NEED: TEACHING YOUTHS, ADULTS SKILLS OF DATA PROCESSING

Two school systems in the State, those of Wood and Wetzel Counties are meeting one of the most crucial training needs of industry, that of teaching youth and adults the skills of electronic data processing.

In both school systems the courses are vocational technical study offered under the direction of the Division of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education.

At Parkersburg the courses are free to both groups. At New Martinsville courses are conducted under the technical education program for high school students, and are offered for fees to adults in the area.

Parkersburg conducts the training center for adults under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Wetzel County is serving industries in the area that want their employees upgraded. Their adult classes come from the Ohio Valley on both sides of the river.

In order to meet increasing demands for programers, many industries are offering their own courses and high schools across the Nation are adding courses as rapidly as they can. In spite of these efforts the supply cannot keep pace with the demands.

The Wetzel County Center is built around an IBM 1440 disk pack system.

Wood County Center has a Burroughs 283 computer with magnetic tape and punch-card capabilities, as well as paper-tape capabilities.

The center offers computer programing courses for the Burroughs 283. Cobol (comman business-oriented language) techniques are also taught for the B–283. IBM 1401 Audocoder programing language, and concept of the IBM 360, are offered as theory courses.

The courses in Wood County were started in August 1964, and students from last year's classes are already working as computer programers in the Washington, D.C. area, in Pennsylvania industries, in the computing centers of three universities, as teachers in training centers, in computer manufacturing, and in tabulating wiring as far away as Phoenix, Ariz.

The Wood County Center is more versatile than the Wetzel County Center, having a greater capacity for breadth of training, but the Wetzel County Center is equipped to serve a sizable number of students in the area in which training is offered.

The data-processing center in Wood County is temporarily housed in a portable metal building on the campus at Parkersburg High School until a building program is completed. The program carried on there is four faceted. It includes adult retraining, student training, county administrative work, and community services. The community services are offered at cost to nonprofit organizations, especially to local government. For example, the center is in a position to do personal and real taxbooks for a county government.

Trainees have done work for the Boy Scouts and are doing some small jobs for industry. The money from these jobs helps pay for operating the center.

At Parkersburg six types of training are being offered. The least complicated course is for the key-punch operator. One trained in that operation can find employment opportunities in almost every business that uses accounting machines. The Bureau of Public Debt in Parkersburg, through which every U.S. savings bond sold anywhere in the world is processed, is the largest employment source in the mid-Ohio Valley for key-punch operators.

A second area of training is that for tabulating machine operators who are concerned with sorting, reproducing, collating, and tabulating in card processing.

In the computer area there is the computer operator, who loads programs, files, mounts magnetic tapes, and checks printouts. There is also the computer programer who plans the system to achieve the desired output after he is advised of the material that will be fed to the machine. He solves the problem, writing in a language that the machine can understand, so that the desired results can be produced.

A bit of incidental information on the modern collegiate front is the fact that some colleges are accepting symbolic computer languages for language credit.

SMITH BACKS CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

The following is a statement issued by Gov. Hulett C. Smith on the West Virginia Education Association's centennial observance:

"As one concerned most sincerely about the future of our State and Nation, I am pleased to salute the West Virginia Education Association on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. I join with the association's innumerable other friends in offering warm congratulations.

"The growth and continued progress of West Virginia depends, in a great sense, upon what we do in education.

"I am confident that with the assistance and cooperation of organizations like the West Virginia Education Association our State shall continue to move forward by improving our schools and providing for a more attractive atmosphere for the teaching profession."

MESSAGE FOR 1965—TEACHER WELFARE NOT SOLE AIM OF STATE ASSOCIATION

Phares E. Reeder has been executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association for the past 23 years. This is his 100th anniversary message to parents:

"The West Virginia Education Association, commonly known as the WVEA, is 100 years old. Our centennial commemoration will be brought to a climax at the annual convention in Charleston on October 13–15.

"So much of that which we write and say is for the teaching profession itself. Through this opportunity made possible by the Sunday Gazette-Mail, we should like for you, the parents, to know more about this professional association which serves the cause of education.

"The WVEA is not an agency of State government. It is to the teachers what the bar association is to the lawyer, the medical association is to the doctor. It is supported solely through the dues paid by the teachers—95 percent of whom belong to their county, State, and national associations.

"Possibly surprising to you, the WVEA does far more than work for the improvement of the welfare of the teachers. But even this work is not done with a selfish motive. As a profession, teachers want the best possible in the way of an educational program for their product—the children and youth of West Virginia. In our competitive American way of life, the WVEA has had to fight for improved teacher welfare. Had it not done so, our schools today would be in a deplorable state.

"In spite of having lost hundreds upon hundreds of newly trained and experienced teachers to other States, we still have increased the educational qualifications of our teachers. Today, 87 percent have 4 or more years of college training whereas 25 years ago only 41 percent had comparable training.

"Some of the welfare accomplishments, effected during the last quarter of a century, that have made the difference between the

good school system which this State has and what could have been a most inferior one are as follows:

"Periodic salary increases—with a real boost through the passage of the Decision 1965 program last winter.

"Job security through a tenure system.

"Development of one of the better retirement systems in the country.

"A plan of sick leave, yet not nearly adequate.

"Such association-sponsored benefits as health and sickness, automobile occupational liability, and life insurance; legal consultative help and service to teachers.

"Of parallel importance from WVEA point of view, are its efforts and contributions toward the overall improvement of education at all levels. The WVEA is deeply concerned with the kind of educational program offered. It is concerned with the improvement of the organization and administrative structure of our school system at all levels. It is ever at work through committees, staff research, and study to improve education in all areas. Naturally, final determination of policies and program is made by the legally constituted authorities—boards of education, et cetera. However, through the creativity of the profession, new concepts of education and new approaches are projected. Many find their way into the program of education itself."

SYSTEM OF TRANSPORTATION DESIGNED TO SERVE CHANGING NEEDS OF SCHOOLS

School transportation in West Virginia is recognized and accepted as an integral part of a total comprehensive school program.

Probably no group agrees with this more than the 253,444 West Virginia schoolchildren who ride schoolbuses each day.

They represent more than half of all the students in the State's schools.

In pursuing a philosophy of equal opportunity for all children to receive quality education, the State's county public school systems are operating the largest public transportation system in West Virginia. The bus fleet continues to grow each year.

Some understanding of this growth can be realized by referring to 1933, the year during which the legislature passed the county unit law. At that time a number of county districts were transporting comparatively few pupils to and from school. In 1933–34, 711 schoolbuses were used in transporting 57,444 pupils in 54 counties. At that time the counties owned 393 of the 711 buses while the remainder were operated by contract carriers.

The school transportation system must be designed to serve the changing school attendance patterns. As dozens of schools are closed and consolidated into new modern buildings encompassing larger school and community areas, more youngsters must be transported. In many cases as school programs become more comprehensive transportation requirements further increase.

To do this tremendous transportation task the 55 counties own and operate 2,111 buses daily. Forty-three privately owned vehicles on contract to transport schoolchildren also operate for a total daily vehicle operating figure of 2,154 units. About 270 spare buses are maintained by the counties to run when regular buses are being serviced or repaired.

These schoolbuses traveled 21,010,337 miles during the 1964–65 school year. Until 1963 there had not been one West Virginia schoolchild fatally injured while riding on a schoolbus since 1939. West Virginia has received some of the highest honors in school transportation safety from national organizations. In one mishap in late 1963, where a schoolbus driver and a girl student died, the only fatality since 1939, State police investigation reports say the bus driver was in no way at fault.

Walter says this excellent record can be attributed to the well-regulated policies and procedures in the employment of schoolbus drivers. Not everyone can be a schoolbus driver—only persons between the ages of 21 and 51 years are eligible to make application.

Written examinations, as well as physical examinations, are required of all drivers at the beginning of each school year.

Prescribed training following employment is required before any driver can report for duty. Inservice training is required as a further assurance that all drivers are properly prepared to assume their responsibilities.

THEORY—HANCOCK SCHOOLS OUTLINE EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Educational innovation in West Virginia's northern panhandle is most pronounced in Hancock County where two new high schools are now in their second year of new programs in new surroundings.

The new schools are campus type facilities with well-designed buildings in quiet, scenic locations.

But the important parts of the schools are teachers and programs, students and initiative.

That's the theory and that's why the new facilities were designed not just as educational plants but rather as facilities particularly adapted to a progressive system of secondary education.

They are, in effect, research centers where well-directed students may educate themselves and develop attitudes which will motivate them to expand their knowledge in the years following formal education.

Hancock County school officials say that one of the reasons for establishing a research-centered program, which is the real new look in the system, is that knowledge is expanding and becoming obsolete so swiftly that it seems almost dangerous to teach a child facts rather than how to discover and organize facts.

If carried out effectively the independent research requirement can individualize high-school education. Under the program the student must examine some topic in depth; he must organize his efforts toward a substantial accomplishment; and he must accomplish enough, largely on his own, to impress a faculty member.

Each student in his final 3 years of high school must earn 12 points, half of those in the senior year, on a project requiring "that the work be described in detail and in formal style in a research paper, a recital, an art showing or a form appropriate to the subject area in which the independent research is done."

Opened in 1964, the two campus-style schools are Weir High in Weirton and Oak Glen in the northern part of the county. Weir, because of its size, is organized on the "little school" concept with each of these units having about 400 students and its own principal. English, social studies and math are taught in the little schools and students go to other buildings for their independent research and other classes.

Both schools center on the library and efforts have been taken to make them distinctive and attractive. In both schools, all manner of space, tiny and large, also has been made available for the independent research program. Some of it is as obvious as allowing a science student to work in a laboratory when neither is scheduled for a class. Mostly, though, it's an ingenious use of nooks and crannies.

Weir High is an eight-building complex on 56 acres of ground. There are the three little schools, a library-science building, theater arts center, gymnasium, business-education-administration building and service building.

Oak Glen's 97-acre site contains an academic building, arts center, little theater and gymnasium.

SCHOOL TAX ROCKETS IN 10 YEARS

Dramatic changes are taking place in the effort exerted to support schools at the local level. For example, in 1953–54 property tax collections for school operations totaled $26.3 million. In 1963–64, the figure was $51.6 million—an increase of $25.3 million.

Some benchmarks which have contributed to this increase are:

Statewide property reappraisal: The forerunner for a Statewide property reappraisal program was enacted in 1947. The original measure has been modified, strengthened, and extended on several occasions by the legislature. Reappraisal is complete in 22 counties with July 1966 set as the target date for completion statewide.

Better schools amendment: In 1958, the voters of West Virginia approved an amendment to the constitution which increased levying and bonding capacities of county schools. Counties may now increase the basic levy rate by 100 percent and extend this rate for a 5-year period. A county may borrow, through bonds, up to 5 percent of the total assessed property valuations in the county. In either case, 60 percent of the voters must approve at a special election.

Local effort: Through special levy and/or bond elections counties have extended effort to improve schools. At the present time 28 counties have both a special school levy in effect, 8 counties have a bond issue in effect, and 6 counties have neither a special levy nor bond in effect.

Improvements at the local level have come as a result of increases in property assessments stemming from higher appraisal values, increased tax leeway under the better schools amendment, and voter approval of school bonds and levies.

THREE-YEAR DRIVE—ALL OF STATE'S COUNTIES HAVE APPROVED PLANS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

West Virginia's 55 county school systems are getting started this year on a program that could make significant changes in the kind of education that is offered in the State's public school classrooms.

The 1965 legislature appropriated $1 million to initiate the Comprehensive Education Program (CEP), a plan of school improvement devised over a 3-year period by the State department of education.

The CEP is designed to use the $1 million, and whatever money it gets in the years ahead, to encourage counties to improve their educational programs. Long range educational planning is an essential feature of the CEP.

All of West Virginia's 55 counties now have approved plans to expand their educational offerings under the CEP.

The plans include 92 programs in 10 subject areas with 11,499 teachers and 418,000 directly involved, State Supt. Rex. M. Smith said.

The detailed plans were drawn up by county school staffs and curriculum committees in each county.

All of the $1 million provided by the legislature will be used. A second distribution of funds will be made to counties which have plans beyond the minimum required to qualify for the participation. Under the CEP, the money will not pay for expanded programs, but will only stimulate improvements.

"I am very pleased that all counties not only studied their educational systems very carefully, but were able to plan projects that would mean more opportunities for the pupils," Smith said.

The 10 general subject areas in which programs have been approved include language arts, social studies, science, guidance, foreign language, mathematics, school lunch, home economics, vocational agriculture, and physical education.

Forty-two counties are expanding their language arts programs under the CEP to provide better opportunities for students to develop reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills.

Fifteen counties are expanding social studies opportunities to allow pupils to gain better understanding of the world in which they live. Science teaching and facilities will be improved in nine counties. One county each is expanding opportunities in the areas of guidance, foreign language, home economics, vocational agriculture, and physical education.

The broad outline for general school improvement under the CEP would make it possible to improve in 22 subject areas. Educators say that if their evaluations of the new projects are favorable, many more projects will be planned next year.

Several counties have undertaken two or more projects under CEP guidelines although receiving funds for only one or two.

"More important than money is the fact that stimulation of effective, detailed planning and analysis of educational programs at the county and State level has really begun in West Virginia," Smith said. "The CEP has caused the most intense examination of our educational systems in recent history.

"This progress does not mean that we have a statewide comprehensive educational program, only that we have made the first significant step," he continued. "We must have funds to maintain the expanded opportunities already begun and then additional funds to expand other areas not touched this year."

Smith explained the background of the CEP this way:

"The CEP grew out of a need for change in West Virginia. Although there are many excellent educational programs now operating in West Virginia and there are continuous untiring efforts on behalf of educators and interested laymen to bring better programs to our State, there can be no argument about the fact that we still need many improvements.

"For example, out of every 100 high school graduates in the State, 30 go to college and 16 receive vocational training. That means that 46 percent of our graduates are prepared to make a go of it in this competitive world.

"What happened to the other 54 percent? Unfortunately, many of these 'forgotten' students are headed for the unemployment lines and the relief rolls unless something is done. We have got to provide meaningful education for every child.

"In addition to these forgotten students, we must also provide for adult citizens who want to continue learning after high school, for those whose jobs have been eliminated by automation and other change, and for those whose jobs depend on continuous education and training. And, of course, we must not forget the preschool child.

"This was the situation the State department of education faced when it set out to develop a plan which would give school board members, administrators, supervisors and teachers an understanding of the need for comprehensive educational programs and direction for the development of such programs."

The plan, representative of the thinking of educators from all over the State and country, features a flexible program which will better serve individual needs and interests of everyone.

It aims to provide three basic things:

A good general education for all, which begins with kindergarten and extends throughout life. This area provides fundamentals of basic courses that everyone needs whether he is going to be a physicist or a mechanic and includes language arts, social science, math, science, creative arts, health, physical education, practical arts and many others.

A good elective curriculum providing salable skills and leading to readiness for productive employment. This area is for students not going to college but who need a job after graduation from high school or post high school. Opportunities should be provided for supervised work experience in such areas as business education, vocational industrial programs and technical education.

A good elective curriculum for those who will continue their formal education provides a background for more advanced work in areas such as English, physics, biology and chemistry.

In addition to an individualized, far-reaching curriculum, a comprehensive educational program also must include other services essential to the successful operation of the program.

These include library and instructional services, health services, guidance, administrative services, school lunch services, transportation and other types of pupil personnel services.

WVEA Convention Due To Start; Drama To Highlight Observance

An estimated 12,000 to 14,000 teachers and visitors will be in Charleston Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday for the 100th Annual Convention of the West Virginia Education Association. The expected record attendance and special events will mark the 3-day convention program as the WVEA, with headquarters at 1558 Quarrier Street, observes its 100th anniversary.

The teachers association, founded in 1865 when a few hundred teachers gathered at Fairmont to discuss common problems, today represents more than 16,500 State teachers.

Highlighting the anniversary observance will be a historical drama to be presented at 7:30 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday nights at the civic center and a downtown parade at 2:30 p.m. Friday. The public is invited to the Wednesday night showing of the drama.

The drama, which depicts the history of the WVEA, is entitled "That Untraveled World." It was written by Dr. Kermit Hunter, author of "Honey in the Rock," and other historical dramas, and is directed by Tom Murphy, of Charleston. A color film depicting the goals of education developed by State teachers during the past 2 years will be incorporated into the drama.

The parade will proceed down Kanawha Boulevard from Morris Street, out Capitol Street to Washington Street, and to the civic center. It will spotlight education with 13 floats, bands, and all that goes with a parade. There will be a special WVEA float and a float sponsored by the West Virginia Classroom Teachers Association. Representation of the 55 counties will be divided among the other 11 floats, and a teacher representing each county will ride them. The county representatives were selected earlier this year in the naming of a Miss WVEA to represent the profession during the centennial year. She is Mrs. Martha Jarrell, a Ravenswood elementary teacher who will occupy the place of honor on the special WVEA float along with 10 regional winners.

Walter F. Snyder, Kanawha County superintendent of schools, will welcome the teachers to the convention at the Thursday morning session at the civic center. Judge Harold C. Kessinger, of New Jersey, will be the main speaker. Judge Kessinger, best known as a humorist, is considered one of the Nation's leading speakers and once was the subject of a TV show typifying an American institution—the public speaker.

On Thursday afternoon, secondary teachers will gather at 19 meetings throughout the city according to their fields of teaching. Elementary teachers will meet at the civic center, where they will hear Dr. Roma Gans, of Columbia University, one of the country's leading authorities on the teaching of reading.

Speaking at the Friday morning general session will be Gov. Hulett C. Smith and Dr. Andrew Holt, president of the University of Tennessee. Jane Hobson, nationally known concert singer of Huntington, will appear on the program. Honor guests will be West Virginia's congressional delegation, members of the board of public works, and State legislators.

Luncheon meetings will be held Friday by four WVEA affiliates—the West Virginia Association of School Administrators, West Virginia Association for Higher Education, West Virginia Classroom Teachers Association, West Virginia Secondary Principals Commission.

A birthday party and ball at the civic center will climax the convention Friday night. Activities will include cutting of a 100th anniversary cake and introduction of "Miss WVEA."

Heritage of State on Display

Visitors by the thousands have come to the campus of Fairmont State College since 1963 to view the little One-Room School Centennial Museum, one of the first permanent mementos to the 100th birthday of the State of West Virginia.

Oldsters and youngsters alike have seen this vanishing segment of American heritage.

Now, 3 years later, portions of the valuable memorabilia will come to Charleston during the 100th anniversary of the West Virginia Education Association, and will be housed in the windows of the Diamond Department Store as a project of the Association of Higher Education, an affiliate of WVEA.

The 23- by 26-foot, white country schoolhouse was taken down in 13 sections 22 miles from the Fairmont State campus where it was erected in 1871, and trucked to the campus to be reassembled amid the halls of learning. There it not only serves as a memory of the early years in rural America, but also is used as a visual aid center to the many young teachers who are trained on the campus each year.

Tribute—WVEA President's Centennial Address Cites Growth, Achievements of State Education

Mrs. Beatrice Burns Harvey of Lewisburg is serving as president of the West Virginia Education Association during its 100th anniversary year.

Following is her centennial message to the State's teachers:

"May I remind you, as we celebrate this occasion, that from a few hundred teachers, called together in 1865, the pioneer spirit has dominated until now the organization has grown to more than 16,500 active members.

"This force of unlimited resources has had a tremendous part in the growth and progress of education in West Virginia. Educators at all levels, have been a part of the existence, growth, and achievement of the WVEA as it has moved forward in the great adventure of rendering service to the youth and teachers of this State.

"One hundred years of living are never uniformly smooth and without struggle. They are years of shadows intermingled with sunshine. Years of experimentation, of trial and error. Years mingled with disappointments and rewards, years of seeking change, of discovering better ways of doing things. All of these experiences have given strength and stature to the association, until it has become the recognized symbol for progress in education.

"As president of the West Virginia Education Association, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to the teachers of our State for their devotion, loyalty, integrity and abundant faith.

"Time after time, in the face of inadequate financing of education you have united your efforts and faced the crisis with rededication of spirit and faith in the future.

"You have dramatically demonstrated your dedication to West Virginia and its growth as you have resolutely refused to be lured to other States by higher monetary rewards, fringe benefits and better working conditions. For this spirit of loyalty and dedication every citizen surely offers a prayer of gratitude.

"You have seen, and continue to see, the State's children as its greatest resource. You have also seen, and will continue to see, your united organization as the most effective way to improve teaching conditions and child opportunities. I salute you for maintaining one of the highest percentages in the Nation in membership in the professional organization. This in itself is indicative of your attitude and devotion to the upbuilding of your profession.

"You have strengthened, and will continue to strengthen, education by demanding high standards for training and certification of teachers. You have taken the lead in demanding excellence in performance of duty, and have set yourselves high goals.

"Be assured that as we move into the next century, the WVEA will take whatever risk is necessary to dream, to build, to move forward. There may be time we will fail, but these will mark only temporary defeat. We will never forsake our goal, and will never compromise for less than excellence."

ASSOCIATION REQUIRES B.A. AT LEAST FOR MEMBERSHIP

Fully certified teachers are the rule today, but 100 years ago they often were hardly better educated than their students.

As late as 1921, there were 4,800 teachers who had not gone beyond the eighth grade.

Today, more than 87 percent of all teachers have at least 4 years of college preparation—79.2 percent of elementary teachers and 96.8 percent of secondary teachers. This is above the national average. Twenty-five years ago, only 41 percent had comparable training.

Of the 17,461 teachers in 1963–64, there were 2,248 nondegree teachers, 10,846 B.A. degree teachers, and 4,367 with masters degrees.

VOCATION STUDY PLANS RESHAPED

Vocational education programs in the public school system of West Virginia have been undergoing redirection, expansion and improvement with the aim of adapting the program to the impending needs of youth and adults who must acquire competency to compete in the changing world of work.

Some of the impetus given to vocational education came from the recent Federal legislation that was designed to encourage the development of more diversified and comprehensive vocational education programs.

Vocational programs in West Virginia are administered through the Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education of the State Department of Education in cooperation with Federal, State, and local educational and other agencies.

Educators estimate that only 2 of every 10 students now in elementary school will graduate from college. If this prediction comes true, the labor market will be flooded with jobseekers in a few years.

By 1970, when many of these students begin graduating, the American labor force will already total about 100 million people. Twenty-six million of this total will be young workers entering the labor force during the current decade. Three million will be women entering or reentering the working world.

These people must have sufficient programs of job training and retraining.

Assistant State Superintendent Fred W. Eberle, who heads the vocational bureau, said that so far West Virginia's programs are staying abreast of the rapidly changing times.

"Regardless of the field involved, our training is based on current needs and subject to rapid readjustment," he said. "Our people are being trained for useful employment."

During the 1964–65 school year, 22,869 students in 182 high schools were enrolled in programs of vocational and technical education. These courses, also taken by 14,414 adults, were offered in 53 counties.

CALLING—TEACHER LOOKS BACK ON 60-YEAR CAREER

Early on a mid-November morning in 1894, 21-year-old Alonzo A. Hopkins walked into the log Belle School in rural Summers County and began a teaching career which would span 60 years, a record that few—if any—West Virginians would ever equal.

The spry, silver-haired Hopkins, who observed his 92d birthday at his home in Bluefield last month, is quick to reveal his philosophy of education:

"Teaching," he says, "is man's greatest calling with the exception of preaching."

In his gray stucco home lying almost in the shadow of East River Mountain, Hopkins keeps many mementos of his years spent in the classroom and still keeps informed of activities in the Mercer County school system where he spent 56 of his years of teaching.

With the exceptions of 1 year's illness and three leaves of absence granted to allow him to serve in the State legislature, Hopkins taught continuously from 1894 until 1945. After his retirement from active teaching in 1945, he served as a substitute teacher until 1954.

Hopkins was elected a member of the West Virginia House of Delegates from Mercer County in 1939 and again in 1941. In 1945, he was appointed as an attaché in the house of delegates to hold the position of secretary of the committee on education.

"It was in 1945," he recalls, "that I saw myself legislated out of a job. That year, the legislature passed a bill making it mandatory for teachers to retire at the age of 65. I was then a teacher at Bluefield High School and was 72 at the time."

Hopkins was born September 28, 1873, at his parents' farm on Ugly Branch near Lerona in Mercer County.

At the age of 9, he began his formal education at the Bitch's Spring School, so named from the fact that two female dogs got engaged in a fight while workmen were constructing the building in the summer and fall of 1866.

The name of the facility, located just across the Mercer County line in Summers County, was changed to Belle School in about 1885 and, in later years, was consolidated with the Pipestem School.

Hopkins received his State teaching certificate August 24, 1894, approximately 3 months before he was employed as the teacher at Belle School.

In 1894, he began taking classes offered by Concord Normal School in Athens and received his diploma in 1900. He was awarded a bachelor of arts degree from Concord College in 1931 and attended Marshall College to do graduate work in the summer of 1932.

Hopkins married Sadie Clair Caldwell, whom he had known from childhood, in 1903. The couple had four children, two boys and two girls. Hopkins' wife died in the spring of 1914 at Lerona.

Eleven years later in 1925, Hopkins married Lula Pearl Robins Bray, of Oakvale, in Mercer County. He had a son by his second wife.

He recalls that the school term during his first teaching experience at Belle School lasted only 2½ months. In 1895, he taught at the Knob Ridge School, also in Summers County, but returned to Belle School the following year. He served as the teacher at the Panther Branch School in 1897 before starting his Mercer County teaching career at Brown's Ridge the following year.

Hopkins points out that the school terms were so short at that time he only taught a total of 12 months during his first 4 years in the profession.

"I was paid $25 a month, or $62.50 for my first term of teaching," he relates. "During my first 5 years as a teacher, I made less than $400.

Hopkins came to Bluefield in 1900 as a teacher at Ramsey School. He remained there for three terms before returning to the Brown's Ridge School.

During the period from 1905 until 1918, he was a teacher in the Brown's Ridge, Athens, Oak Grove, and Green Springs schools.

An influenza epidemic struck the area in 1918 and Hopkins did not teach because of illness.

In 1919, he assumed teaching duties at Lerona which he held until 1924 when he was named supervisor of rural schools in Beaver Pond Magisterial District which encompasses the Bluefield area.

From 1927 until his retirement in 1945, he was a member of the Bluefield High School faculty.

Following his retirement, he was offered a teaching position in North Carolina but decided not to accept. His name was placed on Mercer County's substitute teacher list where it remained until 1954.

Hopkins estimates that he taught approximately 10,000 students during his 60 years of classroom experience. Among his prized possessions is a list of the 40 students who enrolled at the Belle School in 1894.

Since his retirement, Hopkins, still active despite his 92 years, has authored a comprehensive geneological history of the Hopkins, Farley, Cook, Keaton, and Brown families which live in the Mercer County area.

The Belle and Panther Branch schoolhouses are now only a part of southern West Virginia's colorful history but the service of Alonzo A. Hopkins, the man from Ugly Creek who firmly believes that teaching is man's second-greatest calling, will always stand as a living monument to their memories.

FOUR SECRETARIES SERVE WVEA IN 100 YEARS

Only four full-time executive secretaries have served the West Virginia Education Association in its 100-year history.

The first secretary was W. W. Trent, former State superintendent of schools, who at the time of his appointment was serving as part-time secretary and editor of the School Journal while associated with the school system in Randolph County.

In 1920 he was named the association's first full-time secretary and served in this post until August 1927.

The position remained open until the following October and at its annual convention the organization chose J. H. Hickman to succeed Trent. Hickman served until 1936 and was succeeded by R. B. Marston who held the post until 1943.

Marston resigned to accept an appointment with the National Education Association in Washington, D.C., and Phares Reeder, who was serving as the Classroom Teacher Association president succeeded him.

Reeder has served in this position for the past 22 years, longer than all his predecessors' terms combined.

SURVEYED—FURTHER EDUCATION DOUBTED BY 61 PERCENT OF SENIORS

Based on recent records, about one-third of high school seniors can be expected to

go on to college. What will the other two-thirds do? Are they adequately prepared to get jobs, or do they need some kind of additional training? Are new facilities for schooling beyond the high school needed in the State?

In order to establish a basis for studying these questions, the West Virginia Education Association, under the auspices of its committee on education beyond the high school, went to the students themselves. An opinion survey was made of 1,826 graduating seniors at 180 high schools in 54 counties.

Ninety-two percent of the seniors were interested in continuing some type of schooling. Of these, 53 percent were "greatly interested" and 38 percent were "moderately interested." However, 61 percent of the seniors said they believed they couldn't continue their education. The lack of money was the most frequently mentioned reason, followed closely by the desire for immediate employment.

Asked to select from three choices the type of education beyond high school in which they were primarily interested, the seniors chose from 1 to 4 years of regular college education first (43 percent). Following closely was vocational-trade and/or commercial education (37 percent). The third choice was 2 years of college education combined with vocational-technical schooling. Of the seniors 6 percent were interested in none of these types of education.

Eighty-six percent of the students replied in the affirmative when asked if they would be for or against an advanced area school which would include the 12th, 13th, and 14th grades offering a wider variety of 12th grade subjects plus college and/or vocational-trade courses for 13th and 14th year students.

Slightly more than one-third of the seniors favored one of the professions as a life career. Engineering and teaching were the most popular professions with the boys, while teaching and nursing were most favored by the girls. Only 4 percent of the boys were interested in science and even fewer in medicine and law.

STATE MAKES PROGRESS TOWARD EDUCATIONAL TV FOR SCHOOLS THROUGH NEW AUTHORITY

The educational uses of broadcasting came to West Virginia with the advent of radio in the mid-1920's. Almost from the very beginning the operators of broadcasting stations made their facilities available for school and college programs, and a great deal has been done through the commercial stations of the State.

However, it is impossible for a commercial station, generous as it might be, to make available enough time during the school day to serve the educational needs of a community, and with educators turning more and more to mass media for solutions to their problems, educational broadcasting over stations licensed to school systems or colleges has been gaining ground.

West Virginia so far has lagged behind the rest of the Nation and the only educational station in the State is a 10-watt FM radio station operated by Marshall University.

Cooperative efforts to secure educational broadcasting for West Virginia began in 1952 when educators in the northern and central sections of the State secured the allocation of channel 5 in Weston for educational purposes, but funds could not be found to build the station.

In May 1960, six colleges and West Virginia University formed the North Central West Virginia ETV Committee to promote educational television in that part of the State. With the aid of a Ford Foundation grant five visitation teams from this committee visited ETV operations in various parts of the United States.

In November 1960, six West Virginians attended the North Central Conference on the Educational Uses of Television at Ohio State University. While there they drafted a tentative plan for State action which was reported to the State superintendent of schools. In July 1961, the State superintendent called a meeting of broadcasters and educators and a State advisory committee on educational broadcasting was formed.

A steering committee from this advisory group helped plan a statewide dissemination conference sponsored by the North Central Association. This was held at Jacksons Mill in October 1961. County school officials and college representatives from all over the State attended this meeting where statewide plans were prepared and approved by the North Central representatives.

These plans called for more educational use of existing commercial facilities, for greater student participation in broadcast activities, for the preparation of teachers for the advent of broadcast instruction in their classrooms and for the creation of a State educational broadcasting authority to supervise the development of educational radio and television in West Virginia.

To implement the plan, the State superintendent of schools retained an educational broadcasting consultant and the county superintendents were asked to appoint educational broadcasting committees. A pilot area workshop was held in Beckley in December 1961.

However, this procedure was deemed too slow to cover the entire State and it was decided to use television in order to reach the educators in most parts of West Virginia.

On April 21, 1962, a special statewide telecast was carried by WCHS–TV in Charleston and WJPB–TV in Weston on which the State superintendent and his staff talked to the county educational broadcasting committees and the public concerning television and radio and the schools.

In June 1962, the Governor appointed an interim Educational Broadcasting Authority and charged it with making plans for the use of radio and television in education. In October this authority secured a grant of $10,000 from the Benedum Foundation of Pittsburgh to make a Statewide technical ETV survey.

In December 1962, the interim authority also received approval of a $1,500 grant from the Southern Regional Education Board of Atlanta to inform the public about ETV through workshops.

The 1963 legislature formally created the Educational Broadcasting Authority. Six members are appointed for overlapping 6-year terms. One is designated by the West Virginia University Board of Governors, one represents the State board of education, and the ninth member is the State school superintendent.

The authority was given its first budget by the 1965 legislature when $75,000 was appropriated for the 1965–66 fiscal year. The authority has opened an office at 1033 Quarrier Street and the staff consists of Harry M. Brawley, executive secretary; Mrs. Susan Keith-Lucas, coordinator; and Mrs. Shirley B. Jones, office manager.

The authority has two goals. The first is to get as many stations on the air as possible in the shortest possible time by encouraging efforts on the local level and by seeking Federal funds to supplement State money.

REPORT ON THE 54TH CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a brief report on the 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union which was held in Ottawa, Canada, on September 8–17. The Conference was attended by some 554 delegates from 61 member countries of the Union. Delegates from Congo/Léopoldville and Nicaragua attended for the first time.

At the opening ceremony, messages of welcome were received from Mr. Alan Macnaughton, Speaker of the House of Commons; from the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Lester B. Pearson; from the president of the Canadian group, Senator J. M. Dessureault, who was elected President of the Conference, and from the Governor General of Canada, the Right Honorable Georges P. Vanier. All the plenary sessions of the Conference were held in the impressive Chamber of the House of Commons.

The U.S. delegation consisted of 11 Representatives and 2 Senators, as follows: Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York, who served as chairman of the delegation in the absence of Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, who, with most of the appointed Senate delegates, was detained in Washington by the current debate on the farm bill; Representatives E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana, EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, of Texas, PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri, CLARENCE D. LONG, of Maryland, CATHERINE MAY, of Washington, ROBERT MCCLORY, of Illinois, W. ROBERT POAGE, of Texas, and B. F. SISK, of California. The Senate delegates who were able to attend part of the time were Senators STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, and STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina. Former Representative Katharine St. George was also a member of our delegation.

The staff consisted of Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary; Darrell St. Claire, administrative officer; Dr. Charles Gellner and Donald R. Morris, advisers; Milrae Jensen and Martha Price, secretaries. They performed their duties with faithfulness and efficiency, contributing materially to the success of the Conference.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that our delegation played a prominent part in the proceedings of the conference. We were represented at the meetings of the IPU Council by Representatives DERWINSKI and POAGE. During the general debate that followed the opening session Senator YOUNG spoke on the importance of 1965 as the International Cooperation Year, and I spoke on controlling the spread of nuclear weapons as an essential task for international peace.

Representative DADDARIO opened the debate on "The United Nations: Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament" which was a central theme of the conference. He and

I also participated actively in the sessions of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament which hammered out one of the major resolutions adopted by the conference.

Representative W. ROBERT POAGE addressed the conference on "New Prospects for International Economic Relations" and served on the Economic and Social Committee with Representative PAUL JONES, who spoke on "The Process of Economic Development." Representative CLARENCE LONG also served on the Economic and Social Committee, which authored another resolution adopted by this conference.

Representatives ADAIR and MCCLORY represented the United States on the Parliamentary and Juridical Committee, while Representatives SISK and MCCLORY addressed the conference on "Means of Strengthening the Effectiveness of Parliamentary Institutions."

On the Cultural Committee of the Union we were ably represented by Representatives CATHERINE MAY and ROBERT MCCLORY who was the rapporteur of this committee.

Representatives DERWINSKI, SISK, and DE LA GARZA were the spokesmen for the United States on the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions.

All five standing Study Committees of the Union met during the conference and considered amendments to their draft resolutions and formulated their work programs for 1966.

In addition to the subjects of debate which I have already mentioned, the conference also adopted without debate four resolutions on the following topics:

First. The demographic problem and the forthcoming United Nations conference on world population.

Second. Relations between the Interparliamentary Union and UNESCO.

Third. The use of television and other modern technical media for the education of children and adults in a spirit of international peace and friendship.

Fourth. The problem of apartheid in the light of the universal declaration of human rights and the United Nations Charter.

During the conference Senators Dessureault, of Canada, and de Baeck, of Belgium, were elected to the Executive Committee of the Union for 4-year terms to fill two vacancies on that body. Rainieri Mazzilli, of Brazil, was reelected President of the IPU Council for 2 years.

The most significant matters with which the conference was confronted lay in the political area. These reflected the issues of the cold war—Vietnam, Communist China's representation in the United Nations, disarmament, means of assuring world peace, and others. If one subject could be singled out as a matter of the deepest concern as manifested in the remarks of the delegates, it was the conflict in Vietnam.

Many things were said about Vietnam, some of them critical of the policy and actions of the United States. Congressman DADDARIO of the U.S. delegation skillfully presented an analysis of the American position on Vietnam in his statement as a rapporteur of the political committee. He stressed American willingness to enter into unconditional negotiations on Vietnam, and cataloged the many efforts already made by the United States to open a path to a peaceful solution. The United Nations had a role to play in the Vietnamese situation, he said, and the member states should search for any effective way in which an agency of the United Nations could promote peace. The United Nations would be judged by history, he declared, on the basis of its performance in situations like that of Vietnam. In short, Congressman DADDARIO portrayed convincingly the defensive and peaceful aim of the American role in the tragic Vietnamese crisis.

From the very beginning of the proceedings there were specific motions attacking U.S. policy regarding Vietnam that had to be met. In the meeting of the Interparliamentary Council on Tuesday, September 7, preceding the formal opening of the General Conference, consideration was given to resolutions introduced by the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic condemning U.S. actions in defense of the Republic of South Vietnam. The Soviet resolution appealed "to the Congress and the Government of the United States" to stop the "barbarian bombings" of North Vietnam, to withdraw American troops from South Vietnam, and to "respect the right of the people of Vietnam to settle their own affairs by themselves."

The resolution of the United Arab Republic was less direct but called for "cessation of American air raids," the application of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, and insisted on the necessity of negotiations "between all interested parties."

The Council voted against recommending that the Conference take up these resolutions for debate. Under the rules of procedure this meant that the resolutions could be placed on the agenda of the Conference only by a two-thirds vote of that body. The full Conference took the procedural vote on these on Friday, September 10, and they were rejected.

Some delegations felt, however, that the Conference should not remain silent on the Vietnam situation, which they felt to be one of the most dangerous crises on the international scene. In its meeting on September 15, the Interparliamentary Council voted to recommend to the Conference a resolution on Vietnam introduced by Mr. Moutet, of France. This resolution, which was essentially an urgent appeal to the parties concerned to start negotiations to end the conflict without any preconditions, was not objectionable in itself to the United States, but it was thought that if it became a subject of debate in the full Conference it could be a lightning rod attracting acrimonious accusations and extended discussion. The U.S. group, therefore, sought to convince other delegations of the imprudence of placing it on the agenda.

When the question of placing it on the agenda came before the Conference on September 16, I raised a point of order to which the Secretary General replied that if it were placed on the agenda it would be open to debate and to amendments. I observed, if one voted against placing the resolution on the agenda, that would not be a vote against the resolution as such but merely an expression that one felt the subject had already been adequately considered by the Conference. Mr. Moutet himself in presenting the resolution also assisted the situation by saying that he had no wish that his action should result in the reopening of discussions. The resolution failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and thus was barred from the agenda. Consequently there is no direct reference to Vietnam in the resolutions finally approved by the Conference.

The formal political item on the agenda of the Conference was entitled, "The United Nations, Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament." In this title the word "disarmament" is closely linked to that of "peace." The need for disarmament as a means of assuring peace was often stressed at the Conference. In my statement in the general debate I urged action on one of the most pressing arms control tasks the international community should undertake today in the interest of peace; namely, action to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. I advocated three principal ways of doing this—conclusion of an antiproliferation treaty along the lines of that recently proposed by the United States in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, the conclusion of a treaty providing for a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapon tests including those underground, and the adherence of Communist China and other countries which have not yet done so to the currently effective treaty prohibiting nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space and underwater, and finally the conclusion of agreements to limit nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems.

At the Dublin session of the Interparliamentary Union in the spring of 1965 the Political Committee had not adopted a draft resolution on this subject, but envisaged that such a resolution would be prepared at the Ottawa Conference. Six draft resolutions were submitted for the consideration of the Political Committee, each reflecting the particular political positions of the parliamentary groups of the countries concerned. I would like to describe these briefly so that you may obtain an idea of the range of political problems the Conference considered.

The first draft resolution was submitted by the U.S.S.R. parliamentary group. It appealed to all the parliamentary groups to influence their governments to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace and to defend the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries. It condemned "aggressive actions" against the democratic Republic of Vietnam and the "armed intervention" in South Vietnam. It also condemned the "military intervention" in the Dominican Republic. These two latter points were, of course, obviously aimed at the United States.

The Soviet draft also called for various disarmament measures, among them agreements to prevent the proliferation

of nuclear weapons, however, with an anti-NATO multilateral force clause, to ban the use of nuclear weapons, and establish "in different areas of the world" nuclear-free zones, to eliminate foreign military bases, and for nonaggression between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries.

It also covered other matters such as the adoption of a United Nations Declaration on the Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the implementation of the U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Another resolution introduced by the Czechoslovakia group was shorter than the Soviet proposal but similar in tone. It said that the United Nations was "crippled by the aggressive policy of the United States" and called for adoption of a declaration on the principles of peaceful coexistence by the United Nations General Assembly. It was critical of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva and called for a World Disarmament Conference. It also advocated representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

The Yugoslav resolution was somewhat more moderate. It called for strengthening the efficiency of the United Nations and to uphold its "democratization" by adapting it to "changed world conditions." It urged "resolving the question of Chinese representation" within the framework of support of the "universality of the United Nations." In regard to disarmament it called for a World Disarmament Conference, banning all nuclear tests, prohibition of the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons, but it avoided the more objectionable Soviet points such as the "elimination of foreign bases." There was no condemnation of U.S. "aggression" but only a general call for "noninterference in internal affairs" so that peoples could decide their future "without pressure, threat, or the use of force."

The Israeli resolution was quite moderate. It was general in phraseology and called for the strengthening of the United Nations, expressed faith in the future of the United Nations, and stressed the necessity for each nation to fulfill the duties set forth in the charter.

The resolution proposed by the Argentine group was very short and stressed the necessity for parliaments to "reaffirm the spirit of universality and humanism contained in the charter."

The draft resolution submitted by the British group professed a need to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace. It cited principles endorsed by the United Nations committee of 27 relating to friendly relations between states, such as to refrain from force and settle international disputes by peaceful means, to respect the sovereign equality of states, refrain from interference in the domestic jurisdiction of any state, and to respect the principle of self-determination.

It also cited an earlier resolution of the Interparliamentary Union favoring organization of a world police force and the formation of a core unit of military and other specialists at the disposal of the United Nations to send to troubled areas.

Finally, it called for moves toward certain disarmament measures including general and complete disarmament, the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, and the extension of the partial test ban treaty to underground tests.

In general, the British resolution expressed views compatible with those of the U.S. delegation.

In order to facilitate the work of the political committee in reconciling the widely varying resolutions before it, the Secretary General announced on September 11, that the steering committee had decided to appoint a drafting committee composed of representatives of the countries that proposed the six resolutions and of the three rapporteurs that had been designated to lead off the discussion in the political committee: Mr. DADDARIO, of the United States, Mr. Kriegel, of Czechoslovakia, and Mrs. Chakravarty, of India.

The drafting committee met on Monday, September 13. After a preliminary exchange of views among the members regarding various aspects of the proposed resolutions, Mr. Kriegel, of Czechoslovakia, noted that there were certain subjects common to the proposed resolutions, such as the membership of the United Nations, disarmament, colonialism, and so forth.

It was generally agreed that efforts would be made to focus on these various common points and attempt to agree on language to cover them. The British, Czechoslovak, and Yugoslav delegates undertook this specific drafting task. They achieved a large measure of agreement and reported back to the drafting committee a single draft containing two major unresolved provisions, one relating to Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations and the other relating to colonialism. After further discussion the drafting committee submitted an agreed text to the full political committee on September 14. It is noteworthy that the U.S. representative, Mr. DADDARIO, had succeeded in obtaining deletion of specific reference to Communist China in the clause on participation of states in the United Nations.

In the full political committee on September 14 several amendments to the agreed text were proposed. The first sought to mention Communist China by name in the clause on participation in the United Nations. This was defeated. The Soviet Union proposed the addition of two clauses in the section of the resolution on disarmament. One called for the dismantling of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops. It was defeated. The other clause which provided for establishment of nuclear and nuclear-free zones "in different areas of the world" was adopted. Since no reference was made to specific geographic regions, such as Europe, this clause was not deemed unacceptable by the U.S. delegation.

In the final meeting of the full conference on September 17 this resolution as proposed by the political committee was adopted with an addition to the clause on nuclear and nuclear-free zones proposed by the British Delegation.

Let me close this brief report, Mr. Speaker, by making grateful acknowledgments to our Ambassador to Canada, the Honorable Walton Butterworth and the staff of the American Embassy for their briefing of our delegation and all their help, including the reception given in honor of our delegation by the Ambassador at his residence in Rockcliffe Park.

May I also express appreciation of the devoted and efficient participation by the members of the delegation who were faithful in their attendance during the long hours of the sessions and presented our country's position on vital issues in incisive and forceful speeches in committee and before the full conference. In conclusion, I include the text of these speeches and also the resolution adopted at this conference:

CONTROLLING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS: AN ESSENTIAL TASK FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

(Speech by Mr. ALEXANDER PIRNIE (United States) at the 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Sept. 18, 1965)

Mr. President and my colleagues, it is a great happiness and a rich privilege to meet in this stately edifice, the home of our sister parliament to the north. Our closeness is more than a geographic fact—it is a way of life which has permitted our peoples to share mutual problems and objectives in an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation. Our delegation is very happy to be here and appeciates greatly the warmth of our welcome and the generous hospitality we are experiencing.

May I also compliment our distinguished Secretary General upon his comprehensive report in which he highlights so well our accomplishments and our frustrations.

My Nation has long exhibited its deep concern for the welfare of mankind and many members of this body can testify to the timeliness and effectiveness of its assistance. Even as we are meeting here this afternoon, the House in which I am privileged to serve is taking action to continue this humanitarian partnership.

We are all concerned with the Vietnam ordeal and wish for an early peace. My country has made very clear its unconditional desire to negotiate a just and lasting peace—a peace which will preserve national integrity and the right of self-determination. This should be the concern of all peoples.

Our Australian colleague put the problem in correct perspective when addressing this body this very morning. May we meet the crisis of today in a way that will promote a secure and a happy tomorrow.

I hope that the comments I will now make may contribute to our constructive thinking and objective action.

One of the most urgent tasks the international community must undertake in order to strengthen international peace is to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. We welcome the wide dissemination of peaceful nuclear technology because it promises to bring untold benefits to people everywhere. At the same time, however, it is a source of a potentially dangerous security problem. This danger springs from the fact that nuclear armaments, which were once the technological prerogative of just a few powers, have now been brought within the practical reach of many. In some countries, only a governmental decision is required to initiate military atomic production and to trigger an expanded phase of the nuclear arms race.

This is an ominous situation. If the number of nuclear powers should increase, then it is plain mathematics that the chances of a nuclear confrontation, intentional or accidental, will greatly multiply. In view of the incalculable risks of escalation, the proliferation of nuclear-capable powers would constitute a threat to world security of unprecedented gravity.

Conscious of this, the United States has long sought to contain the spread of nuclear weapons. Dating back to the Baruch proposals of the early postwar period, these efforts may be traced through many subsequent proposals presented to the United Nations and other international organizations. At present, U.S. proposals include the following aims:

The first is the conclusion of an agreement to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty recently proposed by the United States at the 18th Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva has this purpose. Under it the nuclear powers would undertake not to transfer nuclear weapons to the national control of states not now possessing them, and would agree not to help nonnuclear powers to make nuclear weapons. The nonnuclear countries in turn would agree not to acquire national control of, or to manufacture such weapons. A major goal of the treaty would be not to increase the present number of states and organizations with an independent nuclear capability.

If the nonnuclear countries forgo nuclear arms under such a treaty and thus contribute to everyone's security, this should not be at the sacrifice of their own safety. Recognizing this, the President of the United States in October 1964 promised "strong support" to nonnuclear states against threats of nuclear blackmail.

One immediate way all states can counter the nuclear proliferation danger is by fully utilizing the international safeguards devised by the International Atomic Energy Agency to prevent diversion of peaceful nuclear materials to military purposes. The United States has admitted these safeguards to certain of its own atomic reactors, and urges all governments, possessors as well as nonpossessors of nuclear weapons, to facilitate the application of these or equivalent safeguards.

Another major aim of the United States is a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests. Some one hundred states have now subscribed to the treaty concluded in 1963, banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. Unfortunately, the failure of a few significant countries to adhere to this treaty creates a gap in the barrier to nuclear arms proliferation. The United States strongly backs the resolution adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission last June calling on all states to accede to this treaty. It also firmly supports the call in this resolution for extending the 1963 treaty to nuclear tests underground, thus making it comprehensive. The United States is ready to discuss at any time the current technical requirements of an adequate verification system for an agreement to ban this type of testing.

Finally, the United States proposes a limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems. The United States has standing proposals for the major nuclear powers to cease production of fissionable materials for military purposes, to transfer substantial quantities of such materials to peaceful uses, and to impose a freeze on their strategic missiles, aircraft, and other nuclear delivery vehicles.

All these United States proposals are in harmony with the wishes of the United Nations as these have been expressed in General Assembly resolutions. They comprise a viable and effective program for curbing the perils of nuclear arms proliferation and containing the nuclear arms race. We urge their active consideration by this Conference and by all members of the United Nations as valid contributions to international peace.

The Process of Economic Development

(Speech by Representative Paul C. Jones, U.S. Delegate, Sept. 13, 1965)

Although the developed countries have been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars of developmental assistance into the underdeveloped countries, the gap between living levels in the developed and the underdeveloped countries is becoming wider, rather than narrower. The obvious question is "Why?"

During the past 20 years the United States alone has contributed more than $110 billion to more than 100 nations in an effort to assist the peoples of those nations to attain a higher standard of living. While in some areas, particularly the war-ravaged countries which were assisted through the Marshall plan, these programs were highly successful, in other areas, particularly the underdeveloped countries, the efforts were most disappointing, and many of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress have recognized that some of these programs have been dismal failures.

You need to understand the feeling of most of my colleagues in Congress. They are generous and sympathetic to relieving suffering, want and hunger wherever it exists, and for years did not hesitate to appropriate the billions of dollars recommended under both Democratic and Republican administrations. They were prepared to accept some disappointments—yes, even failures—in some of the untried programs, but they did expect to see some successes and to be able to point to worthwhile accomplishments through the expenditure of these tens of billions of dollars which were being added annually to the national debt which now approximates $325 billion, upon which our taxpayers are paying interest.

These taxpayers are voters, the constituents to whom each of the 535 Members of Congress must render an accounting as the Members of the House of Representatives present themselves for reelection every 2 years. Many Members have learned from the bitter experience of defeat that foreign aid is not the most popular issue on which to make a campaign. That is why so many of us want to be more certain that the programs of assisting our friends at least maintain these ties of friendship while contributing to the development of the underdeveloped countries.

Policies advocated and practiced by our State Department, based on the principle that "there are no strings attached" to any aid given by Uncle Sam who apparently has been willing to be maligned, insulted, and even to having his property defaced, destroyed, and taken over by uncontrolled mobs who leave the impression that they resent these well-intentioned acts of neighborly love and friendship, these policies are not supported by all Members of Congress.

In appraising the results of the hundreds of programs which have been financed by the U.S. taxpayers, I think it is becoming more apparent that financial aid alone will not bring about development in underdeveloped countries, and that more attention must be given to the development of plans which can be activated through mutual cooperation, confidence, and understanding. There must be clear statements of priorities before any foreign aid can be effective. There must be coordination in developing programs affecting health, education, transportation, power development, and industrialization.

It is time to dispel the fallacious belief that economic development is primarily a problem of capital investment and that with the availability of sufficient capital all of our problems automatically are solved. There must be changes in economic and social organization, there must be changes in the habits of thought and the ways of life of the people. In short, it seems to me there must be a shift in the emphasis from the material to the human aspects of economic progress.

The problem of economic development

The problem of economic development is a process of changing a whole society. Perhaps the most serious aspect of development planning is what the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations calls the vicious circle of population backlash. The more extensive, and the more developed, health services in an underdeveloped country become, the more serious the population problem seems to be. In some countries population doubles every 25 years. Preventive medicine, including the increasing use of vaccines, antibiotics, is radically reducing mortality rates, while birth rates remain high. The largest increases in population continue to be in countries where poverty is most acute.

Economic development depends more upon people than upon capital. The most important ingredient of all in economic development is education in its broadest sense. Indeed, education, in the narrow sense of training, can sometimes be harmful if it is not accompanied by education in the larger sense, which means acquiring the ability to understand the nature of the forces that make for a rising level of living. It means appreciation of the cause and effect relationship between resources and production, on the one hand, and population growth, on the other.

It is dangerous when economic planning creates a revolution of rising expectations without making it clear that the expectations can be realized only after long and arduous effort. It appears that disappointment can easily turn into resentment, even of the best intentions of the donors. Until men and women in the underdeveloped countries want education for their children enough to make sacrifices, it is not likely that there will be effective development. Education and abundance must be desired enough to sacrifice leisure, elaborate ceremonials, and religious codes that make a virtue of resignation and suffering.

It is especially important that plans not attempt to do too much, too soon, by building elaborate superstructures without first laying adequate human foundations.

Means of Strengthening the Effectiveness of Parliamentary Institutions

(Speech by Robert McClory, Member of Congress, U.S. Delegate, 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Ottawa, Canada, Sept. 16, 1965)

My colleagues, the great hope of mankind is in the strengthening of the functions and influences of the parliaments of the nations of the world.

As representatives of the people and as their direct voices in the government, the opportunity for the people to gain expression and to articulate their hopes for international understanding and peace is vested in us.

The role and powers of representative assemblies have frequently been questioned during the 20th century. The development of the welfare state and the management of the national economy have greatly increased the tasks imposed on governmental institutions during recent decades and augmented the authority of the executive branch. The substantive content and volume of the legislative program have also changed. During the 19th century such matters as rivers and harbors legislation, tariff revision and the like comprised a large portion of the legislative agenda of the American Congress. Today problems of foreign policy, social welfare

legislation and the exploration of outer space are major items on our calendars.

Meanwhile, there has been a general shift toward expanding executive initiative in public policymaking, away from the legislature and toward bureaucracy. Moreover, it is the present practice in the United States for the President to make detailed recommendations to Congress and to exert pressure on Congress for the adoption of measures to carry out these recommendations.

The superior position held by the President of the United States since 1932 has stimulated recurring demands for a restoration of legislative initiative and of the coequal place of the Congress in the political scheme of checks and balances. The question of the proper role of Congress in our politcial system has become a matter of much concern to legislators and to students of government.

Many proposals for congressional reforms and improvements are being made at hearings being held now by a joint committee of the American Congress. Numerous suggestions are being made to modernize parliamentary practice in various ways. Some of these proposals call for strengthening party government in Congress, others are designed to correct the dispersion of power in Congress by strengthening the central leadership and by integrating foreign and military policies.

One set of suggestions would expand our research and information services by enlarging the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress to increase its staff in order to provide a central research pool for Members. This expansion would include the establishment of a separate unit to handle constituent inquiries comparable perhaps to the ombudsmen in some Scandinavian countries. It has also been suggested that advisory councils should be created of nongovernment experts in specialized fields to aid Members in researching technical matters. This might include a congressional institute of scholars drawn from the finest minds of the academic community. Committees could also conduct seminars and enter into private contracts for research studies in depth.

A second set of suggestions calls for strengthening the power of the purse. Under this head are proposals to establish a joint committee on the budget designed to provide for a more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of executive agencies. It also has been suggested that the size of the staffs of the Appropriations Committees be enlarged to include accountants, attorneys, economists, and investigators. Others propose that joint hearings should be held by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, that the President be given the power of an item veto on appropriation bills, that appropriations be made for 2 fiscal years rather than annually, and that two sessions of the Congress be scheduled each year with one devoted to money matters and the other to general legislation.

With a view to strengthening legislative oversight of the executive, it has been suggested that the minority or opposition party be given control of the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations, that permanent subcommittees on legislative oversight be created in each standing substantive committee, and that periodic review of Federal grant programs should be conducted.

Finally, the Special Joint Committee on Reforming and Modernizing the Congress has received suggestions to strengthen the central leadership by giving the leaders the authority to determine the agenda of the House, a power now largely exercised by the Rules Committee; giving the Speaker the right to schedule legislation; and by giving the majority party leadership in both Houses the power to take bills from committee and bring them to the floor.

These are only a few of scores of suggested changes in the organization and operation of the American Congress that have been made during recent weeks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as by political scientist witnesses and by spokesmen for various national organizations, at hearings being held by the Special Joint Committee of Congress. The committee has taken no position on any suggested reforms and will study all meritorious proposals with an open mind before arriving at any conclusions. However, the creation and composition of this committee and the character of the testimony it has received reflect the widespread interest in the United States in strengthening our Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relations with other branches of the Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

We parliamentarians must demonstrate our efficiency. We must adopt modern procedures. Our strength lies in large measure in our ability to meet the demands of Government which we can perform best and which at the same time assure the people of the greatest amount of individual liberty.

My colleagues, the great hope of mankind is in the strengthening of the functions and influence of the parliaments of the nations of the world.

As Representatives of the people—and as their direct voices in the Government—this opportunity for the people to gain expression and to articulate their hopes for international understanding and peace—is vested in us.

New Prospects for International Economic Relations

(Speech of Hon. W. R. Poage, U.S.A., at the 54th Interparliamentary Conference, at Ottawa, Sept. 14, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, my friends and colleagues, the need for a sweeping change in the conditions of trade between the nations of the world has long been recognized. The continued deficits which some countries are facing in their trade balances evidences the need. At the close of the last World War the problem was for the countries of the world, particularly those of Europe, to be able to buy at all. They had so little productive capacity and their needs were so great that they simply could not repair their industries without help. They were in the position of a man with a truck loaded with valuable produce who was out of gasoline and out of money. With the gift of a little gasoline he could soon become a factor in the market.

The United States of America, under the Marshall plan, provided the needed gasoline and most of Europe has become strong and prosperous. This is as it should be and we are all happy that it is so.

But the real longtime problems of trade do not exist between the developed countries. There is plenty of trade between such countries. Trade between the United States on the one hand, and Japan or Canada on the other, had run into the billions of dollars each year. These countries have the capacity to produce everything they need and they also have the capacity to buy what they want if they feel that it is more advantageous to buy than to produce.

No, my friends; the real problems of trade are those which confront the underdeveloped nations. They have no gasoline for their truck but if they did they have nothing to sell which would buy the fuel for the movement of the next load.

It is true that the United States and a number of other of the more fortunate countries have in recent years sought to give aid either directly or through credits to those countries which have no industrial base of their own.

I am sure that all of us applauded the humanitarian aspects of this help. It has fed millions of starving people. It has provided medical treatment. It has reduced the death rate, and I am afraid that in many instances it has increased the birth rate. In the final analysis it has increased the pressure of population on inadequate resources. In all too many lands this succor to the unfortunate may have actually aggravated their problems. Definitely it is no lasting answer to a low standard of living for a third party to provide food and shelter.

Of course, these needs can and should be met by the developed nations on an emergency basis—when an area is the victim of an earthquake, a fire, or a tidal wave. The United States is ready, and I am sure every nation represented at this conference is ready, to respond with aid in such catastrophies, but speaking only as a parliamentarian, and for my Government, I think it is a vain hope to expect aid to ever take the place of sound trade.

Aid beyond the disaster assistance of which I have spoken, inevitably debilitates the recipient country. All nations know this fact and secretly acknowledge it. It is all very well for a people to say we will accept no aid where there are any strings attached. But it is impossible to receive gifts or aid without obligations. There may be no expressed or publicly recognized obligations, but there is certainly an element of gratitude in even the most debased individual, or even animal, and so there must be in nations. The great God who made us all, and who most of us recognize, put that trait of gratitude in our hearts and consciences. If I eat bread for which I did not work I am obligated, no matter how loudly I protest to the contrary.

How, then, are the underdeveloped people to secure the capital needed to develop their resources and to raise their standard of living? I think that we all know that this would be a much better world if the people of every land enjoyed higher standards of living and most of us will agree this can only be accomplished by the accumulation of capital with which to build the machines and industrial plants which so enormously extend man's productivity.

In years past this accumulation of capital was a slow and painful process. Capital was first borrowed at fantastic interest rates. My own people borrowed very heavily from Britain, France, and Holland. It took us hundreds of years to repay. The Soviet Union in effect borrowed from the living standards of its own people. It has only been within the last few years that it has been possible to relax this pressure. Other nations have used other devices but in the end all have found that some way or other they must pay for the capital they need.

Most of the undeveloped countries have little with which to pay except primary products—the products of the forest, the fields, and the mines. As I see it what we need is higher prices the world over for these primary products.

Obviously in the limited time I have I cannot analyze any plans for higher prices. I can only point out that if the price of coffee, the price of rubber, the price of wheat, of beef and of oil were increased to something like what the wheat farmer gets in France or the cattle raiser gets in Britain that most of the people of the world would be able to buy much of the capital goods which they must have to start the spiral in the right direction—and that all this is largely a matter of cooperation.

Almost every developed nation now administers prices of its homegrown products. The United States has gone further and has administered the production of many primary items of world commerce like cotton, wheat, and sugar. But I doubt that our people are going to long continue to make

all of the sacrifice. We simply cannot expect American farmers to continue to reduce production unless others do likewise. If we are to have any real increase in the value of primary products all producers the world over must join in the effort.

THE UNITED NATIONS, INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

(Resolution adopted by the 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference)

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference;

Aware of the need to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace and disarmament;

Welcoming the ratification of the amendments contained in Resolution 1991 (XVIII) of the General Assembly, widening the representation of states on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, as an expression of the democratization of the United Nations and its adaptation to changing world conditions;

Conscious that it is of great importance to recognize the principle of the universality of the United Nations by accepting the participation in the organization of all states which are prepared to accept all the obligations stated in the charter;

Invites all states strictly to abide by the principles of the United Nations in their international relations and, in particular, to respect the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of states in order that all peoples may freely decide their own future without pressure, threat or the use of force;

Welcomes the efforts made by the Special Committee on Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States and calls upon this Committee to expedite its work;

Urges the U.N. further to pursue its efforts to resolve in a peaceful manner the international conflicts which are currently occurring in various quarters of the world;

Supports, in accordance with "The Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations" of 1961, moves toward:

(a) general and complete disarmament, including the elimination of nuclear weapons, under effective international control;

(b) an international agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons on the basis of the principles set out in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1665 (XVI) on the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons;

(c) the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests underground to supplement the agreement signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, and the adherence to that agreement of all other states which have not yet done so;

(d) measures to relax international tension, and halt and reverse the arms race;

(e) the establishment in different areas of the world of nuclear and rocket-free zones, as proposed in the resolution adopted by the 52d Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Belgrade entitled "The Creation of Denuclearized and Limited Armaments Zones as a First Step Toward General and Complete Disarmament";

Reaffirms the utility of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and its continuing efforts;

Welcomes further the resolution of the Disarmament Commission of the U.N. which called for the convocation of a World Disarmament Conference and requests the United Nations Organization to set in motion adequate preparations for the successful convening of such a conference at the earliest possible time;

Welcomes the fact that, since the adoption by the U.N. General Assembly of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the adoption by the 53d Inter-Parliamentary Conference of its resolution on the implementation of that declaration, a number of former colonial territories have achieved independence and membership of the U.N.;

Urges further that the process of the liberation of peoples still under colonial rule be pursued expeditiously;

Notes that, since the adoption by the 53d Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Copenhagen of the resolution on the Adaptation of the U.N. Charter and Working Methods to the Requirements of an Enlarged International Society, the U.N. has set up its Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations;

Expresses its support of this Committee in its efforts to achieve agreement on a method of carrying out such operations in full accordance with the U.N. Charter;

Urges national parliaments to bear in mind these principles and considerations, and press the governments to act accordingly and to implement the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

RESOLUTION—THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROBLEM AND THE FORTHCOMING UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON WORLD POPULATION

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Taking into consideration that, according to U.N. data, today's world population of approximately 3.3 billion people is expected to double by the year 2000;

Further taking into consideration that this growth of population will occur especially in the developing countries;

Noting that the decline in the mortality rate, a result of the general advance in the application of medical science and of an almost complete stop in the spread of epidemics which previously caused the death of millions, is the main reason for this future, rapid growth of world population;

Recognizing that, if any nation's population rises faster than its wealth, its standard of living must inevitably fall and therefore it follows that control of population, by whatever means acceptable, is as important as the increase of the national wealth;

Taking into consideration that measures to solve the population problem should be carried out in conformity with the demographic conditions of each country;

Also taking into account that, for the future number of world inhabitants and for the growth of their living standards, it is essential to insure a speedier increase of their vital resources, such as foodstuffs and other consumer goods, housing, etc., in relation to the growth of population;

Believing that an increase of vital resources must be insured by a faster economic expansion, particularly in the underdeveloped regions;

Noting that, in the developing countries, favorable social conditions, such as political and economic sovereignty, economic growth, development of the public sector, solution of the agrarian problems, etc., are necessary for the solution of population problems;

Commending the United Nations for organizing a World Population Conference to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1965;

1. Recommends that the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, proceed as rapidly as is feasible in expanding the scope of the assistance which they are prepared to give, at the request of governments, in the development not only of statistics and research, but also of experimentation and action programs relating to population problems;

2. Urges the governments of developed countries which are in a position to provide assistance for dealing with population problems to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the United Nations and with the governments of interested developing countries in providing such assistance;

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research and research on economic, social, educational, cultural and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs;

4. Urges all parliaments to exercise influence on governments to facilitate participation in the forthcoming World Population Conference of outstanding scholars, scientists and other experts in all relevant fields from both developing and developed countries;

5. Calls on all countries to mobilize their resources for the growth and fairer distribution of the world's wealth and for the harmonious development of the world's population.

RESOLUTION—RELATIONS BETWEEN THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION AND UNESCO

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Welcoming the resolution adopted by the 13th General Conference of UNESCO authorizing the Director-General of that organization to consult with the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union on the most effective and practical means of strengthening existing links by establishing closer working relations between the two organizations,

Noting that the Inter-Parliamentary Union was admitted in 1962 to a status of information and consultative relations with UNESCO (category B),

Mindful that organizations admitted to this category have obligations to acquant their members with UNESCO activities and achievements and also (1) to give advice and provide assistance on UNESCO studies when requested (2) to contribute to the execution of certain parts of UNESCO's program (3) to invite UNESCO to be represented at meetings whose agenda is of interest to that organization, and (4) to submit to the Director-General periodical reports on their activities and the assistance they have given to UNESCO's program,

Endorses the fundamental concept of UNESCO that collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture contributes to peace and security;

Expresses its support of the UNESCO program, particularly those aspects relating to strengthening the educational and scientific bases in the less developed countries;

Directs the Secretary General to take the necessary measures to fulfill the IPU's obligations under its consultative status;

Appeals to members of the Interparliamentary Union to continue and expand their international cooperation in educational, scientific and cultural matters, and to encourage the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, political and community leaders, and other persons engaged in educational, scientific, cultural, political, and other such activities;

Urges parliamentarians of all member states to take an active part in shaping and carrying out the UNESCO program through such means as participation in national commissions and advisory groups to national delegations to the UNESCO General Conference, informing their constituencies about UNESCO and its activities, encouraging private organizations to cooperate in the UNESCO program, and supporting legislation contributing to educational, cultural, and scientific advancement.

RESOLUTION—THE USE OF TELEVISION AND OTHER MODERN TECHNICAL MEDIA FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS IN A SPIRIT OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

The 54th Interparliamentary Conference,

Identifying itself with the principles contained in the draft declaration on measures

designed to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect, and understanding between peoples submitted to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

Aware of the size of the illiteracy problem in many areas of the world and the limited number of teachers available,

Recognizing that the increasing populations will make this a continuing problem for many years,

Considering that the responsibility for the proper education of youth and for the welfare of the younger generation should be the concern of all,

Recalling the resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO noting the impossibility of eliminating mass illiteracy through the use of traditional methods alone,

Noting the recommendations of UNESCO to promote the use of new media for educational purposes in the developing areas of the world and suggesting the possibility for international organizations to undertake projects for training technicians and developing radio, television, and other modern techniques for the use of these areas.

Stating that the upbringing of children and youth in the spirit of the ideals of peace, friendship among all nations, and respect for human labor and all mankind are important elements for preserving and consolidating peace, mutual understanding, and cooperation of the peace-loving nations of the world, which is the proper responsibility of Parliaments and parliamentarians elected by their people, and hence rests upon the Interparliamentary Union,

Taking into account the fact that television and other mass media constitute an important factor which can play a significant role in fulfilling the task of educating children, young persons and adults, particularly so since television and its influence have undergone tremendous development,

Convinced that an exchange of television programs between different countries, particularly those programs directed toward young people, can and should support the idea of better mutual acquaintance, cooperation, brotherhood, and humanitarianism,

Believing that such programs should contain progressive educational values in a humanitarian sense,

Urges that the new educational media also be used for increasing the awareness of science and technology in the developing countries and for the training of technicians at every level to apply existing scientific knowledge to problems of economic development,

Calls upon national groups of the Interparliamentary Union and all parliamentarians to use their influence upon their respective governments and institutions so that TV programs whose subject matter is within their direct competence should serve the particular needs and culture of their own countries and the ideals of peace, mutual understanding, and friendship among all nations.

RESOLUTION—THE PROBLEM OF APARTHEID IN THE LIGHT OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(Presented by the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions)

(Rapporteur: Mr. F. Mohieddine (United Arab Republic))

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Stressing the great importance of the historic documents aimed at abolishing racialism in all its manifestations; namely, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Noting that the Government of the Republic of South Africa, in defiance of the said declarations, of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and other U.N. organs condemning apartheid, continues these policies which constitute a grave crime against humanity,

Strongly condemns the policy of apartheid prevailing in the Republic of South Africa;

Appeals to all the parliaments of the world to urge their respective governments to insure the immediate carrying out of the resolutions and recommendations of the Security Council and the U.N. General Assembly for putting an end to the policy of apartheid.

NEW PROSPECTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

(Resolution adopted by the 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference)

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Appreciating the great importance of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the solution of problems of international trade and economic progress in the developing countries;

Recognizing the great significance of an international division of labor, and of the rapid expansion of trade for the economic development of all countries, and especially developing countries;

Aware of the need to take urgent measures on an international scale to speed up the economic and social progress of the developing countries and remove obstacles to international trade;

Emphasizing that the main task faced by the developing countries on their way to economic progress is the elimination of the economic and social aftermath of colonialism;

Recognizing that the principal problems of developing countries in their efforts toward economic progress are the instability of prices of primary commodities and tariff and nontariff barriers that affect their trade in semimanufactured and finished goods;

Noting that, since the conclusion of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, no real progress has been achieved in putting its resolutions into effect;

Appeals to the national groups of those countries which did not approve the Conference recommendations, and particularly those which were opposed to the principle of extending preferences in favor of developing countries, to assist their industrial development, to bring their influence to bear on their respective governments to revise their positions and establish, to their mutual advantage, useful cooperation between the industrialized and the developing countries for the future harmonious prosperity of mankind;

Recommends that all countries should cooperate in evolving suitable international arrangements so that measures may be taken for stabilizing primary-product prices at equitable and remunerative levels, due account being taken of each country's purchasing power;

Approves the recommendations of the Geneva Conference that the developed countries should give high priority to the removal of tariff and nontariff barriers affecting trade in manufactured articles of interest to developing countries;

Calls on the advanced nations in their own long-term interest to increase their contribution to the rapid progress of the developing countries;

Expresses the conviction that active participation of parliamentarians as members of national delegations to UNCTAD would do much to further its aims;

Invites the United Nations fully to support the Trade and Development Board in its efforts to implement the recommendations approved by the 1964 Trade and Development Conference.

The remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], regarding the conference were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] on September 14, 1965, and appear on pages 23692–23693.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the delegation from the Congress to the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union held in Ottawa last month, I would like to make the following observations:

We observed the deliberate and consistent determination of Communist governments to use every means at their disposal to launch propaganda attacks against the United States. This year's conference of the Interparliamentary Union was to have considered such items as strengthening of the United Nations, the road to disarmament, educational TV, colonialism, and strengthening of parliamentary government. Instead, every subject was used by the Soviet Union and its satellite spokesmen as a vehicle for an anti-U.S. harangue.

However, whenevery any formal resolutions were introduced condemning the United States for its policy in Vietnam, we were able to defeat them in the votes which were held. Thus, despite the propaganda barrage against us, from a practical standpoint, U.S. policy was sustained by a majority of the nations attending the conference.

Representatives of 62 parliamentary bodies were in attendance at the conference in Ottawa, and it is our belief that we helped to stimulate the minds of many representatives from new lands toward an appreciation of the virtues of sound and independent legislative bodies.

My specific assignment at Ottawa was to serve as one of the two U.S. delegates to the Interparliamentary Council. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas, [BOB POAGE], shared this assignment with me. The proceedings of the Council were, by IPU standards, rather normal. As I have indicated, anti-U.S. resolutions were substantially defeated.

Due to the complications on the India-Pakistan border, delegates found themselves distracted from the other items that were on the agenda.

I am especially pleased to note that the agenda of the conference for the spring meeting in Canberra, Australia, will include in the Committee on Non-Self-Government Territories the subject of "new colonialism." This will permit us to explore Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe and Asia and turn the conference to a practical purpose of exploring present-day abuses of human rights, rather than succumbing to the Soviet propaganda against Western imperialism.

As indicated by our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] the members of the U.S. delegation were extremely vigorous and effective in meeting the challenges of the Conference, while at the same time working persistently to develop and expand good will among the delegates from the other countries in attendance.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for the efforts he has made in this matter. He is one of the best men we have to send to these Interparliamentary Union meetings. He comes back and gives us such a clear picture of what has gone on. He takes great courage with him, and it comes back intact.

I want to thank the gentleman particularly for the splendid work he has done.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, particularly in view of her distinguished background in matters relating to our relations with the other countries of the world. She has given the minority outstanding leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a long time and strives consistently for international understanding.

I am sure all members of the delegation deeply appreciate our colleague's words of commendation.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, a very effecfective member of our delegation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], chairman of our delegation for the Interparliamentary Union conference. He gave us not only diligent, conscientious and effective leadership, but also created an excellent impression of the United States with the other countries of the world. We were all gratified and impressed by the warm admiration and deep respect evinced by the individual members of foreign countries' delegates toward Mr. PIRNIE. I would be remiss if I did not express my admiration for the way the entire delegation worked in such excellent rapport to handle several difficult problems and issues with both forthrightness and finesse. And certainly it seems to me these qualities are necessary in giving the United States successful participation in such an important international conference.

This was my initial experience as a delegate to the IPU conference. I felt it was a privilege to share this experience with my colleagues in Congress who represented their Nation so ably and so well.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

May I say that although this was her first appearance as a member of the delegation, I am sure it will not be the last. It was very evident that she had a deep appreciation of our mission, and she contributed greatly to its success.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] who has been addressing us, certainly does the House great credit in bringing before it this concise yet inclusive report upon the events and matters under discussion at the Interparliamentary Union meeting just held in Ottawa. Certainly for those who were not able to be there as a part of the delegation, but who have a concern, as I suspect most of us do have, over international affairs, it will be worth a reading of these remarks to discover the scope of matters which are under consideration at these meetings, specifically the one from which we have returned.

It will give those who are interested in foreign affairs an idea of the things that are discussed and the problems that confront our delegation or our group and the efforts that are made to resolve the sometimes trying situations that arise.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile to note that there is another advantage and that is the matter of being able to become personally acquainted with the people in the legislatures of other nations. In this way, in less formal ways than in the debates that have been described here, we are able to hold conversations and to get ideas about problems and their views concerning these problems perhaps better than we can through the formal discussion and in the formal presentation of such matters.

I do not believe this matter of personal contact can be overemphasized and as the years go on and friendships are renewed and ripen year after year, they tend to become more productive. Even if those people with whom we find ourselves in disagreement on matters of political philosophy, there is an advantage in being able to have a face-to-face exchange of views.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has performed a most useful function in presenting this excellent report to the House today.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. the gentleman together with our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] through their able service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House know from firsthand experience the tremendous responsibility when in communication between ourselves and other nations.

If this mission is to achieve its fullest potential, it has to have the participation of Members of this House who are as dedicated as you people in this work of improving the international climate in which we are now living, and so improving it that we hope we may live in peace for years to come.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri who was a very valued member of our delegation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to add anything to what has already been stated. But I do want to congratulate the gentleman from New York for the brief but very clear résumé that he has given us of this Conference. I think it is unfortunate, of course, that more Members are not actively interested in what takes place at these conferences. As one who has attended several of them, it has not only been a pleasure but it has been most enlightening so far as I am concerned to have a better understanding of what motivates some of the leaders in other countries. I think that this is one opportunity the Congress of the United States has of having the representatives from other nations understand the responsibilities that we have and to better acquaint them with the operation of our own Government so as to enable them to have a better understanding of our motives and understanding our cooperation. At the same time we have the opportunity to let them know that we do feel they have certain obligations, the least of which is to maintain a friendship and an appreciation for what we are trying to do.

Again I want to congratulate the gentleman who for the second time has been the chairman of the group that attended these conferences. The gentleman has done a magnificent job. I am sure that all of us, as has been expressed by other delegates who were there, are proud of the manner in which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] conducted himself in representing the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been a very faithful member of the delegation and has been able to see the purposes and the problems of the Interparliamentary Union at close range for a very long time. His contributions have been outstanding and I appreciate his comments very much.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who was also a member of our delegation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my congratulations to the gentleman from New York on the wonderful report which he has given on this Interparliamentary Union Conference. As a freshman Member of this House, I was greatly honored to participate in the Conference. I regretted very much that I could not participate the full length of the Conference, for I had to come back. Nonetheless, I can add no more to what my colleagues have already said except that, being able to converse in their own languages with many of the delegates there, I discovered the great admiration and respect held for the Members of this House who had heretofore participated in those conferences. I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

I was very proud to participate for the first time and to be received with such respect by the other members, a respect and admiration that had been gained for me by those who had participated before I had gone to the Conference.

The affairs of the United States, when they are handled in the manner in which these affairs were handled, are indeed in good hands. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York and all of those who participated in the conferences before who made it so easy for me and enabled me to be so proud of my delegation because of their conduct, demeanor, and actions at past conferences.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. I join in his commendation of the delegation for their faithfulness throughout the session. I am very glad if the impression created by his initial visit was that which he has outlined to the House.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, a most active Member of our delegation.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman on his splendid leadership of our interparliamentary delegation at the recent Interparliamentary Conference in Ottawa, Canada, and also I wish to point out the very competent way in which the delegation under the gentleman's leadership handled the interests of our Nation at this conference. It is certainly noteworthy, and I believe it arises not only because of the parliamentary experience which the delegation members had but also because of the very complete and able way in which the members prepared themselves for the task. I know there was a great deal of advance work which was done. There was a lot of preparation done before the Conference.

I noted with particular interest the active participation of all the members in the morning briefings which were held before entering upon the debate. We also had close cooperation and close coordination with representatives of the State Department and others in the Government in order that our views would coincide, in order that we would share opinions, and in order that we would represent accurately as well as actively the best interests of our Nation.

As the gentleman has brought out, several very difficult and sensitive subjects arose during the conference, including, of course, the attacks leveled by several delegations against the United States because of the Vietnamese situation. I think that the votes which were conducted and which were cast with regard to this issue were particularly significant in behalf of our Nation, and they demonstrated our influence, friendship, and the respect in which we are held by the nations of the free world particularly.

I should like to recall briefly that this is the oldest international organization in existence, having weathered two world wars. It does provide a great meeting ground for parliamentarians of the world. It is becoming increasingly effective.

I know in regard to my own committee, the Health and Education Committee, we have now established a liaison between our committee and UNESCO with regard to the subject of educational programs in underdeveloped nations. This is another forward step.

I might say, too, that with regard to the resolutions that were adopted at the recent Conference, two of the resolutions were recommended by that committee and received the unanimous support of the Conference at this session.

I note, with regard to the further program of my committee, that the agenda which was adopted by the Conference was that which we recommended to the Conference. It will result in closer study of the application of science to the economic development of the emerging nations.

So I want to call to the attention of our colleagues the significant role the Interparliamentary Union plays as a world and international organization and the importance of that organization to the United States of America and its citizens. I urge the Congress to increase its interest and to expand our influence through this fine organ.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and commend him for his faithful efforts and sustained interest.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, one of the outstanding members of our delegation to this conference.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] has given a most exemplary example today of the bipartisan support which our foreign policy receives. He has done this both in the manner in which he has made his report to the House of Representatives today and by his own individual actions.

It deserves to be told that the gentleman was not only the chairman of our delegation to Ottawa but that this fell on his shoulders at the last moment, when Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, the head of the delegation, was unable to go. He quickly took the reins of leadership in his hands and set together the activity of the delegation in the conference, and he did this in such a way to deserve not only the admiration and respect of each and every member of our delegation, but also of all the other delegations.

It is necessary for us to understand that the head of the American delegation must, in quick order, make contact with the heads of other delegations, to come to some kind of understanding with them in a quick period of time, in order to carry out the duties and obligations which are his as the head of the delegation with these responsibilities in his hands alone.

We here in the House should all have nothing but great commendation for the gentleman because of his activities. He deserves not only our admiration for the report which he has given us, but also our respect as an individual and as a leader in the American action at this time of such great crisis.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. He has been very modest in any reference to his own participation in this Conference. I should like to say that it was a source of great satisfaction to me to watch his handling of a very difficult situation, particularly with respect to the resolution which came forth from the committee for which he was the rapporteur. He had a very trying task ahead of him, which he handled with a dignity and perspective that enabled him to achieve a most satisfactory result. We are grateful for that type of representation, because it serves to make friends in a situation where we could make enemies.

I should like also to make reference to the participation of our distinguished former colleague, Katharine St. George, who served as secretary of this delegation. This talented lady has maintained a lively interest in the field of international relations, to which she gave such distinguished service during her years in the House. She is widely respected not only for her knowledge and gracious manner but also for the determination she displays in assuring that the Interparliamentary Union will at all times reflect a high level of international thought and purpose.

We were very, very proud and pleased that she was again able to accompany our delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in closing with respect to the participation by the members of this delegation. It was a great pleasure to come into the position of leadership of the group because it is no problem to direct people who have a full appreciation of the purpose of the mission and a desire to do their very best to accomplish it. We met early each morning in order that we might study the problems facing us that day. As your chairman, it was a source of great strength to me that these meetings were invariably attended with the full membership present, so that we might study the issues lying ahead of us and present a united viewpoint. There is a great deal to be learned from this close association with other nations. When you realize that there were 61 nations represented at this Conference, most of them having delegations of substantial numbers, headed by people of responsibility in their several governments, you get an idea of its importance. Therefore, whatever we were able to say on the floor of the Conference and whatever we were able to express in private conversation did serve to convey a message from this country to our fellow members of this body. I believe that the representation this time through the distinguished appearances of the people that I have listed as serving with me on the delegation was outstanding. It was one of the most dedicated groups that we could ever expect to assemble. They were faithful to their task throughout. I hope we were able to fulfill the purpose of the House in adequately presenting to this distinguished meeting some of the ideals and ideas of our great Nation. I consider it a distinct privilege to have been their leader.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various speeches made by members of the delegation and resolutions passed there.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, October 14, to consider the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966.

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

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider a resolution making continuing appropriations on Wednesday, October 13.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this has been cleared with the minority side and the Members on this side of the aisle.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has cleared this with the leadership on our side, with Mr. FORD and with myself, with the understanding, I think, that they know we are going to make a fight on this continuing resolution. We are opposed to it, and we will raise some questions. However, we do agree to the continuing resolution being brought up on Wednesday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask why is it necessary to move this up, and for what length of time will the continuing resolution be for?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, the Committee on Appropriations plans to meet on Wednesday morning in respect to that matter. I do not know, but it would be my thought that we should make it through the 23d of October. That would be 1 week from this coming Saturday. This would seem to be in order and reasonable in the circumstances. Regardless of how fast we may move toward adjournment, I think we would not be likely to get House and Senate approval on the pending conference reports on the agriculture appropriation bill and the public works appropriation bill as well as the supplemental appropriation bill, much prior to that date. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has to hold hearings before reporting the supplemental appropriation bill.

These bills have to go to the White House and they have to be signed. So we have to have a continuing resolution and it seems to me that the 23d of October might be desirable. I expect to recommend that date to the Committee on Appropriations, but the committee will, after consultation with the leadership on both sides, determine what to present to the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the last time a continuing resolution was presented it was for 15 days, and only after some discussion and colloquy when we withdrew our objection. I would certainly hope that with the light of adjournment fever burning high, as did the ancient light of Phoebus on high we might, perhaps, have adjournment on Saturday evening with all of our work done. If we did not sacrifice our afternoons, such as we are here today, for example, and if we would bring up and calendar the bills so that we might progress toward orderly adjournment sine die, the 16th appears to be a Saturday, the close of this week and, if we are going to bring up this appropriation bill containing deficiencies and supplemental items of appropriation, it would seem entirely within possibility that with just 1 day intervening we might have no difficulty in accomplishing our objective.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will be able to achieve adjournment as early as possible in the coming week. I, for one, would be willing to undertake to pile Mount Pelion on Ossa in order to achieve this goal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with that assurance, and on the basis that we probably can and will adjourn next week, and with notice being served that this resolution will be opposed, which the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations has done, does the distinguished gentleman know whether this will be calendared as the matter of first consideration on Wednesday?

Mr. MAHON. I could not speak for the leadership, but I have mentioned it to the Speaker and I understand that probably it will be the first order of business on Wednesday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, surely the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, was not referring to a former Member of this body, from Buffalo, N.Y., who was defeated in the last election, whose name was Pillion.

Mr. MAHON. No.

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

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ZALESKI, OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, the legitimate government in exile of that country, addressed the Council of the Republic of Poland meeting in London on October 2. I believe that President Zaleski's comments merit the attention of Members of the House:

Since I had the honor of addressing this assembly in April this year, the tragic plight of Poland has not been marked by the slightest improvement. True, so-called elections were held in Poland but they brought no real change. It could not have been otherwise under the electoral system current in all the countries with a totalitarian structure. The single list of candidates on the ballot papers bore only a tiny percentage of representatives sponsored by non-Communist parties (if these really merit the name); even so, these groupings could figure on the electoral single list only if the Communist regime approved their existence. It is not strange therefore that things are as bad in Poland after the elections as before them.

It is true there is much talk about a possible change at the post of First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' (Communist) Party. But in any case such a change can have no real significance as each and every head of the Polish politburo will be nothing but the faithful executor of Moscow's orders.

The upshot of this state of affairs is that the standard of life among the population of Poland is far lower in every respect than in the countries of that Western civilization to which Poland has belonged for the last thousand years, still belongs and desires to belong—despite the efforts of Russia and her devoted Communist rulers of Poland.

The persecution of the church, the absence of personal liberty and of freedom of speech continues whilst the economy is steadily deteriorating. Earnings are between 500 and 5,000 zlotys per month; the average wage of a manual worker is 1,500 zlotys (equivalent to £7.10.0 or $21 per month at the official rate of exchange of the Bank Polska Gasa Opieki (PKO in Warsaw) and such a sum is naturally quite insufficient to maintain a family. Hence the great majority of the population is forced to supplement its income by illegal earnings. But, even this is no simple matter.

The whole economic life of Poland is dependent on Russia. Most of the country's export trade is with Russia and most of Poland's imports come from Russia. Under these circumstances, with the Communist regime in Poland completely dependent on Moscow, these transactions not only bring Poland no profit but also provide Russia with a field for arbitrary exploitation. The Communist regime in Poland has recently been striving to expand foreign trade with the countries of capitalist structure. Exchanges of official visits between Western European politicians and representatives of the Communist regime in Poland usually end with announcements that trade turnovers will increase, as no other understanding would be allowed by Moscow. The implementation of even these trade agreements can be undertaken only insofar as Russia grants her consent. The picture of the extremely difficult situation of our native country would be incomplete without mention of the considerable unemployment now rife there. The only heartening feature is that the regime has not succeeded in introducing the collective-farm system. The farmers in Poland are therefore in better plight than the others. However, the natural increase of population and the evident impossibility of adding to the area of agricultural land result in rural overpopulation, with the excess unable to find work in industry or homes in the towns, where housing construction in any case fails to keep up with the increase in the number of inhabitants.

Poland's exceedingly serious position is further complicated by the world situation. The fact that her western frontiers remain unrecognized not only by the German Federal Republic but also by her wartime allies undoubtedly plays into the hands of Russia who exploits this circumstance in her relations with present-day Poland.

In general, the indefinite postponement of a peace treaty after the Second World War—perhaps even complete renunciation of the idea of concluding one—has created the difficult world situation which has marked international relations for the last 20 years.

When the Yalta and Potsdam agreements were concluded, the three signatories imagined they would harmoniously wield authority over the whole world. Reality very quickly cut short these dreams. It transpired that Russia exploited the situation to consolidate her imperialistic position in Europe by a permanent occupation of Eastern

Germany. This was followed, in fact, by a period during which the defense of Western Europe was organized against a further extension of this imperialistic peril. Nonetheless, it is not surprising that, after the dire experience yielded by Yalta and Potsdam, there is a breakdown of confidence in many lands toward the countries chiefly responsible for this state of affairs. Some west European countries started a movement for the creation of a union not only as an economic factor but also as an independent center of defense. Despite the great difficulties which stand in the way of this gigantic undertaking, there is hope that the organization of Europe will sooner or later assume concrete forms.

The rise of a united Europe is undoubtedly desirable from the Polish standpoint. We hope that the menace of the present world situation will cause mutual concessions to be made by the interested parties and bring about the formation of an organization of European states able not only to stop the further expansion of Russian imperialism in Europe but also to incorporate those countries which lost their independence after the last war. This would seem to follow from President de Gaulle's latest policy enunciations.

The emergence of China with her enormous population as a fresh imperialistic element in Asia and the rift between her and Russia caused by diverse ideological interpretations of Communist doctrine have aroused hopes in many political centers that a conflict will break out between these two Communist lands. Such a conflict may possibly come about as Russia is now the only European county with a great colonial empire in Asia, whilst Communist China claims the right to control the whole Asiatic Continent. But it can be supposed that both those countries, with their well-known caution, will try to avoid this conflict or at least postpone it as long as possible.

The very thought of such a conflict implies a great danger. The possibility of a new setup amongst the non-Communist countries is already taking shape. Depending on their geographical location, some of them may consider it to their advantage that Russia gain the upper hand whilst others may favor China. Fortunately, this danger has been realized by many of the decisionmaking centers. Its significance is marked by the fact that the Pope is to visit America in person with a view to calling on the United Nations Organization, and hence the whole world, to preserve peace.

In this exceptionally complicated situation, we Poles who remained in the free world to struggle for the real independence of our country should unite the more effectively to cope with the great difficulties which face us.

COINCIDENCE OR COERCION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this is another chapter in the saga of the march of the U.S. Office of Education down the road toward control of education. In remarks I made on the floor a few weeks ago, I referred to that "one more step" Mr. Keppel and his centralist-thinking associates were taking on that road, but I fear we must now refer to it as a "headlong dash."

Mr. Speaker, I have warned before that the Office of Education is not satisfied with being just a junior partner on our local boards of education. Their high-handed social climbing tactics are designed to make the Office of Education the chairman of the board. They have deliberately used devious means to circumvent the intent of Congress.

Members of this Congress in both bodies worked long and arduous hours to hammer out a Civil Rights Act that would be as fair and as equitable as possible for all of our citizens. After careful consideration Congress determined that congressional and judicial review of all executive branch actions in carrying out the civil rights law must be assured.

In the Office of Education's headlong thrust to attain their goals for more control, they have embellished the civil rights law itself; and if there is any doubt left in anyone's mind that the education centralists will stop at nothing in order to reach their goals, I can think of no better example than the recent fiasco perpetrated by the Office of Education in Chicago.

The Office of Education announced the authorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for the State of Illinois on September 28, of which Chicago was to get $30 million. Two days later it became pointedly clear that Chicago Superintendent of Schools Benjamin Willis would definitely recommend that Chicago not participate in the equal education opportunities survey, one of the Office of Education's pet assessment projects. On the following day, the funds for Chicago were "deferred."

Mr. Speaker, I charge this action was worse than a chance misinterpretation of the law. One sentence has deliberately and surrepticiously been added to the rules and regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would permit the Department to waive the provisos of section 602 of the Civil Rights Act, and 45 CFR 80.8(c), and which would frustrate the congressional guarantees so laboriously worked into the bill. Let me quote that one little sentence:

> The Department shall not be required to provide assistance * * * during the pendancy of the administrative proceedings (45 CFR 80.8(b)) to determine if there has been a noncompliance with the Civil Rights Act.

In other words, they can withhold, or refuse, or suspend, or defer grants, or whatever word you want to use, for an indefinite time if they want to, until the so-called administrative proceedings are concluded.

In the opinion of Alanson W. Willcox, General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department had authority by implication under title VI of the Civil Rights Act to withhold funds from a city "where we feel there may be a violation at some future time." This, he added, was why the Chicago school funds were impounded. Authority by implication. Just what are they talking about?

This is so far from congressional intent as to the almost ludicrous. During the Senate debate Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, stated:

> While the matter is pending before the congressional committee involved, there will be further opportunity to end the discrimination without the necessity of cutting off of Federal funds or in other ways curtailing the particular assistance program in question.

Apart from this consideration, however, the legislative history of title VI makes clear that no action to refuse to grant assistance could be accomplished without compliance with the requirements of section 602. As Senator PASTORE has so succinctly outlined:

> There is, finally, one additional feature of title VI which demonstrates beyond doubt that it is not intended to be vindictive or punitive. I am referring to the fact that the authority contained in the title to cut off funds is hedged about with a number of procedural restrictions and requirements. These would hardly be necessary or appropriate if the bill were designed as a punitive or vindictive measure. These restrictions have already been briefly described, but let me here again summarize what must be done before funds can be cut off. The following would have to occur:
>
> First. The agency must first adopt a general nondiscrimination rule, regulation, or order.
>
> Second. The President must give his approval.
>
> Third. The agency must seek to secure compliance by voluntary means.
>
> Fourth. A hearing must be held before any formal compliance action is taken.
>
> Fifth. The agency may, and in many cases will, seek to secure compliance by means not involving a cutoff of funds.
>
> Sixth. If the agency determines that a refusal or termination of funds is appropriate, it must make an express finding that the particular person from whom funds are to be cut off is still discriminating.
>
> Seventh. The agency must file a written report with the appropriate congressional committee and 30 days must elapse before further action is taken.
>
> Eighth. The aid recipient can obtain judicial review and may apply for a stay pending such review.

That should have made it imminently clear—even to the Office of Education what the intent of Congress was when this law was passed—an orderly, measured procedure, allowing for enough time to permit a complete and fair investigation of any charges or allegations.

However, the Office of Education in its glee at having slipped the aforementioned sentence past the Congress has failed to make sure the action it took was "consistent with achievement of the objectives" of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To quote section 602 of the Civil Rights Act, any department and agency which would be dispensing Federal funds was directed to make "rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken."

Consistent. That is a good word. I wonder if the Office of Education knows what it means. In a speech this past week to the Education Writers Association, Mr. Keppel said that the funds under these acts are designed to help strengthen State departments of education, which he termed "the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we mean to keep American education strong and decentralized." I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Keppel's words, but unfortunately his actions have not in the least been consistent with his words.

In spite of the fact that in the testimony before the House and Senate com-

mittees concerned with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it was made crystal clear that the Federal Government would deal only through State education agencies. The Commissioner "deferred" Chicago's funds under this act without even consulting with the State of Illinois superintendent of public instruction, Mr. Ray Page. Mr. Page first received word by a hand-delivered letter of the Office of Education's action on Friday, October 1, which stated that "preliminary investigation indicates probable noncompliance." One October 2 Mr. Page telegraphed Mr. Keppel as follows:

> You have not advised what these complaints contain and have not furnished the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction with a copy. No investigator from your office has called upon me and I am completely uninformed as to the specific charges. What noncompliance is alleged? Is not the State Office of Education entitled to complete information on these matters, including a copy of the complaint? Will the investigators confer with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois? I have not been contacted by them.
>
> I stand ready and willing to lend every assistance possible in resolving this situation in the interest of all the schoolchildren in Chicago and in the State of Illinois.

In view of this, it is apparent that the Office of Education most certainly did not work through the State office.

Mr. Speaker, on September 9, I produced an administratively confidential memorandum from an executive group meeting of the Office of Education in which they had already decided:

> No Office of Education hand is to be tied by (1) having to deal only through a backward State education agency.

I submit that Illinois certainly is not a "backward State" by any stretch of the imagination.

Now, it is easy to see that in the strange logic they have over there, they have advanced from "backward" to "unnecessary," and have completely ignored the language of the Civil Rights Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

No matter how many protestations of innocence or high-sounding ideals we hear from various officials of the Department of HEW and the Office of Education, I do not see how anyone can now have any doubt in his mind about the true goals of the Office of Education to directly control our entire education system. Chicago is a prime example of what could happen to any school district. When a scream was raised in Chicago, it carried all the way to the White House, and the Office of Education quickly back-pedaled.

But why did it take this precipitous action in the first place? Could it have been that pet assessment project I have referred to was about to go down the drain because so many schools had refused to give it?

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at great length on September 23 about this educational opportunities survey that the Office of Education gave last September 28 and 30 to 4 percent of our schools. Originally, it was intended that this test be given to 5 percent but all indications are that 20 percent of the schools contacted are refusing to give it. This high refusal rate should cast a shadow on the validity of the results.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert the Office of Education's "conjecture" as to what they consider to be the "legislative intent of the civil rights survey":

MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 16, 1965

To: Participants in June 17 meeting at Bureau of the Budget.
From: Equal opportunities survey staff.
Subject: Legislative intent of the civil rights survey.

The conception of the civil rights survey changed considerably during the early stages of the legislative history.

The bill as originally introduced required the Commissioner to "conduct investigations * * * upon the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied to individuals by reason of race." The thinking is reflected in Attorney General Kennedy's testimony of June 26, 1963, at the House hearings. Mr. Kennedy stated: "It is expected that the Attorney General will call on the Commissioner of Education for information and advice in deciding which cases to file and preparing cases * * * and the Commissioner will obtain much useful information from the nationwide investigation of discrimination in education which title III (later, title IV) would direct him to make" (p. 1378, pt. II, of House hearings). On July 10, 1963, Secretary Celebrezze testified on the civil rights survey: "As the Attorney General indicated in his June 26 testimony before this committee, the information obtained will be needed in carrying out section 307, dealing with suits on desegregation by the Attorney General. It will also be essential to the Commissioner of Education in administering the provisions of sections 302–305 which provide assistance to school boards in the desegregation of schools" (p. 1526, pt. II, of House hearings).

The implications of racial imbalance for the civil rights bill received considerable attention in the hearings after this time (cf. pp. 1422–1427, 1509–1520 and 1584 of pt. II and much of pt. III). Much of this dialog centered around a fear of how the Government would resolve the complex issues involved in questions of racial imbalance, especially with regard to title VI (nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs). The result of these concerns was the deletion of references to racial imbalance and the addition of the following statement to section 401(b): " 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." Also, section 402 was changed to require the Commissioner to "conduct a survey * * * concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race."

Note that "investigations" was changed to "a survey" and "the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied" was changed to "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities." Both the concern over investigations dealing with racial imbalance and the changes in wording of section 402 suggest a shift of congressional intent away from the investigative approach. This interpretation is consistent with Senator HUMPHREY's analysis of section 402 in Senate debate on March 30, 1964. Senator HUMPHREY said: "Since the matter to be reported on is not merely the statistics as to the extent of segregation and desegregation but the quality of education available to whites and Negroes, it is appropriate that responsibility for the survey and report be vested in the Commissioner of Education" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 5, p. 6542).

The staff of the civil rights survey discussed the intent of Congress with regard to the survey with Mr. David Filvaroff, Assistant to the Attorney General, who worked extensively on the civil rights bill. Mr. Filvaroff's statement supported the interpretation that the intent of Congress shifted away from the investigative approach. He said that the survey will not be used as an investigative tool of the Justice Department. He also said that the survey is not intended to provide data for particular communities in court cases, although the general results of the survey might be used in such cases. He emphasized at several points in the discussion that quality of education should be the focus of the survey. Data on the extent of school segregation in the South would be useful, he felt, but are not as important as data on quality of education.

The staff also spoke with Mr. Harry Chernock and Mr. Michael Wyatt of the HEW Office of General Counsel. They felt that section 402 is so loosely worded that it allows the Commissioner ample latitude in determining the content and scope of the survey. They felt that the intent to discriminate would not have to be part of the survey.

Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention specifically to a statement made by the then Senator HUMPHREY. The Office of Education has taken a sentence out of that statement, completely out of context, to support their conjectures. I quote his statement in full:

> Title IV also provides, in section 402, for a survey and report to Congress, by the Commissioner of Education, concerning "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin" in public schools and colleges. This survey will cover not only continued existence of unconstitutional racial segregation, but all forms of discrimination and inequality of treatment.
>
> The existence of inequality, of deprivation of educational opportunity because of race and color, is obvious. But their extent is not yet fully known. An authoritative survey and report is needed, and will be most useful to the Congress. Since the matter to be reported on is not merely the statistics as to the extent of segregation and desegregation but the quality of education available to whites and Negroes, it is appropriate that responsibility for the survey and report be vested in the Commissioner of Education.

Now, this is a survey concerning the deprivation of educational opportunities because of race and color and it is to show the extent of this. This is not what they are going to do at all.

To read Senator HUMPHREY's statement as if it contained no more than the last sentence is to misread it completely, and this is exactly what the Office of Education has done. To interpret section 402 as if its principal purpose were to determine the quality of public education being obtained, or the level of learning being reached at the several grade levels, by members of the different races, creeds, and ethnic groups in various regions of the United States, is to deliberately misinterpret it.

There is no evidence in the record to warrant an inference from Senator HUMPHREY's statement that Congress is principally, or even at all in this case, interested in differences in "quality of education available to whites and Negroes" in the abstract and apart from the question of whether any differences in quality are "by reason of race."

Moreover, the record is completely devoid of any specific references to testing pupils. If testing is necessary in order to report on "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities" within a given school system, then testing pupils would have been authorized by section 402; since it does not, the authority of the Commissioner to test pupils is extremely doubtful. Also, if the Commissioner felt that his authority under section 402 to test pupils were clear, he undoubtedly would have made such testing mandatory rather than voluntary.

The survey required by section 402 was intended principally to furnish Congress with information about the continued existence and extent of unconstitutional racial segregation and other forms of discrimination of treatment "by reason of race." Differences in quality of education received by Negroes in the North and South are not at all relevant to the question of unconstitutional segregation or discrimination. Only "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race" within a given school system, or at most a State, are relevant to the question of unconstitutional discrimination.

"The quality" of educational opportunities is relevant only in those school systems in which there are some schools serving primarily children of minority groups and other schools serving primarily children of the majority group. In such systems, if in the schools attended by minority groups, the buildings are older, the classes larger, the teachers less well trained, the libraries less well stocked, and the guidance departments less well staffed, the Commissioner would certainly not need to test the pupils to find all of this out.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education have deliberately ignored the plainly stated intent of Congress and even the very language of the act. In the case in Chicago, the Office of Education not only acted illegally, but also any claim of coincidence in their "deferring" the education funds for Chicago right after Chicago strongly indicated the likelihood of nonparticipation in the educational opportunities survey is beyond belief. In addition, the present form of this survey represents another deliberate attempt to bypass congressional intent.

Since it is quite apparent that the Department of HEW is getting off on the wrong foot in proper administration and interpretation of not only the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but also in the carrying out of certain provisions of the Civil Rights Act, it may be appropriate for the Judiciary Committee to take a "look-see" in addition to the Education and Labor Committee which normally would exercise the responsibility of legislative review.

We have been so busy railroading through this Congress so much ill-conceived and little thought-out legislation that it is no wonder the bureaucrats are having a field day in promulgating administrative rules and regulations that go far beyond congressional intent and, in many cases, in direct conflict with the expressed will of the Congress.

The two instances I have dealt with today are certainly testimony to this charge.

I include the following at this point:

[Excerpt from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352]

TITLE VI—NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

SEC. 602. Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken. No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President. Compliance with any requirement adopted pursuant to this section may be effected (1) by the termination of or refusal to grant or to continue assistance under such program or activity to any recipient as to whom there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure to comply with such requirement, but such termination or refusal shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and, shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found, or (2) by any other means authorized by law: *Provided, however*, That no such action shall be taken until the department or agency concerned has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with the requirement and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means. In the case of any action terminating, or refusing to grant or continue, assistance because of failure to comply with a requirement imposed pursuant to this section, the head of the Federal department or agency shall file with the committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program or activity involved a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. No such action shall become effective until thirty days have elapsed after the filing of such report.

SEC. 603. Any department or agency action taken pursuant to section 602 shall be subject to such judicial review as may otherwise be provided by law for similar action taken by such department or agency on other grounds. In the case of action, not otherwise subject to judicial review, terminating or refusing to grant or to continue financial assistance upon a finding of failure to comply with any requirement imposed pursuant to section 602, any person aggrieved (including any State or political subdivision thereof and any agency of either) may obtain judicial review of such action in accordance with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and such action shall not be deemed committed to unreviewable agency discretion within the meaning of that section.

SEC. 604. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

SEC. 605. Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

[Excerpt from the Federal Register, Dec. 4, 1964]

TITLE 45—PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Part 80—Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Effectuation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

§ 80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.

(a) General. If there appears to be a failure or threatened failure to comply with this regulation, and if the noncompliance or threatened noncompliance cannot be corrected by informal means, compliance with this part may be effected by the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance or by any other means authorized by law. Such other means may include, but are not limited to, (1) a reference to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce any rights of the United States under any law of the United States (including other titles of the Act), or any assurance or other contractual undertaking, and (2) any applicable proceedings under State or local law.

(b) Noncompliance with § 80.4. If an applicant fails or refuses to furnish an assurance required under § 80.4 or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to that section Federal financial assistance may be refused in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (c) of this section. The Department shall not be required to provide assistance in such a case during the pendency of the administrative proceedings under such paragraph except that the Department shall continue assistance during the pendency of such proceedings where such assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application therefor approved prior to the effective date of this part.

(c) Termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance. No order suspending, terminating, or refusing to grant or continue Federal financial assistance shall become effective until (1) the responsible Department official has advised the applicant or recipient of his failure to comply and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure by the applicant or recipient to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to this part, (3) the action has been approved by the Secretary pursuant to § 80.10(e), and (4) the expiration of 30 days after the Secretary has filed with the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program involved, a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. Any action to suspend or terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other applicant or recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.

(d) Other means authorized by law. No action to effect compliance by any other

means authorized by law shall be taken until (1) the responsible Department official has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) the action has been approved by the Secretary, (3) the recipient or other person has been notified of its failure to comply and of the action to be taken to effect compliance, and (4) the expiration of at least 10 days from the mailing of such notice to the recipient or other person. During this period of at least 10 days additional efforts shall be made to persuade the recipient or other person to comply with the regulation and to take such corrective action as may be appropriate.

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, STATE OF ILLINOIS

(By Ray Page, superintendent)

Yesterday I received the following communication from Commissioner Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education:

"Hon. RAY PAGE,
"Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, Ill.

"DEAR SUPERINTENDENT PAGE: Under the state of compliance files by the Illinois Office of Public Instruction and your supplementary letter of March 17, 1965, your office is concerned, along with this Department, with assuring compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the Department's regulation under that act.

"Complaints of discrimination in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the Department's regulation, have been filed with regard to the Chicago school system. A departmental team has begun the investigation of these complaints. Some of the complaints are very complex and may require analysis over some period of time. The preliminary investigation of certain of the complaints, however, indicates probable noncompliance with the act and the regulation, and brings into serious question the assurance of compliance made by the Chicago school authorities pursuant to section 80.4 of the departmental regulation. We believe that these latter complaints can, with the full cooperation of the Chicago school authorities, be fully investigated in a relatively short time and that they can and must be satisfactorily resolved before any new commitments are made of funds under Federal assistance programs administered by the Office of Education, either directly or through your office.

"In view of our joint responsibility for assuring compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the regulation, we are sending members of our staff to discuss the matter with you in further detail and we will keep you fully informed of the status of the investigation. It is our hope that the complaints being intensively investigated at this time can be resolved with a minimum of delay so that new commitments of funds to the Chicago school authorities can be permitted as soon as possible. This is particularly important, of course, with regard to making available funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANCIS KEPPEL,
"U.S. Commissioner of Education."

This morning I have dispatched by Western Union the following reply to Commissioner Keppel's letter:

"I have your letter of September 30 concerning complaints of discrimination in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act with reference to the Chicago school system. Prior to the receipt of your letter and the time that it reached the public through the news media, I had dispatched the following telegram to Mr. Albert A. Raby, convenor, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, Chicago, Ill.:

"ALBERT A. RABY,
"Convenor, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, Chicago, Ill.:

"I have received your telegram dated September 29, 1965, the content of which I had previously read in the public press. Some of the conclusions you state are based on erroneous information. You also express doubt as to the legality of some action the Office of Public Instruction plans to take.

"Nonetheless, I will be happy to meet with you and representatives (not exceeding three) of the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, such meeting to be held at a mutual convenient time and place. My only desire is to serve the schoolchildren of the State of Illinois. In that effort I am more than willing to meet with those who express similar attitudes.

"RAY PAGE,
"Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois."

As shown in my reply to Mr. Raby, my office is prepared and has expressed willingness to lend every assistance possible to resolve these difficulties.

You have not advised what these complaints contain and have not furnished the office of the superintendent of public instruction with a copy. No investigator from your office has called upon me and I am completely uninformed as to the specific charges. What noncompliance is alleged? Is not the State office of education entitled to complete information on these matters, including a copy of the complaint? Will the investigators confer with the office of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Illinois? I have not been contacted by them.

I stand ready and willing to lend every assistance possible in resolving this situation in the interest of all the school children in Chicago and in the State of Illinois.

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, again this year the House of Representatives pauses in its deliberations to acknowledge the richness and variety of our American heritage by commemorating the life of Casimir Pulaski, patriot and hero of our Revolutionary War, who 186 years ago today gave his life on the altar of America's freedom.

General Pulaski came to America at the request of Benjamin Franklin. His many years of experience in battle, valiantly trying to stem the tide of partition of Poland, made him an invaluable addition to our young Army.

A brilliant tactician and a man of exceptional personal courage, Pulaski quickly was appointed to command the entire cavalry force of the American Army. He inspired his officers and men with his unswerving devotion to honor and to liberty. His unyielding experience in the effort to preserve a united Poland against overwhelming odds was invaluable in his command of the American cavalry forces. He refused to acknowledge defeat.

In the Battle of Savannah on October 11, 1779, Casimir Pulaski gave his life for an ideal of freedom and personal integrity which has persisted for almost two centuries.

Our country would not be the richly endowed and abundantly talented Nation it is if we had not accepted men and women from other nations as individuals, free to add their personal stamp to the tapestry of our history.

Casimir Pulaski was a great American. He gave his life that Americans of all nationalities might be free. We honor him most fittingly when we strive to preserve the standards of liberty and integrity which he set for us so long ago.

It is fitting to remind ourselves that the dignity of Pulaski's cause for freedom is alive today as much as it was during the American Revolution. His spirit and devotion to freedom continues to be a source of inspiration to all of us.

COLUMBUS DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time a year ago many Members of Congress were active in giving voice in support of making Columbus Day a national holiday. Today, interest in that legislative item has somewhat waned. I do hope that the appropriate committees of both Houses may again consider the matter and that the Congress will support the legislation necessary to establish October 12 as a national holiday so that the memory of Columbus will be honored throughout the entire country just as it is today in some States and in some communities. The huge, colorful parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, New York City, tomorrow will mark the 473d anniversary of the discovery of the New World.

The observance of the birthday of Christopher Columbus not only serves us as a reminder of the heroism, the courage, the imagination, and the navigational skill of the intrepid Italian explorer but it causes us to pause and reflect upon the influence which so many of our great forefathers of foreign birth have had upon our lives.

Our very heritage of freedom and independence is ours today largely because of the ideals, the wisdom, the courage, and the determination of those tens of thousands of freedom-seeking migrants who adopted this country for themselves and the generations to follow them.

Columbus showed great leadership in maintaining discipline aboard his own and sister ships and in holding steadfast to his westward course when each day the fears and uncertainties of the unknown seas ahead became more pronounced. This is the type of leadership which the founder of this Nation displayed in wresting our independence from the British Redcoats. It was the same brand of leadership in establishing a new nation based on the equality of men and the inalienable rights of the individual. And it was the kind of leadership which governed and hastened America's westward expansion, the leadership which bound up the wounds of a severed nation, and the leadership which has guided us successfully through the

series of foreign wars in which the preservation of our liberties and the rights of freemen have been at stake.

Mr. Speaker, it is most important that Americans give adequate heed to commemorating the birthday of Columbus. It is important that every adult be reminded and every child be instructed concerning not only the initial historic voyage of Columbus and his courageous followers, but of the subsequent voyages.

Our debt to Columbus should remind us of our debt to all the patriots who lived and died that we might have a nation of the people and for the people.

When America takes its blessings of freedom for granted; when America fails to realize that our independence cost the lives of thousands of our forefathers through whose veins flowed the blood of more than a score of alien nationalities; and when Americans forget to honor the memory of those to whom we are eternally indebted—then, Mr. Speaker, America's greatness is doomed and its future as a leader among nations is jeopardized.

We can be grateful indeed that the members and officers of the loyal and patriotic Italian American societies are doing so much to honor Columbus. Theirs is a magnificent contribution but they need the help of all Americans to make the celebration of the birthday of Christopher Columbus most meaningful. We should especially pay tribute to Fortune Pope, president of the Columbus Citizens Committee and grand marshal of tomorrow's New York celebration.

ROGER L. STEVENS EXPLAINS CERTAIN ACTIONS HE HAS TAKEN TO AVOID CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the arts and humanities bill on September 15, I raised the question of a possible conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Roger L. Stevens, the new Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am pleased to be able to report today to you and to my colleagues that this question has been amicably and fully resolved. Mr. Stevens has written me an extensive letter, explaining certain actions he has taken to avoid conflict of interest in his new post and I find his answer entirely satisfactory. I surely want to commend him for thus avoiding any possible conflict of interest in his new post as chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and I wish him every success.

My concern was grounded in my sincere belief that any appearance of conflict of interest must be avoided in such a new and untried program as that to be conducted by the National Endowment for the Arts. I must say that I still have sincere reservations concerning the Endowment and my efforts in regard to Mr. Stevens were separate and apart from the question of the Endowment itself. I believe that it is entirely possible that we may, within not too long a time, find that we have created another French Academy of Arts. The French Academy has a long record of bypassing great art, while subsidizing secondary creations. Time after time, it has officially recognized the work of men long forgotten. With equal authority it has declared unfit the work of such painters as Renoir, now thought the greatest of the impressionists; Cezanne, who was forced to retire in disgrace, but whose work found great fame after his death; Van Gogh, who shot himself after his paintings were officially banned. Toulouse-Lautrec, Dages, Gaugin and Rodin were never recognized or were actually rejected by the Academy.

However questionable the concept of a National Endowment for the Arts, I am now convinced that it will be headed by a gentleman free from any conflict of interest.

My fears that conflict of interest could exist were based on two major premises. First, in an unusual procedure, the legislation was written in such a way that the new chairman of the endowment did not need to face Senate confirmation hearings, which is the normal place where possible conflict of interest is explored. Second, Mr. Stevens is well known for the vast holdings which he has previously had in the theater world. These holdings have included over 150 plays, many of them leading hits, as well as theaters themselves.

Recognized as perhaps the most comprehensive study ever conducted into conflict of interest is "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," issued in 1960 by the New York City Bar Association. On the very first page of this report, prepared by many distinguished and nationally known lawyers, we find that they write:

> A conflict of interest does not necessarily presuppose that action by the official favoring one of these interests will be prejudicial to the other, nor that the official will in fact resolve the conflict to his own personal advantage rather than the Government's. If a man is in a position of conflicting interests, he is subject to temptation however he resolves the issue. Regulation of conflict of interest seeks to prevent situations of temptation from arising. An internal revenue agent auditing his own tax return would offer a simple illustration of such a conflict of interest. Perhaps the agent's personal interest in the matter would not affect his discharge of his official duty; but the experience of centuries indicates that the contrary is more likely, and that affairs should be so arranged as to prevent a man from being put in such an equivocal position.

Mr. Speaker, it was because the legislation did not provide for a Senate confirmation hearing that I offered an amendment that would have required the chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts to face such a hearing, the same as the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. If my amendment had prevailed, there would have been no necessity for me to pursue other means of determining that no possible conflict of interest was involved. I feel strongly that conflict of interest must be avoided and likewise any appearance of conflict of interest must be equally avoided, if the people are to maintain confidence in their government. After my statement, Mr. Stevens resigned from the board of the National Symphony.

Thus, I wrote to Mr. Stevens and later had the opportunity to talk with him. It was as a result of that correspondence and conversation that he reduced to writing the letter which I shall offer today. I asked him to explain in detail his present associations with various semipublic organizations in which he has held positions which could lead to possible conflict of interest, as well as the current status of his private business dealings, which could also have a conflict of interest status.

Specifically, I asked Mr. Stevens to write to me and state either that he was going to resign from the Metropolitan Opera Association and the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center for the Performing Arts or that they would not be eligible for endowment funds so long as he is chairman of the Endowment, for he also serves on the board of directors of the Metropolitan Opera and is chairman of the Kennedy Cultural Center. I also asked for further information concerning other specific organizations and business interests with which Mr. Stevens has been associated in the past and their effect on his dispensation of endowment funds without conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the legislation which prevented Mr. Stevens from appearing before a Senate confirmation hearing was unwise, for it did not give him the usual channels through which to state unequivocally the manner in which he has acted to divest himself of any interests which might constitute a conflict of interest.

However, I believe it is certainly to Mr. Stevens' credit and helpful to the operation of democratic government that he has chosen to make such a statement in correspondence with me. In order that it may be a matter of public record, I am placing this sequence of events in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, following is the letter from Mr. Stevens:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 8, 1965.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Room 1211, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Thank you for your cordial letter of October 6. Since receiving your letter, I testified before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and this morning I made a public statement on the question of conflict of interest. I said:

"There have been inquiries as to whether there is a conflict of interest in my position as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and I would like to clear up any possible misconceptions and allegations made during the past few days.

"First, there is an important job to be done in the field of the arts and humanities as indicated by the mandate given us by Congress. I am proceeding to the best of my ability and judgment to carry out this responsibility.

"I am perfectly willing to declare unequivocably that no organization with which I have an affiliation will be entitled to funds from any Government program with which I am associated.

"At the time of my appointment as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts I resigned from all business and nonprofit organizations that might have any possible

conflict with my present position. The only organizations in the arts with which I am affiliated now are the Metropolitan Opera Association and the American Shakespeare Academy which are nonprofit organizations and any organization I might join would be in the same category.

"I feel in carrying out my duties as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts it is important to be thoroughly familiar with as many developments in the field of the arts as possible by being a member of nonprofit organizations, as long as there is no financial conflict.

"There has been some discussion of royalties that may accrue to me from plays. As soon as the first class production of a play is finished, the title of the play reverts to the author. It has been suggested that such royalties be put in trust. This is impossible to do because, as has been stated, the ownership reverts to the author and all control remains in his hands.

"I would like to further state that at the time I accepted the position I had many personal commitments including those to employees who have worked with me for many years. I have had to pay very substantial amounts as a result of the continuing deficits incurred by these commitments. I would be glad to open my books to confirm these substantial financial losses.

"I have worked 4 years as chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center without any compensation, traveling a minimum of 250,000 miles for this organization and on behalf of the National Council on the Arts, to bring to the country a greater knowledge of their activities. At least 90 percent of the cost of this travel has been paid personally. For this I expect nothing in return, for I believe it is the duty of every American citizen to serve his country when asked.

"As President Johnson has said concerning the arts legislation: 'This Congress will consider many programs which will leave an enduring mark on American life. But it may well be that passage of this legislation, modest as it is, will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization.'

"I am delighted to serve, to the best of my ability, under his leadership to see that these new programs fulfill the promise for which so many people have worked so long and so hard."

I now want to supplement this public statement by answering your questions directly.

As far as the National Opera Co., which is cosponsored by the Metropolitan Opera and the Kennedy Center for the purpose of bringing opera to the country at large and giving young American singers and musicians an opportunity to perform in their own country, it is carrying out the philosophy and the intent of Congress.

Section 4 of the Kennedy Center Act provides:

"The Board shall—

"1. Present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries;

"2. Present lectures and other programs;

"3. Develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation;

"4. Provide facilities for other civic activities at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts;

"5. Provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts a suitable memorial in honor of the late President."

It is logical that in carrying out this purpose the joining hands with the Metropolitan Opera, whose reputation for management is worldwide and second to none in this country, was a logical step. Our participation in this national project was approved by the late President Kennedy, announced from the White House (copy of this press release enclosed), and approved by the trustees. The Center's share of the financing was supplied from unrestricted funds, which were not used for matching the Federal grant.

Also, it might be of interest to you to see the enclosed clippings evidencing that this National Opera Company has had a most successful premiere in Indianapolis and is fulfilling its purpose in a manner which the trustees hoped.

As to the future of the Kennedy Center, which is a Bureau of the Smithsonian, Congress is represented on the board with 4 Senators and 3 Congressmen, as well as 9 other Government officials. Since I am only one of the 45 trustees, I don't see how there is any possibility of concern about a conflict of interest at this time.

The biography that you mentioned in your letter is an old one. About the time I was appointed as chairman of the National Council I resigned my directorship and sold all my stock in City Investing.

Producers Theater has been an inactive organization which stopped producing plays when my partner, Robert Whitehead, became director of the Lincoln Repertory Theater, and if for any reason I have inadvertently not resigned, I will of course immediately do so. As to the Phoenix Theater and ANTA, I have resigned from these organizations.

Several months ago I thought I had done everything necessary to forestall any public criticism. However, in order to avoid any future criticism regarding the so-called royalties, I have requested my lawyers to look into some plan that can cover this possible question.

I am enclosing a clipping, in case you have not noticed it, which appeared in the Washington Post by the distinguished drama critic, Richard Coe, which I think is a good summary from a knowledgeable person of the importance of having someone who is qualified and experienced to be chairman of this Foundation.

I hope the above is satisfactory in answer to the questions involved in your letter, and I do appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY AT STATE BREAKFAST, NEW ENGLAND READING ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the State breakfast, New England Reading Association, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, September 28, 1965.

READING—A NATIONAL CONCERN AND CHALLENGE

(Address delivered by Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY at the State breakfast, New England Reading Association, Boston, Tuesday, September 28, 1965)

I am delighted to be with you in New England and to speak to you about the importance of reading as a national concern and challenge. This is one audience that clearly does not need to be sold on the importance of reading. As individuals and as a group, you have long sought to encourage and promote the involvement of children and adults in the world of books. But today's educational needs call for greater effort on the part of both the teacher and the Congress in improving reading instruction.

In the last decade we have seen a lively, often controversial public reappraisal of the ability of the educational establishment to cope with the problems of modern society. Today, every informed parent, the press, and a host of new experts both within the schools and outside them are caught up in a mood of questioning. Can Johnny read and how should we go about seeing that he can if he cannot? Are the new alphabet systems we hear about anything more than a way of confounding teachers and parents? Will small ungraded classes in schools fitted with the new educational hardware—computers and teaching machines—make enough of an educational difference in learning to read and write to justify the sums and efforts necessary to incorporate them in our schools?

As one looks at these recent developments, two important factors emerge from research and experience: First, we are making real progress in improving the curriculum materials used by children in schools; and, second, reading skill—the ability of the child to gather and store information about his world—is the key to the successful use of the new courses, and it is here that we must concentrate if we want excellence in our schools.

First, let me speak of the research being accomplished in educational curriculum development. There has been a subtle, quiet development taking place in the growth of new insights and concepts concerning the learning process of the child. Largely through cooperative research administered by the Office of Education scores of universities and schools throughout the country are studying the learning process and the curriculums of our elementary and secondary schools. Here are some of the important results to date:

At Yale, and more recently, at Rutgers, Social Psychologist O. K. Moore demonstrated that children as young as 2 can be taught to read by using their own natural curiosity in an atmosphere of encouragement rather than an atmosphere of stultifying drill and repetition.

At Syracuse University and Webster College, mathematicians Robert Davis and Sister Jacqueline Grennan developed programs to guide elementary school children in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics. The programs tested in Scarsdale, N.Y., and western Connecticut as well as in Syracuse and St. Louis are progressing so well that teachers are now being trained in their use and school systems throughout the country are eagerly adopting them.

At Stanford University, Philosopher-Mathematician Patrick Suppes is teaching advanced algebra to fifth graders. Nobel Prize Winner William Shockley is working on teaching the concept of conservation of energy to ninth graders.

At the University of California in Berkeley, Mark Schorer, the biographer of Sinclair Lewis, has been developing kinescope models on the teaching of poetry, drama, the short story, and the novel in the 10th grade.

Throughout the country we are beginning to see the results of these developments in curriculum in the schools. Children 2 and 3 years old are learning to read and write; first graders are dealing with the fundamentals of economics and algebra; second and third graders are learning physics and how to write music; fourth and fifth graders are discovering new theories of mathematics; junior high school students are studying anthropological concepts; and high school students are studying physical theory and literature courses usually taught in colleges.

These are not isolated instances of experimentation in scattered individual classrooms. New math programs are now taught in three-fifths of all American high schools and two-thirds of all high school physics students are now studying the new physics. New English curriculum materials are in experimental use in 16 States. New foreign language programs have become widely accepted with 50 percent of all foreign language teachers in the country trained in their use.

What has led to this dynamic eruption of new courses which have been affecting the schools as they adopt them? First, the scholars and scientists have come into the classrooms and along with experienced teachers, they have created, tested, and revised materials and methods that incorporated the best knowledge available today. Second, the new teaching techniques which have been developed to present these new courses rely heavily upon honest and rigorous teaching of basic concepts from the academic disciplines.

Finally and most important, the new curriculums represent the merging of two broad developments in our approach to learn: new understanding of the basic structure of each of the subjects taught in the schools, and a new and liberating approach to our estimates of the capacity for learning inherent in children. This is perhaps best expressed in a classic remark of the psychologist, Jerome Bruner, "Any subject can be taught effectively to any child at any age, in some form that is honest and useful."

But despite these impressive gains, we still see indications of failure in our educational system. Consider this set of figures on the Nation's tremendous talent loss each year; talent which we need to manage our schools and our colleges; talent which we need in our armed services; talent which will run our factories and laboratories. We know, for example, that:

One out of every three students in the fifth grade now drops out of school before high school graduation. Only 2 of every 10 now graduate from college.

Almost a million youths drop out of our elementary and secondary schools each year; 250,000 of these fail to complete even elementary school.

Over 23 million Americans 18 years of age and older have completed less than 8 years of schooling. Included in this figure are some 8 million adults aged 25 and older who have completed less than 5 years of schooling.

Thirty percent of the high school seniors in the 80–90 academic percentile of their class and 43 percent of the 70–80 percentile fail to enter college.

And even more disturbing results turn up when we look at the basic problems of reading and spelling among those youngsters who do stay in school. Some of the results from a continuing program of research sponsored by the Office of Education underline this problem.

Project Talent is a series of studies done by the University of Pittsburgh for the U.S. Office of Education and some other Government agencies, with an expenditure of more than $2,500,000 of Federal funds. In the spring of 1960 a 2-day battery of tests and questionnaires was given to 440,000 students in 1,353 different public and private high schools throughout the Nation. The number represented 5 percent of the total number of students in grades 9–12. The undertaking was the largest and the most representative testing of high school students ever done. For example, in reading the student's ability was tested on representative paragraphs selected from current periodicals and from classic novels. Test questions were developed to estimate the completeness of the reader's understanding of these paragraphs. The average 12th grader was able to answer correctly 78 percent of the questions concerning matter from typical articles in motion picture magazines, but his comprehension declined swiftly to 28 percent on material selected from the more literary type of periodicals such as the Atlantic Monthly and the Saturday Review. On reading materials selected from writing of well-known novelists it was found that the average 12th grader was able to comprehend only about half of the broader ideas of the authors of typical classic novels.

At first glance, spelling looks much better; they found that the average senior could spell 93 percent of the test words, which were a representative sample of the 5,000 words used most frequently in published materials. But then we find that almost all of these words are very easy, such as corn, five, pages, rain, sang, and tea, all of which were spelled correctly by all seniors. On the other hand, over half of the 12th graders could not correctly spell "breathe." To illustrate the difficulty of the words given in the tests, the authors report that the test results mean that the average senior would misspell about 4 words in the preamble of the Constitution, which contains only 40 different words. When the students were asked to write two 1-paragraph themes, 99 out of 100 of these high school students committed errors in spelling and usage, a revelation which shocked the test administrator.

Why do we continue to see problems of this sort cropping up in our society when we have made such great advances in recent years? The key to the problem seems to be that despite our great advances, despite our greatly increased funds for research in education, and despite our efforts at improving the learning situation, we are still just on the threshold of discovery in the area of reading. There is much that we know, but even more that we do not know about how children learn to read and how well they could read if we had the proper tools and knowledge. No area of learning is more important and yet needs so much new attention.

But we are now making some progress—both in the Congress and in the laboratory. One important area is in making more and better library resources available, for as Thomas Carlyle, the great 19th century English philosopher, once noted: "All that mankind had done, thought, gained, or been * * * it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books."

Several important pieces of recent legislation are aimed at improving the materials available for readers of all ages and with all sorts of interests.

The Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, for instance, provides Federal assistance in the construction of libraries as well as in improving libraries' services. Funds may be used for salaries, books and other materials, equipment, and various operating expenses and for construction, expansion or remodeling of public libraries.

Title II of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is directed at helping the schools cope with the staggering explosion of knowledge.

It provides money for improving school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials such as films and records. States have considerable leeway in the use of funds to improve instructional materials, but they may not substitute them for money already being spent.

And the Higher Education Act, which is expected to be approved by the Congress this week, provides for college library assistance and for library training and research. The legislation would not only help colleges in acquiring appropriate library materials but also would help prepare individuals for working in information sciences, thus contributing to improved services by personnel in all libraries.

In addition, under the recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act, institutes are provided to train school librarians, teachers of reading, and personnel who work with disadvantaged youth. During the summer of 1965, there were 54 institutes for teachers of reading.

Meanwhile, in laboratories and schools throughout the country the improvement of instruction in reading also has been receiving greatly increased attention through the U.S. Office of Education's cooperative research program and will continue to receive it under the increased appropriation we made available only last week.

Already underway is the first large-scale comparative study of the teaching of reading to first-grade children. Twenty-seven separate but interrelated studies in this effort involve children from all sections of the country and try out a variety of techniques, but use the same evaluative tests.

More than 26,000 children and 800 teachers are participating. Results of these studies will contribute substantially to the improvement of the teaching of reading. Also, the large body of data accumulated should be useful for other studies related to reading habits and skills.

While the 27 studies are scheduled for completion in December of this year, already 17 follow-up studies are in process to gather additional information on the progress of the young participants in the second and third grades.

When this study is completed we may at long last have the information we need to settle questions about which of the many ways of teaching reading is most effective with which type of child.

Another major cooperative research reading effort is Project Literacy, which is being coordinated by Cornell University. It is a truly significant scientific project to stimulate and carry out research concerned with the development of reading skills and to relate the findings to other research and curriculum developments. This program is being conducted by psychologists, linguists, and reading specialists from 20 of our greatest universities. Some of the early results already confirm the importance of early language training for later excellence in reading.

And besides the coordinated projects on first-grade reading and those in Project Literacy, the Office of Education currently has in process over 40 other studies specifically concerned with reading and numerous other studies that are tied into reading.

The Office of Education also is supporting research and development activities in programed instruction and in teaching by machine.

This technique holds great promise for teaching certain aspects of beginning reading, and new reading programs based on this type of instruction are currently being tested at several places in the country.

One interesting result of these investigations has been the dramatic improvement in reading skills of little boys. As you well know, boys too often lag behind girls in reading, sometimes because they feel that reading is for sissies.

A study in California found that after a year of programed instruction, boys surpassed girls in reading proficiency, and further investigation is being made to determine under what general conditions programed instruction is most successful in teaching reading.

Technological advances also are being used to improve the reading skills of handicapped children. In an experimental program at this University of South Florida, for example, mentally retarded youngsters taught by programed instruction learned words six times faster than those taught by traditional methods.

Compressed speech recordings are still another advance made possible by modern technology.

Studies supported by the Office of Education show that these recordings hold great promise for use by the blind, who normally read Braille at only 60 words a minute or listen to sighted individuals who read at about 250 words a minute. With compressed speech, recorded reading can be speeded up to 240 words per minute with little or no loss in comprehension. This means that we can now teach blind children to read with their ears at four times the speed of Braille.

Much of the research aimed at studying disadvantaged students also recognizes education as an essential means of relieving the harassments—chiefly ignorance and illiteracy—that paralyze the poor. It also points to reading as the most important factor in programs to improve the education of the disadvantaged.

Adult and basic literacy programs, programs to prevent school dropouts. Project Head Start for preschool children, and a variety of community action undertakings all have implications for development and utilization of reading skills, and all lean heavily on improved reading. Without reading, there cannot be learning. It is utterly impossible to conceive of one without the other.

And the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in the key title I section which provides financial assistance to local educational agencies to improve education of poor children, enables schools to make renewed efforts to attack the reading problems of the disadvantaged.

As teachers of reading, I am sure you are all aware of how closely reading is tied to oral expression and how the development of reading skills is geared to the formation of ideas and concepts by young people. So if we can improve the reading ability of these youngsters from pockets of poverty, we can open up new vistas of learning.

That the country will benefit from our efforts to improve reading no one can gainsay. Reading is the key to education and education is the key to just about everything we do as a nation. The time, if there ever was one, when we could be complacent about our education, about what we already know, is past.

Our future as a nation and as individuals depends upon the capacity to keep informed. In a world in which yesterday's solutions may be wholly inadequate for today's problems, and in which broadened human understanding and compassion are necessary if we are to survive, a literate public is a basic requirement.

For it is only in knowing and understanding the wisdom of the ages and the latest insights of our best thinkers, scholars, scientists, and writers can we hope to build a better world for ourselves and children. In this effort, the schools, the universities, Government agencies, and the Congress must become cooperating parties in a new and bolder effort.

Perhaps the greatest need in this area is a growth and continuation of the existing cooperation between the schools and the Government. This has not always been a comfortable relationship, for in many ways the teacher—like the artist and the poet, resents the association with the bureaucrat and the politician. I can think of no better answer to this problem than to quote from President Kennedy's remarks recorded for the television program on Robert Frost which was presented on February 26, 1961. In these remarks, President Kennedy said:

"There is a story that some years ago an interested mother wrote to a principal of a school, 'Don't teach my boy poetry. He is going to run for Congress.' I have never taken the view that the world of politics and the world are so far apart. I think politicians and poets share at least one thing, and that is that their greatness depends upon the courage with which they face the challenges of life. There are many kinds of courage—bravery under fire, courage to risk reputation, friendship, and career for convictions which are deeply held. Perhaps the rarest courage of all—the skill to pursue it is given to very few men—is the courage to wage a silent battle to illuminate the nature of man and the world in which he lives."

TRIBUTES TO FATHER SANTIAGO NUNEZ, FOUNDER OF CASA HISPANOAMERICANA FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PUERTO RICAN CITIZENS OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican citizens of my home city of Springfield, Mass., have had the benefit of spiritual guidance from a congenial Central American priest during the past few years, the Reverend Santiago Nunez. The soft-spoken, warmhearted priest now returns to his home diocese in Costa Rica after many accomplishments in Springfield, not the least of which was the founding, organizing, and very effective leadership of Casa Hispanoamericana—Spanish-American House—for our Spanish-speaking neighbors in Springfield. Father Nunez had come to Springfield specifically at the invitation of the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese of Springfield, to labor among the city's Spanish-speaking people. Civic officials and leaders of the Puerto Rican community last week gave Father Nunez a testimonial before his departure for Costa Rica.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a column about Father Nunez' work at Casa Hispanoamericana, written by Jim Mason for the Springfield Union of October 8, and the story of his testimonial in the Springfield Union of October 4:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 4, 1965]

PRAISE HEAPED ON FATHER SANTIAGO AT TESTIMONIAL—200 TURN OUT TO HONOR PRIEST RETURNING TO COSTA RICA PARISH

City officials, lawyers, and clergymen joined with day laborers, tobacco workers, and the unemployed at Springfield Turn Verein Sunday to pay tribute to a Central American priest who came here 4 years ago to work with this city's Puerto Rican community.

MAYOR SPEAKS

Amid words of praise by Mayor Charles V. Ryan, one of the special guests, more than 200 persons expressed their gratitude for the work of "Father Santiago"—Rev. Santiago Nunez, who will return this month to his home parish in Costa Rica.

Other special guests included Rt. Rev. John F. Harrington, representing the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield; Rabbi Samuel Dresner of Temple Beth El, representing the city's Jewish clergy; Rev. Albert Garner, head of the Urban Ministry of the Greater Springfield Council of Churches; State Representative Philip Kimball; Rev. Thomas McCarthy of Sacred Heart Church, a coworker with the Puerto Rican community, and Dr. Walter English, municipal director of intergroup relations.

MEMORY BOOK PRESENTED

John V. Shea, Jr., director of the city's antipoverty program, presented Father Nunez a memory book, and Neri Perez, toastmaster, presented a purse and cash gift.

The testimonial dinner was sponsored by Casa Hispanoamericana, an organization for assistance of the city's Puerto Rican populace conceived and organized by Father Nunez.

Father Nunez came here at the invitation of the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese, specifically to work among the city's Spanish-speaking people.

During his stay here, his niece, Miss Martha Monge, also of Costa Rica, came to live in this city with the mayor's mother, Mrs. Charles V. Ryan, Sr., of Oxford St.

She married Robert Hafey, executive secretary of the Springfield Action Commission, and they reside in Caracas, Venezuela.

Mrs. Dolores Perez was chairman of the banquet and reception, and Mrs. James Fiorentino was ticket chairman.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 8, 1965]

FATHER NUNEZ' WORK WITH PUERTO RICANS: CASA HISPANOAMERICANA EMBODIES IT

(By Jim Mason)

Rev. Santiago Nunez, who has been a kind of ex officio citizen of this city for 4 years, returns this week to his home diocese in Costa Rica, and he will be sorely missed here.

UNDERSTANDS POVERTY

"Father Santiago," as he has been known in the Puerto Rican district at Memorial Square, was probably one of the handful of people in the city with a deep understanding of poverty and its paralyzing effects on those it touches.

It was this insight, no doubt, that facilitated his working closely in secular neighborhood projects with Rev. Hugh Wire, Protestant mission minister in the North End, and Mr. Wire's successor, Rev. Albert Garner, long before the ecumenical movement made such relationships fashionable.

The realities of poverty and the scarcity of leaders willing to live with it, and share its frustrations, were such that these men, and a few others like them, easily found a common bond.

This was indicated in the spring of 1963 when Father Nunez, Mr. Wire, and Rev. Thomas McCarthy, another North End priest, protested when two young Puerto Rican mothers were separated from their children and jailed, not for a crime, but because they were material witnesses to a murder in Holyoke.

The mothers were unwed, sinners in the eyes of the church, and therefore not inclined to engender public sympathy, but Father Nunez and a few others looked beyond the law of Christ to the love of Christ in their vain attempt to get justice for these women, who remained in jail for more than 3 months until the court heard the case.

In one of the early police commission meetings this summer when civil rights groups raised charges of police brutality, Father Nunez stood quietly in the rear of the meeting room. He had been here before, but Puerto Ricans had never been able to dramatize their claims of mistreatment by law enforcement officials the way the civil rightists' claims were dramatized then.

On one occasion, however, a Puerto Rican delegation led by Father Nunez had achieved the transfer of a policeman from a beat in the Puerto Rican neighborhood.

CONSTANTLY AFRAID

But the Police Department was only one of the many points on Father Nunez' busy itinerary in his search for answers to problems of the poor. His dealings with welfare departments in Springfield, Chicopee, and Holyoke prompted him to say in 1963, "President Roosevelt said in 1940 we should have freedom from fear. Believe me. These people, whether they are Puerto Rican, Negro or white, are constantly afraid when they go to the welfare departments.

"Welfare workers sometimes withhold aid on the slightest legal technicality. It doesn't matter if a family is hungry or needs medical attention or shelter," he said.

In the last 2 years, Father Nunez' major effort, and possibly his lasting contribution to the city, was the organization of Casa Hispanomericana (Spanish-American House).

The frustrations he encountered in his first 2 years here, both with the Puerto Ricans themselves, and the community institutions designed to help them, made him realize that this tiny minority of powerless citizens had to learn to organize and communicate their grievances and needs in a fashion that city officials and other agents of the community power structure would understand.

By drawing all Spanish-speaking people of the area into a cultural and civic organization, the advantaged members could help the disadvantaged to develop leaders and spokesmen, Father Nunez reasoned.

COMMUNITY'S VOICE

Starting with many friends but few funds, Father Nunez set to work organizing Casa, and it soon caught the imagination of Puerto Ricans themselves. Quarters at Memorial Square were scrubbed, painted, and carpentered by Puerto Rican volunteers and by early 1964, the new organization was gaining prestige as the voice of the Puerto Rican community.

Discouragements have been frequent in Father Nunez' work here. He said in 1963 that hostile feelings toward Puerto Ricans could be greatly alleviated by changes in the Puerto Ricans themselves.

Most came to the U.S. mainland from rural areas with no skills for urban employment, little or no English, and customs alien to urban life. All this must change, but the roots of tradition are deep, and Father Nunez' constant nudging has not always been successful.

But perhaps the seeds of change actually have been sown most effectively in Casa Hispanoamericana. If this fledgling institution can survive without the forceful leadership of Father Nunez, his work here may ultimately prove to take years off the social assimilation process which Puerto Ricans are now only entering.

EXTREMISM AT ITS WORST

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. RACE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, all of us, regardless of political affiliation, should be and are concerned about threats to our democratic processes and institutions. I do, therefore, applaud recent efforts by the leadership of the Republican Party in disclaiming the John Birch Society.

An editorial comment on this matter, written by the respected editor of the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth-Reporter, Carl Keyser, appeared in that paper on October 7.

I include that editorial as part of my remarks:

EXTREMISM AT ITS WORST

The Republicans in the sixties are suffering from the same kind of infection as did the Democrats in the thirties—the infiltration by extremists who purportedly share the ideals of the party but who in actuality are working to destroy them.

The most basic of these ideals is the one called "democracy," which has to do with the free and open interplay of competing ideas, majority rule tempered by a loyal opposition, compromise, fair play.

Democracy is a dirty word to the rightist John Birch Society, just as it is in its true sense, to the Communists. The guiding principles of the Birch Society founder, Robert Welch, could have come directly from the lips of Lenin.

The John Birch Society is an authoritarian structure. Orders come directly from the top, with none of this nonsense about democratic discussion. Every member of the society acknowledges the right of the leader to oust him at any time without explanation.

The most fantastic and insidious thing about the Birch Society is that it does not hurt its ostensible enemy, the Communists, in the slightest. It does not even pay much attention to liberals. Its most bitter venom is directed against responsible and respected American conservatives.

Clearly, as Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, has said, "There is no place for it in the Republican Party."

Nor, it might be added, in any association of Americans.

HILL-BURTON AMENDMENTS INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE DOW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year this Congress passed medicare provisions which help pay the costs of long-term nursing care for our Nation's elderly. When these provisions take effect in January 1967, we can expect an increase in applications to our Nation's nursing homes and other long-term-care facilities, which are already trying to cope with the problem of having half a million less beds available than are needed.

Over the years, increases in the funds authorized for Hill-Burton Act grants have helped to gradually decrease the deficit between the number of beds available and the number of beds needed. But now, to keep from backsliding due to medicare, I am convinced we are again going to have to increase the funds made available to public and nonprofit organizations for the construction, expansion, and remodeling of long-term-care facilities.

I am introducing today a bill which would double our annual grant program for such facilities, from $70 to $140 million. This bill would also allow the Surgeon General to redistribute to all other States those funds remaining unused from any one State's allotment. Under the present law these funds revert to the Treasury if not used by the State for which they were earmarked.

With so many of our States suffering a serious shortage of beds for long-term care, it is a crime if all the funds authorized by Congress are not used.

Present Hill-Burton appropriations are helping to provide about 15,000 new beds annually. My bill would help to provide about 30,000 beds a year. The extra 15,000 should help to meet the peak demand caused in 1967 and 1968 by medicare. In the third year, which is the final year for the present act, which my bill would amend, the extra 15,000 beds would accelerate the elimination of the half-million-bed deficit.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF UGANDA ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of Uganda celebrated on October 9 a deeply satisfying event in the history of their nation. On that day in 1962 they achieved their independence from Great Britain. One year later, on the first anniversary of becoming a sovereign nation, Uganda became a republic within the British Commonwealth of Nations. Now, on this third anniversary, the people of this African country are looking forward to a future of striving for a bettering of their lives through a plan of economic development to increase their national product at a rate of 4 percent per year for the next 15 years. This effort will involve great changes in the way of life of the Ugandans. New industries are to be created. The traditional reliance on two agricultural products—cotton and coffee—for foreign exchange will partially give way to a diversification of goods which come from the nonindustrial sector of the economy. Education and new skills will be learned. Mineral extraction will increase. This modernization of the means of production will be a phenomenon which we should applaud. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to extend my sincere congratulations to the people of Uganda as they enter the fourth year of their free and proud nationhood.

THE FEDERAL FINE ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE ACT CAN BEAUTIFY OUR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill, H.R. 11523, to foster outstanding architectural design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11523, the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act, would provide for Federal public buildings in the 50 States the same sort of expert advice on design and decoration and on the selection of architects and artists that the Fine Arts Commission gives for Federal structures in the Capital. The bill would do this by creating an Architectural Advisory Board and an Art Advisory Board in the General Services Administration.

Equally as important, the bill provides for the creation of a cumulative fund for the acquisition and maintenance of works of art for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia. It authorizes annual appropriations for the art fund of 1 percent of the amount appropriated during the preceding fiscal year for design and construction of Federal public buildings outside the District.

Such a fund would allow the United States to build beauty into Federal buildings in the 50 States to a degree that has not been possible in the past.

The new fund for the acquisition of works of art would have three major advantages:

First. The continuing threat that highly desirable artistic embellishments would be squeezed out of a building because of other cost problems would be avoided since the funds for works of art would not be tied to the cost of specific building projects, as at present.

Second. The fund would also allow a decision to include works of art at the earliest stage of planning. The artist could be selected at the beginning and would work with the architect throughout the design and construction of the building to assure that the artistic embellishment would be an integral part of the building and not something stuck on as afterthought.

Third. The fund would allow the Administrator of the General Services Administration and his advisers flexibility to make larger allocation of funds for art for Federal buildings where beauty is of particular importance. Thus, much more than 1 percent of the construction and design cost might be allocated for the acquisition of a major art work or works for a Federal building that would be a landmark in the center of one of our cities. On the other hand, use or location might dictate little or no spending for art in other buildings. In all cases, the amounts allocated would be determined according to expert judgment of the need for artistic embellishment, rather than by a procrustean formula.

The Art Advisory Board to be established under H.R. 11523 would advise the Administrator of the General Services Administration on expenditures from the art fund, on the selection of artists whose work is to be acquired by means of the fund, and on designs or models of works of art to be purchased.

The Art Board would consist of the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration, as chairman, and six distinguished artists who would serve staggered 3-year terms.

The legislation specifies that two of the artists be painters, with one of them experienced in mural decoration; two would be sculptors, with one of them experienced in monumental sculpture; one would be an interior designer, and one an artist specializing in the decorative arts and crafts, such as mosaic, stained glass, and grillwork.

The Administrator of the General Services Administration would make the appointments to the Art Board after considering nominations from leading national professional organizations in the fields and after consulting with the Commission on Fine Arts and the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Director of the National Gallery of Art.

The Architectural Advisory Board would make recommendations on Federal public buildings and leased post offices whenever it considered the buildings of "sufficient significance" to justify the Board's consideration. The Architectural Board would give advice on the selection of architects and would review and make recommendations on designs. Its recommendations would go to the Administrator of the General Services Administration on buildings to be built by him under the Public Buildings Act of 1939 and to the Postmaster General on buildings to be built for lease as post offices.

The membership of the Architectural Board would consist of the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration, as chairman, and at least five distinguished architects appointed for 3-year staggered terms. A sixth member would be an expert in city planning, who could also be an architect.

Liaison between the two Boards would be provided not only through the presence of the Assistant Commissioner for Design on both Boards but also by the assignment of one member of the Art Board to meet with and advise the Architectural Board.

These boards and the cumulative fund would be used only on projects in the 50 States. The legislation would not interfere with the duties and prerogatives of the Fine Arts Commission within the District or upon the Commission's functions which are not related to Federal public buildings outside the District.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 11523 will meet a real need.

Nearly four centuries ago, Sir Henry Wotton gave us an enduring definition when he said:

> Well-building hath three conditions: commodity, firmness, and delight.

As we look at the Federal buildings around the Nation, we must conclude sadly that all too often we have not built well because we have neglected the delight that comes from works of art and from outstanding architecture.

For many years we placed too little emphasis on obtaining imaginative, striking, handsome designs which would represent the dignity, the vitality, and power of the United States in its buildings and structures. The post offices built after World War II under the lease-construction program were remarkable for their uniformly dull and nondescript architecture.

Little attention and money has been devoted to adorning Federal public buildings outside the District with appropriate works of art. During the depression, the New Deal gave hungry artists jobs and put murals and other art works in public buildings. But the United States soon slipped back into its old ways.

The Kennedy Administration opened a new era. President Kennedy was concerned with the architecture of Federal buildings and with what their appearance said to us and to the world about America.

He revitalized the Fine Arts Commission. He saved Lafayette Park. He appointed an ad hoc committee on Federal Office Space consisting of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Budget Bureau Director David Bell, General Services Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, and his special assistant, Timothy J. Reardon, Jr.

The ad hoc committee on Federal Office Space reported in June 1962, recommending the following three-point architectural policy for the Federal Government:

First. The policy shall be to provide requisite and adequate facilities in an architectural style and form which is distinguished and which will reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American National Government. Major emphasis should be placed on the choice of designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought. Specific attention should be paid to the possibilities of incorporating into such designs qualities which reflect the regional architectural traditions of that part of the Nation in which buildings are located. Where appropriate, fine art should be incorporated in the designs, with emphasis on the work of living American artists. Designs shall adhere to sound construction practice and utilize materials, methods, and equipment of proven dependability. Buildings shall be economical to build, operate, and maintain, and should be accessible to the handicapped.

Second. The development of an official style must be avoided. Design must flow from the architectural profession to the Government, and not vice versa. The Government should be willing to pay some additional cost to avoid excessive uniformity in design of Federal buildings. Competitions for the design of Federal buildings may be held where appropriate. The advice of distinguished architects ought to, as a rule, be sought prior to the award of important design contracts.

Third. The choice and development of the building site should be considered the first step of the design process. This choice should be made in cooperation with local agencies. Special attention should be paid to the general ensemble of streets and public places of which Federal buildings will form a part. Where possible, buildings should be located so as to permit a generous development of landscape.

In line with these excellent recommendations, Mr. Boutin and Karel

Yasko, the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration and former State architect of Wisconsin, set about enthusiastically to upgrade the quality of the architecture of Federal public buildings.

We are already seeing the first fruits of their efforts for outstanding design in new Government structures.

And, following the recommendation of the ad hoc committee, Mr. Boutin issued a directive that—

> If the architect-engineer recommends some form of art embellishment, and if the limit of cost indicates some margin of funds available, the funds not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the estimated construction cost must be set aside in a reservation.

The directive also provides that fine arts must be "appropriate" to the building and that they will not "ordinarily" be included in buildings with an estimated construction cost of less than $250,000.

Projects carried out recently or under design include interior fountain sculpture in the Federal Office Building in St. Louis; a ceramic tile mural in the Federal Office Building in Cincinnati; carved wood panels in the courthouse and Federal Office Building in Denver; interior and exterior mosaic murals at the customhouse and Federal Office Building in Los Angeles, and stained glass panels in the courthouse and post office in Gainesville, Fla.

We have come a long way in the last few years. President Johnson, like his predecessor, is deeply concerned with beauty in our national life.

H.R. 11523 is designed to build upon the progress that has been made and to provide the legislative basis for even higher standards of art and architecture in Federal buildings outside the Capital.

The art fund will assure more and better artistic embellishment of our public buildings. I believe it is time for the United States to move on from the rather limited use of artistic decoration possible under the present General Services Administration directive to the greater program possible with the art fund and the Art Advisory Board.

The value of a board of experts on architecture in improving Federal buildings has been demonstrated more than once. The Fine Arts Commission, though the subject of controversy in the past, has made significant contributions to good architecture in Federal and other structures in the District.

The State Department used an advisory board somewhat similar to the one proposed in H.R. 11523 in designing the the American Embassies which have shown the excellence possible in American public architecture when the Nation's talents are brought into full play.

On a much smaller scale, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I have used an advisory committee on art and architecture to promote beauty in the new Milwaukee main post office which will be a dominating feature in the center of our city. The advisory committee has made a number of very useful recommendations which, I believe, will lead to a more pleasing building in a more attractive setting than we would otherwise have had.

It may be asked why H.R. 11523 does not provide that the Fine Arts Commission should advise on Federal public buildings outside the District as well as those within the Capital. The Fine Arts Commission, however, is fully occupied with its concerns in the District. Its members serves on a part-time basis and would be overwhelmed if confronted with the task of advising and making carefully-considered recommendations on Federal buildings to be built outside Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in an eloquent message to Congress earlier this year President Johnson pointed out:

> Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit.

I hope we shall make this truth our watchword in providing for the construction of Federal buildings. I hope that Congress will soon consider and pass this bill to continue and step up our progress toward higher standards of art and architecture in our Federal public buildings.

The text of H.R. 11523 follows:

H.R. 11523

A bill to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this Act to provide—

(1) for the maintenance of high standards of architectural design and art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia; and

(2) a program for the acquisition and preservation of suitable works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The term "public building" shall have the same meaning as is provided in section 13(1) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

SEC. 3. (a) The Architectural Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. There shall be six other members of the Board each of whom shall be appointed by the Administrator to serve for a term expiring during one of the first three calendar years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members may have a term expiring in the same calendar year. Five of the six appointed members shall be distinguished architects, one of whom shall be experienced in landscape architecture. One appointed member shall be a city planner who may also be an architect. The Administrator shall give consideration to any nominations submitted to him from time to time by leading national organizations in architecture, and shall consult with the Commission of Fine Arts on such nominations. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) In all cases where the Board determines that the buildings involved are of sufficient significance, it shall make recommendations—

(1) to the Administrator on the architect and design of public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and

(2) to the Postmaster General on the architect and design of buildings to be constructed outside the District of Columbia for lease to the United States for use by the Post Office Department.

The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator or to the Postmaster General the holding of competitions for the selection of such architects.

(c) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to acquire and maintain works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia. In addition to any amounts otherwise authorized, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in each fiscal year, to remain available until expended, an amount equal to one percent of the total amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year for the design and construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5 (a) The Art Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. The remaining six members of the Board shall be appointed by the Administrator from among distinguished representatives of professional fields as follows:

(1) painting, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in mural decoration;

(2) sculpture, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in monumental sculpture;

(3) the decorative arts and crafts, one member; and

(4) interior design, one member.

Such appointments shall be made by the Administrator after giving consideration to any nominations submitted to him by leading national organizations in the respective professional fields, and after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Director of the National Gallery of Art. Each appointed member of the Board shall serve for a term expiring in one of the first three years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members and not more than one painter or sculptor may have a term scheduled to expire in the same calendar year. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) The Board shall make recommendations to the Administrator concerning the artists and works of art to be acquired under section 4. The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator the holding of competitions for the selection of artists and of designs or models of works of art.

(c) The Board shall designate one of its members to meet with and advise the Architectural Advisory Board.

(d) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as

such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on October 5 here in Washington, D.C., the 20th anniversary of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was celebrated at a large luncheon for more than 400 persons from public and private life.

Four awards were presented: The President's Committee Distinguished Service Award to the General Services Administration for its work in eliminating barriers to entry by the handicapped in Government buildings; the Blinded Veterans Association 1965 Award to the Internal Revenue Service as the top Government employer of blind persons this past year; the first award of the District of Columbia Commissioner's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped to the Sidwell Friends School for its cooperation with the District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation; and to the U.S. Treasury Department, a special award from the National Capital chapter of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped for their work in hiring the handicapped, presented by Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver.

It was a real pleasure to see three Federal agencies and one private school receive recognition for service over and above the call of duty.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release on the President's Committee Distinguished Service Plaque, signed by President Johnson, be inserted in the RECORD, together with my own remarks on this historic and significant occasion.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION TO RECEIVE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

Leadership in the nationwide program of furthering employment opportunities for the handicapped in and out of the Federal service has earned for the General Services Administration the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The award will be presented at the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week Luncheon of the District of Columbia Commissioners' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped at the Presidential Arms, 1320 G Street, NW., on Tuesday, October 5, 1965, at noon.

The award will be presented by William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary of the President's Committee. It will be accepted by John H. Finlator, Director of Manpower and Administration of GSA.

The General Services Administration was cited for its cooperation in the nationwide program to eliminate architectural barriers. The agency took the initiative to make buildings used by Federal agencies accessible to the handicapped by assuring that design and construction of new Government buildings meet specifications adopted for the accommodation of persons with ambulatory limitations.

In addition, GSA in cooperation with the President's Committee, established a two-pronged program in July of last year to increase subcontracting opportunities in America's sheltered workshops.

Under this program, GSA urges firms holding prime Government contracts to give area sheltered workshops opportunities to bid on subcontracts. The Agency's Business Service Centers all over the Nation provide counseling to sheltered workshops wishing to submit bids for subcontracts. This program is actively promoted in all GSA regions.

In addition to providing increased employment for handicapped persons in sheltered workshops, the program serves constantly to remind contractors of the capabilities of the handicapped.

GSA has made an outstanding record as an employer of the handicapped in all of its 10 regions. When a civil service program of hiring retarded persons on certification of a rehabilitation agency was instituted in January 1964, GSA hired a number of retardates.

Each year during National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week the Agency helps to publicize the abilities of its handicapped employees through displays and exhibits in the lobbies of Federal buildings in 11 major cities. In addition, GSA carries on an internal campaign to gain acceptance for handicapped workers through articles and statements in its employee publications.

INTRODUCTION OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, BY WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

For a decade and a half now, it has been my pleasure to appear before our speaker along with Admiral McIntire, General Maas, and now Harold Russell in support of our annual appropriation. Incidentally, the President's Committee as an independent unit of the Government is the only such unit I know of which has a private citizen defend its appropriation. I must say that our relations with our speaker today have always been most harmonious and, if anything, he has asked us to take on more responsibility rather than less.

It is no news to this audience that Congressman JOHN FOGARTY has been such a booster for medical research and other help to the handicapped that is generally known in the House of Representatives as champion of better health for the Nation. He not only honors us with his presence here today, but we honor him for a long record of distinguished leadership in the legislative branch of the Government. If there was as much harmony in all branches as there is between the legislative and executive in the area of rehabilitation and health, I feel sure we would be a long way further down the road to our national destiny.

Winning the Albert Lasker Award in 1959 for his work in medical research and public health, Mr. FOGARTY typically donoted the $5,000 honorarium to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children. He also donated an $8,000 Kennedy Foundation Leadership Award to public service. He is the only living American to my knowledge to have three health and educational facilities in his home State named after him while he is still living.

Our speaker's trademark is a fighting heart for the underprivileged, which he wears on his sleeve, and a sporting bow tie, usually green, which he wears on his neck. The first time I met our speaker, however, he was wearing dungarees. This was on Guam during World War II when he was on a special mission for the President. He was a temporary Seabee at the time, the only group of men that marines give precedence to.

I had the pleasure of introducing our speaker at a goodwill luncheon in 1958 and at the time emphasized his part in passage of Public Law 565. I also said:

"Formerly President of Bricklayers Union No. 1 of Providence our speaker lays bricks of logic and rhetoric in helping shape the destiny of a free people.

"For 18 years he has represented Rhode Island's Second Congressional District. Here in the Capital, a town more notable for brick throwing than bricklaying, he has laid aside the tools of his early occupation and today builds lasting monuments in support of and expansion of such major breakthroughs on the social front as Public Law 565.

"Our speaker is not only abreast of the times, but ahead of the times, and always eager to embrace new and imaginative programs for the betterment of his fellow countrymen."

It is a pleasure to present a 24-year Congressman, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and rehabilitation plantation.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT KICK-OFF LUNCHEON FOR THE NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 5, 1965

I have been asked to talk about the handicapped worker and his place in the Great Society. You have asked the right person. If I have anything to say about it, and I have, the place of the handicapped worker is front row center. This should be the case in any society, but particularly in our society which means a sharing of our God-given abundance with those willing and eager to take their place and to play their part in the society we are building.

It has not always been so, and for too many handicapped people in our great country, it is not yet a fact of life, but the plans we have laid and the dreams we have dreamed on Capitol Hill—together with planners and dreamers of the administration and the body public—are speeding the day when all the well-motivated handicapped will take their rightful place front row center in the world of work.

Too long have too many toiled on the side aisles, too long have too many worked in the galleries of business and industry, too long have too many not even been able to get into the theater of our workaday world. In spite of what you and I know has been a most remarkable two decades of progress and of almost revolutionary breakthroughs in both attitudes and practices, we still have hundreds of thousands of persons with limitations of body or mind who can perform and produce as well or better than persons now working, but who have not yet gotten out of the standing room only area. Some of them do not even have standing room, they are seated on the sidelines in their chromium thrones.

After 25 years on Capitol Hill, I have become firmly convinced that there is nothing more important than work. God expects it. Man needs it. Society demands it. That is one reason I am so sold on vocational rehabilitation leading to employment. That is why so many of our so-called problems would be solved overnight, for when people are working, problems tend to vanish or grow smaller.

There is no brighter story on our Nation's role of honor today than the progress that has been made in the field of employment of the mentally retarded. Just a few years ago, the dedicated and persuasive Eunice Shriver who graces our table today delivered a fiery speech about what was not being done by Government to hire the retarded. She could not make that speech today, thanks to the leadership and vision of our late President who threw open the doors not only of Government, but of business and industry in one magnificent and dramatic appeal to the conscience of the Nation.

At his insistence, the Congress coupled his vision with its own imagination and today, the retarded are working at places nobody ever dreamed they would be able to enter. And you have not seen anything yet. If our beloved President John F. Kennedy is remembered for any one special act or program, I think that his work in behalf of the mentally retarded and mentally restored may well be one of the brightest areas on his battle shield.

You are familiar, generally, with what has been done in placing more than 700 retarded workers on the Federal rolls in a few short months. What you may not be aware of is the encouragement which the Federal program has given employers in the private sector. The demonstrated competence of hundreds of qualified workers who happen to have mental retardation is giving countless employers of good will the courage to go forth and hire the retarded themselves.

Many of you are familiar with the policy of the W. T. Grant Co. which has been honored for its enlightened policies of hiring qualified retardates, but do many of you know that the president of the Grant Co. has written his fellow retail merchandising executives urging them to investigate the relatively untapped manpower which the retarded can provide in jobs which have been plagued for many years with rapid turnover. This progress is the best kind, for it benefits both employer and employee. It is almost like the gentle mercy that drops from heaven, if a bricklayer can paraphrase Shakespeare, being twice blessed, blessing him that gives and him that takes.

I am honored to be here at this head table with people who are on the firing line. We in the Congress generally can only load and point the weapons to correct injustice. It takes people like my friends up here and my friends out in the audience to zero in on the target and knock out the opposition.

People like the General Services Administration which has hired the retarded in large numbers and which has rendered distinguished service in the elimination of architectural barriers. People like Mrs. W. Willard Wirtz who has given so generously of her time and talents to provide the spark of leadership needed to generate extra enthusiasm in jobs for the handicapped through useful work in workshops and at home. The arts and crafts project which she heads up may make a very real and lasting solution to the problems of the severely handicapped. And people like Eunice Shriver who somehow seems to have invented a day stretcher, for it does not seem possible that the good she does could be accomplished in one movement of the earth around the sun.

Thus, the fine work of these dedicated volunteers brings me to the subject closest to my legislative heart today, H.R. 8310, which passed the House of Representatives without a single dissenting vote after 2 hours of debate.

What they have done, will do, and are doing is fine, but it is not enough. For that reason, the Congress hopes to make 1965 a rehabilitation year, a year that will rank alongside of 1954 when Public Law 565 gave new hope to added hundreds of thousands. I would like to tell you about our bill and our hopes for it. I know that you do not vote on legislation, except indirectly through the force of public opinion, but let me give you the highlights so that you will know that the Congress is aware of the problem and is taking dramatic steps to help in its solution.

The Federal-State rehabilitation program has, through the years, proved to be a happy partnership. It has provided the physically and mentally handicapped—the neglected and bypassed—new hope for life and work. The present public program owes much of its strength to the muscular amendments of 1954 which pumped new vitality into the skeleton rehabilitation structure that had grown out of the problems presented by returning veterans of World War I. But just as 1920 legislation did not meet the needs of the early 1950's, just so the amendments of 1954 are not sufficient today to carry the full load of our complete national rehabilitation potential.

By mustering the energies blended together in the Federal-State relationship, we were able last year to count 135,000 rehabilitated men and women who successfully availed themselves of the services provided by their local agencies. Even though this was a record, the number should have been 300,000 if we merely hoped to keep abreast of the new disability cases which come into the picture each year. Because we cannot cope with the current number of new disabilities each year, our backlog is growing recklessly and disastrously. Because the Federal Government and the States have permitted this program to operate far below its potential, we face the backlog of about 3½ million persons in need of rehabilitation services.

This is why the U.S. House of Representatives has strengthened and expanded the force of the Federal-State rehabilitation programs. The changes are far reaching. Their effects will certainly influence the history of rehabilitation, and result in the return to productive and constructive lives of many persons who until now were denied the right to vocational opportunities.

We hope that in just a few short years the number of yearly rehabilitants will reach 300,000, to take care of the new persons needing rehabilitation each year, so that we then can turn our attention to reducing the tremendous backlog.

H.R. 8310 proposes to do this by changing a number of existing legislative provisions:

Financing of the basic Federal-State program would be changed to provide for a more liberal allotment of Federal funds to the States. At present the Federal share of funding the program under a variable matching formula ranges between 50 and 70 percent. Eventually this Federal share would climb to 75 percent for all States without varying.

Another important feature is that the States will be authorized to accept severely disabled persons, for whom the outlook for employment is obscure, and provide services to them for a period up to 6 months to test the feasibility of providing intensive rehabilitation training. Heretofore uncertainty of employment possibilities precluded many severely handicapped persons from undergoing services. The agencies has just so much money to wager, and they had to bet only on likely winners. Now they can be a bit more long sighted in choosing a winner.

In the case of mentally retarded persons, this special provision authorizes such exploratory services for as long as 18 months. This will provide the time to find the hidden talents which more often than not are brought out by patient probing and skillful counseling, so that the person with retardation can take his rightful place one day in the working community.

A program of grants to assist in meeting costs of construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops is also authorized by H.R. 8310. In the past, only a very limited effort was authorized in this field—usually confined to alterations, expansion, and equipment—without any funds available for construction. Approved projects from public and nonprofit private rehabilitation organizations will be eligible for grants to cover 50 percent of new construction costs.

And when these newly constructed workshops are ready to be staffed, grants will be available to pay part of the costs of initial staffing. These grants can start off paying as much as 75 percent of the staffing costs for professional personnel, and will gradually reduce to 30 percent in the later months of the 51-month period authorized by the bill.

Grants would also be available to pay 90 percent of the cost of providing training services to handicapped persons in private, nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities. Grants would also be authorized to pay part of the costs of projects to analyze, improve, and increase professional services and to provide for technical assistance in existing workshops.

In connection with these new programs for workshops and rehabilitation centers, an advisory group would be established to provide assistance in the administration of these facilities.

The nationwide campaign to eliminate architectural barriers would receive a tremendous boost through the establishment of a National Commission on Architectural Barriers, with members drawn from among the general public, and private and professional groups concerned with architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of physically handicapped individuals.

In the training program administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in which students pursue degree work in preparation for a career in rehabilitation, financial assistance for the student would be extended from a period of 2 to 4 years.

The amendments also provide for the establishment of a national data service in rehabilitation, using modern automated data systems to collect, store, analyze, retrieve and disseminate research information essential to rehabilitation programs and to the hundreds of voluntary organizations serving the disabled throughout the country.

Many other important features and technical amendments have been included to improve the operation of both the public rehabilitation program and the cooperating voluntary programs. They give ample encouragement to the many private agencies which are sharing in the burden of disability. The philosophy behind this piece of carefully considered legislation recognizes the worth of voluntarism as a vital force in our Nation's concerted battle against disability, and the legislators recognize that humanitarian problems are best solved by humans in a way that best benefits humanity.

This is why we have weeks like National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. And this is why volunteers count so much. More rehabilitated persons mean more jobs must be found to assure their acceptance in the world of work. Your mission is clear. One week of enthusiasm during the year is not sufficient to sustain the pace of victory. The need for opening up job opportunities for the handicapped applicant continues year round and demands your energies on a year-round basis. It is the only way we can assure his position in front row center.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY, for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 11, 12, 13, inclusively, on account of official business.

Mr. HOSMER, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. MARSH (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), indefinitely on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 15 minutes, on Tuesday, October 12, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Iowa) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. TODD.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. PELLY on the subject of Leif Ericsson Day.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. CAMERON in three instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Intitution for use in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1666. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Patent Office," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1667. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1668. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on analysis of certain aspects of bidding by both sealed bids and oral auction bids on national forest timber in the northern region (region 1) and the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1669. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on October 8, 1965, the following bills were filed on October 9, 1965:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11428. A bill to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront; with amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11439. A bill to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11487. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7526. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 11520. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11521. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code with respect to dislocation allowances paid to members of the uniformed services under section 407 of that title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11522. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act (the Hill-Burton Act) so as to double the amount authorized for assisting the construction of nursing homes and other long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11523. A bill to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architectural Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11524. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the Northeastern Corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Education, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution to authorize travel by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, outside the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11525. A bill for the relief of Filomena Quaranta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11526. A bill for the relief of Maria Logoteta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11527. A bill for the relief of Rocco Manfre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 11528. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11529. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hedwig Hauke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11530. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Ekonomides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11531. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

279. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., relative to tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

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

Mr. Richard Langham Riedel, of the Senate staff, a deacon of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Thou Great Spirit of the universe, our Father and our God:

We thank Thee for Thy presence. We thank Thee for the Senate of the United States. We are especially grateful for the rapid recovery of the President of the United States. We ask Thy blessing upon the Chaplain, Dr. Harris, as daily he leads so many hearts and minds toward Thee. We seek Thy blessing and guidance for the Vice President and each Senator, in all their thoughts and actions throughout this day and always.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 9, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 7, 1965:

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1965:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes.

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. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

The message also announced that on October 8, 1965, 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. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with new reports, and not including nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

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 MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, sundry nominations in the Coast Guard are on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent be notified immediately of the confirmation of all 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.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the 13 minutes preceding 1 o'clock I may have the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in conjunction with the majority leader's request, I ask that the last 15 minutes preceding the allotment requested by him be allotted to the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These will not be considered second speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Is there morning business?

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators as members of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to be held in Rome, November 20, 1965: GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, and JACK MILLER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Patent Office," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. ROBERT WESLEY COLGLAZIER, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to bills proposing to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

First, to express, on behalf and in representation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to the Congress and the President of the United States its solidarity with the purpose of increasing the Federal minimum wage contemplated in the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act at present under consideration by Congress, at the same time that it declares its conviction that if approved, the main amendments to said act, concerning Puerto Rico, will adversely affect the development of Puerto Rico's economy and the living conditions of our laborers.

Second, to express the solidarity of the legislative assembly with the standpoint assumed by the executive branch of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in support of the continuance of the flexible system of fixing wages through the industrial committees and soliciting that Puerto Rico be exempted from any provision contained in the said bills providing for automatic increases in the minimum wage.

Third, to declare that the present coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act should remain unaltered.

Fourth, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington.

I, Carlos Roman Benitez, secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the S. Subs. to House Concurrent Resolution 9, entitled: "Concurrent resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered" has been approved by the Senate of Puerto Rico and the House of Representatives and signed by the speaker and the president of the respective houses on September 23, 1965, as appears from the printed copy attached herewith.

CARLOS ROMAN BENITEZ,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H.R. 10779. An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation to construct, maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex. (Rept. No. 859).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 860).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 861).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2619. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2620. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the Northeastern Corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2621. A bill for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2622. A bill to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2623. A bill to amend chapter 33, subtitle II—"Other Commercial Transactions"—of title 28, District of Columbia Code, with respect to charging or deducting in advance interest on loans to be repaid in installments; and

S. 2624. A bill to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2625. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Esparza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Northeast Corridor Transportation Commission.

This bill is designed to fill the need for interim developmental planning in the complicated matter of intercity transportation in the crowded megalopolis of our Northeast States. It follows logically, and will supplement, the high-speed ground transportation act of 1965 which was signed into law by President Johnson on September 30, providing $90 million for research and demonstrations in ground transportation. The bill I introduce today suggests a way for insuring that the findings of the Government research program will be put into action.

Specifically, the bill provides for a framework for interstate cooperation in the form of a commission whose members would represent each of the eight northeast seaboard States, plus the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. The Commission is empowered to formulate a development program which shall include such features as the routing of future facilities, the location of terminals and other facilities, the method of financing such developments, and finally, the organizational plan under which new facilities may be constructed and operated.

It is this last feature—the matter of organizational structure—which is perhaps the most basic element of this bill. The Commission is directed to consider such alternatives as a Federal corporation, an organization established by interstate compact, or continuation and modification of the Commission itself, presumably with added provisions for financial support. To my mind it is very important that the Federal, State, and local governments involved start thinking now about this very important question of how best to operate our future transportation systems with maximum participation by the private sector of the economy.

It is my hope and my belief, for example, that the public-authority concept which I first advanced in 1962 and which is incorporated by Senate Joint Resolution 16 which I introduced in the present Congress, will prove to be the appropriate structure for long-range development of interstate transportation facilities. But the negotiation of such a public authority, involving eight States and dozens of other municipal and county jurisdictions, undoubtedly will require protracted and complex discussions before the agency could evolve. This bill would provide a framework for such discussions and thus begin, none too soon, the protracted job of translating plans into action.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to make special mention of the important role which Congressman CARLTON SICKLES, of Maryland, has played in preparing this legislation, a companion version of which he is introducing in the House today. Congressman SICKLES, in connection with his work with the Commission to create a transportation compact incorporating Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, has experienced, at first, the complex difficulties of multilateral negotiations and has played a primary role in preparing the legislation we introduce today. I am happy to be associated with him particularly now that the Governors of the States involved are holding preliminary discussions on this very problem in Trenton, N.J., October 15.

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

The bill (S. 2620) to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeast corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be added as a cosponsor to S. 2579 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, at its next printing.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 2460 the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the next printing of a bill which I introduced, S. 2180, a bill to improve the safety of rail transportation, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that the names of three Senators be added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 51, to express the sense of Congress that the United Nations provide for the self-determination of the Baltic States—the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 1, 1965, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MUNDT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold and silver produced in the United States, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators) on October 1, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I announce as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill was introduced by me on March 25, cosponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement setting forth the details with respect to these hearings, which will take place on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, announced today that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill, S. 1630, which was introduced by Senator CLARK on March 25 this year is also sponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

"Hearings have been scheduled," Senator CLARK said, "for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, at which time the subcommittee will hear testimony from a number of distinguished economists, including former members of the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as representatives of labor and industry. Additional hearings may be scheduled at a later time.

"The bill would require the President, as part of his Economic Report, to submit to Congress each year a full employment and production budget which would anticipate for the approaching fiscal year and the next 5 years, the projected performance of the national economy and the degree to which this performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment and production with stable prices. Under the bill, the President would also be required to submit a Federal budget and a tax monetary program designed to minimize any full employment surplus or deficit which might be anticipated.

"Thus, these amendments would enable the President to provide Congress and the Nation with rough targets in employment and the investment needed to fully utilize our manpower and production resources so that the levels of unemployment could be reduced below 3 percent within the near future."

Senator CLARK noted that "in spite of the fact that this country has experienced more than 56 consecutive months of the greatest prosperity in its history, we are still plagued with joblessness at a rate of 4½ percent of the Nation's work force.

"Many of the unmet needs which have plagued our Nation and held us back from meeting our full economic potential will be met by the programs enacted by the 89th Congress in the fields of regional economic development, education, and poverty. Nevertheless, allocations of Federal expenditures in the public sector of our economy have never been governed by considerations of how such expeditures might effect our annual employment levels."

Senator CLARK invited comments from all interested persons and stated that his subcommittee would be happy to hear testimony or receive statements from interested Members of Congress.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nominations:

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana; Herman F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; William M. Rountree, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa; and William H. Weathersby, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Sudan.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Comment on report of the first national conference on the problems of rural youth in a changing environment, edited by Mrs. Ruth Cowan Nash, of West Virginia.

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

FEDERAL-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to the States and through them to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for additional sponsors until close of business Monday next, October 18, 1965, unless the Senate adjourns sine die before that time, and that it lie on the desk until the Senate does adjourn if sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2619) to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill now implements what has become rather popularly known as the Heller plan developed in June 1964, by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

I introduce this bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. A parallel measure is being introduced today in the House by Congressman REID of New York and other Members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables and a study showing what the States would receive under my bill.

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

State-local government revenues, existing Federal outlays to the States and localities and additional Federal allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal

State	Total general revenues 1963–64	Revenues from Federal Government		Federal revenue sharing allotment			State	Total general revenues 1963–64	Revenues from Federal Government		Federal revenue sharing allotment		
		Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Percent increase of revenues from Federal Government (col. 2)			Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Percent increase of revenues from Federal Government (col. 2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*		*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Alabama	$904	$214	23.7	$84.3	9.3	39.9	Nebraska	$488	$80	16.4	$14.4	2.9	18.0
Alaska	180	91	50.6	2.6	1.4	28.6	Nevada	218	52	23.9	4.4	2.0	8.5
Arizona	592	95	16.0	19.0	3.2	20.0	New Hampshire	197	36	18.3	5.9	3.0	16.4
Arkansas	502	138	27.5	47.4	9.4	34.3	New Jersey	2,179	187	8.6	57.3	2.6	30.6
California	8,929	1,257	14.1	213.6	2.4	17.0	New Mexico	429	103	24.0	28.4	6.6	27.6
Colorado	802	136	17.0	21.8	2.7	16.0	New York	8,096	650	8.0	202.2	2.5	31.1
Connecticut	1,018	134	13.2	23.1	2.3	17.2	North Carolina	1,233	188	15.2	119.0	9.7	63.3
Delaware	199	26	13.1	4.4	2.2	16.9	North Dakota	273	55	20.1	8.7	3.2	15.8
Florida	1,870	251	13.4	62.6	3.3	24.9	Ohio	3,182	440	13.8	88.7	6.4	20.2
Georgia	1,189	234	19.7	105.8	8.9	45.2	Oklahoma	870	213	24.5	26.8	3.1	12.6
Hawaii	314	64	20.4	8.5	2.7	13.3	Oregon	800	172	21.5	20.7	2.6	12.0
Idaho	239	45	18.8	18.1	7.6	40.2	Pennsylvania	3,526	439	12.5	101.8	2.9	23.2
Illinois	3,576	437	12.2	88.8	2.5	20.3	Rhode Island	289	49	17.0	8.2	2.8	16.7
Indiana	1,597	170	10.6	47.4	3.0	27.9	South Carolina	568	93	16.4	62.4	11.0	67.1
Iowa	1,003	134	13.4	30.2	3.0	22.5	South Dakota	267	61	22.8	19.0	7.1	31.1
Kansas	821	114	13.9	25.4	3.1	22 3	Tennessee	1,011	216	21.4	92.8	9.2	43.0
Kentucky	861	205	23.8	76.5	8.9	37.3	Texas	3,144	505	16.1	103.2	3.3	20.4
Louisiana	1,252	278	22.2	96.0	7.7	34.5	Utah	380	95	25.0	11.0	2.9	11.6
Maine	300	52	17.3	10.0	3.3	19.2	Vermont	150	36	24.0	4.5	3.0	12.5
Maryland	1,136	129	11.4	30.5	2.7	23.6	Virginia	1,176	207	17.6	38.4	3.3	18.6
Massachusetts	1,959	244	12.5	49.7	2.5	20.4	Washington	1,285	204	15.9	34.3	2.7	16.8
Michigan	3,125	404	12.9	86.3	2.8	21.4	West Virginia	509	98	19.3	44.3	8.7	45.2
Minnesota	1,426	195	13.7	42.7	3.0	21.9	Wisconsin	1,591	168	10.6	48.9	3.1	29.1
Mississippi	589	128	21.7	61.1	10.4	47.7	Wyoming	191	64	33.5	4.2	2.2	6.6
Missouri	1,355	244	18.0	36.4	2.7	14.9	District of Columbia	355	100	28.2	6.3	1.8	6.3
Montana	302	74	24.5	8.4	2.8	11.4							

State allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal (assuming total distribution of $2,500,000,000, with 80 percent going to all States and 20 percent going to 13 low-income States)[1]

State	State and local revenue from own sources (1963–64) (1)	Personal income (1963) (2)	Revenue effort ratio (col. 1÷ col. 2) (3)	Relative State effort ratio (col. 3÷13.0) (4)	State percentage of total population (1964 estimated) (5)	Unadjusted State allotment (col. 5×$2 billion) (6)	Adjusted State allotment (col. 4× col. 6) (7)	State percentage of 13-State population, total (8)	Extra allotment (col. 8×$.5 billion) (9)	Total allotment (10)
	Millions	*Millions*				*Millions*	*Millions*		*Millions*	*Millions*
Alabama	$690	$5,538	12.5	96	1.8	$35.6	$34.2	10.0	$50.1	$84.3
Alaska	89	704	12.6	98	.1	2.6	2.6			2.6
Arizona	497	3,340	14.9	115	.8	16.5	19.0			19.0
Arkansas	364	2,986	12.2	94	1.0	20.2	19.0	5.7	28.4	47.4
California	7,672	52,317	14.7	113	9.5	189.0	213.6			213.6
Colorado	665	4,831	13.8	106	1.0	20.5	21.8			21.8
Connecticut	889	8,490	10.4	80	1.4	28.9	23.1			23.1
Delaware	174	1,570	11.1	85	.3	5.1	4.4			4.4
Florida	1,619	11,933	13.6	105	3.0	59.6	62.6			62.6
Georgia	954	7,715	12.4	95	2.2	44.9	42.6	12.6	63.1	105.8
Hawaii	250	1,667	15.0	116	.4	7.3	8.5			8.5
Idaho	194	1,366	14.2	110	.4	7.2	8.0	2.0	10.1	18.1
Illinois	3,138	30,020	10.5	81	5.5	109.6	88.8			88.8
Indiana	1,427	11,648	12.3	94	2.5	50.4	47.4			47.4
Iowa	869	6,399	13.6	105	1.4	28.8	30.2			30.2
Kansas	707	5,017	14.1	109	1.2	23.2	25.4			25.4
Kentucky	656	5,545	11.8	91	1.7	33.0	30.0	9.3	46.5	76.5
Louisiana	974	6,072	16.0	124	1.8	36.3	45.0	10.2	51.0	96.0
Maine	248	1,971	12.6	97	.5	10.3	10.0			10.0
Maryland	1,007	9,163	11.0	85	1.8	35.9	30.5			30.5
Massachusetts	1,715	14,889	11.5	89	2.8	55.8	49.7			49.7
Michigan	2,721	20,624	13.2	102	4.2	84.6	86.3			86.3
Minnesota	1,231	8,152	15.1	116	1.8	36.8	42.7			42.7
Mississippi	461	3,183	14.5	112	1.2	24.2	27.1	6.8	34.0	61.1
Missouri	1,111	10,900	10.2	79	2.3	46.1	36.4			36.4
Montana	229	1,553	14.7	114	.4	7.4	8.4			8.4
Nebraska	408	3,376	12.1	93	.8	15.5	14.4			14.4
Nevada	166	1,246	13.3	103	.2	4.3	4.4			4.4
New Hampshire	161	1,450	11.1	86	.3	6.8	5.9			5.9
New Jersey	1,993	18,861	10.6	82	3.5	69.8	57.3			57.3
New Mexico	327	1,953	16.7	129	.5	10.5	13.6	3.0	14.8	28.4
New York	7,445	53,361	14.0	108	9.4	187.3	202.2			202.2
North Carolina	1,046	8,601	12.2	94	2.5	50.7	47.7	14.3	71.4	119.0
North Dakota	218	1,300	16.8	129	.3	6.7	8.7			8.7
Ohio	2,742	25,164	10.9	84	5.3	105.6	88.7			88.7
Oklahoma	656	4,858	13.5	104	1.3	25.7	26.8			26.8
Oregon	628	4,568	13.7	106	1.0	19.5	20.7			20.7
Pennsylvania	3,082	28,017	11.0	85	6.0	119.8	101.8			101.8
Rhode Island	240	2 153	11.1	86	.5	9.6	8.2			8.2
South Carolina	475	3,944	12.0	93	1.3	26.7	24.8	7.5	37.6	62.4
South Dakota	206	1,390	14.8	114	.4	7.5	8.5	2.1	10.5	19.0
Tennessee	795	6,588	12.1	93	2.0	39.7	36.9	11.2	55.9	92.8
Texas	2,640	21,351	12.4	95	5.4	108.7	103.2			103.2
Utah	286	2,083	13.7	106	.5	10.4	11.0			11.0
Vermont	114	827	13.8	106	.2	4.3	4.5			4.5
Virginia	968	8,907	10.9	84	2.3	45.8	38.4			38.4
Washington	1,081	7,575	14.3	110	1.6	31.2	34.3			34.3
West Virginia	411	3,348	12.3	95	.9	18.8	17.8	5.3	26.4	44.3
Wisconsin	1,424	9,617	14.8	114	2.1	42.9	48.9			48.9
Wyoming	127	834	15.2	117	.2	3.8	4.2			4.2
District of Columbia	256	2,645	9.7	75	.4	8.4	6.3			6.3
Total			[2] 13.0							2,456.4

[1] Details may not agree because of rounding.

[2] Average.

TABLE B–64.—*State and local government revenues and expenditures, selected fiscal years, 1927–63*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year [1]	Revenues by source [1]							Expenditures by function [2]				
	Total	Property taxes	Sales and gross receipts taxes	Individual income taxes	Corporation net income taxes	Revenue from Federal Government	All other revenue [3]	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	All other [4]
1927	7,271	4,730	470	70	92	116	1,793	7,210	2,235	1,809	151	3,015
1932	7,267	4,487	752	74	79	232	1,643	7,765	2,311	1,741	444	3,269
1934	7,678	4,076	1,008	80	49	1,016	1,449	7,181	1,831	1,509	889	2,952
1936	8,395	4,093	1,484	153	113	948	1,604	7,644	2,177	1,425	827	3,215
1938	9,228	4,440	1,794	218	165	800	1,811	8,757	2,491	1,650	1,069	3,547
1940	9,609	4,430	1,982	224	156	954	1,872	9,229	2,638	1,573	1,156	3,862
1942	10,418	4,537	2,351	276	272	858	2,123	9,190	2,586	1,490	1,225	3,889
1944	10,908	4,604	2,289	342	451	954	2,269	8,863	2,793	1,200	1,133	3,737
1946	12,356	4,986	2,986	422	447	855	2,661	11,028	3,356	1,672	1,409	4,591
1948	17,250	6,126	4,442	543	592	1,861	3,685	17,684	5,379	3,036	2,099	7,170
1950	20,911	7,349	5,154	788	593	2,486	4,541	22,787	7,177	3,803	2,940	8,867
1952	25,181	8,652	6,357	998	846	2,566	5,763	26,098	8,318	4,650	2,788	10,342
1953	27,307	9,375	6,927	1,065	817	2,870	6,252	27,910	9,390	4,987	2,914	10,619
1954	29,012	9,967	7,276	1,127	778	2,966	6,897	30,701	10,557	5,527	3,060	11,557
1955	31,073	10,735	7,643	1,237	744	3,131	7,584	33,724	11,907	6,452	3,168	12,197
1956	34,667	11,749	8,691	1,538	890	3,335	8,465	36,711	13,220	6,953	3,139	13,399
1957	38,164	12,864	9,467	1,754	984	3,843	9,252	40,375	14,134	7,816	3,485	14,940
1958	41,219	14,047	9,829	1,759	1,018	4,865	9,699	44,851	15,919	8,567	3,818	16,547
1959	45,306	14,983	10,437	1,994	1,001	6,377	10,516	48,887	17,283	9,592	4,136	17,876
1960	50,505	16,405	11,849	2,463	1,180	6,974	11,634	51,876	18,719	9,428	4,404	19,324
1961	54,037	18,002	12,463	2,613	1,266	7,131	12,563	56,201	20,574	9,844	4,720	21,063
1962	58,252	19,054	13,494	3,037	1,308	7,871	13,489	60,206	22,216	10,357	5,084	22,549
1963	62,890	20,089	14,456	3,269	1,505	8,722	14,850	64,816	24,012	11,136	5,481	24,187

[1] Fiscal years not the same for all governments.

[2] Excludes revenues or expenditures of publicly owned utilities and liquor stores, and of insurance-trust activities. Intergovernmental receipts and payments between State and local governments are also excluded.

[3] Includes licenses and other taxes and charges and miscellaneous revenues.

[4] Includes expenditures for health, hospitals, police, local fire protection, natural resources, sanitation, housing and community redevelopment, local parks and recreation, general control, financial administration, interest on general debt, and other and unallocable expenditures.

NOTE.—Data are not available for intervening years.

Data for Alaska and Hawaii included beginning 1959 and 1960, respectively.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

101. State and local total expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures				Revenue				Gross debt [4]		
	Total, direct [1]	State		Local direct	Total, State and local [3]	From own sources		From Federal Government	Total	State	Local
		Total [2]	Direct			State	Local				
1902	$1,095	$188	$136	$959	$1,048	$183	$858	$7	$2,107	$230	$1,877
1913	2,257	388	297	1,960	2,030	360	1,658	12	4,414	379	4,035
1922	5,652	1,397	1,085	4,567	5,169	1,234	3,827	108	10,109	1,131	8,978
1927	7,810	2,047	1,451	6,359	7,838	1,994	5,728	116	14,881	1,971	12,910
1932	8,403	2,829	2,028	6,375	7,887	2,274	5,381	232	19,205	2,832	16,373
1934	7,842	3,461	2,143	5,699	8,430	2,452	4,962	1,016	18,929	3,248	15,681
1936	8,501	3,862	2,445	6,056	9,360	3,265	5,147	948	19,474	3,413	16,061
1938	9,988	4,598	3,082	6,906	11,058	4,612	5,646	800	19,436	3,343	16,093
1940	11,240	5,209	3,555	7,685	11,749	5,012	5,792	945	20,283	3,590	16,693
1942	10,914	5,343	3,563	7,351	13,148	6,012	6,278	858	19,706	3,257	16,449
1944	10,499	5,161	3,319	7,180	14,333	6,714	6,665	954	17,479	2,776	14,703
1946	14,067	7,066	4,974	9,093	15,983	7,712	7,416	855	15,917	2,353	13,564
1948	21,260	11,181	7,897	13,363	21,613	10,086	9,666	1,861	18,656	3,676	14,980
1950	27,905	15,082	10,864	17,041	25,639	11,480	11,673	2,486	24,115	5,285	18,830
1952	30,863	15,834	10,790	20,073	31,013	14,330	14,117	2,566	30,100	6,874	23,226
1954	36,607	18,686	13,008	23,599	35,386	15,951	16,468	2,966	38,931	9,600	29,331
1956	43,152	21,686	15,148	28,004	41,692	18,903	19,453	3,335	48,868	12,890	35,978
1957	47,553	24,235	16,796	30,757	45,929	20,728	21,357	3,843	53,039	13,738	39,301
1958	53,712	28,080	19,991	33,721	49,262	21,427	22,970	4,865	58,187	15,394	42,793
1959	58,572	31,125	22,436	36,136	53,972	22,912	24,684	6,377	64,110	16,930	47,180
1960	60,999	31,596	22,152	38,847	60,277	26,094	27,209	6,974	69,955	18,543	51,412
1961	67,023	34,693	24,578	42,445	64,531	27,821	29,579	7,131	75,023	19,993	55,030
1962	70,547	36,402	25,495	45,053	69,492	30,115	31,506	7,871	80,802	22,023	58,779
1963	75,760	39,583	27,698	48,062	75,317	32,750	33,846	8,722	87,451	23,176	64,276

[1] Direct expenditures are amounts as finally disbursed by units of government for their own functions regardless of source of receipts. Include expenditures for utility, liquor stores, and insurance trust; exclude payments for debt retirement.

[2] State payments to localities are included in State total expenditures and in local direct expenditures. They are excluded from State direct expenditures.

[3] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.

[4] Short- and long-term debt outstanding at end of fiscal year. See table 48 for data on net debt.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

104. Per capita State and local direct expenditures, by function and State, fiscal year 1963

State	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	Health and hospitals	Police and fire	General control	Insurance trust	Other
Total	$408	$129	$60	$29	$25	$19	$13	$27	$105
Alabama	297	88	51	35	17	10	9	10	78
Alaska	760	215	215	25	33	21	29	29	194
Arizona	446	165	66	23	15	17	15	21	125
Arkansas	273	90	58	33	18	8	9	10	47
California	579	184	57	45	30	28	19	56	159
Colorado	466	179	57	52	27	18	18	23	91
Connecticut	412	132	70	28	22	23	14	26	97
Delaware	435	165	84	21	21	15	15	17	96
Florida	375	109	59	20	31	19	16	12	109
Georgia	314	100	56	26	29	11	11	10	70
Hawaii	505	147	40	19	35	22	23	25	195
Idaho	379	126	83	24	20	17	13	19	77
Illinois	387	126	50	35	24	22	12	27	92
Indiana	343	145	51	14	21	15	11	15	70
Iowa	378	140	78	28	23	12	12	8	77
Kansas	384	148	72	26	23	12	14	10	80
Kentucky	331	103	86	27	18	10	9	12	66
Louisiana	392	115	71	56	19	14	10	16	91
Maine	354	110	75	30	15	14	11	17	81
Maryland	384	132	56	17	29	22	12	23	92
Massachusetts	435	105	53	43	34	28	15	40	116
Michigan	429	151	57	24	32	18	12	23	113
Minnesota	437	151	66	36	28	14	13	21	108
Mississippi	276	88	58	26	23	8	8	7	58
Missouri	329	112	56	35	24	18	11	13	61
Montana	453	155	113	23	16	13	17	24	92
Nebraska	429	126	86	17	18	11	11	10	151
Nevada	614	174	114	20	46	31	29	43	157
New Hampshire	397	111	88	24	21	16	11	16	109
New Jersey	367	113	43	17	23	26	15	39	91
New Mexico	408	172	74	30	17	12	15	15	73
New York	528	140	58	33	43	31	18	48	157
North Carolina	268	103	39	19	18	10	9	10	60
North Dakota	417	152	93	27	13	8	13	14	98
Ohio	370	109	59	26	19	15	11	38	92
Oklahoma	382	121	67	62	19	11	11	11	80
Oregon	492	175	81	27	22	17	19	34	117
Pennsylvania	373	113	51	26	19	15	12	34	101
Rhode Island	370	103	52	31	21	23	15	40	87
South Carolina	246	90	38	15	20	9	7	9	58
South Dakota	362	141	98	24	11	10	14	6	58
Tennessee	345	87	64	18	22	12	8	13	121
Texas	323	112	59	23	16	14	10	11	78
Utah	439	184	76	24	16	14	14	17	96
Vermont	444	134	114	34	18	10	16	18	101
Virginia	315	108	68	11	17	12	9	6	85
Washington	559	175	74	36	19	18	14	38	184
West Virginia	296	97	51	37	17	8	9	23	54
Wisconsin	431	148	73	27	26	21	14	20	102
Wyoming	599	184	175	21	36	15	18	33	117
District of Columbia	497	85	75	34	62	43	16	32	150

Source: Computed by Tax Foundation from data in table 105, based on population at the beginning of the fiscal year.

107. State and local revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total [1]	From own sources						From Federal Government	Per capita [5]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Liquor stores [3]	Utility	Insurance trust [4]		Total	Taxes
			Total general	Taxes [2]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$1,048	$1,041	$979	$860	$119	$2	$60	----------	$7	$13.37	$10.97
1913	2,030	2,018	1,900	1,609	291	----------	116	$2	12	21.08	16.71
1922	5,169	5,061	4,673	4,016	657	----------	266	122	108	47.29	36.74
1927	7,838	7,722	7,155	6,087	1,068	----------	403	164	116	66.30	51.49
1932	7,887	7,655	7,035	6,164	871	----------	463	157	232	63.38	49.53
1934	8,430	7,414	6,662	5,912	750	91	499	162	1,016	66.92	46.93
1936	9,360	8,412	7,447	6,701	746	189	558	218	948	73.32	52.49
1938	11,058	10,258	8,428	7,605	823	272	605	953	800	85.51	58.81
1940	11,749	10,804	8,664	7,810	854	294	704	1,142	945	89.40	59.43
1942	13,148	12,290	9,560	8,528	1,031	390	887	1,454	858	98.30	63.76
1944	14,333	13,379	9,954	8,774	1,180	567	1,066	1,792	954	107.06	65.54
1946	15,983	15,128	11,501	10,094	1,407	864	1,169	1,593	855	116.47	73.56
1948	21,613	19,752	15,389	13,342	2,047	946	1,565	1,851	1,861	149.14	92.07
1950	25,639	23,153	18,425	15,914	2,511	904	1,808	2,016	2,486	170.11	105.59
1952	31,013	28,447	22,615	19,323	3,292	1,037	2,071	2,724	2,566	199.75	124.46
1954	35,386	32,420	26,046	22,067	3,979	1,093	2,403	2,877	2,966	220.48	137.50
1956	41,692	38,357	31,332	26,368	4,964	1,136	2,718	3,171	3,335	250.06	158.15
1957	45,929	42,085	34,320	28,817	5,503	1,183	2,944	3,638	3,843	270.46	169.69
1958	49,262	44,397	36,354	30,380	5,974	1,170	3,041	3,832	4,865	285.07	175.80
1959	53,972	47,596	38,929	32,379	6,550	1,216	3,320	4,131	6,377	307.05	184.21
1960	60,277	53,302	43,530	36,117	7,414	1,264	3,613	4,896	6,974	337.25	202.08
1961	64,531	57,400	46,907	38,861	8,045	1,260	3,856	5,378	7,131	355.21	213.91
1962	69,492	61,621	50,381	41,554	8,827	1,282	4,026	5,932	7,871	376.45	225.11
1963	75,317	66,596	54,169	44,281	9,888	1,316	4,474	6,637	8,722	401.86	236.26

[1] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.
[2] Excludes unemployment compensation tax collections included in insurance trust revenue.
[3] Principally receipts from sales in States with alcoholic beverage monopoly systems. Excludes alcoholic beverage taxes.
[4] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.
[5] Based on estimated population, excluding Armed Forces overseas, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

117. State expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal year, 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt	Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to local governments [1]	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]			Total	Direct	Payments to local governments [1]	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$188	$136	$52	$192	$183	$9	$230	1948	$11,181	$7,897	$3,283	$11,826	$10,086	$1,740	$3,676
1913	388	297	91	376	360	16	379	1950	15,082	10,864	4,217	13,903	11,480	2,423	5,285
1922	1,397	1,085	312	1,360	1,234	126	1,131	1952	15,834	10,790	5,044	16,815	14,330	2,485	6,874
1927	2,047	1,451	596	2,152	1,994	158	1,971	1954	18,686	13,008	5,679	18,834	15,951	2,883	9,600
1932	2,829	2,028	801	2,541	2,274	267	2,832	1956	21,686	15,148	6,538	22,199	18,903	3,296	12,890
1934	3,461	2,143	1,318	3,421	2,452	969	3,248	1957	24,235	16,796	7,440	24,656	20,728	3,928	13,738
1936	3,862	2,445	1,417	4,023	3,265	758	3,413	1958	28,080	19,991	8,089	26,191	21,427	4,764	15,394
1938	4,598	3,082	1,516	5,293	4,612	681	3,343	1959	31,125	22,436	8,689	29,164	22,912	6,252	16,930
1940	5,209	3,555	1,654	5,737	5,012	725	3,590	1960	31,596	22,152	9,443	32,838	26,093	6,745	18,543
1942	5,343	3,563	1,780	6,870	6,012	858	3,257	1961	34,693	24,578	10,114	34,603	27,821	6,782	19,993
1944	5,161	3,319	1,842	7,695	6,714	981	2,776	1962	36,402	25,495	10,906	37,597	30,117	7,480	22,023
1946	7,066	4,974	2,092	8,576	7,712	865	2,353	1963	39,583	27,698	11,885	40,993	32,750	8,243	23,176

[1] Principally shared taxes and fiscal aids.
[2] Principally grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. Includes minor amounts from localities for shares of programs administered by the State, payments for services performed by the States, and repayment of advances.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

118. State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare [1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other [2]		
1902	$136	$134	$17	$74	$10	$32	$9	$23	$39	----------	$2
1913	297	297	55	26	16	53	14	38	95	----------	----------
1922	1,085	1,031	164	303	38	125	61	69	271	$54	----------
1927	1,451	1,380	218	514	40	170	94	96	248	71	----------
1932	2,028	1,965	278	843	74	215	119	114	322	63	----------
1934	2,143	2,009	228	738	363	203	85	108	284	64	70
1936	2,445	2,223	297	754	422	221	93	130	306	79	143
1938	3,082	2,576	347	815	453	268	128	146	419	302	240
1940	3,555	2,730	375	793	527	300	144	151	440	601	224
1942	3,563	2,769	391	790	523	299	159	164	443	505	288
1944	3,319	2,666	489	540	577	331	164	162	403	226	426
1946	4,974	3,153	518	613	680	424	207	192	519	1,158	663
1948	7,897	6,186	1,081	1,510	962	663	344	266	1,360	1,020	691
1950	10,864	8,033	1,358	2,058	1,566	947	468	317	1,319	2,177	654
1952	10,790	8,653	1,494	2,556	1,410	1,132	539	361	1,161	1,413	723
1954	13,008	10,109	1,715	3,254	1,548	1,276	563	419	1,334	2,096	803
1956	15,148	12,319	2,138	4,367	1,603	1,470	670	477	1,594	1,984	845
1957	16,796	13,647	2,341	4,875	1,745	1,652	787	531	1,716	2,313	836

See footnotes at end of table.

118. State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63—Continued

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare [1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other [2]		
1958	$19,991	$15,448	$2,727	$5,507	$1,855	$1,848	$875	$569	$2,067	$3,675	$869
1959	22,436	17,319	3,093	6,414	2,007	1,967	976	619	2,243	4,259	860
1960	22,152	17,783	3,396	6,070	2,221	1,896	842	654	2,704	3,461	907
1961	24,578	19,004	3,792	6,230	2,311	2,059	906	725	2,981	4,701	873
1962	25,494	20,373	4,268	6,635	2,509	2,161	973	763	3,064	4,238	882
1963	27,698	22,491	4,954	7,425	2,712	2,330	1,097	830	3,143	4,306	900

[1] Principally categorical public assistance. See table 126.
[2] Principally police, correction, interest, and social insurance administration.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

123. State payments to local governments, by function and State, fiscal year 1963

[In millions]

State	Total	Specified function				General local government support	State	Total	Specified function				General local government support
		Education	Highways	Public welfare	Other [1]				Education	Highways	Public welfare	Other [1]	
Total	$11,855.4	$6,993.0	$1,415.8	$1,918.9	$545.4	$1,012.3	Missouri	$158.1	$131.7	$15.0		$5.0	$6.3
Alabama	171.4	123.8	34.9		6.6	6.1	Montana	23.5	21.0		$0.6	1.9	
Alaska	16.3	14.4			.4	1.6	Nebraska	46.0	7.3	15.7	20.3	1.8	.9
Arizona	105.7	62.3	10.0		2.0	31.5	Nevada	26.8	21.0	3.0		.3	2.5
Arkansas	74.4	49.2	15.1	.1	4.2	5.9	New Hampshire	7.3	4.2	.5	.1	.4	2.2
California	1,804.1	881.5	136.6	587.2	116.7	81.5	New Jersey	209.8	113.9	15.5	62.7	15.4	2.4
Colorado	151.5	51.3	21.1	74.9	4.1	.2	New Mexico	92.9	81.6	4.6		1.4	5.1
Connecticut	88.3	72.7	4.7	3.6	6.3	1.0	New York	1,731.4	1,017.1	85.7	406.9	114.6	107.1
Delaware	50.1	46.6	1.3	1.3	.8		North Carolina	339.2	238.1	7.6	67.6	9.2	16.6
Florida	269.1	233.4	15.2		20.3	.3	North Dakota	26.7	16.5	8.2	.7	.6	.7
Georgia	218.5	174.5	28.5	5.8	9.7		Ohio	538.8	205.4	138.2	121.4	7.2	66.5
Hawaii	22.6				3.2	19.4	Oklahoma	135.0	87.0	38.0		8.0	2.0
Idaho	33.9	21.0	8.9		1.8	2.2	Oregon	110.1	71.6	28.6	1.4	2.5	6.0
Illinois	434.3	244.8	122.5	60.6	6.4		Pennsylvania	492.7	392.0	56.3	7.4	30.8	6.2
Indiana	250.7	134.9	67.2	35.9	4.9	7.8	Rhode Island	29.4	19.2	.4	2.2	.7	6.9
Iowa	138.1	49.3	52.6	.3	2.2	33.8	South Carolina	115.2	89.3	7.9		6.4	11.6
Kansas	121.6	55.2	14.1	40.9	1.5	9.8	South Dakota	12.4	7.8	2.4	.1	.6	1.6
Kentucky	129.6	115.5	2.3		10.2	1.5	Tennessee	180.0	123.6	36.7	.1	4.4	15.2
Louisiana	257.5	182.6	17.6		7.1	50.2	Texas	445.2	435.5	7.9		1.7	.1
Maine	24.0	18.6	3.5	.7	.7	.5	Utah	61.5	54.5	3.9		2.0	1.0
Maryland	267.6	115.9	45.3	43.8	9.7	52.9	Vermont	14.2	7.3	5.7	.5	.7	[2]
Massachusetts	355.4	75.4	14.2	153.5	34.7	77.6	Virginia	179.6	121.1	12.1	26.2	6.9	13.2
Michigan	653.1	360.9	132.4	59.0	20.4	80.4	Washington	288.5	217.0	33.9	7.1	15.7	14.7
Minnesota	278.4	154.1	37.8	62.6	5.8	18.1	West Virginia	73.6	70.4		.4	2.7	
Mississippi	128.7	84.8	25.3		5.6	12.9	Wisconsin	475.8	98.8	74.4	58.0	18.6	226.0
							Wyoming	27.0	17.3	2.6	4.1	.6	2.5

[1] Largely health and hospitals, other, and unallocable.
[2] Less than $50,000.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

130. Total State revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total	From own sources						Intergovernmental		Per capita [4]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Insurance trust [2]	Liquor stores [3]	From Federal	From local	Total	Taxes
			Total	Taxes [1]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$192	$183	$181	$156	$25		2	$3	$6	$2.46	$2.00
1913	376	360	360	301	59			6	10	3.92	3.14
1922	1,360	1,234	1,128	947	181	$106		99	27	12.49	8.70
1927	2,152	1,994	1,857	1,608	249	137		107	51	18.28	13.66
1932	2,541	2,274	2,156	1,890	266	118		222	45	20.50	15.25
1934	3,421	2,452	2,243	1,979	264	119	$90	933	36	27.27	15.78
1936	4,023	3,265	2,914	2,618	296	168	183	719	39	31.67	20.61
1938	5,293	4,612	3,460	3,132	328	890	262	633	48	41.13	24.34
1940	5,737	5,012	3,657	3,313	344	1,074	281	667	58	43.88	25.34
1942	6,870	6,012	4,274	3,903	370	1,366	373	802	56	51.67	29.36
1944	7,695	6,714	4,484	4,071	413	1,702	528	926	55	57.86	30.61
1946	8,576	7,712	5,419	4,937	482	1,494	798	802	63	62.90	36.21
1948	11,826	10,086	7,517	6,743	774	1,711	857	1,643	97	82.09	46.81
1950	13,903	11,480	8,839	7,930	909	1,831	810	2,275	148	92.74	52.90
1952	16,815	14,330	10,944	9,857	1,087	2,462	924	2,329	156	108.87	63.82
1954	18,834	15,951	12,417	11,089	1,328	2,560	974	2,668	215	117.96	69.45
1956	22,199	18,903	15,093	13,375	1,718	2,791	1,019	3,027	269	133.78	80.60
1957	24,656	20,728	16,454	14,531	1,923	3,209	1,065	3,500	427	145.86	85.96
1958	26,190	21,427	17,008	14,919	2,089	3,361	1,058	4,461	302	152.23	86.72
1959	29,164	22,912	18,196	15,848	2,348	3,631	1,085	5,888	364	166.64	90.56
1960	32,839	26,094	20,619	18,036	2,583	4,347	1,128	6,328	363	184.53	101.35
1961	34,603	27,821	21,911	19,057	2,854	4,791	1,119	6,412	370	191.29	105.35
1962	37,597	30,117	23,677	20,561	3,116	5,306	1,134	7,108	373	204.54	111.86
1963	40,993	32,750	25,640	22,117	3,523	5,950	1,161	7,832	411	219.65	118.51

[1] Excludes unemployment compensation taxes included in insurance trust revenue and shown in table 132.
[2] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.
[3] Gross receipts from the sale of liquor and associated products in State alcoholic beverage monopoly systems.
[4] Based on population, excluding Armed Forces overseas and District of Columbia, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

168. Local expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63 [1]

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt	Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to State governments	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]			Total	Direct	Payments to State governments	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$965	$959	$6	$914	$858	$56	$1,877	1948	$13,460	$13,363	$97	13,167	$9,666	$3,501	$14,980
1913	1,970	1,960	10	1,755	1,658	97	4,035	1950	17,189	17,041	148	16,101	11,673	4,428	18,830
1922	4,594	4,567	27	4,148	3,827	321	8,978	1952	20,229	20,073	156	19,398	14,117	5,281	23,226
1927	6,410	6,359	51	6,333	5,728	605	12,910	1954	23,814	23,599	215	22,402	16,468	5,933	29,331
1932	6,420	6,375	45	6,192	5,381	811	16,373	1956	28,273	28,004	269	26,352	19,453	6,899	35,978
1934	5,735	5,699	36	6,363	4,962	1,401	15,681	1957	31,057	30,757	300	29,021	21,357	7,664	39,301
1936	6,095	6,056	39	6,793	5,147	1,646	16,061	1958	34,023	33,721	302	31,348	22,970	8,378	42,793
1938	6,954	6,906	48	7,329	5,646	1,683	16,093	1959	36,341	36,136	205	33,572	24,684	8,888	47,180
1940	7,743	7,685	58	7,724	5,792	1,932	16,693	1960	39,056	38,847	209	37,324	27,209	10,114	51,412
1942	7,407	7,351	56	8,114	6,278	1,836	16,449	1961	42,641	42,445	196	40,483	29,579	10,904	55,030
1944	7,235	7,180	55	8,535	6,665	1,870	14,703	1962	45,279	45,053	226	43,147	31,506	11,642	59,255
1946	9,156	9,093	63	9,561	7,416	2,145	13,564	1963	48,309	48,062	247	46,534	33,846	12,689	64,276

[1] Debt as of end of fiscal year.
[2] Largely shared taxes and fiscal aids from State governments.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TAX SHARING: A BRIEF LIST OF REFERENCES, 1961–65

"A Plan To Divert Part of Federal Tax Take to States Hits Snags," Wall Street Journal, November 17, 1964, page 1.

Abiko, Nabuo, and William H. Stringer, "Federal Funds Debated," Christian Science Monitor, December 30, 1964, pages 1, 10.

"Dollars from District of Columbia," Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Monthly Review, February 1965; pages 26–29.

Ecker-Racz, L. L., and I. M. Labovitz, "Practical Solutions to Financial Problems Created by the Mutilevel Political Structure," Conference of the Universities—National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, Princeton University Press, 1961.

"Governors Look to United States," Washington Post, March 24, 1965, page A20.

Heilbroner, R. L., "The Share-the-Tax Revenue Plan," New York Times magazine, December 27, 1964, pages 8, 30–31, 33.

Lutz, Harley L., "States and Surpluses: Why Federal No-Strings Distributions Would Be Unwise," Wall Street Journal, December 28, 1964, page 6.

Maxwell, James A., "Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, 1962.

"No String Federal Aid Finds Backers at Forum," Business Week, April 3, 1965, pages 28–29.

Otten, Alan L., and Charles B. Seib, "No-Strings Aid for States?" the Reporter, January 28, 1965, pages 33–35.

"President Favors Giving the States Share of Revenue," New York Times, October 28, 1964, page 1.

"Revenue Rebates Sought by States," Christian Science Monitor, January 25, 1965, page 11.

"States Bid Johnson Revive Plan To Give Them Share of Tax," New York Times, March 23, 1965, page 1.

"States Look to Heller Plan," New York Times, May 23, 1965, page 12F.

"Tax Sharing Plan May Get Review," New York Times, March 24, 1965, page 18.

"United States Is Still Considering Revenue-Sharing Plan," Washington Post, February 24, 1965, page 1.

"Western Governors Urge States Share in U.S. Revenues," Washington Post, July 13, 1965, page A7.

Worshop, Richard C., "Federal-State Revenue Sharing," Editorial Research Reports, volume 2, December 23, 1964, pages 943–960.

FINANCING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

(NOTE.—Reprinted August 1965, with permission, from the "Proceedings of a Symposium on Federal Taxation" sponsored by the American Bankers Association (1965).

(This reprint of a paper based on research sponsored by the National Committee on Government Finance is issued for general distribution. The National Committee on Government Finance was established in 1960 by the Trustees of the Brookings Institution to supervise a comprehensive program of studies on taxation and Government expenditures. These Studies of Government Finance are supported with funds provided to the Brookings Institution by the Ford Foundation.

(The interpretations and conclusions in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of members of the Brookings staff, the administrative officers of the institution, or the National Committee on Government Finance.

(The Brookings Institution is an independent organization devoted to nonpartisan research, education, and publication in economics, Government, foreign policy, and the social sciences generally. Its principal purpose is to serve the American people and their representatives by helping to bring knowledge more effectively to bear on major and emerging issues of national importance.)

Expenditures of the States and local governments have grown rapidly in recent years, and will continue to grow rapidly in the foreseeable future. These governments are already spending more than $70 billion per year; they will be spending more than $100 billion in 1970. The rise in State-local spending reflects the demands of an expanding population for more and better public services. These demands have strained the fiscal resources of the States and local governments, and they have responded with an unprecedented tax effort. Nevertheless, the need for State-local services will increase faster than State-local revenues.

In the past, State and local needs have been met in part by Federal grants-in-aid for particular purposes. These specific Federal grants have helped to finance programs in which the national interest was particularly strong. But it is now clear that the States and local governments also need help to meet the needs of their citizens in areas of traditional State-local responsibility.

Until recently, the Federal Government has not been able to provide general assistance to the States and local governments, simply because it has had rapidly growing commitments for defense and defense-related programs. But the pressure for larger expenditures for these Federal activities seems to have abated. Unless the Federal Government takes on new responsibilities, it now seems likely that its potential revenues at present tax rates will increase more rapidly than its expenditures. This prospect provides the opportunity for consideration of methods of helping the States and local governments out of their fiscal plight.

This paper discusses the reasons why the States and local governments need assistance, examines several methods of providing such assistance, and suggests the outlines of a new approach that seems worthy of further exploration.

STATE-LOCAL NEEDS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

The burdens placed on State and local governments in the past two decades have been extraordinarily heavy. They found themselves at the end of World War II with a large backlog of unmet needs; and rapid population growth has added new demands on top of this backlog. Between 1953 and 1963, the school-age population (those 5 to 19) rose 40 percent while the total population increased only 19 percent. In the same period, the number of persons over 65 increased 35 percent. Thus, the age groups which require the costliest Government services and contribute least to the tax base—the old and the young—increased much faster than the rest of the population.

The problems of population growth were aggravated by mobility. People moved freely from State to State and from region to region in the search for new jobs and better living conditions. They migrated from the rural to the urban areas, and left the central cities for the suburbs. New communities were developed while others were being abandoned. New schools, roads and sewers, and more teachers, policemen, firemen, and other personnel were urgently needed in most parts of the country. As a result, the largest growth industry in the United States has been State and local government.

The story of how the States and local governments tried to meet the challenge of growth has been told many times. I shall review it briefly here as background for the discussion of the fiscal problems it has created.

Recent expansion of State-local expenditures

In the 10 years ending in 1963, annual State-local expenditures for general governmental purposes (current operations, capital outlay, and interest on debt) more than doubled, rising from $28 billion to nearly $65 billion. About 53 percent of the increase went for education, health, and welfare (table 1).

TABLE 1.—*General expenditure of State and local government, by major function, fiscal years 1953 and 1963* [1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Function	Amount		Increase, 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution	Percent increase
Total general expenditure	$27,910	$64,816	$36,906	100.0	132.2
Education	9,390	24,012	14,622	39.6	155.7
Highways	4,987	11,136	6,149	16.7	123.3
Public welfare	2,914	5,481	2,567	6.9	88.1
Health and hospitals	2,290	4,681	2,391	6.5	104.4
Police and fire	1,636	3,468	1,832	5.0	112.0
Natural resources	705	1,588	883	2.4	125.2
Sewerage and sanitation	908	2,187	1,279	3.5	140.8
Housing and community redevelopment	631	1,247	616	1.7	97.6
General control and financial administration	1,263	2,474	1,211	3.3	95.9
Interest on debt	614	2,199	1,585	4.3	258.1
Other	2,572	6,343	3,771	10.2	146.6

[1] Excludes insurance trust, liquor stores, and public utility expenditures. Includes Federal grants-in-aid.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Most of the expenditure increase reflected the need to provide services for the large increase in population, but price increases also played an important role. Equipment and construction costs rose rapidly. Salaries of teachers and other Government employees had to be brought into better alinement with salary levels in the private economy. Even moderate adjustments in compensation involved large expenditures, since personal services constitute a large part of State-local budgets.

While State-local outlays increased everywhere, the level of expenditures varies greatly in different States. For example, in fiscal year 1963, the five States with the lowest per capita income spent $262 per capita for State-local services, while the five States with highest per capita income spent $417 per capita, and this despite the fact that the five poorest States made a larger tax effort (as measured by the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income) and received more Federal aid per capita than the five richest States. In fiscal year 1964, expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools were over $550 in four States, but less than $350 in nine States. Average monthly payments to families with dependent children in June 1964 varied from less than $20 per recipient in 6 States to more than $40 in 11 States. These wide variations in expenditure levels indicate that deficiencies are far more serious in some parts of the country than in others.

The available expenditure figures reflect amounts spent and not amounts that would have been spent if adequate resources had been available to finance a level of services consistent with need. Satisfactory measures of the degree to which State-local expenditures fall short of need are not available, but many of the deficiencies are obvious: overcrowded classrooms, inadequate health and hospital facilities, poor housing, blighted areas with high levels of juvenile delinquency, clogged streets, and polluted air and water. These deficiencies are all the more glaring against the background of rapidly rising private consumption standards.

Sources of funds

Federal grants to State and local governments tripled between 1953 and 1963 (from $2.9 to $8.7 billion), but this increase accounted for only 16 percent of the $35 billion increase in State-local general revenues. The remaining 84 percent—close to $30 billion—was raised from their own sources (table 2). State-local tax collections increased by $23 billion, or 111 percent during this period (while Federal collections increased by $24 billion, or only 38 percent). State-local debt rose from $34 to $87 billion (table 3).

TABLE 2.—*General revenues of State and local government, fiscal years 1953–63*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Source of increase	Amount		Increase 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution of total increase	Percent distribution of tax increase
General revenue [1]	$27,307	$62,890	$35,583	100.0	
Revenue from Federal Government [2]	2,870	8,722	5,852	16.4	
General revenue from own sources	24,437	54,169	29,732	83.6	
Taxes	20,908	44,281	23,373	65.7	100.0
Property	9,375	20,089	10,714	30.1	45.8
Sales and gross receipts	6,927	14,456	7,529	21.2	32.3
Individual income	1,065	3,269	2,204	6.2	9.4
Corporation income	810	1,505	695	1.9	2.9
Other	2,731	4,962	2,231	6.3	9.6
Charges and miscellaneous	3,520	9,888	6,359	17.9	

[1] Excludes revenue from publicly operated utilities, liquor stores, and insurance trust systems.

[2] Includes in addition to direct grants-in-aid, shared revenues, amounts received from the Federal Government for contractual services, and payments in lieu of taxes. Excludes grants-in-kind (distribution of commodities, technical assistance, etc.) and net loans and repayable advances.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—*State and local government debt, fiscal years 1953–63*

End of fiscal year	Debt outstanding	
	Amount (in millions)	Index 1953=100
1953	$33,782	100
1954	38,931	115
1955	44,267	131
1956	48,868	145
1957	53,039	157
1958	58,187	172
1959	64,110	190
1960	69,955	207
1961	75,023	222
1962	81,278	241
1963	87,451	259

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Almost the entire increase in local tax collections and 46 percent of the combined State-local increases came from higher property tax revenues. While new construction and higher property values contributed significantly to the property tax base, tax rates were increased substantially. In many cities and towns, property tax rates are already too high and further substantial increases in these rates are undesirable.

Consumer taxes provided 32 percent of the 1953–63 increases in State-local tax collections; income taxes provided only 9 percent. These revenue increases also came in large part from the higher incomes and increased spending made possible by economic growth, but new taxes and increases in the rates of old taxes were important contributors. Since 1952, five States have entered the general sales tax field, and two-thirds of the 33 States with general sales taxes in 1952 have raised their rates (some two or three times during this period). Nineteen States now have 3 percent sales tax rates and eight States have rates in excess of 3 percent. Only two States have enacted new individual income taxes since 1949, but tax rates have been raised in most of the other 31 States with income taxes. Income tax rates have been increased most at the lower income levels, and the degree of progressivity has declined. Local governments in several States have moved into sales and payroll taxes; and many States and localities have introduced new taxes on business activities, many of them of the nuisance variety.

Outlook for the future

The fiscal pressure on the States and local governments shows no sign of easing. Although these governments have made great efforts in the past decade, serious deficiencies remain and new needs will be created by continued population growth, increasing urbanization, and rising expectations. There is little doubt that without substantial assistance from the Federal Government, State-local revenues will fall far short of their expenditure needs. The basic problem is that needed State-local expenditures rise faster than gross national product, while State-local taxes, unlike Federal taxes, are relatively unresponsive to economic growth.

The magnitude of the problem may be roughly illustrated by the following projection. Suppose gross national product grows at 5 percent per annum and State-local receipts (including Federal grants) keep pace with this growth. On these assumptions, State-local receipts would reach about $88 billion by 1970. But if needed State-local expenditures grow at 7 percent per annum—which seems conservative in the light of past experience—they would reach $103 billion by 1970, leaving a gap of about $15 billion.

In the absence of additional Federal aid, the States and local governments would have to raise their tax rates to fill this gap of $15 billion. But this is hardly likely to occur. In every State and municipality, fear of driving commerce and industry to competing jurisdictions or of discouraging the entry of new businesses restrains new and increased taxes. Recent elections in many States demonstrate the political hazards facing elected officials who support tax increases. Furthermore, from the standpoint of tax equity and economic policy, it is undesirable to finance these long-run requirements almost entirely by property and consumer taxes—the revenue sources on which State and local governments largely depend.

In brief, the States and local governments cannot—and should not—meet all of their foreseeable revenue needs from the revenue sources now available to them. Given the present division of functions and of revenue sources, it is a matter of national concern that many essential government services may not be provided because of the inadequacy of State-local financial resources.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLOOK

By contrast with State-local receipts, Federal receipts rise rapidly as the economy expands because they are based largely on personal income and corporate profits. With continued economic growth, Federal budget receipts will grow about $6 billion per year in the next 5 years. At the same time, defense expenditures seem more likely to decline a bit than to increase (unless, of course, international conditions worsen), and expenditures for space exploration will probably level off. This means that a dividend of $6 billion will probably be generated each year for nondefense purposes, or a total of $30 billion for a 5-year period.

The availability of such a dividend is a blessing only if it is used wisely. Recent experience suggests that the rate of private saving will exceed the rate of private investment. For this reason, it will not be good economics to allocate a substantial part of the dividend, if any, to debt retirement. Further tax reduction and/or expenditure increases will be needed to avoid an increase in unemployment. Indeed, unless the dividend were used in this way, it would probably not be available at all. Efforts to hold down expenditures while maintaining tax rates would add to the fiscal drag that has already made the achievement of full employment so difficult.

The remedy is to continue to maintain a fiscal policy that stimulates demand if the private economy is not strong enough. This can be done either by reducing taxes or by increasing expenditures for needed Government services. The difference is that tax cuts favor private spending, while expenditures increase investment or consumption in the public sector. It is important to note that public spending need not be at the Federal level. Even though the revenues are Federal, they may be used in part to finance State-local public services.

In the present circumstances, there are too many pressing public needs to justify reliance on tax reduction as the sole mechanism of eliminating the fiscal drag. Some portion of the growth of $30 billion in Federal receipts over the next 5 years will doubtless be needed to finance growing Federal activities. Since so many of the public needs are within traditional State and local responsibilities, it would also be in the national interest to use part of the $30 billion to help finance the more rapidly growing State-local activities. In fact, unless inflationary pressures develop, there will be room in the Federal budget for increased Federal expenditures and additional assistance to the States and local governments, as well as for some tax reduction.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF ASSISTING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

There are many possible ways to help the States and local governments. In choosing among them, most people will agree that we should be guided at least by the following three criteria: First, the amount of assistance should be large enough to make possible a significant increase in the level of State-local services; second, the funds should help to equalize the services available to citizens of different States; and, third, the plan should not reduce the progressivity of the total Federal, State, and local tax system.

The most frequent proposals for accomplishing these objectives involve reduction of the Federal tax take. They include: (1) Federal tax reduction to enable the States to raise their own taxes; (2) relinquishment of specific Federal taxes; (3) tax credits for State and local taxes against Federal taxes; and (4) sharing of Federal tax collections with the States. In addition, suggestions are made to expand Federal grant programs of the type now existing or adding new ones. As the following discussion will indicate, the four tax alternatives fail, in varying degree, to meet the criteria for an appropriate method of fiscal assistance to the States and local governments.

Federal tax reduction

A reduction of Federal taxes does not, in the first instance, have any effect on the fiscal resources of the States and local governments. State-local receipts would increase indirectly as a result of the effect of the Federal tax cut on the national income, but this would be only a small fraction of the revenue released by the Federal Government. The State legislatures and county and city councils would have to take positive action to pick up the remainder of the lost revenue. Although some of this will occur, there is little likelihood that all of the lost Federal revenues will find their way into the budgets of the States and local governments.

Furthermore, to the extent that State-local taxes increase, they will be largely of the sales or property tax variety. These taxes are already overworked and are regressive besides. From the standpoint of tax equity, there is nothing to commend the replacement of Federal income taxes by State and local sales and property taxes.

Relinquishment of Federal taxes to the States

Relinquishment of one or more Federal taxes in the hope that the States and/or local governments will pick them up is also not a practical alternative. State and local governments find it difficult to move into an area vacated by the Federal Government, because of local opposition to tax increases and fear of interstate competition. Past experience with the admissions tax and the electrical energy tax has indicated that reduction or elimination of a Federal tax is not necessarily followed by State and local adoptions. Local governments had long sought reduction or repeal of these taxes on the ground that they were particularly suitable for local use. Following repeal of the Federal electrical energy tax and drastic reduction of the Federal admissions tax, local governments did not make the anticipated use of these taxes. Similarly, it is doubtful that the States and local governments will pick up more than a small proportion of the reduction of Federal excises which will soon be considered by the Congress.

The response of the States and local governments to the release of any tax by the Federal Government is bound to be spotty, because it depends on action by many separate executive and legislative bodies. Moreover, tax relinquishment, like general tax reduction, would fail to channel larger shares of the released revenues to the poorer States.

Tax credits

A more effective way of increasing the chances that the States and localities would pick up the revenue released by the Federal Government would be to give a credit against Federal income taxes for certain State and local taxes paid. However, a credit would not automatically increase State-local revenues. The States and localities which already impose the taxes eligible for the credit would have to raise their rates. Since this could be done without raising total taxes paid by their citizens they might be encouraged to do so, but there would be strong opposition from the groups that would prefer to enjoy the tax reduction provided by the credit. The 17 States without individual income taxes would benefit from the full amount of the credit, provided they imposed such a tax and the credit applied to income taxes. Encouraging these States to enact income taxes would be desirable, but such a move might be regarded as Federal coercion and, in some States, would run up against constitutional barriers.

Tax credits, like the two previous alternatives, fail to redistribute resources to the neediest States. At best, the credit simply diverts the same revenues from the Federal Government to the States where they originate.

Tax sharing

Proposals have been advanced recently that the Federal Government share with the States all, or a portion of, the collections originating in each State from certain Federal taxes. Sharing of tax collections is a common arrangements at the State-local level, but not at the Federal-State level. All States share one or more taxes with their local governments. The usual basis for sharing, however, is not source of collection, but some measure of local need (such as population).

One tax that has been mentioned as a possibility for Federal-State sharing is the Federal tax on local telephone service. But the volume of telephone business is not distributed in a manner that corresponds with financial need. Other suggestions for tax sharing would also help the richer States more than the poorer ones. By the very nature of the plan, tax sharing cannot meet the criterion of equalizing resources of the State and local governments.

Specific grants-in-aid

Federal financial assistance to State and local governments is now given almost entirely in the form of grants to support specific types of government services. Total Federal grants already exceed $11 billion in this fiscal year. Further substantial increases have been recommended to the Congress and are likely to be enacted in the present session. If the administration's plans go through, Federal grants will amount to $13.6 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year.

The main advantage of the specific grant approach is that the Federal Government regulates the conditions under which the funds are spent. It can choose to support activities in which there is a particularly strong national interest. It can set minimum standards. Through matching provisions and similar devices, it can insure that the federally supported programs receive State support as well. Various formulas can be used to allocate funds to States where the need for the particular program is greatest or where fiscal capacity is least.

The new plan for assistance to primary and secondary school education proposed by the administration is a good example of the specific grant-in-aid approach. The Federal Government considers it essential to increase the educational opportunities of the children of low-income families. To this end, the administration proposes to distribute Federal funds to school districts (through the State government) on the basis

of the number of schoolchildren in families with incomes below a certain specified level. The funds are to be used to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, on the basis of plans formulated by local school boards and approved by State boards of education. Special incentive grants are provided for school districts that increase their current expenditures by 5 percent or more. Public reports are required both from the school districts and from the State boards, so that the Commissioner of Education can evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

The support of particular activities through specific grants-in-aid will, and should, remain the basic method of providing assistance to the States and local governments. Only in this manner can the Federal Government assure itself that programs in which it has an interest are carried out by the States and local governments. At the same time, there are many State-local services of national importance that cannot be appropriately dealt with by specific grants. Unnecessary administrative burdens on the Federal Government would be avoided, and the varying preferences of States and localities could be allowed for more fully, if their ability to render these services were strengthened by the adoption of a more general grant system to supplement the specific grant programs.

A GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THE STATES

The discussion so far suggests that the States and local governments will need assistance from the Federal Government over and above the assistance they will receive in specific grants. If a general assistance program were adopted, it would be desirable to devise some method to assure the States and local governments of a dependable source of funds that will grow with the needs of the growing population. Various methods have been proposed to achieve these objectives. For example, a certain percentage of Federal revenues, or of Federal income tax collections, or of the Federal individual income tax base might be set aside for this purpose. Each grows more rapidly than national income, and each would provide a satisfactory basis for calculating the amount to be allotted for State-local purposes. The difficult questions are (1) How should the funds be allocated among the States? and (2) What constraints should the Federal Government impose on the use of the funds?

Method of allocation

Ideally, the amounts to be distributed to the States should be based on their need for public services and their fiscal capacity. Unfortunately, both need and capacity are very difficult to measure.

A State's need depends on its population and age distribution, population density, distribution of income, local costs, and other factors. A State's fiscal capacity also depends on a variety of factors, including population, per capita income, and the value of taxable property and sales. One formula that reflected all these factors would be difficult to construct and highly complex. However, population is probably the simplest and most appropriate measure of the relationship between need and capacity. On the one hand, population is a reasonably good indicator of general need for public services. On the other hand, a per capita allocation would make some allowances for varying capacity: since residents of high-income States pay more Federal taxes per capita than do residents of low-income States, distribution on a per capita basis would redistribute resources from high- to low-income States.

Per capita distribution may not adequately reflect the more urgent need for fiscal assistance by the poorest States, but this deficiency could be recognized by reserving a part of the funds for distribution among States with the lowest per capita income. It is not necessary to allocate more than a small proportion of the funds for this purpose to achieve a substantial redistributional effect. Even if as little as 10 percent of the total were divided among the poorest third of the States (say, in proportion to population weighted by the reciprocal of per capita personal income), the grant to the poorest State would be almost double the amount it would obtain on a straight per capita basis.

It might also be desirable to include a measure of tax effort among the factors determining the share of a particular State. A simple and effective way of allowing for effort would be to weight the per capita grants by the ratio of State to average tax effort in the country, where tax effort is defined as the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income. Inclusion of such an effort factor would give the States an incentive to maintain and increase their own tax collections and allay the fears that States with lower-than-average tax rates were getting a free ride.

Limitations on State uses of the funds

I have already indicated that the most urgent national need is to allocate more of our resources to public programs which are primarily State and local responsibilities. Experience during the last several years indicates that, without central direction or coercion, State governments have actually used most of their scarce financial resources for those urgent needs. They have also allocated increasing amounts through grants-in-aid to local governments for education. (Between 1953 and 1963, 47 percent of the increased expenditures by States went to education—most of it through grants to local governments.) This evidence suggests that, if the States were to receive unencumbered funds from the Federal Government, they would spend them on urgently needed State-local services whether the particular services were stipulated in the legislation or not.

The Federal Government should satisfy itself that the funds would be shared with the local governments in an equitable manner, but this is also much less of a problem than most people might suppose. The extent to which the States delegate responsibilities to, and share revenues with, local governments varies greatly. All States give aid to local units and most give substantial amounts. (In the aggregate, intergovernmental transfers from State to local governments account for more than a third of State general expenditures and nearly 30 percent of local general revenues.) In view of the differences among States in forms of intergovernmental cooperation, it would be difficult to specify that some uniform percentage of the general grant be reserved for local use in all States. The individual States are in a better position to make the allocation in the manner suited to their particular circumstances. Moreover, legislative reapportionment will help assure that the needs of the communities will be recognized by the State legislatures. Several States are already making plans to use existing or new grant-in-aid programs for distribution to the localities of any unencumbered Federal funds that may become available in the future.

On the other hand, it can be argued that it is bad financial management for the Federal Government to give away its funds without exercising a minimum amount of supervision to see that they are employed productively and in the national interest. One method of achieving this objective, and also of allowing flexibility for each State to meet the needs it considers most urgent, would be to require the Governors to file statements showing the plan for the use of the funds in detail. As guidance for the development of such plans, the Congress might indicate the general areas which it regarded as most urgent, including the need for making funds available for local government services. To be sure that the plan represented a broad spectrum of opinion in the State, the Governor might be directed to consult with local officials and representatives of citizens organizations before incorporating the plan in his budget. A detailed audited report on the actual use of the funds might also be required, as well as a certification by appropriate State and local officials that all applicable Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act, have been complied with in the State and local activities financed by these grants.

CONCLUSION

The States will be unable to meet their growing needs without substantial additional assistance from the Federal Government. Part of this additional assistance will come from specific grant programs which are already enacted or are now being considered by the Congress. But the States will need supplementary assistance in the form of general aid to help finance other State-local programs.

The States have important functions to perform in our system of government. They have been subject to criticism in the past, in part because of their inability to carry out these functions with the resources available to them. If we expect the States to play their role effectively, we should increase their ability to do a good job. The alternative is to shift their functions to the Federal Government, which is a solution that most people in the United States would rightfully oppose.

The type of general assistance program I have discussed would help revitalize State governments in this country. It would provide them with a growing source of revenue from taxes that are much more equitable than those that are now available to them. It would help eliminate the recurrent fiscal crises that have impaired their ability to function effectively. It would help them attract the caliber of people they need in executive, judicial, and legislative capacities. It would provide an additional margin for funds for strengthening their grant programs to local government units. And it would encourage them to solve their own problems rather than to vacate their responsibilities to the Federal Government.

In the light of the inadequacy of their finances, the States have made a remarkably good record in the postwar period. With reapportionment, they will do even better. Improvement of the finances of State governments, and through them the local governments, would strengthen our federal system and, at the same time, increase the welfare of all our citizens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed with my remarks.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Tax-Sharing Act".

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Tax-Sharing Fund". The Tax-Sharing Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in this section.

(b) (1) There is hereby appropriated to the Tax-Sharing Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury equal to one percent of the aggregate taxable income reported on individual income tax returns during the preceding calendar year.

(2) For purposes of this subsection—

(A) The term "taxable income" shall have the same meaning as specified in section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(B) The term "individual income tax returns" means returns of the tax on the income of individuals imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, from time to time, but not less often than quarterly, transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Tax-Sharing Fund the amounts appropriated by subsection (b). Such transfers shall, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the amounts referred to in subsection (b). Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent that prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (d), the Secretary shall, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and during each fiscal year thereafter, pay to each State, from amounts appropriated to the tax-sharing fund for the fiscal year in which payments are to be made, a total amount equal to the allotment or allotments of such State in such fiscal year under this section. Such payments may be made in installments periodically during any fiscal year, but not less often than quarterly.

(b) From 80 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State in such fiscal year an amount equal to the product resulting from multiplying—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to such 80 percent of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, by

(2) a number which is the quotient resulting from dividing the revenue effort ratio of such State by the average national revenue effort ratio.

(c) From 20 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each of the thirteen States with the lowest per capita income of individuals an amount in such fiscal year which bears the same ratio to such 20 per centum of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of such thirteen States.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, (1) the amount of any State's allotment in any fiscal year under either subsection (b) or (c), (2) the total amount of any State's combined allotments in any fiscal year under subsections (b) and (c), or (3) the total amount resulting from combining any State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year and any reallotment to such State under this subsection, shall not exceed 12 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 2 for such fiscal year. In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under the provisions of the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) or (c) for such fiscal year.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "State" means any of the various States and the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "revenue effort ratio", when used in relation to any State, means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total of the revenues derived by such State (including revenues derived by any political subdivision thereof) from its own sources, and (B) the denominator of which is the total income of individuals residing in such State.

(3) The term "average national revenue effort ratio" means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total resulting from adding together all revenue effort ratios of the States, and (B) the denominator of which is 51.

(4) The term "income of individuals", when used in relation to any State, means income subject to the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 4. (a) Each State may use payments from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under section 3 for activities, programs, and services in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

(b) Each State shall apportion in accordance with equitable criteria, from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year, to each local government within such State an amount not less than an amount which bears the same ratio to such allotment or allotments as to such local government from revenues of such State derived from all sources during the five years preceding such fiscal year bears to the total amount of revenues of such State derived from all sources during such five year period.

(c) Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government to which such State has apportioned part of its allotment or allotments—

(1) has used any amount of such allotment or allotments for purposes not within the scope of subsection (a),

(2) has not apportioned any amount of such allotment or allotments in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b), or

(3) has not obligated any amount of such allotment or allotments within five fiscal years immediately following the fiscal year in which such allotment or allotments were made

the Secretary shall subtract, from any subsequent allotment or allotments to such State, a total amount equal to the amount referred to in paragraph (1), (2) or (3). In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment in any fiscal year under this subsection, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such year.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "health, education and welfare", when used in relation to any activity, program, or service, shall not include any activity, program, or service designed to provide—

(A) Administrative expenses for State and local government.

(B) Highway programs.

(C) State payments in lieu of property taxes.

(D) Debt service.

(E) Disaster relief.

(2) The term "local government" means any city, township, village, municipality, county, parish, or similar territorial subdivision of a State, but shall not include any department, agency, commission, or independent instrumentality of a State.

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Any State desiring to receive its allotment in any fiscal year under this Act shall, on behalf of itself and any local government which may receive any apportionment thereof, certify and provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary that such State and local government will—

(A) Use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for any allotment paid to such State, and any apportionment made by such State to local governments, under this Act;

(B) make such reports to the Secretary, the Congress, and the Comptroller General, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act including a statement of intent as to how and for what purpose the fund shall be spent, except that any State may make such reports on behalf of any local government thereof; and

(C) adhere to all applicable Federal laws in connection with any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from such allotment.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be deemed to be applicable to any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from any allotment received by a State under this Act.

(b) Whenever in any fiscal year the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government thereof, is not in substantial compliance with the purposes of subsection (a), the Secretary immediately shall—

(1) in the case of the failure of compliance of any State, cancel any subsequent payments to such State under this Act in such fiscal year and reallot any remainder of such State's allotment in such fiscal year to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such fiscal year, or

(2) in the case of the failure of compliance of any local government, require satisfactory assurance that such State will cancel any subsequent payments to such local government under this Act in such fiscal year and reapportion any remainder of such local government's apportionment to other local governments of such State in proportion to the original apportionments to such local governments under section 4(b) for such fiscal year.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year. Each such report shall include a statement of the appropriations to, and the disbursements made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year; and estimate of the expected appropriation to, and disbursements to be made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the current fiscal year; and any changes recommended by the Secretary concerning the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund.

SEC. 7. The Appropriations Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall conduct a full and complete study at least once during each Congress with respect to the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund and the activities, programs, and services provided by the States from allotments received pursuant to this Act, and report its findings upon such study to each House, respectively, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable at the earliest practicable date. This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill would accomplish a number of objectives in an effort to bring about better equalization between the tax resources upon which State and local governments can draw and those which are preempted by the Federal Government. This is a problem which every State—including my own State of New York, which has the second largest tax revenues in the country—must solve.

The Javits plan would provide as follows:

First. Establishment of a trust fund in which 1 percent of aggregate taxable income would be deposited from the Treasury, beginning July 1, 1967. Under present conditions, this would amount to $2.5 billion a year and would grow as the tax base grows. Transfer from the Treasury to the tax-sharing trust fund would take place at least once every 3 months.

Second. Payments from the trust fund to the States under the following formula: (a) 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population. This amount would be increased or decreased depending on the State's own tax effort, which would be measured by the ratio of the total revenues derived by the State over total personal income of individual State residents, as compared with the national average; (b) 20 percent of the fund would be paid each fiscal year to the 13 States with the lowest per capita income. This would be distributed according to population of the States involved.

Third. No State could receive a total payment for a fiscal year in excess of 12 percent of the trust fund in that year.

Fourth. A State may use its allotment of funds for programs in the fields of "health, education, and welfare," but not to include (a) debt service of the States, (b) general administrative expenses for the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of State and local government, (c) highway programs, (d) State payments in lieu of real property taxes, (e) disaster relief.

Fifth. To benefit from the plan, a State must file reports with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General and the appropriate committees of Congress, including a statement of intent as to how and for what purposes it shall spend the money. States must also comply with all applicable laws including title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Secretary of the Treasury must provide a detailed audit report to the Congress annually on the operation of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year.

Sixth. Failure to comply with prescribed conditions would require cancellation of future payments and permit reallocation of the remainder of a State's allocation to other States in proportion to the original allotment.

Seventh. The State must distribute to its local governments an equitable portion of its allotment. The amount distributed to local governments must be no less than the average of the State's distribution of its own revenues to local governments over the previous 5 years.

Eighth. Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Finance Committee of the Senate and Ways and Means Committee of the House, responsible for appropriations and tax legislation, must, at least once during each Congress, conduct a complete study of the operation of the trust fund and provide such legislative recommendations as appropriate.

The measure I introduce today is designed to provide a workable formula to channel Federal revenues to the States with a minimum of strings attached in order to restore fiscal balance to the Federal-State partnership and to strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens effectively.

The general outlines of a plan to distribute Federal tax revenues to the States was first suggested in June 1964 by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It has since been endorsed by a task force of economists headed by Joseph W. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. It was supported by the Republican Governors Association last July as well as by numerous conferences of local officials. But no concrete plan has yet been formulated as to the precise allocation of Federal funds for a wide range of State activities. Despite its complexity, I believe Congress should have before it now a carefully drawn proposal embodying this plan so that it may be fully considered by congressional committees during the period between sessions and may be the subject for hearings early in the second session.

State and local governments face a severe crisis. While the future with its demands for new services is rushing in on them, they remain victims of a financial revenue base which is years out of date. In the past 18 years, total State and local government expenditures have multiplied six times over. State and local outlays for education alone increased from $3 billion at the end of World War II to $22 billion last year. In the past 10 years, these expenditures, now totaling about $87 billion per year, have risen at 8 percent per year, twice as fast as the gross national product. In contrast to this, the Federal Government made cash expenditures during fiscal year 1965, excluding costs of national defense, of $66 billion.

The sad fact is that the present resources of State and local government are not sufficient to meet the expanding needs caused by exploding population, rapid urbanization, and advanced technology; nor is there any indication that this situation will correct itself. Indeed, almost every imaginable tax resource has already been subjected to increasing and sometimes undesirable pressures. State taxes alone have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964, an average increase of over a billion dollars a year. In 1965, property taxes increased 7.3 percent over the previous year; sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes rose 7.5 and 6.3 percent respectively—all in 1 year.

In 1964, State tax increases siphoned off one-third of the $6.5 billion Federal tax cut. Despite warnings from economists, a bewildering variety of consumption, payroll, and service taxes have appeared at the local level from Detroit to Oakland, Fairbanks to Mobile, Los Angeles to Baltimore. Over 40 cities have recently imposed motel and hotel taxes in an effort to shift some of their tax burdens to nonresidents. In a frantic search for additional revenues, New Hampshire has instituted a State-sponsored sweepstakes on horseracing.

The end is not in sight. Twenty-six Governors have asked for tax increases this past spring and many of those who are relying on larger yields from present taxes have warned their legislatures that increased taxes are a future necessity. Yet there is evidence that traditional taxes have already reached the limits of desirable expansion.

Dramatic proof of the growing disparity between government responsibilities and government resources is found in the increase in State and local debt. From a $15.9 billion level in 1946, public indebtedness at the State and local level almost doubled by 1952. Since that year, State and local debt has tripled, an average increase of more than $4½ billion per year.

State governments, which can tap a wider variety of revenue sources than local authorities can, have been active in using these sources. Between 1946 and 1963, no less than 14 States instituted a tax on cigarettes, while general sales taxes were added as a source of funds by 13 States. At the same time, four States added an individual income tax. Of course, virtually all States have also increased rates on previously tapped tax sources.

The financing of local government expenditures has been a problem of at least similar difficulty. These governments rely almost exclusively upon property tax revenues. While the postwar increase in property valuations has swelled the property tax base, there has still been a steady need to raise the property tax rates themselves.

Interstate competition to attract new industry—and similar competition among localities—has undoubtedly hampered efforts to add to current revenues, particularly in the case of corporate taxes. States and localities generally offer some form of inducement to attract new corporations to their areas, with the long-range objective of creating new job opportunities and increasing the overall tax base, and this competition tends to restrain local governments from increasing tax rates.

In the face of heavy demands placed upon State and local governments, the increase in their taxes and borrowing has been insufficient to prevent them from becoming gradually more dependent upon financial assistance from the Federal Government. The bulk of Federal assistance in the form of grants-in-aid programs has grown from a total of $884 million in 1946 to approximately $11 billion in 1965. In 1964 the Federal expenditure of $9.8 billion represented approximately 16.7 percent of total taxes and other general revenues raised by State and local governments, compared with only 7.3 percent in 1946. Grants to help support public welfare programs and to help build public roads and highways have shown the sharpest

increase over the postwar years, and together they totaled some $7.5 billion in 1964.

Despite their achievements to date, State and local governments will continue to face a wide variety of additional public needs, and they do not want to curtail their responsibilities. They have doubled their employment over the past 13 years and increased their budgets many times. Obviously, problems of water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, and substandard recreation and housing facilities, as well as inadequate health care exist. In our vast and diversified country, these services can often be most effectively provided only through programs run at the State and local level. Thus, the immediate problem is to develop intergovernmental relationships that will enable State and local governments to carry out their vital role. Innovation and experimentation will be needed in future Federal-State cooperation and in planning and budgeting public programs if we want to get maximum benefit out of every dollar spent.

Under the plan I introduce today, New York whose 1963–64 State and local revenues amount to $7,445 million—the second largest in the Nation—would receive $202 million; Alaska, with State and local revenues during this period amounting to $89 million—the smallest in the Nation—would receive $2.6 million. Similarly, California would receive $213 million and Arkansas, $47 million. Through this plan, for example, New York would receive a 31-percent increase in Federal aid; California, 17 percent; Ohio, 20 percent; Alabama, 39 percent; Colorado, 16 percent, and Kentucky, 37 percent.

It may be argued by some that State and local governments will not use these Federal funds wisely or that they will use them to reduce their own taxes and expenditures for necessary programs. Experience of the past, however, indicates that such fears are groundless. A large proportion of total State and local outlays over the past years have been used for educational, health, and welfare purposes—an indication that local governments are cognizant of the needs of their people in these areas and are attempting to meet them.

Grants made to State and local governments under a plan such as this will enable these bodies to operate more independently. Local officials will be free of Federal domination, and the spread of a growing Federal bureaucracy may be halted. State and local governments will be in a stronger financial position, and a better fiscal balance will be achieved between Federal, State, and local governments.

Now, let me direct one word to those who may feel that the sort of tax-sharing plan I propose would mean further incursion on State prerogatives. Of course, there is always a possibility that this can happen, but the choice we face is not between State dollars and Federal dollars, but between Federal dollars bound by strings and conditions and funds which are relatively unconditional and can help buttress the capability of State and local governments to carry their responsibilities and not to abdicate authority to the Federal Government due to financial inability to discharge it.

For, we have to look to the days and years ahead when the demand for more and better local governmental services will increase.

Critics on the one side of the political spectrum are suspicious of the States and seemingly convinced of Federal "infallibility"; critics on the other side are suspicious of Washington. But mutual suspicions should not produce a deadlock, for this country cannot be governed well unless Government is imaginative and active and responsible and works at all levels in a Federal-State system.

I feel that the proposal embodied in the bill I introduced today can help prepare our governmental system to meet needs of the coming decades, and can help us to put cooperative federalism into practice for the benefit of all our people.

HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in yesterday's Star there appeared a story extolling the merits of Harry McPherson, formerly general counsel of the Senate policy staff on the Democratic side.

Harry McPherson is an extraordinary and outstanding individual. He performed his duties in the Senate with intelligence, integrity, and humanity. I am delighted that this recognition is being given to this outstanding American.

Mr. President, when a man reaches the age of retirement and can look back at a fruitful career, he feels that his life has been well spent. But when a man in his middle thirties can look on a single decade of his life and can feel the same broad sense of accomplishment, he has even greater reasons to be proud. Such a man is Harry C. McPherson, who at 36 years of age has already won the admiration and respect of his colleagues for his intellectual and personal qualities, his drive and wide-ranging interests.

An anonymous colleague of his at the Department of State put it well when he said, "he has a brilliant mind, he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings." What greater tribute can a man be paid?

Harry McPherson came to Washington fresh out of law school in 1956 as a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody liked immediately—he is still a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody still likes. But now, only 9 years later, he is also a man who has served with distinction in the Senate, the Departments of State and Defense and now the White House.

The past for Harry has been a fine one—he has already had a rich and varied career—the future, I am certain, holds even greater promise.

It is to President Johnson's great credit that he has selected a man like Harry McPherson to serve as a member of the outstanding White House staff.

I am happy to join all Harry McPherson's friends in commending him for his many achievements which merited this fine article in the Washington Star of yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Sunday Star of October 10, 1965, entitled "New White House Aid, a Man of Versatility," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW WHITE HOUSE AID A MAN OF VERSATILITY

(By Robert Walters)

Harry C. McPherson, Jr., the White House's unofficial resident playwright, peered from behind a pile of papers on his desk to explain one of the problems confronting him.

"I'm just not the kind of guy who can turn off, then turn on and go full blast," he said. "I do an awful lot of scrabbling before I get any ore."

The method may not be orthodox, but ability and creativity have more than compensated for McPherson's "scrabbling" since he came to Washington in 1956.

One of the most recently appointed presidential aids, McPherson moved into his second-floor White House office in late August.

He is one of several Texans working there who disprove the theory—embraced by some cynics—that presidential staff members are so many "old cronies" of Lyndon Johnson, and are hired for that reason.

BRIGHT YOUNG MEN

If he must be stereotyped, McPherson can best be classified as one of Washington's bright young men on the way up. At the age of 36, he is earning $28,500 and quickly gives the impression he is worth every taxpayer dollar.

A bouncy, cheerful, and soft-spoken young man, McPherson describes himself as "something of a utility infielder" at the White House, handling everything from speech writing to legal assistance on such diverse topics as agriculture and international education.

His outside interests range from squash and tennis to drama and archeology. He is an Air Force veteran, a former senior warden of his church, and holds two graduate degrees.

POLITICALLY ASTUTE

McPherson's former associates at the State and Defense Departments have nothing but praise for him. "He sees the political significance of a problem with intellectual penetration," said one.

"Harry's a good and rather quick judge of character. He's got good political instincts. And he's very unlikely to let you know something he doesn't want you to know," said a State Department official, a former coworker. He added:

"He's usually pretty sure his judgment is right—and he lets you know it, but never in any oppressive way. You don't get the impression he's a know-it-all.

"His personal inclination is somewhat in the direction of his cultural interests. He enjoys music and has written and directed plays.

"He has a good feel for personal relationships in a bureaucratic government. He's bright, forward-looking and not doctrinaire. He's obviously dedicated to the President, personally as well as professionally. He's got a long way to go."

McPherson is considerably more modest in describing himself. But one quickly perceives the vast range of his interests when, during a half-hour conversation, he quotes Homer, Mort Sahl, and Albert Camus, then goes on to discuss Bertold Brecht, Joseph McCarthy, and Jelly Roll Morton.

For someone born 9 weeks before the 1929 "Black Friday" stock market collapse, McPherson has come a long way. After 2 years at Southern Methodist University, he transferred to the University of the South and graduated in 1949 with a B.A. degree in English.

He began graduate studies at Columbia University, but left to join the Air Force in 1950, shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war. In 1953, he returned to civilian life, only to find Senator McCarthy terrorizing the country with his "anti-Communist" crusade.

"That was one of the things which made me decide to enter law school," he explained. "At Columbia, I thought what I wanted to do mostly was to write poems and be a teacher, but I later became more interested in politics."

TEXAS LAW GRADUATE

Entering the University of Texas Law School in 1953, he graduated with his law degree in 1956. The Senate Democratic policy committee was seeking an assistant counsel at the time.

The committee chairmanship is held by the Senate's Democratic leader, who at that time was Lyndon Johnson. To fill the slot, Johnson asked the law school faculty to recommend a bright young graduate.

"I guess he was looking in the right month," McPherson explained with a grin. "I took the job and came up here for what I thought was 2 years. I certainly didn't have any plans for moving permanently."

He never made it back to his hometown of Tyler, Tex. In 1958, he was named associate counsel of the policy committee. Three years later, he was elevated to general counsel. All during that period he worked closely with Johnson.

TO EXECUTIVE BRANCH

When Johnson assumed the Vice-Presidency, however, McPherson remained in the Senate employ. In 1963, he moved to the executive branch, serving first as deputy executive branch, serving first as Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for International Affairs.

In April 1964, he received the additional title of Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army for civil functions. Four months later, he moved to the State Department where he served as assistant secretary for educational and cultural affairs.

He remained there until receiving the White House appointment—a post which involves responsibility for agriculture, rural life, urban affairs, international education and tariff and trade matters.

When he can forget about those concerns after a 10- or 12-hour day, McPherson turns to a wide variety of personal interests. Chief among them is drama.

Brecht is probably his favorite playwright, but he acknowledges considerable interest in Eugene Ionesco, Tennessee Williams, George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare as well.

About 10 years ago, McPherson began writing and directing one-act plays for an amateur company of fellow parishioners at St. Marks Episcopal Church. "It developed beyond my expectations, it probably was the most fecund experience I have ever had in the church," he said.

McPherson said he did "only the most modest kind of occasional reading in archeology" but friends described him as something of an authority on the subject.

The family expert in archeology, McPherson insisted, is his wife, Clayton, who watches over a daughter, Courtenay, and a son, Peter, in the McPherson's Capitol Hill home.

"Most of our income since we were married has been spent on records," said McPherson, who described himself as a "Mozart fiend and a Bach lover," before launching into a discussion of Louis Armstrong and Jelly Roll Morton.

CHURCH INTERESTS WIDE

His added governmental responsibilities have forced McPherson to give up his post of senior warden at St. Marks—the highest lay office in the parish—but one church leader recently described him as "a man who always has been a leader in the church." He added that McPherson has lectured at colleges on the relationship of theology and politics.

"Harry is an excellent theologian. In the councils of the church he is very much respected," the man added. "He's very active, but he's more than just a 'good Joe' who helps to run the bazaars."

The church leader went on to describe McPherson as "one of the coming great men—but one who has no yearning for the public spotlight at all."

FELLOW WORKERS

Other former coworkers echoed that opinion. Because they weren't sure McPherson would appreciate anything said about him for publication, they asked to be quoted anonymously.

"There's no question in my mind that this guy will make his mark in life," said a State Department official who once worked closely with McPherson. "He has a brilliant mind; he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings."

He continued:

"Books seem to fascinate Harry. He also likes to swim, but I don't think he gets enough time for it anymore. And he likes a good cigar.

"He does his homework. When we went before Congress with our budget presentation, he had the answers at his fingertips. They appreciate someone who knows what he's doing."

From a former coworker at the Defense Department came this praise:

"He's a terrific guy to work for—a very yeasty kind of man who sees life as a challenge. He's a very effective and agile speaker on his feet. When he talked off the top for his new boss, he described himself well."

McPherson has similar praise for his head. He always handled Johnson as "the most tremendous man to work for I ever encountered in my life." Asked if he regretted having to give up some outside interests because of the heavy White House responsibilities, he said:

"I've got only one life. If I get a chance to become involved in the affairs of state, it's well worth it."

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, every Senator remembers when Harry McPherson used to sit at the front table. He had, indeed, one of the most cordial personalities of anyone I have ever encountered, and along with it there was a real desire to help Members on both sides of the aisle. Coupled with that was a singular capacity not only for legislative but for executive work. I watched Harry McPherson when he went to work on the White House staff. I know he has made a steady advance on that staff. I salute him and join in any encomium that reflects glory and recognition to a former staff member of the U.S. Senate. Harry McPherson richly deserves the compliment paid him in the article in yesterday's Sunday Star.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished minority leader for the kind words he has had to say concerning Harry McPherson.

WISHING THE PRESIDENT WELL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, like most of the people in the United States, we in West Virginia send our best wishes to President Johnson for a complete and speedy recovery from his recent illness.

I believe the sentiments of the country are well expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times of October 8, 1965. I ask that the editorial be printed in the record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed as follows:

TIME FOR A REST?

The prayers of the Nation today will go to Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, for successful surgery and a speedy recovery. As was the case when President Eisenhower suffered three serious illnesses while in the White House, politics will stop at the sickroom door.

Removal of the gall bladder has become an almost commonplace operation, but the procedure still involves the excision of a human organ from the abdominal cavity and a layman cannot look upon the surgery with the same matter-of-factness as a physician. The President, of course, is assured the best in the way of professional care under hospital conditions both for surgery and recuperation that are unparalleled.

Possibly the enforced slowdown which will be the President's lot as he convalesces will be good for him and the country. It will give heated congressional tempers a chance to cool and pave the way for enactment of the rest of his program when the lawmakers return to work next year.

In the Senate, a filibuster led by Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is underway on the repeal of section 14(b). Ol' Ev has worked with President Johnson closely during most of the long session, and it is possible he feels he must assert his prerogatives as the Republican leader in order, so to speak, to keep the franchise.

The House also is chafing under the amount of legislation it has passed in the extraordinarily productive session. Its mood is not unusual after Labor Day when the days begin to drag and thoughts of adjournment fill the air.

Some tired and frustrated Members are getting fed up with being called rubberstamps for writing one of the great achievement records in history. Some want to go home to mend fences—or just to rest.

Republicans recently tied up the House for 12 hours in protest against what they claimed was overuse of the process by which bills can be taken away from the Rules Committee after 21 days of inaction. The lower Chamber whipped through a resolution endorsing unilateral action against communism in the Western Hemisphere—a measure that was in no way part of the administration's foreign policy program—and it passed a wage bill for several employees much higher than recommended by the White House. Home rule for Washington, which the administration decided to push, was beaten, and only by 10 votes was an attack on the foreign aid appropriation bill beaten off.

President Johnson's postoperative convalescence would give him a thoroughly sound excuse for telling Congress it could go home and come back when it was in a better humor. He already has got more at this session than any President in history, and most of his major legislative goals have been attained.

L.B.J. doesn't ordinarily surrender without battling to the last ditch—and he may not this time. But prudence dictates that he take it easy for a while, and he might as well let Congress do the same.

HIGHER RANKS FOR WOMEN IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, great strides have been made in recent months to break down barriers which discriminate against women in various fields of employment. Much of this progress results from recommendations advanced by the Commission on the Status of Women, created by the late President John F. Kennedy. It was my pleasure to serve on that Commission and to consider ways to discard outmoded limitations on the full and effective use of women in our labor force.

On September 23, 1965, the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army met in Washington, D.C., and adopted a resolution petitioning the Secretary of Defense to establish higher ranks for the women who direct the women's branches of our Armed Forces—WACS, WAVES, Women Marines, Nurse Corps and medical services of the three armed services.

Trustees of the association have explained that the women directors of these units are "outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities."

It is my hope that the Secretary of Defense will give favorable consideration to the recommendations of the association's trustees. Such action would be in keeping with policies of our Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the text of the petition presented to the Secretary of Defense by the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRUSTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY PETITIONING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RELATIVE TO HIGHER RANKS FOR DIRECTORS OF THE WOMEN'S BRANCHES OF THE ARMED FORCES

1. The Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army respectfully requests the Secretary of Defense to initiate steps for the creation of field and flag ranks in the several women's branches of the Armed Forces, and for the increase in the number of senior officers thereof.

2. It is the considered opinion of this council that the role of women in the military forces of the United States will be an expanding one. The experience of World War II, and years subsequent thereto, have demonstrated beyond doubt the value of the talents and ability of women in the successful prosecution of the missions of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Recognition of this fact is best evidenced by the permanent status accorded women in these branches of the Armed Forces by Public Law 625, 80th Congress, June 12, 1948.

3. Currently the highest grade or rank which any woman can achieve is that of colonel in the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, or captain in the Navy, and in the law there is provision for only one such officer in each, to wit, the officer charged with the overall direction of the particular branch.

4. It is submitted that the responsibility which is now vested in the directors of the WAC, WAVES, Women Marines, and WAF, and in the chiefs of the Nurse Corps and the medical services in the three armed services, justifies revision in ranks so that each director should be accorded the rank of brigadier general or equivalent. In addition, the commanding officer of the WAC Training Center and Schools at Fort McClellan should be accorded the rank of brigadier general. This is the mobilization base for expansion of the Women's Army Corps in time of war and hence has responsibilities for planning that merit a higher rank. Provision should also be made for the promotion of more lieutenant colonels to the rank of colonel, who would be assigned to positions in which a male colonel is normally assigned. It is firmly believed that there are positions for from 5 to 10 WAC colonels.

5. Under the present organizational structure the ceiling on rank imposes certain inequities which place women at a disadvantage, and we believe them to be inconsistent with the policy of the U.S. Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. For example, the director of the WAC is outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities.

Moreover, the present ceilings on rank are bound to have an adverse effect on morale and the incentive of female officers who are performing their duties in such an outstanding manner that under similar circumstances male officers could expect promotion to higher rank. This is confirmed by the rising trend in the number of those voluntarily retiring from the Women's Army Corps after 20 years' service.

6. In the congressional hearings on legislation designed to give the WAC permanent status in the U.S. Army, General Eisenhower said in part:

"In tasks for which they are particularly suited, WAC's are more valuable than men, and fewer of them are required to perform a given amount of work. * * * In the disciplinary field they were, throughout the war, a model for the Army. * * * More than this, their influence throughout the whole command was good. * * * I assure you that I look upon this measure as a must. * * * You are at perfect liberty to quote me privately or publicly in this matter."

(House Committee on Armed Services subcommittee hearings on S. 1641, February 18, 1948, including letter from Chief of Staff to chairman of House Committee on Armed Services, January 30, 1948.)

Similar laudatory remarks on other women's branches of the Armed Forces during World War II can be cited. Time has confirmed the value of women as an integral part of our military forces.

THE COMING WAR OF HUNGER

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, no proposal made during this session of Congress is as important as the call to a war against worldwide hunger urged by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota and former Food for Peace Director, Mr. MCGOVERN. And no proposal is receiving more deserved attention than his International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965, S. 2157, introduced June 17. I am glad to say that I am a cosponsor of that bill.

My mail almost daily contains articles from newspapers and magazines telling of the coming world food and population crisis and our colleague's proposal to meet it.

My weekend mail includes an interview with Senator MCGOVERN and a subsequent editorial in the October 4 and October 7 issues of the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent for these two items to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Monitor editorial concludes:

Senator MCGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

I believed very strongly when I joined the Senator from South Dakota as a coauthor of S. 2157 that our agricultural production capacity is our greatest asset in the struggle for world peace, and that this would ultimately be widely recognized. It is gratifying that this recognition is coming with great speed.

Typical of press response to our proposal is one I have received from Mr. MCGOVERN's home State—an editorial which filled the editorial column of the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal on Sunday, October 3. It contains endorsement of both the Senator's proposed war against hunger and of his effort to remove restrictions which now prevent our sale of surplus wheat to Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rapid City Journal editorial also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senator MCGOVERN's world food proposal began to receive widespread attention very quickly after it was made last June.

The press saw it both as a foreign policy tool, and as a new domestic farm program—producing to meet human need instead of subsidizing acreage restrictions to control surpluses.

United Press International distributed a background article by Marguerite Davis which was printed in a great many papers across the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article as it appeared in the Springfield, Ill., Statesman, be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, perhaps most significant is the breadth of the ideological spectrum from which endorsements have come.

An article and editorial by Carroll Streetor, editor, which appeared in the very conservative Farm Journal has already appeared in the RECORD.

I shall not ask to include the full text, but I was struck by an advertisement which appeared in Life magazine, September 24, indicating that even the usually very conservative business world is becoming alert to the constructive value in the foreign relations field of our capacity to produce food.

The top two-thirds of the full-page advertisement was a magnificent picture, in color, of a wheat field at harvest time. There were fleecy clouds in an otherwise blue and sunny sky. On the ground, combines were moving through the field.

It was a beautiful, modern-day harvest scene.

The caption on the picture was: "This Is a Battlefield."

Beneath the picture the Republic Steel Corp., the advertiser, told its readers:

Day in, day out, giant weapons of peace are fighting the whole world's common enemy, hunger—right here on your own vast farmlands. And it is many battles later than you think. Creeping hunger is advancing over much of the world's bursting population. The biggest barrier to widespread starvation is grain from the breadbaskets of America.

The text of the advertisement then deals with the merit of Republic Steel Corp. steels used in farm machinery.

A reader could not avoid, Mr. President, observing how much greater satisfaction the men of this corporation appeared to reflect in this ad from the contribution their products make to machinery for the battlefields of peace, than they find when their steel must be shaped into instruments of war, destruction and death.

It was a very forceful advertisement; forceful in the cause of a world food program, forceful in its demonstration that there is economic benefit for all—farmers, urban workers, and industry—in waging the war against want, and forceful in its revelation of the pride that men and corporations will find in making a constructive contribution to the welfare of man.

I am convinced that we have seen the beginning of a movement in the session of the Congress now drawing to an end which will become a reality in the next session and a very powerful instrument of foreign policy, and peace building, in the years just ahead.

I want to congratulate and thank the Senator from South Dakota for the leadership he is providing in this and other fields.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO DECLARE WORLD WAR ON FAMINE

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—"We ought to declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet," says South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, "and do it now."

"The number of people is outracing the amount of food available at an almost unbelievable rate," he says. "In the next 35 years the population of the world will double—from 3 billion to 6 billion. And the food supply is not going up significantly.

"The enormous food gap in prospect is the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century," the Senator contends.

"Hunger and malnutrition are serious enough today. But major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years, unless we start today to tackle it."

The American people are not aware of the facts, Senator MCGOVERN said in an interview. They still think of large American surpluses when in fact these are sharply reduced and approaching dangerously low levels. They see great efforts being made to produce birth-control programs, but these cannot be expected to solve the problem in time.

"Our position of moral leadership will not permit us to turn our backs on this problem. Nor will our national security. Much of the tension and unrest that opens the way for violent upheavals and Communist inroads have their roots in hunger and misery."

Senator MCGOVERN has a bill before Congress to attack this problem. It would turn American farms back from crop controls to deliberately stimulated production.

"If we begin now to divert a portion of the $2 billion annual farm control budget into the purchase, shipment, and distribution of farm commodities abroad, where they are needed, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expense."

The McGovern bill would spend $500 million next year for three purposes:

To purchase needed nutritious foods in the United States for distribution abroad.

To help the receiving countries to store and distribute the food more efficiently, with better facilities.

Greatly to strengthen the food-producing capacity of farm people in the underdeveloped world, by all available technical and educational means.

A similar sum would be added each year for 6 years. The total would then equal the amount spent on foreign aid of all sorts by the United States in the coming year.

FARMERS CORPS SUGGESTED

But the switch from negative cropland restriction to a program of stimulating production in the United States would be a strong stimulus to the American economy, Mr. MCGOVERN said.

One of the Senator's more intriguing suggestions is that of an American farmers corps, not unlike the Peace Corps except that its members would have high professional ability.

It would consist of "retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time."

They would go out like the highly successful agricultural county agents in the United States, as teachers who can show how, as well as tell how, and who know how to combine new technology with old skills.

"When I was Food-for-Peace Director under President Kennedy," he recalled, "I reached the conviction that the most overwhelming paradox of our time was to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"The sciences have broken the space barrier, at a cost heading toward $20 billion, but not the bonds of hunger."

The Senator based many of his facts on the rapidly enlarging hunger gap on a new official study of the situation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It compared for the first time, it is said, comprehensive figures on population growth with similarly careful figures on expectable food production.

OWN RESERVES CHECKED

A typical conclusion: In Asia, merely to maintain present meager diets, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. This would require an annual use of an additional amount of fertilizer that would nearly equal the world's entire output of fertilizer today.

For many Americans, however, the Senator's account of the present state of American farm surpluses will be equally suprising.

"They are not much above the level, now, that is needed for our own national reserves," he said. "For example: Wheat stocks have been worked down from 1.4 billion bushels at the start of this decade to 800 million bushels today. Corn and other feed grain supplies have been sharply reduced.

"The present composite reserve of wheat and feed grains is scarcely equal to 6 months' consumption in the United States."

Senator MCGOVERN recalled that President Johnson recently suggested that Congress build a food reserve. If this were done on a 6-month supply basis, the present food-for-peace program of American aid abroad would have to be eliminated, or American farm production sharply enlarged.

Senator MCGOVERN wants the United States to work with and through the United Nations, as well as on its own, in the big enterprise that he recommends. The effort will have to be cooperative and international, he said.

Senator MCGOVERN, coming from a farm State as he does, is aware of the great complexity of the task of helping other countries with their farm production. The collapse of the high hopes for technical assistance after the last World War, he agrees, are illustration enough.

He mentions, as reasons why these hopes were not justified, the lack of an all-around approach to the problem: lack of rural education, adequate credit, forms of landownership that reward incentive, rural extension services, farm to market roads or cash markets for produce. He blames the shortage of fertilizer, pesticides, good irrigation facilities and methods, hybrid seed and feed mixing equipment—and the knowledge to apply them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 7, 1965]

WAR ON HUNGER

Two of this newspaper's Washington correspondents recently took a long, hard look at the world's rapidly approaching food crisis. Their purpose was not to alarm but to alert.

They report that data produced by demographers, agronomists, economists, and other specialists point to a coming world famine of unbelievable proportions. It can be averted only by a worldwide effort far greater than anything now on the horizon.

One fact alone explains the profound concern expressed by authorities: World populations are soaring way beyond the unimpressive growth in food production. Every single week there are over 1 million more people living on this earth than were here the week before.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, sees the enormous food gap in prospect as the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century. He asks that we declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet and do it now.

To meet the world hunger challenge is not only an imperative moral responsibility but a matter of the utmost practical urgency to every inhabitant of this globe, including those in the most affluent societies. A world half of which is well fed and half of which is starving cannot long endure.

The most radical and violent political and social movements feed on extreme desperation born of the threat of mass starvation. Knowledge of this ought to be sufficient warning to the more affluent North Atlantic community to bend every effort to find solutions while there is yet time.

American efforts to meet the problem, while commendable, are still far from adequate. Nor can the United States solve a problem of this magnitude merely by its own efforts, however great.

The export of food, fertilizers, insecticides, credits, agricultural know-how, and so on, together with the recent tentative steps taken toward encouraging effective birth control programs, when all put together, still fall far short.

Only greatly increased food production coupled with much wider use of effective birth control methods will solve the world's hunger problem. And only then will conditions be conducive to world peace. In view of this, we question Pope Paul VI's

statement before the United Nations, apparently advocating reliance on the one but not the other.

Senator McGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Rapid City Sunday Journal, Oct. 3, 1965]

SURPLUS FOODS SHOULD BE USED

What to plant and how much is the problem plaguing legislators and farmers. The 4-year proposal now approved in Washington is a temporary, patched job which seems to have appeased very few.

It is known the United States can produce more food, whatever the crop or animals might be, on fewer acres than ever before. For those in the cities, it is difficult to understand why millions of dollars are paid each year to store more grain, bury more lard, give away butter, fail to process cotton for fabric or oil.

It is equally difficult for millions of Americans to understand why other people on this globe go hungry.

South Dakota's Senator GEORGE McGOVERN offers a solution which could head off world famine and aid the cause of world peace. On September 20, Senator McGOVERN told a regional Methodist conference in Sioux Falls:

"Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world." He suggested hunger is a focal point where the United States can earn good will, rather than ill will.

Carl A. Quarnberg, Rapid City businessman with wide interests as operator of a flour mill and feed, seed, and grain buyer, processor, and distributor wrote the following letter to Senator McGOVERN:

"Press reports on your address greatly intrigue me.

"You are right. 'Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world.' In that statement, you may have uncovered a really great idea that can be of real service to wheat farmers as well as starving people of the world.

"Wheat programs of the past have not been fully acceptable to farmers of South Dakota. And wheat farmers of western South Dakota are even more independent than those living on the east side of the river. Western ranchers and farmers are definitely individualistic. They like standing on their own feet. They definitely resent the idea that a government employee sitting at a mahogany desk in Washington, D.C., must tell them what to plant and how much. They want their independence back. They want to use their own judgment as to what and how much.

"Again you are right. 'It is time to tell the world that we have a great unused farm capacity and that America is going to use it to help end hunger in the world.'

"Over the past many years, the United States has continually reduced wheat production while at the same time and under the same world conditions, Canada, Australia, and Argentina (even Germany and France) has encouraged increased wheat production, much to the benefit of their farmers as well as consumers.

"Again you are right when you say, 'If we spend as much money purchasing and distributing our farm surplus production as we now spend paying farmers not to produce, we would lay a foundation for a greater farm prosperity at home and much less hunger abroad.' You have expressed a perfect two-point idea: Food for starving millions of the world; and in the very same breath, a possible answer to the ever-present but still unsolved farm problem.

"Your experience as director of food for peace points to you as better informed on world food problems than any man in public life today. I urge you to pursue your idea to final conclusion. Laying all politics aside, I pledge my personal support to this end."

The capacity to produce seemingly unlimited supplies of commodities for citizens of the United States has been challenged by the farm bills. More production results on fewer acres Subsidies for unplanted acres merely add to the total cost for taxpayers.

McGOVERN served as director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy. Subsequently he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

McGOVERN and Senator KARL MUNDT do not see eye to eye on the farm bills, nor on how best the surpluses might be utilized. Senator MUNDT does not believe in giving aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in any manner. Yet it seems there should be a way to win good will.

What better way to win than with our surplus food?

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Springfield (Ill.) Statesman]

SENATOR URGES CROP USE TO FEED A HUNGRY WORLD

(By Marguerite Davis)

WASHINGTON.—For years, a bountiful America has struggled—and spent millions—to control its farm surpluses.

Now a farm-State Senator wants an about-face which would let farmers grow more food on more land and would distribute more of it to the world's hungry millions.

Led by Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a group of midwestern Democrats in Congress contend it is neither sensible nor moral for the United States to follow a program of sharply curtailed food production when every day half a billion people go to bed hungry.

And they warn that strict Federal controls have reduced the Nation's food stockpiles to such a low point, that there are not enough of some of basic commodities to maintain a 6-month reserve for home consumption.

They admit that the problems in their plan could be many and complicated. But they argue that the results would be good for American farmers as well as for international relations. They believe President Johnson agrees.

The roots of the food-for-peace (FFP) program lie in a 1954 law which provides for the distribution of surplus U.S. crops to have-not nations. The food may be given, bartered, sold for the currency of the receiving nation, or bought through a 40-year American loan plan.

In 1961 the program was designated food for peace, with McGOVERN as its first Director. But he found his office carried little authority. He resigned in 1962 to run for the Senate. But his 18-month exposure to food for peace left its mark.

On one side of the world he had seen mass graves of those who had starved to death; children whose gaunt limbs and distended stomachs testified to their hunger, and some blind from lack of proper nourishment.

At home were millions of acres taken out of production in a continuing battle against too much food, even while farmers declared that their private economic depression could eventually engulf the cities.

President Johnson suggested in his farm message to Congress establishment of strategic reserves of food but he submitted no bill to accomplish this.

Representative CLAIR A. CALLAN, Democrat, of Nebraska, did so June 3 with a measure which called for reserves of food equal to half a year's requirements. According to his calculations, this would wreck the food-for-peace program.

Under his proposal, for example, 600 million bushels of wheat would be kept on hand. That would leave only 41 million for distribution abroad.

Two weeks later McGOVERN submitted to the Senate an "International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965." It would authorize an additional $500 million of foods of all kinds, not merely those now surplus, for distribution to hungry nations.

The program would be increased at the rate of $500 million a year until it reached $3.5 billion in 10 years.

His bill went to the Foreign Relations Committee whose chairman, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has indicated he believes food-for-peace program should be stepped up from the mere dumping of surplus foods to providing the vitamins and proteins which hungry children require.

Support for his plan was forthcoming.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY promised whatever help he could give. Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, claimed that McGOVERN'S plan would work for this country's own interests.

"For every 10 percent the less-developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent," he said. "Italy, Japan, and Nationalist China have moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports."

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the RECORD.

It expresses the wishes of us all for the successful and speedy recovery of our President.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 7, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S OPERATION

The prayers of all Americans will be with President Johnson as he enters the hospital on Thursday for a gall bladder operation the following day.

Happily, medical science has reached the stage where this type of surgery is regarded as fairly routine. The President is expected to spend no more than 10 to 14 days in the hospital following the operation; then will probably have a period of reduced activity for several weeks. But when he gets back on the job, there is no reason why he should not be as vigorous as ever—and vigor is one of Mr. Johnson's prime characteristics.

When the President is ailing, every American is deeply concerned. That is why it is so important that the public be kept fully informed. In taking it upon himself personally to announce his impending operation, and in making it possible for newsmen to obtain all the information they desired from his physicians, President Johnson is pursuing the intelligent course instituted by President Eisenhower, during his several illnesses.

Mr. Johnson has been careful also to make sure that, if the need should arise for any Presidential decision when he is under sedation, Vice President HUMPHREY would act in his place. He has pointed out that "the doctors expect there will be a minimal time during which I will not be conducting business as usual," but every contingency, obviously, must be covered.

The strains upon the President, and the burdens of responsibility placed upon him,

are very great. The hope has been expressed many times that Mr. Johnson would slow down his amazing pace, and take more time out for rest and relaxation. Considering the demands of the office, and the President's devotion to duty, that has been something easier to hope for than to achieve.

The country, extending its best wishes to Mr. Johnson, will look forward to his emergence from the hospital, a few days hence, completely recovered.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY FORMER NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL GOLDSTEIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein was installed as president of the American Friends of the Hebrew University last Sunday. Mr. Goldstein is one of New York's most distinguished citizens. He served the State as attorney general from 1942 to 1954 and was my immediate predecessor in that post. During his terms of office under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York moved forward and led the Nation, in many areas of government concern, including civil rights, education, and health. Also during that time, Mr. Goldstein was a leading figure in the National Association of Attorneys General. In addition to the bar, he has also distinguished himself in philanthropy and community service.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the acceptance speech of Attorney General Goldstein on the occasion of his installation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN OF NEW YORK, UPON HIS INDUCTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1965

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind introduction. May I also express my deep appreciation to the Minister of Commerce of the State of Israel, His Excellency, the Honorable Haim Zadok, for his most gracious remarks. Were I, in turn, to present him to you, I should characterize him succinctly as a brilliant lawyer, a superb public servant and, above all, a gentleman of the highest order.

I accept the indicia of office today with due humility, realizing the duty which goes with it and the accompanying obligation to that great citadel of learning, standing at the crossroads of the Middle East, in all of its majestic glory, beaming its rays of knowledge throughout the civilized world.

The Hebrew University performs a dual function. It supplies the professions to administer to the needs of the people of Israel, the scientists, the doctors, and the lawyers. It produces the teachers so essential to man the primary and secondary schools, for brick and mortar without teachers can be of no avail. I know I need not stress its importance, for it is self-evident and axiomatic.

For the next few minutes, I should, therefore, like to tell you what impelled me, with all of my manifold duties and obligations, to accept the presidency of the American Friends. It is inherent in the second great historic mission of the Hebrew University.

We are the people of the Book, and learning has sustained us throughout the ages, in all of our travail and suffering—and it is learning which can bring peace and tranquillity to the world.

Nuclear weaponry is not the answer, for in a span of 50 years we have fought and won two world wars, steeped in blood, sweat, and tears. Checkerboard diplomacy will not do it, for with all our statesmanship and diplomatic maneuvering, we find ourselves on the brink of world war III.

Knowledge, learning, education, and understanding must supply the tools, by which the human race can survive, in a world of plenty and splendor.

Unfortunately, America, the most powerful nation on earth, which has done so much good for so many people, has been unable to reach the underdeveloped and newly developed countries of Asia and Africa. Unless there is a rapport with them, I fear that mistrust and misunderstanding will continue. Unless we can infuse them with our democratic way of life, we shall be groping in the dark and in the abyss of dismal failure. We, who are living under the best form of government conceived by man, cannot transmit our good and our blessings to these people.

But there is one ray of hope. In an era when the use of force as a weapon in diplomacy has become an anachronism, the example of Israel stands forth as a guiding light. The diplomacy of economic and technical assistance waged so ably by Israel is doing much to win the hearts and the minds of the people of these developing countries. Dedicated young people trained by the Hebrew University are now practicing the diplomatic art and setting an example which the free countries of the world can follow and learn from.

Let me name a few specifics where the Hebrew University is now playing its important role, helping their Asian and African neighbors. There is, at the university, a unique program for training Africans in modern medicine, under the auspices of the World Health Organization, an arm of the United Nations. The program, now in its third year, will soon graduate the first group of physicians, who will return to their native lands in Africa and head hospitals, research centers, and, before long, be training physicians and technicians essential to the health of their people.

Similarly, there are African and Asian students in economics, social work, the law school, as well as in the multifaceted fields of modern science.

There is presently underway a newly created Institute for American Studies. Although less than a month old, this institute is teaching American history and an appreciation of the guiding principles of American democracy. I can think of no more direct channel to the consciousness of the people of the emerging nations than through the tutelage of another new democracy which has benefited so dramatically from the American experience.

This little State of Israel has been able, in a short time, to reach the eyes and the ears of these Asians and Africans. It has been able to gain their confidence and trust. And this little State, through the Hebrew University must be the catalyst by which these people can be reached.

To eradicate poverty of the body is all important, but to feed the poverty of the mind is also important, if we are to live in a world of rule by law.

We, in America, must provide the wherewithal, for the Hebrew University can supply the manpower and the brains. All that we are being asked for is dollars, and dollars, unless put to good use, lie fallow and helpless. This, believe me, my friends, is the cheapest insurance premium we can pay for the survival of civilization.

THE CIGARETTE ADVERTISING DOLLAR AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this year the Congress passed the Cigarette Labeling Act, requiring a hazardous warning statement on each cigarette package. The Congress declined to act favorably on the companion proposal to include a similar warning in all cigarette advertising. One of the reasons for this reluctance to act was the claim that the effects on consumption of the cigarette advertising were not known. As a useful contribution to this discussion, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Julian L. Simon, which appeared in the May 1964 issue of the Illinois Business Review, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING AND THE NATION'S WELFARE

(By Julian L. Simon, assistant professor of advertising)

The Federal Trade Commission is now holding hearings about whether cigarette companies should be required to post a "danger to health" warning on packs of cigarettes and in advertisements. These hearings are an outgrowth of the recent report by the Surgeon General on the health hazards of cigarette smoking.

Some individuals and groups, including Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and Consumers Union, favor the proposed regulation. Some want cigarette advertising prohibited completely. However, no responsible person has suggesting outlawing the manufacture or sale of cigarettes themselves.

People who oppose the warning proposal and the ban on advertising base their opposition on grounds of legality as well as of economics. This article will consider only the economics of a warning requirement or a ban. It will not consider other economic alternatives such as an increase in cigarette taxes.

I shall discuss the possible effects on cigarette use, and the consequent economic impacts of these two proposals on the groups that have a stake in what happens. Mostly, I shall talk about the ban on advertising, because its effect is better understood. The effect of a warning requirement would probably be much less than an advertising ban, but of the same general nature.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE CONSUMPTION RATE

Opponents of a warning or ban will say that forbidding cigarette advertising, or requiring a danger warning, will have "practically no effect" on consumption. Supporters of the warning, however, argue that advertising has a "substantial" effect in influencing people to start smoking, and in keeping them smoking. Where is the truth?

It is perfectly clear that advertising has the power to influence the purchase of particular brands of cigarettes. The $220 million spent annually for cigarette advertising is proof-positive of that. But we are not interested in the power of advertising to shift smokers from one brand to another. We want to know how cigarette advertising as a whole starts people smoking or keeps them smoking.

Neil Borden examined the role of cigarette advertising in the astounding growth of cigarette smoking starting about 1900, when the annual per capita consumption of cigarettes was 49. By 1962 the rate had risen to 3,958 cigarettes per capita. Borden did not say that advertising caused the rise in cigarette consumption. He argued that if

the public had not been ready to take up cigarette smoking, advertising could never have caused such a large increase in consumption. Nevertheless, Borden concluded that advertising was an important factor in the size and speed of increase in cigarette smoking.

But we want to know the effect of advertising now, when cigarette smoking is a very prevalent habit. We want to know what would happen if advertising were banned, or if a warning were required.

Robert Basmann carried out an intricate statistical study of the rise and fall in cigarette advertising from year to year in the United States, and its apparent effect on cigarette consumption. He found that for each 1 percent change in total cigarette advertising, the number of cigarettes smoked changed one-twentieth of 1 percent. In other words, the consumption of cigarettes is affected by the amount of advertising, but it takes a big change in the amount of advertising to make much of a difference in consumption. This is typical of an industry once it has become well established, but it may also result from the degree to which the smoking habit takes hold of people and the fact that nothing else is a good substitute for smoking.

What would happen if all cigarette advertising were cut off? An extension of Basmann's finding would suggest that if there had been no cigarette advertising last year, consumption would have been about 5 percent less than it was. If the ban on advertising continued, we might expect further decreases in the amount of consumption each year, but the absolute decrease would be less each year. These predictions are subject to many technical reservations, and they go far beyond the data. But they are the best that we can do at this time.

A required danger-warning in the ads would be a type of negative advertising. We cannot estimate how much the warning would cut smoking, but certainly the effect would not be as drastic as a ban on advertising, or no firm would continue to advertise. Our inability to come up with any better prediction is testimony to how little scientific knowledge we have about the effect of different forms of advertising copy. But it should certainly be possible to pretest ads that contain warnings, just as other ads are pretested, in order to obtain an estimate of the effect of a warning.

Now let us estimate the health effect of an advertising ban and the resulting reduction in cigarette consumption:

1. For each cigarette smoked, someone's life is shortened by 5 to 9 minutes. We shall figure 7 minutes per cigarette.

2. About 523 billion cigarettes were smoked last year. A decrease of 5 percent in consumption for just 1 year would mean an increase of human life in the United States of about 183 billion minutes, 349,000 years of life. Remember, this is the amount of lifetime increased by a decrease of 5 percent in smoking for just 1 year.

3. People who are kept from starting smoking will live, on the average, 5 years longer than if they had started smoking.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT AND LOCAL ECONOMIES

An estimated 225,000 people make a substantial part of their living in tobacco agriculture, earning approximately $600 million last year, of which about $450 million came from cigarettes. Some 31,000 factory workers earned $150 million last year from cigarette manufacture. In total, then, cigarette purchases put about $600 million into the pockets of workers and farmers. How will a ban or a warning affect them?

Notwithstanding the frantic reactions of Southern State officials, however, a drop in consumption would have no immediate effect on farm earnings, because of the Government subsidy program. Unless the Government removed the subsidy, the taxpayers at large, rather than the farm population, would take the loss. But let's assume that the subsidy would be cut.

If the subsidy were cut, the effect of a loss in earnings would probably be worse than the figures show, because the effect would be concentrated in a few States that are already economically backward. Many tobacco farmers are already poor and would find it hard to find new jobs. For example, North Carolina is an agricultural State and almost half of its farm income comes from tobacco.

Using our estimates above, employment and earnings would be cut by 5 percent at most during the first year of an advertising ban. In subsequent years, the further cut in jobs and/or dollars would be less. I say "5 percent at most" because there is good reason to believe that an important proportion of smokers who quit smoking cigarettes, or young people who never start, would use other forms of tobacco instead. The accompanying table shows that cigarettes largely replaced other forms of tobacco and did not create much new demand for tobacco. To the extent that smokers switch to pipe tobacco, cigars, chewing tobacco, and snuff, the damage to tobacco farming would be reduced, even though cigarette tobacco is a more expensive product than other types of tobacco.

Furthermore, some or many tobacco workers who are thrown out of work would get other jobs, so we are overestimating greatly when we assume that the equivalent of lost cigarette industry wages would be lost to the economy as a whole. But we assume the worst, or close to it, for the sake of argument. Later we shall look at the potential effects on employment again, when we consider the overall picture.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE COMPANIES

To understand the effect of a ban or a warning requirement on the cigarette companies, we must first understand the nature of advertising as a business investment.

When a firm spends a dollar in advertising a brand of cigarettes this year, the advertising bought with that dollar increases cigarette sales this year. But it also increases cigarette sales next year, and the year after, and in subesquent years. Customers get into the habit of buying a given brand, a habit that may continue for many years. To say it another way, a dollar of advertising may create some goodwill or brand loyalty that persists long into the future, though each year the effect of that single dollar of advertising is less than the year before. Cigarette advertising is really an investment, just like an investment in a new machine that will produce for many years after it is bought.

Lester Telser studied the pre-World War II cigarette market in considerable detail. He found that only 15 to 20 percent of the advertising investment is used up in the year in which the advertisements appear. This means that for each dollar of sales created in the advertising year, much more than $3 of sales will be created in subsequent years. (However, because of the chaos in the post-war cigarette market, investment is probably used up faster than Telser's estimate.)

Therefore, even if all cigarette advertising were stopped tomorrow, the established cigarette brands would continue to sell well for many years, though at continually diminishing rates. During that time the cigarette companies would be recouping the investments they have already made. Furthermore, since all the firms would have to stop advertising, the investments already made would not be used up as fast, which would give the cigarette companies a better return on their invested dollars than they expected to earn when they made the investments.

The total effect, then, would be that in future years the sales of any brand would gradually decrease. But the gross profits on a brand would be at a very high rate for a while, because the firm would not be making any further investment in advertising. The cigarette companies would have a fine opportunity to milk their brands for profit.

The cigarette companies already know how to milk a brand after they cease advertising it. For example, substantial quantities of nonfilter Old Golds have been sold in the last couple of years despite the fact that Lorillard practically quit advertising them.

If advertising were stopped, the cigarette companies would generate large amounts of cash each year, which they could either liquidate to stockholders or use to diversify. The former is not likely because of our tax structure and because no executive likes to liquidate himself out of a job. In the latter case, much of the capital would go to create new jobs in other industries.

Either way, I would guess that a cigarette stock would have a very solid value if advertising were banned. The same type of predictions would apply if a warning were required, but the effects would not be as sweeping.

EFFECT OF ADVERTISING MEDIA

The advertising media have already been hit by the Surgeon General's report. Some radio and television stations have voluntarily restricted cigarette advertising to certain hours of the day, while others have cut it off completely. Some magazines and papers have always refused to accept tobacco advertising, notably the Reader's Digest. And now the cigarette advertisers have set up an authority to regulate copy and media.

A warning requirement would not hit the media as hard as a ban, of course. But a warning that really affected consumption would make advertising less profitable for the firms, and they would therefore advertise less.

Television would lose more than $120 million in advertising revenue, about 7 percent of its total revenue last year. But that would not represent a dead loss to television stations and networks. Television time is limited, especially on networks, and the time is therefore rationed among potential advertisers. If cigarette advertising were banned, the television time could be sold to other advertisers, though at a somewhat lower price.

Television stations are charged with the public interest to a greater extent than are other communication media, because they are given a free franchise for a channel. This franchise gives them some monopoly power. Therefore, the television people should be particularly slow to complain about the loss of cigarette advertising revenue if it is in the public interest.

Radio would lose an estimated $20 million in cigarette advertising revenue, less than 3 percent of its total revenue. Other advertisers would not replace this revenue. But radio stations also have a free franchise granted by the public.

The $34 million loss to general and farm magazines would be a complete loss, about 7 percent of their total revenue. The magazines would not find other advertisers to replace cigarettes, and some magazines would feel a considerable strain. But since it would hit them all, they could all be expected to reduce their editorial cost somewhat, without fear of losing advertisers or circulation to competition. This might cushion the impact somewhat.

The $18 million lost to newspapers would be only one-half of 1 percent of their advertising revenue.

EFFECT ON ADVERTISING AGENCIES

The advertising agency business would take a beating if cigarette advertising were banned. Agencies would also be hurt if a warning were required, because in that case total cigarette advertising would decrease. Madison Avenue-type agencies would lose approximately $200 million billing of their total of perhaps $4 billion, about 5 percent

of their total. (Actually, only 15 percent of the $200 million—$30 million—stays with the agencies. The rest goes to the media.) Perhaps a thousand copywriters, account executives, and other agencies would be scurrying about looking for jobs, and the job market would be glutted for a while.

It is interesting to note that some major advertising agencies have said, after the Surgeon General's report came out, that they would refuse to handle cigarette advertising, because they now consider it immoral. Expectedly, none of those agencies now has a cigarette account. But their statements do mean something, nevertheless.

EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE

The total cigarette market is about $6.8 billion. Excluding taxes, the industry accounts for $3.6 billion, much less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

We have some evidence that Americans tend to spend a fairly constant percentage of their total yearly income, year after year. This suggests that a decrease in cigarette sales would lead to a compensating increase in other spending. If so, the effect on the economy as a whole would be lessened. Exactly how much the first impact would be, we cannot say. It would be somewhere between no effect and $180 million (5 percent of $3.6 billion).

On the other side of the ledger, the "multiplier effect" would magnify the ill effects of whatever decrease in spending does take place, by a factor of two or three. This effect is due to the spending of money again and again by people in the business chain. In other words, if people saved half of the $180 million drop in cigarette sales, the drop in national income would then be between $180 million and $270 million.

In any case, a small yearly decrease in cigarette sales and cigarette advertising, made even smaller by a shift to other forms of tobacco, would not be even a drop in the bucket for the economy as a whole.

Cigarette smoking does affect the Federal economy and the economies of the States and some cities, too, by way of taxes paid on cigarettes. Federal excise taxes amount to $2 billion, State taxes are above $1 billion, and municipal taxes are $40 million. These taxes are important to the tax-collecting bodies. But at first the loss would only be 5 percent of taxes that represent 2 percent of total government revenues. Furthermore, if taxes are not collected one way, they can be collected another way, at the same total cost to the public.

On the other hand, cigarettes may cost the economy far more than they contribute. Louis Lublin, a retired vice president of Metropolitan Life Insurance, estimates that cigarettes cost the Nation $10 billion annually in the lost services and earnings of men killed prematurely by cigarettes. My own estimate is a loss of more than $4 billion, based on 1.1 years of life lost by the average smoker before the age of 65, half of the men in the United States being smokers, and an annual payroll of $322 million.

In sum, then, we must balance the expected effects on health against the expected effects on employment and earnings.

Putting together our previous estimates, we can say that it takes a reduction of 880 cigarettes to produce a drop of $1 in tobacco-worker's earnings. And a drop of that many cigarettes means that someone's life expectancy goes up by 880 times; 7 minutes equals 104 hours. The drop in both consumption and earnings would be less in subsequent years. But they would stay in step with each other, so the same type of dollars-for-hours-of-life relationship would hold.

When we consider the $4 to $10 billion in earnings lost each year by men killed prematurely by cigarettes, it is clear that the country will gain more in live-men's earning power than it will lose in revenue. And, in fact, the gain in earning power for people kept alive by not smoking would be 10 to 20 times the loss in earning power of tobacco-industry workers.

Then, too, deaths caused by smoking decrease consumption spending. In the 104 hours lost by each dollar of cigarette-industry earnings, a live person would spend more than $20. This consumption spending is important to the economy.

This, then, is the decision that will eventually be made, if our assumptions are correct. Should the Nation decrease employment temporarily to gain 104 hours of life per dollar of earnings lost? Should the Nation reduce the tobacco industry revenue, gaining $2 in earnings from live men for each dollar decrease in tobacco industry revenue, and a gain of $10 to $20 in earnings of men kept alive for each dollar of tobacco workers' earnings lost?

CONCLUSION

There is much to gain, little to lose, by stopping the advertising of cigarettes. My chain of reasoning goes like this:

1. Advertising could be banned without prohibiting smoking;

2. A ban on advertising would bring about no boomerang noneconomic ill effects and the economy's overall vitality would hardly be affected;

3. A prohibition on cigarette production could have harsh repercussions, as with the prohibition of alcohol in the twenties;

4. There are other commodities (e.g., contraceptives, medical services, liquor on radio and television, and many others) that are sold but cannot be advertised, so this would be no new precedent; and

5. Therefore, let's ban cigarette advertising.

POSTSCRIPT

If the Nation wishes to decrease cigarette consumption, raising the tax on cigarettes is an obvious alternative or additional measure that might be taken. There is no doubt that fewer cigarettes will be bought if the price is higher. However, the tax would take a larger proportion of some people's income than of others. And if the price of cigarettes goes up, people will smoke the butts closer to the end. The more of a cigarette that is smoked, the more dangerous it rapidly becomes. So an increase in taxation may not be a good alternative solution.

DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN: ELWOOD HAYNES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in my home State, I had the pleasure to visit the Howard County Historical Society and witness the excellent work being done in Kokomo, Ind., to preserve a vital portion of our heritage.

During my trip I was reintroduced to the noted American—Elwood Haynes—whose place in the history of the automobile is well established and well known. His laurels, however, rest not alone with his gasoline automobile of 1894; Elwood Haynes is widely recognized for his activities ranging from industrialist, metallurgist, and inventor to educator and philanthropist. His accomplishments are numerous, and his contributions to these many fields are significant yet today.

Mr. President, it is fitting that the Howard County Historical Society should nominate Mr. Haynes for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans. He certainly merits consideration for such an honor. It is my hope, however, that the distinguished electors for this honor will not be alone in reviewing Mr. Haynes' record. It is important for all American citizens to come in contact with the achievements and qualities of greatness that inhere in men such as Elwood Haynes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of his life, prepared by the Howard County Historical Society, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ELWOOD HAYNES NOMINATED TO THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS

Elwood Haynes (1857–1925) was nominated by the Howard County Historical Society, Kokomo, Ind., for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, as inventor, scientist, metallurgist, industrialist, educator, and philanthropist. In nominating Mr. Haynes our thought was that he rightly belonged among the most notable men and women of the country. The nomination has been accepted by the Hall of Fame.

A brochure has been published to substantiate the claim, all facts being taken from Haynes papers now in possession of the historical society and other recognized authorities.

Judging from the bibliography mailed with the brochure to the 100 electors (two from each State) and the directors, we must conclude that the original Haynes car is his best known invention. This Haynes car is in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., labeled as follows:

"Gasoline automobile, built by Elwood Haynes in Kokomo, Ind., 1893–94. Successful trial trip made at a speed of 6 or 7 miles per hour, July 4, 1894. Gift of Elwood Haynes, 1910 (262–135)."

Mr. Haynes was the first to introduce aluminum in the automobile, a standard for automobile motors today, and first to use nickel steel in the automobile. He is credited as being the first to depart from the horseless carriage idea, since every part was made specifically for the car except the buggy seat and the horsepower Sintz marine upright 2-cycle gasoline engine. He also invented and built in 1903 a rotary gas valve engine. His place as a founder of the automobile industry is deserved.

However, "of the many industrial and social contributions of Elwood Haynes, perhaps the most significant may be his invention of the basic cobalt-base alloys. As a perpetual living memorial, his alloys are in use today. The need was so urgent and his provision was so complete that in many applications, no improvements have been necessary in his alloys after 60 years of effective and valuable use.

"The alloys known as Stellite alloy No. 4, Stellite alloy No. 6 (also 6B and 6K), Star J Metal and 98M2 are produced today throughout the world, exactly as invented by Elwood Haynes as early as 1899 and described in his patents granted in 1907 and 1913. These alloys continue to be valuable for use as cutting tools, well and mine drilling bits, bearing materials, and hand-facing for articles that must endure severe wear conditions: tractor plowshares, discs, machinery parts and the like. Several original Haynes alloys are in use in many modern severe-service applications: jet aircraft, nuclear energy installations, rocket motors and the like."

(Examples of the above are nuclear steamship, *Savannah*, alloy No. 6; nuclear submarine, alloy No. 1; Jet plane, No. 12; modern cars; manufactured diamonds No. 12; Snap 8, a compact experimental nuclear reactor using the more adaptable materials

commercially available, No. 6B. All these are late developments using Elwood Haynes' original formula—E.P.R.)

"In 1911 Elwood Haynes discovered some valuable properties in stainless steels and made significant improvements and advances in the art. His patent granted in 1915 based on his stainless steel improvements, was a foundation of the American Stainless Steel Corp. (about 1920) in Pittsburgh, Pa.

"In keeping with his characteristics as a benefactor and teacher, Mr. Haynes shared his knowledge and discoveries by publishing many technical papers disclosing his contributions to metallurgy." (Joe J. Phillips patents engineer, Steelite division, Union Carbide Corp., Kokomo, Ind.)

Of his lesser known contributions that should be mentioned are natural gas industry, education, philanthropy.

Natural gas industry: Elwood Haynes was manager of the Portland Natural Gas Co., Portland, Ind., 1886–90, at which time he became field superintendent of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., Chicago, Ill., with headquarters at Greentown, Ind. In 1886 Mr. Haynes invented a small vapor thermostat used on natural gas.

During Mr. Haynes' superintendency of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., "He found that the pipeline carrying gas to Chicago would freeze up in winter, and he decided to dry the gas to prevent the trouble. After considering chemical absorbents he made the proper choice of drying by refrigeration and designed a workable unit. At the time this was pioneer engineering. * * * considerable ingenuity was required. He found that this process not only removed the water vapor from the gas, but also condensed some of the lower boiling constituents and he was one of the first or perhaps the first to produce casing head gasoline. There was no market for this gasoline and it was dumped in an open space and allowed to evaporate." William A. Wissler, former director development and research, Haynes Stellite Co., served in research and development, Union Carbide Corp., Niagara Falls, N.Y. Presently retired.

In education Elwood Haynes was principal of the Portland High School 1883–84 and taught science in the Eastern Indiana Normal School in 1885–86, both in Portland, Ind., his birthplace. At the time of his death April 13, 1925, at his home, Elwood Haynes had been a member of Indiana Board of Education and a member of the Indiana Library Board since 1921. His special interest was vocational education. Some of his ideas are just now being initiated.

(NOTE.—Between his time as principal of the Portland High School and science professor at the Indiana Normal School he did postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins University in chemistry, biology, and German.)

The main areas of philanthrophy were the Presbyterian Church; the Worcester (Mass.) Polytechnic Institute; the Prohibition Party and movement. He was especially generous to struggling young churches of all denominations; small colleges and students needing assistance.

Other lesser known facts about Kokomo's famous inventor were his candidacy for the U.S. Senate in 1916 on the Prohibition ticket; the honorary LL.D. by Indiana University in 1922; the Liberty Ship No. 269 named for him January 26, 1944, from the Permanente Metals Corp., launched at Richmond, Calif. Mr. Haynes' alloys had significant use in World War I, II, and the Korean episode.

Many seem interested that his work in metallurgy started, when at 15 years of age, he succeeded in melting brass, cast iron, and high carbon steel, using furnace and blower of his own construction; also invented an apparatus for making hydrogen and another for oxygen.

His thesis at Worcester Polytechnic Institute was "The Effect of Tungsten on Iron and Steel." There, he also wrote both the words and music for the class ode, 1881.

Perhaps his greatest honor was the John Scott Medal given by the University of Pennsylvania, the American Philosophical Society, and the National Academy of Science, one of the highest awards given to a scientist of the United States.

The monument erected at the site of the trial run of the original Haynes car by the Indiana Historical Commission and the Hoosier State Automobile Association, dedicated in an elaborate ceremony July 4, 1922; the bronze plaque on the site where he invented and designed the first Haynes car and started work on the alloys; and the boulder marking the site of his birth, attest his contribution to the American way of life.

The Bernice Haynes Hillis family has purchased the Haynes House, now being renovated to receive the Haynes papers and collection, and "The Kokomo Firsts," a monument to Kokomo industry. The house is expected to be dedicated later this year. Come, visit Kokomo, Ind.

EOS PETTY RICHARDSON,
Curator, Howard County Museum.

A PLANNING MEETING FOR SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to speak Saturday, October 9, 1965, at the first planning meeting for the newly created Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. The meeting was held on Spruce Knob, near Elkins, W. Va., and was arranged by several national and State conservation clubs as a preliminary work session for the development of what will eventually become a 100,000-acre recreation center for the entire country.

The Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, was also present and spoke of the great contribution that can be made by conservation clubs to the recreation needs of the country.

I was happy to have the opportunity to trace some of the natural and legislative history of this new recreation area. I have long had a deep appreciation for the natural and scenic wonders of Spruce Knob and introduced legislation in the Senate in 1963 to reserve the area for public use. The Congress did not have an opportunity to act upon the measure in the 88th Congress, but I was pleased to reintroduce it during the opening days of the 89th Congress in January on behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH. It was later included by President Johnson in his message on natural beauty and was signed into law by the President on September 28, 1965.

I have also been active in securing appropriations for the purchase of lands within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, and, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I shall continue in my efforts to secure the necessary funds to implement the authorizing legislation and make the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area the No. 1 recreation spot for the tens of millions of Americans who live within a day's automobile travel.

I hope that each Member of Congress will some day visit Spruce Knob and I ask unanimous consent that my address to the members of the conservation clubs be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOOKING ON FROM SPRUCE KNOB

We gather here tonight because of our common interest in this area, which has now become the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. We will spend but a relatively short time talking about this area on this occasion. By contrast, it took nature millions of years to create it.

But we take these moments because we value this wonderful world of mountains, valleys, streams, and forests—a wonderful world that is far too rare in our crowded, mechanized society. We know how much we need such places. And, sadly, we know how easy it is for us to destroy them. Here in this magnificent region, we have a heritage of natural beauty that is ours to protect and use providently; or it is ours to destroy, if we ignore the lessons of the past.

But, wisely, we are not going to destroy our heritage. This meeting is evidence of a public determination that this portion of the Monongahela National Forest will remain, unspoiled, always to enrich the lives of those who come here. That determination, expressed through the active support of people such as you, is the force that has encouraged the Congress of the United States to designate these 100,000 acres in the highest, and a most beautiful, part of this State for public enjoyment. The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is now established by an act of Congress, and, I firmly believe, welcomed by all who seek to preserve a little more breathing space.

You are witness to the capacity of this region to fulfill its purpose for healthful outdoor recreation. Each year thousands of others share the same pleasures that you enjoy as you come to visit this region. People will continue to come—next weekend, next year, and the year after—in growing numbers.

Most of the visitors will come from among the 30 million people who live within 250 miles from here, chiefly from cities and towns, for this area is right next door to the most populous, most crowded part of the entire country. This is an area of great open spaces easily accessible to those who need open space the most.

But this is a national recreation area, not a regional one; and I want very definitely to emphasize the word "National." These mountains are a national asset. Thomas Jefferson wrote that the view at Harpers Ferry was worth a voyage across the Atlantic. Well, then, I will say that it is worth traveling a little farther to see the top of West Virginia, the Smoke Holes, and the great rocks standing above narrow valleys. Who here tonight would not recommend this region to any visitor searching for America's scenic grandeur?

With such a fine area as this now in public ownership, and managed in the public interest, I wonder if many people realize how close we came to losing it. The harsh details of the past have faded. The beautiful countryside shows little of a different kind of scene that was once all too apparent. It was a scene of waste and destruction. We might well remember that the spirit of conservation did not come easily to the mountains of West Virginia.

In the early part of this century, the ancient forests of these mountains were cut—without thought of new forests to replace the old—without thought of the needs of another generation. Timber was stripped to feed hungry mills; and, as part of this boom

period, the great sod areas were plowed up to grow food for loggers and millhands.

Then fire swept through cutover lands and destroyed healthy forests as well. Floods were spawned on denuded slopes and rolled down into the valleys with tragic regularity. Moreover, the location of many farms on steep slopes, on poor soil, only added to the ruin of the land.

At that time, no authority existed to protect or manage these lands in the public interest. There was no system of forest fire protection, no game management, no organized erosion control, none of the conservation measures so widely recognized today.

Fortunately, the abuse did not go unchallenged. Public protest found voice in a growing conservation movement, inspired by public-spirited Americans of national stature. People cared about the land then, as they do now. They wanted the land managed for all time, not just for a quick profit. And their concern was expressed in new laws and in government action.

One of the early conservation laws was the Weeks law of 1911. It provided authority by which 20 million acres of wornout, abused lands were brought under national forest production, mostly in the East where no public domain lands remained. It authorized the Federal Government to work with the States for forest fire control. Because of that law, the Federal Government—during the last 50 years—has purchased and restored more than 800,000 acres in West Virginia. We are standing on some of that land. These are among the acres we are now proud to call the Monongahela National Forest.

I think you will agree that the Monongahela National Forest is an effective monument to the conservation movement. It is particularly impressive when one considers the raw area with which the Forest Service started working. They used to call this the Monongahela National Burn—it looked that bad. But foresters went to work—and they were content to work for long-range goals, knowing that they might never live to see the end result of their labors. So here, on the Monongahela, they have gradually brought the land back. They planted trees, checked erosion, fought fires, and improved the fish and wildlife habitat. Bit by bit, they acquired land that needed better management. Today the crystal waters of Seneca Creek flow from the national forest, showing us what our Potomac River might again become. And, encouragingly, the work still goes on.

However, I need not dwell on the continuing struggle for conservation. Most of us are made aware of this by the abundance of manmade ugliness, by silt-choked streams, by endless urban sprawl, and by many signs of neglect or outright destruction of our greatest resources.

I shall dwell, rather, on what we have accomplished here in the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region. A law has been passed which I think we can call a milestone in West Virginia's quest for the golden fleece of tourism. Not only you and I, and the people of West Virginia, but also the people of the United States have recognized that we have something special here.

We can be grateful for that recognition, and proud, too, for it did not come automatically. Some years back, I looked for a means of drawing attention to Spruce Knob, the Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks. I found, happily, that many others shared my interest; therefore, in March of 1963, I introduced a bill in the Senate, in behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH, to establish this country as a national recreation area. The bill did not pass in the 88th Congress, so I introduced it again in the 89th. Subcommittees of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees held hearings. Support began to build up. President Johnson added his endorsement, specifically, mentioning this area as a "must" item in his message on natural beauty. The bill, S. 7, was finally passed by Congress on September 14 of this year, and, on September 28, President Johnson signed it into law.

Now that this law has been enacted, the question might well be asked, "What will we do with this area?" Quite appropriately, that is the question that appears to be on everyone's mind. With the national spotlight on Spruce Knob, it is very much on my mind as well.

In response, let me say that I believe this region to be in good hands—responsible hands. After all, the evidence is all around us.

First, let us consider that this region has been made a national recreation area because of what it is—not because of what we propose to do to it or with it. People come here, and will continue to come, because this is a magnificent realm of natural wonders.

Nevertheless, there will have to be some developments to accommodate the many visitors to the area. And that is what causes most of the concern at this moment. What sort of developments?

I would prefer to meet the question by looking at the provisions of the act that is now on the law books. Let us see just what the law has done.

First, it has placed the congressional stamp of approval on the management of this area for outdoor recreation. It has provided the spotlight for the area which it has so deserved—for a long time.

Second, it has provided a means of assuring that all of the conservation programs in this area will move ahead more rapidly—under the force of congressional sanction. This includes programs in all resource activities, with particular emphasis on scenic protection and outdoor recreation.

The act provides that the Forest Service will continue to manage the land, which is a vote of confidence for the way it has been handled so far. The Forest Service will continue to work closely with the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, and other groups interested in developing the full potential of this area for outdoor recreation.

There is a provision that deserves special mention: the overall size and boundaries. The area will total about 100,000 acres, which will include 4,000 acres not heretofore within the national forest boundaries. Since land acquisition will depend heavily on the land and water conservation fund, the act specifically makes these additional 4,000 acres eligible for acquisition by using these funds.

But the question of development remains. On the basis of congressional hearings and conferences with Forest Service officials, I believe I can look ahead and give you some idea of what I foresee.

One of the first jobs is going to be the acquisition of key tracts of land, either through full Government title or in the form of easements. Already 40,000 of the 100,000 acres are federally owned. Full development will require acquisition of title or easements on another 45,000 acres—privately owned land within the national forest. The Forest Service has indicated that approximately 60 percent of this remaining acreage will eventually be owned by the Government. Scenic or conservation easements will be used as much as possible to protect the appearances of the landscape and to continue many of the present compatible uses, such as certain types of farming, grazing, and timber management.

The physical developments of this area will move ahead concurrently with land acquisition. It will provide basic facilities to accommodate 1 million visitors by 1970 and will eventually have a capacity to serve 5 million visitors a year.

What sort of facilities? More of the same, properly located, giving each of the many types of users the kind of recreation he seeks. There will be scenic roads and overlooks for those traveling by car. There will be campgrounds, picnic areas, and related facilities. There will also be rugged back country for those who want less of civilization's trimmings. Rock climbers and cave explorers will continue to enjoy this country. The clear headwaters of the South Branch will continue to provide pleasure for whitewater canoeists and fishermen alike.

I consider the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area as one of the best investments that this Nation can make in its public lands. We will be making needed capital improvements in an outstanding area adjacent to the populous northeastern and midwestern regions.

In West Virginia, the development of this area will have definite benefits for the surrounding communities—and I think such an area as this should contribute something tangible to the lives of its people. The building of roads, trails, campgrounds, and picnic areas will provide jobs in an area that for too long has had too few jobs. The continued development of other resources, such as timber and wildlife, will require willing workers.

But beyond the benefits of direct Federal employment, this area will attract a growing number of visitors who will stimulate local trade through their purchase of goods and services. Many visitors will want the comforts of home, so they will look for motels, restaurants, and resort facilities which will be provided by private enterprise in the surrounding area. Even those who choose the more rugged outdoor life will need gas, food, ammunition, fishing tackle, and many other such items that can be provided locally.

Economic benefits are not, of course, the only ones that West Virginia will receive. The greatest benefit will be the enjoyment of the national recreation area—a benefit available to everyone regardless of where he lives. People will come here, not so much because of new motels or clean campgrounds, but because the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region is one of the most magnificent examples of mountain scenery in the Appalachian region. They will come—and come again—everyone finding something to enjoy according to individual interests. They will hunt. They will camp. They will fish. Or perhaps they may just sit and listen to the wind in the trees.

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area will be the place to come to absorb the majesty of West Virginia—the place to see and feel the world as it ought to be. This is the essence of what West Virginia will soon offer to the citizens of our Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of October 7, 1965.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S OPERATION

It's inevitable that the illness of a President will be cause for not only some sincere public concern but for a good deal of political flap. But taken on the whole, it strikes us that Mr. Johnson has sensibly acted to minimize the one and avoid the worst of the other.

Faced with a gall bladder operation, he had two choices. He could have slipped quietly into the hospital, had his operation and said nothing about it until it was all over. Secrecy about the President's health has not

been unknown in the past. President Cleveland underwent surgery while in office and the public learned of it only long afterwards; President Roosevelt ran for reelection when all but the public knew he was seriously ill.

President Johnson chose instead to follow the example of President Eisenhower, who saw that the public was fully informed after his heart attack and his abdominal surgery. Everybody knows about Mr. Johnson's illness, its cause and the planned remedy, even the day of the operation.

For one practical thing, this puts a check on the rumor mill and avoids the surely unsettling effects from a dramatic and unexpected announcement after the event that the President of the United States had been operated upon. Beyond that, it has the virtue of treating people as adults, not as children to be shielded from the fact that a President can suffer the ills all of us are heir to.

The candor will not remove the concern with which everyone will await word from the hospital tomorrow. It should, if people react in adult fashion, keep that concern in perspective and dampen the political disturbance. A small point, perhaps; but in contrast with the past, one not without its importance.

SALUTE TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. JOHNSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the passage of the highway beautification bill seems to me to be a most fitting conclusion for this great Congress. I think it is one of the brightest stars in the crown of achievement of the Johnson administration. It is a tribute not only to the vision of a great President and a hard-working, constructive Congress, but it is especially a tribute to the First Lady of our land, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. President, the United States is fortunate that we have in Mrs. Johnson a woman of rare intelligence and dedication to the public interest. Her dream of a more beautiful America may very well be one of the most enduring monuments of the 1960's. Through her tireless efforts, her travels, her public statements and her numerous related activities, she has added a dynamic new dimension to "America, the Beautiful."

I think it is regrettable that a few Members of the other legislative body, instead of discussing the merits of highway beautification, utilized their allotted discussion time for some scoffing comments about the First Lady's concern for the quality and beauty of our countryside. These gentlemen not only delayed action with irrelevant attacks on the highway beautification bill, but they also created a needless delay which made Members of the House of Representatives miss one of the most stirring and dramatic evenings I have ever experienced—the President's salute to Congress.

I would like to take this occasion to salute both President Johnson and his gallant lady for the inspiring vision of America that they have held up to us all. We are about to complete the most constructive and impressive legislative session in American history. Much of the credit for that accomplishment belongs properly to the President. All of this has been accomplished at a time when the administration was grievously burdened with dangerous and difficult foreign policy crises, including the war in Vietnam. While I have not always agreed with every aspect of our foreign policy in recent years, I have developed a growing appreciation for President Johnson's long-rang commitment to peace.

My prayers are with him in that commitment and for his speedy recovery and return to the White House.

PROPOSED MEDICAL TRAINING FOR ARCTIC DOCTORS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a story appeared in the Anchorage Times for September 15 announcing that a committee of the American Academy of General Practice was recommending a special training program for doctors who will be practicing in the Arctic regions of Alaska. The practice of medicine in the Arctic is complicated by many factors. Dr. Carroll L. Witten, of Louisville, Ky., president of the academy, chose a particularly apt phrase to describe one of the complications. He said that Alaska has many peculiar problems as to the size and availability of villages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Anchorage Times be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that Congress will better understand the recommendations soon to be made to the Surgeon General.

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

MEDIC TEAM TO ASK BUSH AREA TRAINING

The recommendation which would provide a 2-year training program to qualify physicians to practice in remote regions of Alaska is being advanced by a committee from the American Academy of General Practice.

The committee which will present its recommendations to the Division of Indian Health in Washington is composed of Dr. Edward J. Kowalewski, Akron, Pa., chairman; Dr. Carroll L. Witten, Louisville, Ky., president of the academy and consultant to the Surgeon General; Dr. Paul S. Read, Omaha, Nebr., and Dr. Herman E. Drill, Hoskins, Minn.

Dr. Kowalewski said the new program would provide new or additional services to interior Alaska, and also would relieve the Alaska Native Hospital of an overflowing number of patients.

Twelve to sixteen volunteer physicians would be trained at the hospital and in the bush, then would remain at an assigned area. Many times the physician would be the only doctor in a wide area of Alaska.

Another recommendation by the committee would provide volunteer help to replace doctors who presently are practicing in remote areas but cannot leave because no other physician's services would be available.

The volunteer help would allow the regular physician to take 3 or 4 weeks to brush up on new advances in medicine and to take a vacation from his duties.

In a third recommendation, the committee would increase the number of Health Aid program volunteers who are operating in remote Alaska. The volunteers, which have been serving Alaska nearly 28 years, are young people trained to recognize symptoms of patients and to radio the information to a central station.

A physician then prescribes medicines which the volunteer has available. The system is under the direction of the Public Health Service.

"We were very impressed with the proficiency of medical care in Alaska," said Dr. Witten, "even though Alaska has many peculiar problems as to size and availability of villages.

"The Health Aid service is especially well developed, and we are recommending that these volunteers be commended both publicly and officially."

SUPPORT FOR UNDERGROUND TRANSMISSION LINES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I recently introduced two measures, S. 2507 and S. 2508, to promote research and development into an economic and practical program of burying underground transmission lines. An article in the September 27 issue of the trade magazine Electrical World reviews the interest generated by my proposals within the utility industry and the appropriate departments and agencies of the Johnson administration. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HOW MUCH R. & D. FOR BURIED TRANSMISSION?—EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE CREATES TASK FORCE TO CONSIDER STEPPING UP EXTRA HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE PROGRAM—FEDERAL AGENCIES WEIGH RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT'S PLEA

The investor-owned utility industry is seriously considering stepping up its R. & D. program in underground transmission. At the same time, Federal agencies are pondering their next step in response to President Johnson's call for accelerated research in this area. But there are questions all around as to just what the President is after and what direction industry and Government efforts will take.

At a meeting September 9, the Edison Electric Institute Board approved creation of a task force that would suggest ways for accelerating the extra high voltage cable research and development program now being conducted by the Edison Electric Institute Transmission and Distribution Committee. The new task force is also directed to consider the feasibility of an expanded research activity relating to both a.c. and d.c. cable in the extra high voltage range. The Edison Electric Institute Board is asking the new group to come up with cost data on an expanded program by December.

Announcement of Edison Electric Institute's action carried no reference to President Johnson's statement of August 24 in which he reported that he had instructed his science adviser, Dr. Donald Horning, "to work with the appropriate Federal Departments and agencies to speed our research into the technology of placing high voltage lines underground." The statement was issued at the time the President signed the bill permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to build overhead transmission lines to serve its Standard Linear Accelerator Center.

Also in the statement, Johnson said, "I have instructed the AEC to give great weight to the natural environment in constructing the line, including not only the design of the poles but to their location and to the clearing operations." A vertical configuration on metal poles has been proposed for the 220-kilovolt Stanford line.

Acting on the President's instructions, Horning has talked with the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department on spurring underground transmission research. But neither Hornig nor the agencies has seen fit to disclose the nature or content of these conversations.

Yet, there is talk among Government power men of the possibility that the administration may begin a drive this year for legis-

lation to authorize research, development, and demonstration projects on underground transmission. Measures along these lines have previously been introduced in the House by Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. The Ottinger bill (H.R. 10514) calls for a $30 million program; the Neuberger bill (S. 2508) calls for a $150 million research program.

There is some feeling at Interior that no big push on underground transmission R. & D. can be mounted without a new appropriation such as would be authorized under terms of the Ottinger or Neuberger bills. While relatively little attention has been paid to these bills up to now, they would assume significance if chosen as an administration vehicle for expanding Federal effort in the underground transmission field.

Meanwhile, at FPC, the industry task force on underground transmission continues its work. A report is expected from this group early next year. It is looking into research only in a general way—being concerned specifically with such matters as: (1) Finding ways to express underground transmission terminology in layman's language so utilities can discuss the situation with Government leaders at local and other levels; (2) determining the state of the art; (3) determining the economics of overhead versus underground lines; (4) defining the relation of underground costs to overall utility costs as these apply to individual power bills.

The FPC effort at this time appears more concerned with determining costs and evaluating applications. Interior seems more concerned with initiating some type of research and development program.

Earlier this year, a three-man Interior team (Special Research Assistant Morgan Dubrow, Reclamation Engineer Ted Mermel, and Bonneville Power Administration Engineer Eugene Starr) reviewed underground, but this was aimed directly at what should be done about the controversial 345-kilovolt lines from the Cornwall pumped-storage plant in New York. That group decided it would be uneconomic to mount a campaign to urge that the lines be buried. The recommendation went directly to the White House for the President's consideration.

Informed observers in Washington think there is a likelihood that hearings may begin before the end of the year on underground transmission. But just what form such hearings take, and in what forum they will be conducted depends on what President Johnson and his administration are after. If hearings are not conducted this year due to the impending adjournment of Congress, then these observers look for a real push early next year.

Comment on the industry role in the larger natural beauty campaign came from still another administration source in recent weeks. Speaking before a gathering of conservationists groups in Wyoming, the President's wife made passing reference to several contributions made toward improving the appearance of utility installations.

BIG BROTHER IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE: EDITORIALS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently I have received a large number of editorials dealing with the curbing of Big Brother in the Internal Revenue Service. All of the articles, with the exception of one, are critical of the IRS practices exposed by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in recent hearings.

In the interest of fairness, I wish to bring some of the more outstanding editorials to public attention—both favorable and unfavorable.

I ask unanimous consent to have the one critical and seven favorable articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Recorder, Aug. 2, 1965]

WIRETAP EVIDENCE

The Internal Revenue Service admits it has resorted to the use of wiretaps, hidden microphones, and two-way mirrors while investigating suspected tax frauds. But it insists such tactics have been limited to the campaign against organized crime and never in probes of ordinary taxpayers.

Neither the IRS nor the average American citizen condones trickery. But the fact remains that income tax violations constitute about the only charges against racketeers that result in conviction.

The record proves that it is difficult to obtain evidence against organized racketeering. Informers must be able to identify criminals without being seen, and the devices being used by the IRS appear to be the only way of accomplishing that.

So either the Government employs available techniques to break up crime rings or permits them to operate unmolested. Of the two choices this allows, we think the IRS has made the right one.

[From the Progressive, Sept. 1965]

Due process still has its champions in the Congress of the United States, wiretapping is frowned upon, and illegal searches and seizures are condemned. This is our hopeful conclusion after observing Senator EDWARD V. LONG's investigation of illicit surveillance techniques employed by the intelligence division of the Internal Revenue Service. We would be more encouraged still if LONG's Senate Judiciary Subcommittee were to go on to scrutinize the practices of the sacrosanct FBI and the score or so of other Federal agencies that maintain their own police and intelligence forces. Incursions into the rights of alleged tax evaders seem to strike a more responsive chord than assaults on the liberties of other citizens.

This is not to suggest that IRS was unworthy of the subcommittee's attention. On the basis of testimony taken by LONG and his colleagues, the Treasury's electronics devices school is clearly one of the more advanced educational institutions of its type. IRS apparently operates its blacklight scopes, concealed recorders, two-way mirrors, and wiretapping gear with a deftness worthy of 007 or the Man from U.N.C.L.E.

The philosophy of the Service's operatives, on the other hand, seem to be more reminiscent of Dick Tracy or Little Orphan Annie. When Senator LONG asked O. Burke Yung, who teaches at the electronics devices school, whether questions of guilt and innocence should not be decided by juries rather than agents, Yung protested that he had taken an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, and that he believed he had done so.

We were not present when Yung and his fellow agents took their oath of office, but if it followed the usual Federal form, it called on them to uphold the Constitution as well as to defend it.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, July 31, 1965]

MORE IRS SNOOPING

A Senate subcommittee investigating Government invasions of privacy goes on piling up evidence that the Internal Revenue Service is one of the worst offenders. Some might argue that the IRS, after all, does its snooping in a good cause and thus should be leniently judged. What this argument boils down to is a contention that collecting money for Uncle Sam's coffers justifies violating the safeguards written into the Constitution. We do not think so.

The argument is even thinner than that. For snooping devices, electronic and otherwise, do not necessarily make the difference between catching or not catching an income tax evader; often they are simply an easier way of doing the job.

At one recent hearing, an IRS agent testified that on orders he broke into the home of a Boston tavern owner to sneak a look at what was believed to be a vault in the basement. The vault turned out to be a cedar clothes closet, but that makes no difference so far as the IRS method is concerned. The agent broke the law; both in spirit and letter, he violated one of our most honored traditions—that a man's home is his castle, not to be entered without a warrant. The agent's testimony that he also observed the tavern owner's wife through a long-range snooperscope while she was sunning herself merely adds to the distastefulness of the whole proceeding.

Yet this was a comparatively mild and simple invasion of privacy. Hearings have brought to light instances of eavesdropping with various electronic devices. Such gadgets, and the even more sophisticated ones likely to be developed, pose a serious threat to individual privacy. The Government simply has no business using them, in violation of the law, no matter how laudable its purpose.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Aug. 10, 1965]

CONTROLLING TAX SNOOPS

When it comes to collecting taxes, it seems clear that some agents and officials of the Internal Revenue Service do not consider themselves bound by such trivialities as fairness or citizens' rights to privacy. A Senate judiciary committee under Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat of Missouri, is continuing to turn up evidence of an "anything goes" philosophy in the IRS, including its use of hidden microphones and two-way mirrors in supposedly private conference rooms.

LONG said Sheldon S. Cohen, Internal Revenue Commissioner, had given him a list of 22 cities across the Nation—Chicago was one—in which the IRS had bugged conference rooms, and 10 cities in which the trick mirrors had been used. (These gimmicks look like normal mirrors from the front, but allow an observer behind to watch everything going on in a room.)

LONG has denounced such snooping practices by Federal agencies as unnecessary invasions of privacy—which of course they are. But there is a further consideration that makes it particularly important to stop them.

It is that Federal agencies seem to adopt these practices without a qualm as long as they are not specifically forbidden by law. Such abstract ideas as "right to privacy" plainly have no power to keep such an agency from using any method it can to get information, as long as the method has not been forbidden by name.

In short, we'd better not expect the IRS or any similar Government body to police its own methods. The tax men are out to do a job, and will not deny themselves any useful tool in doing it. The policing will be up to Congress and the courts—and we hope Senator LONG's findings will prompt them to tighten controls on Government snooping.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram & Sun, Aug. 11, 1965]

BUGS IN THE PHONE BOOTH

Of all the disclosures emerging from a Senate subcommittee inquiry into Governmental wiretapping, perhaps the damnedest

yet is the admission by the Miami Chief of Intelligence for the Internal Revenue Service that agents had bugged a public telephone booth and recorded all conversations.

The reason? The booth had been used often by a suspected bookmaker.

So, in the process, all other dialogs rippling across the wires were also eavesdropped by big brother.

A Senator asked the Miami sleuth if it wasn't a moral, if not legal, violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion. The witness paused, then said yes, he guessed it was.

Obviously this bugging business has gone beyond all bounds of necessity, sense, or taste. Out of the Senate hearings had better come some stern restraints on electronic snooping, Government style.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Aug. 11, 1965]

U.S. AGENCIES NEED RULES ON SNOOPING

Although confession may be good for the soul, it is hardly sufficient for the Internal Revenue Service and other Government agencies that have engaged in a surprising amount of wiretapping, use of two-way mirrors, and other secret techniques in overzealous efforts to keep the public honest.

The latest disclosure is that the IRS since 1958 had installed and sometimes used two-way mirrors and hidden microphones in 26 cities. Yet, by what authority were these widespread installations made, and what real steps have been taken to prevent their use again? The answers thus far have been few.

Apparently the former IRS Commissioner, Mortimer M. Caplin, had developed an eager group of antiracketeer specialists who reported directly to Washington and who were not closely supervised by district and regional directors. Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating these things, said some agents abused this freedom by engaging in illegal wiretapping. Then the present Commissioner, Sheldon Cohen, ordered his local directors to assume close supervision of the racket investigations.

But simply closer supervision at a lesser level is not a satisfactory deterrent, for it is rather unlikely that some local IRS officials were not aware of this organized spying. Explicit legislative or administrative controls, with procedures that will back check on their enforcement and leave no doubt about their meaning, are what is lacking.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Aug. 16, 1965]

"BUGS" IN THE REVENUE SERVICE

Under the prodding of a Senate subcommittee, the Internal Revenue Service now acknowledges that it has made a widespread practice of spying and snooping on citizens. In at least 22 cities, IRS offices had bugged conference rooms, and at least 10 instances of two-way mirrors were uncovered.

It is small comfort to be told that the hidden microphones in Chicago and other cities "were not used on the average taxpayer," but only in investigating organized crime. The mikes were there, and the chance remarks of any unsuspecting visitor to the conference rooms could have been recorded.

The practice of eavesdropping spread in spite of instructions to the contrary from the top levels of Government. It came to light only because of the persistent digging of Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri. Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, head of the IRS, "was not aware of the extent to which these devices were used," said a spokesman.

The insidious growth of such practices in a supposedly free society is shocking and degrading. We expect this sort of spying on citizens in a police state, but not in America. And the lengthening list of bugged rooms eloquently supports the proposition that wiretapping is an evil that, once begun, all too easily gets out of hand.

If the IRS needs broader powers to investigate tax evasion and assist in the war on organized crime, let it seek and use such powers openly, if it can justify them to the public. But until or unless it gets such powers, the agents who have been playing "big brother" should have their knuckles rapped.

[From the Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C., Sept. 8, 1965]

IT'S TIME TO UNBUG

The Internal Revenue Service has informed Senator EDWARD V. LONG that it's going to stop doing what it should never have been doing in the first place.

In a letter to the Missouri Democrat, who is in charge of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigating the ofttimes illegal spying by Federal agents, especially revenuers, into the lives of private citizens, IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen has revealed the names of cities in which the agency had installed various surveilliance gadgets in its conference rooms.

In 10 cities, including Greenville, S.C., and Montgomery, Ala., agents had been using two-way mirrors with which they could watch taxpayers without themselves being watched.

In 21 cities, also including Montgomery, concealed microphones had been placed so that the agents could hear without being overheard. Not a very pretty picture. And not very legal, either. The privacy of communications between a lawyer and his client is supposed to be respected, even by investigators looking for evidence of illegal activities.

Now the IRS says it will unbug its conference rooms. This is, we suppose, progress, and perhaps we should be grateful, but we can't help wondering what other malpractices Senator LONG's subcommittee is going to uncover.

The IRS seems to be "hooked" on wiretapping, even though the agency knows and the agents know that wiretapping evidence can't be used in Federal courts and can even ruin a case that's based on it. The IRS is under Presidential orders to kick the habit, but the attitude of some of its agents suggests that won't be easy. In Miami, Fla., the other day, the longtime head of the agency's intelligence division there confessed to Senator LONG that his agents had bugged a public telephone and recorded all conversations from the booth.

"Was this not a moral, if not a legal violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion?" the Missouri Democrat asked. "Yes," replied the division chief after a long pause, "I guess it was."

And a Pittsburgh, Pa., special agent asked if he hadn't felt embarrassed about his illegal entrance into a private citizen's office to plant an illegal bug, replied: "I never gave it a thought."

No one ought to be allowed to get away with evading his taxes. But no one either should be allowed to get away with evading the letter or spirit of the laws, and that includes in particular those sworn to uphold them. "Criminal prosecution," said the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, "should not be deemed a dirty game in which 'the dirty business' of criminals is outwitted by 'the dirty business' of law officers."

If IRS agents or any other governmental officers at any level flout the law they breed contempt for the law, and if anything may truly be called subversive this is it.

PRESIDENT RENEWS THE FLAME

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the torch of freedom must eternally be rekindled with acts of justice.

The recent signing of the immigration bill was such an act, and it was fitting that this should be done by the colossal statue, designed by Bartholdi, and presented by the people of France on the 100th anniversary of American independence.

Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty is well known:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

In the beginning, of course, there was unlimited immigration to this country.

Then, shortly after World War I, immigration was definitely restricted.

Immigrants numbered over 1 million in 1910. Very few came during the war. By 1920, over 400,000 were admitted.

Then a national policy of strict limitation was adopted.

Immigrants, except those from the Western Hemisphere, were admitted only in definite quotas from each country.

When signing the new bill, President Johnson said the old system represented a "harsh injustice," that the system violated the basic principle of our democracy, the principle that values and rewards each man on the basis of his merit as a man.

Now, "Those who come will come because of what they are—not because of the land from which they sprung."

PULASKI DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 10, I was privileged to attend the parade and banquet honoring Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski in Wilmington, Del.

This celebration annually highlights the contribution that General Pulaski made to this country and the continuing contributions that have been made by Americans of Polish descent.

At this year's celebration the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish-American Congress adopted a resolution. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be included as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas in a rapidly changing and increasingly chaotic world, we must cling to the fundamental principles among nations, those of freedom and justice, and we should feel it our duty to restore them where they are missing, and

Whereas inspired by the thought of Casimir Pulaski's life who came to this land to help other people in their struggle for freedom and finally sacrificed his life for their cause and common ideals: we, Americans of Polish descent, assembled in the afternoon

of October 10, 1965, at the Pulaski Triangle in Wilmington, Del., at a meeting held on the occasion of celebrations in memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress; and mindful that, because of our origin, our opinion on the chaotic world affairs can be of service to our country, the United States of America, and to our leaders,

Resolved, That in any policy adopted toward Eastern Europe in general and toward Poland in particular, a distinction should be made between the countries and their rulers who may have been imposed by force on the peoples concerned, and that the policy of "building bridges" should be referred to the people and not to their governments;

That, while endorsing the above policy, it cannot accomplish a great deal without a resolute diplomatic action at an opportune moment;

That, any agreements with Soviet Russia, who may be pressured by circumstances to come to terms with us, should be preceded by restoration of freedom to the people of Poland deprived of it by Russia after World War II;

That the recognition of the present border between Germany and Poland on the Oder and Neisse Rivers will not change the "de facto" status of the questionable territories as they are populated by Poles, integrated with Poland and regarded as a return of previous national possessions of Poland; and that such recognition will become a factor in helping the Poles release themselves from the Communist yoke, and of arresting the encouragement of German revisionism, a reaction increasingly strong in Germany;

That the celebrations of Poland's millennium of christianity during the next year will be an occasion for our country to emphasize our links with Poland and to demonstrate our common cultural heritage, and that such celebrations will give the people of Poland hope and courage toward attaining so greatly desired and so greatly deserved freedom from oppression; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Delaware Senators and Representative to Congress, the Governor of the State of Delaware, and the U.S. Ambassador to Poland, to whom we extend our wishes of success on his new appointment.

For the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress.

ADAM J. ROSIAK, *President*
ANGELA C. TUROCHY,
Corresponding Secretary.

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN AMERICAN BOTTOMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Friday, October 8, 11 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], wrote a letter to the President of the United States, which was subsequently released to the press, advocating that the 50-percent requirement of shipments of wheat in American bottoms to certain Communist countries, including the Soviet Union, should be revoked administratively.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 7, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodies in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do no know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, FRANK CARLSON.

AN AWARD FOR DR. WEAVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, swiftly moving events in the realms of science and math are among the most spectacular and noteworthy achievements of our age.

We all experience a thrill when we hear of great discoveries in the laboratory or major explorations in the world of numbers. Yet, the new vocabulary, the unusual terms have little meaning for too many people. In fact, they are denied any real understanding of the most exciting ideas of our time—that stimulate the scientific community to produce even more of the same.

Dr. Warren Weaver is a rare human being. A mathematician and benefactor of the sciences, he not only understands and contributes to these ideas, but he also eases the plight of the interested public that wants to reach for comprehension but needs the services of an understanding interpreter.

Last week the Pacific Science Center Foundation awarded Dr. Weaver the Arches of Science Award "for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man." This prize acknowledges the fact that so many people are indebted to Dr. Weaver. Those of us who are interested—but uninitiated—are at least a little wiser for his efforts to make the achievements of science and mathematics more comprehensible.

Naturally, I am proud that Dr. Weaver is a resident of New Milford, Conn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Science World Honors Weaver," which appeared on October 6 in the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SCIENCE WORLD HONORS WEAVER

(By Earl Ubell)

For more than 30 years, Dr. Warren Weaver has played Alice to the crazy wonderland. As the public has viewed the mysterious goings on, he has tried to make sense out of it and helped others to make sense out of it, too. He had more luck than Alice did.

Yesterday the public and the scientists rewarded the sharp-witted shaper of science who is at once a mathematician, a science benefactor, a writer, an orginator, a needler, and an expert devotee to the lore and writings of Lewis Carroll: They gave him the $25,000 Arches of Science Award for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man.

STUNNED

Dr. Weaver took the whole proceedings at the Overseas Press Club with cheerful astonishment. All he had been doing for the last three decades was giving away a few million dollars to scientists through the Rockefeller and Sloane Foundations, starting science television programs, writing science books for bright children, cajoling newspaper editors to cover science, increasing the number of science writers, and saving a little time to start a new field of mathematics—information theory.

"I was so stunned when I could not say one single word," he said at a press conference.

There he was, playing Alice again. In Carroll's masterpiece, Alice had just presented all the animals with prizes as equal winners in a caucus race. The dodo bird, however, insisted that Alice get a prize herself—a thimble.

"The dodo solemnly presented the thimble, saying, 'We beg your acceptance of this elegant thimble,' and when it had finished this short speech, they all cheered. Alice thought the whole thing very absurd but they all looked so grave that she did not dare laugh,

and as she could think of nothing to say, she simply bowed, and took the thimble looking as solemn as she could."

ESSENTIAL

Dr. Weaver was not entirely dumb. He reserved to his wife the right of disposal of his prize, which he gets in Seattle on October 25. It was put up by the Pacific Northwest Telephone Co., and awarded by the Pacific Science Center Foundation. He also said he was leaving for Paris to pick up an international award: the Kalinga Prize, given for the popularization of science.

He also pointed out that he hardly thought the Arches of Science prize was absurd:

"It is essential that we today have individuals who are willing to live their lives partly within science and also partly within the world of affairs. These persons, working at the interface of science and society are more than useful—they have become essential."

He said he hoped the Arches of Science prize would be a stimulation to such people.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, representatives of various States recently met in Kansas City, Mo., to discuss the role of the Federal Government in education. An incisive editorial from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard points out graduate education particularly as being in need of a comprehensive Federal program.

It also warns that "50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as 1 Federal program."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Register-Guard editorial.

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

TOO MUCH FOR THE STATES TO COPE WITH

Thursday and Friday, representatives of most States will meet in Kansas City, Mo., to talk about a compact for education. It is the brainchild of Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina. The Governor shares with others concern over the increasing role of the Federal Government in education. Governor Sanford and friends have taken note of the warning of James Bryant Conant, former president of Harvard and America's education elder statesman, who has warned of a "tangled mess that no one can straighten out" in Federal education programs. The State representatives will try to get control back into their own hands.

Good luck. Unfortunately, however, they are likely to find that 50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as one Federal program. And one increasingly troublesome area of higher education must eventually become the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. That is graduate education, the cause of major problems in Oregon this year.

Sooner or later State legislatures must decide to what extent individual States are willing and able to provide the highly expensive kind of education that leads to Ph. D. degrees. Sooner or later, legislatures will discover that there is little relationhsip between what a State contributes to the national Ph. D. force and what it gets from it. For the American graduate student is one of the most mobile persons on earth. Only rarely does he stay in the State where he earned his graduate degree.

Many State schools discourage their graduates from taking advanced degrees on the campuses where they earned their B.A.'s. Also, many refuse to hire their own Ph. D.'s. There is a reason for this. The schools want to prevent inbreeding, believing that it is as beneficial to get a teacher into a new environment as it is to get a student away from home. That's one of the ways we become a nation instead of a bunch of regions. Therefore, it is not unusual for a native of Utah to get his bachelor's degree in Utah, his Ph. D. in Oregon and then to teach in California or Arizona.

The tendency of the educated to move away from home begins with high school. The more education a person has the more likely he is to forsake his hometown for the big city and a big job, or the more likely he is to flee his home in the city for less populous regions where he can grow with the country. Among Ph. D.'s only 1 out of 5 lives in the State where he got his degree.

Oregon is still a debtor State in this regard. We import two Ph. D.'s, mostly professors, for every one we train and send away. Washington imports 1½ for every one it sends out. California, with its vast educational plant to train and consume Ph. D.'s, breaks even, as do North Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Iowa, however, train five for every one they import. Importing five for every one they train are Maine, Pennsylvania, and some Southern States.

Plainly, legislatures will someday look at the benefit-to-cost ratio. Oregon's will not be the first to do so. For Oregon is still benefiting. But even in Oregon, the national problem can be seen. At the University of Oregon from 1961 to 1964, undergraduate enrollment increased by 1,774 students, or 20.2 percent. But in the same period, graduate enrollment increased by 974 students, or 64.7 percent. And this graduate enrollment was costly—in money, in teaching time, and in critically short space.

Not only are more students attending college, but more are deciding that commencement is just that, only the beginning. State representatives in Kansas City may find they can make some arrangements among themselves to help out. But in the long run, they're going to have to grant that graduate education, as we now know it, should be as much a Federal as a State responsibility.

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM: THE PACE BETWEEN FOOD AND PEOPLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cover of the October 4, 1965 issue of U.S. News & World Report, is headlined "The World's Biggest Problem." This heading is explained in an excellent article pointing up the challenge to mankind posed by the acceleration of population and the strain on future world food supplies. The editors of U.S. News & World Report have been on top of this problem for some time. Their first issue of 1964—January 6—carried a cover story headlined "Why Hunger Is To Be The World's No. 1 Problem." This well-informed earlier report which was based in considerable part on the findings of the Department of Agriculture's brilliant Dr. Lester Brown was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at my request following an address to the Senate on this theme, September 23, 1965.

Believing that the editors of U.S. News are performing an invaluable service to the Nation and to the world in giving attention to the vital problems of food supplies and world population, I ask unanimous consent that the article of October 4, 1965, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM—HOW EXPERTS SEE IT

How can the world feed all its people, at the rate the population is growing?

That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

A look at what's happening shows why experts are worried. The human race is doubling in numbers every 35 years. That means the food supply must be doubled, too—in just 35 years.

Can that be done? Or is famine ahead?

For United States, it means a new challenge. And officials already are moving to meet it.

Startling facts that dramatize the world's biggest problem are brought to light by an international industrial conference sponsored by Stanford Research Institute and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The problem is this:

In the next 35 years, the world's population, now about 3.3 billion, will skyrocket to about 6 billion—almost doubling by the year 2000.

Biggest population increases—more than 100 percent—will come in the less developed nations, where population already is pressing severely against food supply.

Smallest increases—about 40 percent—will come in the well-fed, industrial nations best able to handle growth.

These United Nations estimates of future population are conservative. Actual increases may prove to be much higher.

The story of what these figures mean was reported by experts at the conference, held in San Francisco in September.

NEEDED: TWICE AS MUCH FOOD

The drama of the population story is this:

The world, even now, is facing a food problem. Diets are inadequate in the huge underdeveloped areas of the world, which include almost all of Asia and Africa and most of Latin America.

Just to maintain the present inadequate level of diet will require a virtual doubling of the world's output of food in the next 35 years.

This vast increase in food production must be achieved at a time when nearly all of the virgin lands of the world already have been brought into production.

There is no assurance that the job can be done in time.

Great famine, as a result, could be the outlook.

This warning is voiced by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University and onetime chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportion as to threaten the peace and stability of the western world."

SPEEDUP IN POPULATION GROWTH

But, it is asked: Hasn't the world always found a way to feed its ever-growing population?

The answer, according to the exports, is that the problem today is far more complex than at any time in the past.

For one thing, population growth is faster now—and getting faster all the time. Dr. Butz paints this picture:

"At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million.

"In the next 16 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600.

"Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion.

"In the less than two-thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again.

"Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again.

"The astonishing fact is that the human race is currently doubling in numbers every 35 years.

"Obviously, this rate of growth cannot persist indefinitely, because of the sheer limitation of space and food."

Complicating the problem is the fact that food production is not increasing as fast as the population. Dr. Butz reports this:

"The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years.

"Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in a serious decline."

WHERE FOOD CRISES LOOM

The drama of the food problem that lies ahead will center in the following areas: Latin America, Asia, Africa.

Latin America's population in the next 35 years will zoom 157 percent—from 245 million people now to 630 million people by the year 2000.

Even now, Latin America as a whole is compelled to import food to feed its own people. The only Latin American countries classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having adequate diets are Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ahead, for Latin America, is the problem of finding food for 385 million more people within 35 years.

Asia, which already holds 55 percent of the world's population, is expected to show a rise of 89 percent in population in the next 35 years, up from 1.8 billion now to about 3.4 billion in the year 2000.

Here, too, is an area that must import food to live. Today Red China is forced to buy grain in large quantities. The millions of India are heavily dependent on food supplies from the United States. Few Asian nations are able to provide their people an adequate diet.

Asia's problem, loaded with potential for future tragedy, is where to find food for the 1.6 billion additional people that it must feed 35 years hence.

Or take the case of Africa, heading for a population growth of 151 percent in the remainder of this century. Only South Africa, in this whole vast continent, is classified as having an adequate diet today. Africa, already importing food, faces the problem of feeding 466 added millions by 2000.

Taken all together, the hungry countries of the world—those considered by experts to have deficient diets—now contain about two-thirds of the world's population but produce only about one-third of the world's food. And it is almost exactly these hungry areas that face the biggest population growth in the years ahead.

A TURN IN THE FOOD FLOW

What makes the food problem even worse is the decline of underdeveloped areas as food producers. Only a generation ago, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the more advanced countries, especially to Europe.

Now the food flow is reversed. The underdeveloped areas that once grew more food than they ate now must import food from the developed nations.

The reason is that food production in those hungry, underdeveloped areas is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with the increase in population. From 1953 to 1963, there was an actual drop in the amount of food produced locally per person in the underdeveloped regions.

DILEMMA OF THE WEST

Here's a problem for the free world: Communist countries, including Red China, face a smaller population explosion than non-Communist countries.

The outlook, as analyzed by the experts, is that the population in the Communist world will grow about 49 percent while the population in the free world will grow about 98 percent between now and the year 2000.

What this means is that growing food problems could fan agitation for revolution in areas not now Communist.

OVERCROWDING

Not only food but living space will become a serious problem in the population explosion ahead. Even now, many parts of the world are overcrowded. The following figures show the density of population in 1965 and the density expected by 2000:

Population per square mile

	1965	*2000*
Asia	108	202
Africa	26	65
Europe	167	192
Latin America	31	78
North America	26	41
Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, etc.)	5	10

As these figures show, North America will continue to be a part of the world that offers its inhabitants the most elbowroom. But even Americans will begin to feel crowded.

NOTE OF HOPE, TOO

One hopeful note is sounded by the experts: The world is not likely to run out of essential fuels or industrial materials in this century.

Sir John Cockcroft, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1951 and now master of Churchill College at Cambridge, England, told the conference:

Reserves of coal, oil, gas, and uranium will be adequate to provide increasing amounts of power for many years.

By the time uranium supplies run out—if they ever do—man will know how to extract energy from water.

Industry will have to turn to lower grade sources of raw materials. But the ocean floor may yield large quantities of manganese, copper, nickel and cobalt. And plastics will be improved to replace metals in many uses.

A WATER SHORTAGE?

Water, in the crowded world of the future, looms as a problem almost as serious as that of food. Sir John Cockcroft discusses the water situation in these words:

"Water supplies could be a limitation on the development of the economy, especially water supplies for industrial and agricultural use, since requirements are likely to double in the next 20 years. The future of Asia, Africa, and Australia could be vitally affected by water shortage, and even in some parts of the United States this is becoming a problem.

"Desalination of brackish and sea water may help in some areas of the world, especially if combined with less wasteful methods of using water for agriculture and the development of plant varieties which require less water."

WHAT EXPERTS BELIEVE

Is there an answer to the worlds biggest problem? Two things must be done, say the experts:

1. Increase food production greatly.
2. Reduce the world's birth rate.

"In the long run," says Dr. Butz, "say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution."

But Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, of Toyko University, warns:

"The control of population growth, although it might become a kind of necessity in the future, cannot be depended upon too much now as the major means of adjusting the unbalanced food and population relationship.

"As the adoption of birth control among the developing nations will presuppose a raised standard of living, a wider diffusion of general education, as well as a changed mental outlook, it will certainly take many years to come. During this time, the predicted crisis will not stop approaching.

"It will be a race between the two, and our prospect of winning the race is not too bright at present.

"So we have to turn our attention toward the increase of food production."

U.S. ROLE IN FOOD BATTLE

The United States, it is clear, will play a leading role in the coming battle to feed the world.

This country produces so much surplus food that the official policy has been to limit grain production.

Now official thinking is beginning to change.

On September 23, a new policy was proposed by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former Director of the food-for-peace program. He told the U.S. Senate:

"The most overwhelming paradox of our time is to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production. * * *

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger. * * * We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food-producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential."

A bill has been introduced by Senator MCGOVERN which would authorize the Federal Government to buy American-produced food to give to hungry nations or to sell to them at bargain prices. Other countries also would be given help in improving their own food production.

President Johnson is known to be thinking about the world food problem. He has expressed his conviction that the United States cannot remain secure as an island of abundance in a world full of starving people.

The time is seen approaching when U.S. farmers will be asked to spur food production—instead of curb it.

THE CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

Can the United States really feed the world of the future?

"The opportunity for increased food production on the North American Continent is tremendous," says Dr Butz, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

However, he points out: "We can add only a limited supply of additional arable land. We can get some additional food from the sea—but here again we face practical limits.

"The only practical alternative available to us is the accelerated application of capital and technology to our own agricultural system in an effort substantially to increase output per acre and per man."

This also is pointed out by the experts: United States and Canada themselves face a population growth of about 64 percent in the next 35 years. Those additional people will take a large part of any increase in production.

Feeding a population the size of that foreseen by 2000 is going to be a job too big for any one country. Yet, for the United States, says Dr. Butz: "There is no realistic alternative for us except to gear up to meet this challenge."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM—BREAKTHROUGH IN BIRTH CONTROL: ANSWER TO POPULATION EXPLOSION?

As birth rates soar—governments, in the United States and elsewhere, are moving into "family planning" as never before.

It's a big break with the past. And the story is just beginning to unfold.

Birth control is breaking more and more into the open as governments begin to look for ways to curb the world's population explosion.

Japan, in the years after World War II, was the first nation to go in for birth control on a massive scale. There it was considered a success in causing population to level off.

Now other countries are moving rapidly in the same direction.

India has opened a factory to produce an intrauterine device—itself a revolution in birth-control technique. Goal is a supply for 20 million users by 1970.

In Latin America, predominantly Roman Catholic, Chile has started making birth-control services available to the poor, and private clinics are flourishing in Brazil.

Korea, Tunisia, and other countries are in the midst of birth-control campaigns, or are planning them.

In the United States the Government is taking a greatly changed attitude toward the idea of supporting birth-control programs at home and abroad.

As recently as 1959, President Eisenhower rejected the idea of Government support for birth-control programs abroad.

Laws in most States prohibiting distribution of birth-control information or devices were seldom enforced—but efforts to get them repealed met with repeated failure.

Today, by contrast—

The Child Health and Human Development Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service is spending about $6 million for research on human reproduction, much of it related to the search for universally effective and acceptable methods of "family planning."

The Department of the Interior is offering birth-control services on Indian reservations, in Pacific Trust Territories, and to Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in Alaska.

Birth control is becoming part of the "war on poverty," too.

St. Louis and Buffalo, for example, are getting Federal money for birth-control clinics, publicly or privately operated, as part of their overall grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity, subject to meeting specific conditions aimed at minimizing controversy.

Expansion of Federal activity in this field already is being mapped.

A "RIGHT" FOR PARENTS

On September 9, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, head of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that family planning services should be available as a "right" to all parents. She added:

"The conviction has grown that education and instruction in effective family planning should be an essential component of both the health and welfare agencies * * * for dependent families."

State and local governments, meanwhile, have started moving in the same direction.

In the last 2 years, 12 States have removed, in whole or in part, legal barriers to the distribution of birth control information and devices.

Twenty-seven States and the District of Columbia are offering family planning advice as part of their maternal-care programs for the poor. In a dozen other States, local tax money is going into birth control programs.

In addition, birth control services are being offered free of charge, or at nominal cost to more and more people by the 275 privately run clinics of the Planned Parenthood Federation.

Last year this organization reported a 44 percent increase in its caseload over the previous year.

BIG PROBLEM: THE POOR

The family planning campaign is being centered on America's poor—who are found, on the average, to have larger families than others, with less ability to support them or raise them properly.

Public officials, worried by soaring welfare costs of more than $1 billion a year for dependent children alone, are attracted to the idea of making birth control aid available to the poor.

This availability, it is stressed, would leave individual parents free to accept or reject family planning—and, if they accept, to decide which method to use.

In Illinois, where 65,000 illegitimate children are on welfare, the legislature this year extended birth control aid to any mother, married or unmarried, who is 15 years of age or older and on public welfare.

Chicago's Board of Health, since March, has been prescribing oral contraceptives for women applying at 7 of its 34 clinics.

New York City operates eight clinics in slums. Detroit and San Francisco recently launched municipally run clinics for indigent women seeking birth control help. In Washington, D.C., where 1 in every 5 births is illegitimate, about 8,000 women over the past 12 months have received birth control services at public hospitals from funds that were provided by Congress.

Just what impact such programs are having is being debated widely.

It is the claim of Planned Parenthood that an intensive campaign in one slum area of Chicago brought a 25-percent decline in the birth rate between 1960 and 1965. In North Carolina's Mecklenburg County, a birth control project involving 180 women, each getting relief money for 5 or more children, reduced pregnancies to zero after a few years.

On the other hand, Detroit's health commissioner, Dr. John J. Hanlon, reported that response so far to the municipal birth control program was "not as great as we expected." He explained:

"Basically, we are dealing with the most indigent, who suffer from a lack of education. There is a cultural lag. They have to become aware of the advantages of limiting the number of dependents."

WATCHING AN EXPERIMENT

Population experts are closely watching the outcome of studies in Corpus Christi, Tex., where Planned Parenthood has been running a central clinic for 6 years and now is setting up "satellite" clinics in neighborhoods with the help of $8,500 in Federal funds.

To date, studies show this:

The number of live births to indigent parents at the charity clinic in Corpus Christi declined 24 percent between 1961 and 1964.

Postabortion treatments at this hospital declined from 374 to 224 during that period.

At present, obstetrical cases of all kinds at the charity hospital are running at about 60 percent of the rate of 1963, the year before the birth control center began distributing oral contraceptives on a large scale.

HELP FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Federal funds to support birth control programs soon are to start flowing abroad, too.

President Johnson last January promised that "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population * * *." In August, he urged United Nations delegates to "act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth."

Word has gone out to foreign governments that the United States will consider all requests for aid except for the providing of contraceptives themselves. Assistance could be given, for instance, to a nation in the training of family planning workers, in research, or in the purchase of mobile clinics and other equipment to be used in birth control programs.

Foreign governments, at the present time, are drawing up applications for U.S. aid on birth control programs—and advance signs are that the number of such requests will not be small.

Korea, which hopes to reduce its rate of population growth from 2.9 percent to 2 percent by 1971, has already made a big start in plans to distribute a million intrauterine devices.

Formosa, where a birth control drive already is well under way in the cities, expects to extend it to the countryside.

India, despair of the world's population experts, is just beginning a mass campaign to reduce the number of births from 40 per 1,000 to about 25 by the early 1970's. That would make a sizable dent in the present baby crop, estimated at 14 million births a year.

Before the war between India and Pakistan, the latter also had plans for a birth control drive that was to require substantial U.S. aid.

Tunisia is mapping a large-scale campaign to reduce births—the first Arab nation to do so. Turkey, which recently repealed a ban on contraceptives, is to apply for large amounts of American help.

Even Latin America, where the subject is highly controversial, is getting into birth-control programs.

Chile, already offering contraceptive devices to the poor in cities, soon expects to extend that service to peasants in the countryside.

In Peru, the Ministry of Public Health and Social Assistance has set up a population-study center that is seen as leading, almost inevitably, into a campaign to promote birth control.

In Brazil, privately operated clinics offering help on birth control are functioning in cities—some with the support of Catholic priests behind the scenes. Numerous churchmen are privately encouraging family-planning promoters to go ahead with any type of contraceptive that seems effective.

Communist nations, too, are joining in the worldwide rush to curb explosive population growth.

East Germany is quietly liberalizing restrictions on abortion, and plans to manufacture oral contraceptives. In Red China, oral contraceptives are beginning to make an appearance, amid signs that the Communist leadership intends to intensify its drive against early marriages and childbearing.

BRINGING PRICES DOWN

Technical developments are accelerating the worldwide movement toward birth control.

Until a few years ago, the contraceptives then available seemed impractical for mass campaigns. Even the oral contraceptive, which must be taken for 20 consecutive days

at a cost of $25 or more a year, was not popular among slum dwellers and peasants of low income, literacy, and responsibility.

Legalized abortion, largely responsible for bringing Japan's population growth almost to a standstill, is being used in Red China and Eastern Europe—but elsewhere is making little headway. Sterilization, in India and some other nations, is found to require more physicians than usually are available in such countries.

In that situation, the appearance of intrauterine devices is considered of major importance to mass programs of birth control.

One type of device, made of plastic and shaped like a double S, can be manufactured in Asia to sell for about 2 cents—and, once inserted by a physician, can remain indefinitely in about 75 percent of the cases. Satisfactorily in place, it is found to prevent conception in 98 or 99 percent of its users.

What is also giving a push to Government programs to curb birth rates is growing worry about the population crisis.

Former President Eisenhower, once opposed to Government action in this field, is publicly urging that the Government assume a more active role. Congressmen who once considered the birth-control issue "political dynamite" are considering a bill that would establish "population offices" in two departments of the President's Cabinet.

Early this year, a Gallup poll reported that 78 percent of Catholics questioned believed that birth control should be made available to anyone wanting it. This was a substantial increase over the 53 percent noted in a June 1963 poll.

In Chicago, it was Catholic politicians who led the way for approval of that city's birth-control program. In Massachusetts, Richard Cardinal Cushing urged repeal of that State's law against birth control, although the legislature voted against repeal.

A RELIGIOUS VIEWPOINT

For Catholics themselves, church teaching is that "artificial contraception" is immoral. The "rhythm method"—abstinence from marital relations during a woman's fertile period—is cited as the only permissible method of regulating family size.

Some Catholic scholars are calling for a reexamination of this stand. Pope Paul VI, after getting the report of a papal commission, is expected to make a pronouncement on the subject soon.

In the meantime, much debate is building up among Catholics on the growing role of governments.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing U.S. Catholic bishops, approved a statement to Congressmen asserting: "If the power and prestige of government is placed behind programs aimed at providing birth-control services to the poor, coercion necessarily results and violations of human privacy become inevitable. * * *"

On the other hand, some prelates are endorsing this view, given last year by the Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of Boston College's law school:

"The exploding population of the world * * * and the tragedy of more than 1 billion human beings living on a substandard diet can hardly be said to be a problem on which the modern state can be neutral by being inactive."

This much is becoming clear:

Technically and politically, governments are finding that many obstacles to the launching of mass programs of birth control are being removed.

Programs already underway are far from solving the world's population worries. In America itself, for instance, best estimates are that birth control for the poor is reaching 10 percent of 5 million impoverished women.

Even so, population experts say that the situation today is far different from what it was 2 or 3 years ago—and that even bigger changes are likely to come in years just ahead.

SBA REGIONAL COUNSEL FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, earlier this year Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, established Alaska as a region in itself, and Robert E. Butler, an outstanding Alaskan, was named regional director. This was one more step Mr. Foley took to aid in Alaska's economic development. Few public servants have brought as much vigor and imagination to their jobs as Mr. Foley did for SBA and now will in his new position as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

Today I can announce that a final step in making Alaska a full region has been taken. The positions of regional counsel and assistant regional counsel have been established in the Anchorage office.

This is an important, indeed, a vital step in permitting the Small Business Administration to operate as it should. Until now all loans had to be closed in Seattle. By road, Seattle is over 2,500 miles away from Anchorage, the city where most of the business activity takes place. The establishment of Alaska as a region in permitting the Anchorage regional office to operate as a region should be a demonstration of the fact that Alaska is growing and growing at a rapid pace. The Small Business Administration is playing an essential role in the growth of the State and I want to take this opportunity to commend all of those in SBA who have contributed so much.

THE HUNGER OF CHILDREN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, despite efforts to fight hunger around the world, Latin America faces the severe crisis of population growth racing ahead of food production. The extent of the problem is often difficult to envision. An article in Today's Health poignantly sketches the urgency of coming to grips with the widespread hunger in parts of the lands to the south. It places in perspective the efforts now being made to overcome hunger and how far behind the problem these efforts are. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a portion of this excellent article by Gwen Schultz.

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

A new baby can bring into a home bright hope of happiness ahead. But in a rueful number of Latin American families hope shrivels all too soon to sorrow—sorrow caused by malnutrition. That insidious "hidden hunger," whose easiest victims are children and whose confederates are poverty, illiteracy, and out-of-control birth rates, is rampant in large parts of Central and South America. A defense as simple as a balanced diet could rout it, but still its menace grows.

In those lands there are far too many tiny coffins carried to cemeteries, too many little bodies dwarfed and distorted, too many baby smiles that fade into irritable frowns, sparkling eyes that dull with disinterest or stop seeing altogether, and energies that flag into limp apathy.

Why have Americans, renowned as militant hunger-fighters around the world, tolerated this mass misery in their own backyard? Their earnings go generously to governmental agencies, the United Nations, universities, churches, and various other organizations which assiduously attack hunger in underdeveloped areas. Every day an average of five 10,000-ton ships leaves the United States carrying food-for-peace around the world. Then why isn't hunger in our hemisphere whipped into retreat? It is, but not everywhere and not fast enough.

Of all the world's major regions, Latin America has the highest rate of population growth. It has had the highest rate in every decade since 1920. Between 1920 and 1960, while the United States and Canada increased 72 percent and south Asia 85 percent, Latin America zoomed up 136 percent. By the year 2000, its present population, if unchecked, will triple and in some areas it will quadruple while the world as a whole only doubles.

Latin America's food production must increase faster than population if hunger is to diminish, but it is not even keeping pace. There, where population growth is the fastest in the world, agricultural production per capita has paradoxically been decreasing. Children are produced faster than food to feed them.

The food shortage may seem unrealistic in view of the large grain and meat exports from South America. But these come from the pampas of Argentina and Uruguay, a region much like the North American Corn Belt but smaller in area. In all of Latin America this is the only first-class agricultural region of any important size, and these are the only two countries that have an ample food supply.

The Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP) recently investigated the deaths of children aged 1 to 4 in several Guatemalan villages. Civil registers indicated malnutrition was the cause of only 1 of 109 deaths in a given period. INCAP investigators, reexamining the cases, clearly determined that not 1 but 40 were due to malnutrition.

This surreptitious killer has escaped detection, too, because its method of operation has not been fully understood, even in medical circles. For decades the need for minerals and vitamins has been explored, and we know that severe deficiencies of certain of them still cause numerous cases of anemia, blindness, scurvy, rickets, pellagra, and other illnesses in underdeveloped areas like Latin America. Now medical science is advancing into another nutritional realm. It has put the finger on the world's most critical childhood deficiency—protein, particularly high-quality protein found in animal foods such as meat, milk, fish, eggs, cheese, and butter. These vital foods do not keep well in farm climate; they are high priced, and besides, taboos and superstitions prohibiting their consumption by children are widespread.

Marasmus and kwashiorkor—still unfamiliar words probably; but these are the two most destructive childhood diseases of underdeveloped tropical and subtropical areas. Protein shortage is a factor in both. Marasmus afflicts children under 1 year of age; kwashiorkor afflicts those somewhat older. These two diseases, somewhat allied, often merge with one another. The infant with marasmus has a wasted, "skin-and-bones" look. Eating little but watery gruels, he is literally starving. If he survives he will in time be fed more calories but still not enough protein. Then, usually following an infectious disease, kwashiorkor will be superimposed upon the marasmus condition.

Protein deficiency diseases are curable if treated in time. Skimmed milk, mixed from

dry milk powder, has proved highly successful in recovery and preventive diets. Mothers are being encouraged to use an inexpensive milk substitute, Incaparina (named for its developer INCAP), where it is available. A formula mixture of corn, sorghum, cottonseed flour, yeast, calcium carbonate, and vitamin A, it contains protein of good quality although no animal protein.

The basic use for Incaparina is as a gruel for infants and for older children. Presently, considerable thought is being given to special ways of incorporating it into the diet of children beyond the age when they will eat whatever is placed before them.

Fish flour can be a boon to low-protein diets. Said to be the world's cheapest, richest potential source of high-quality protein when properly prepared, it keeps and ships well and can be made tasteless and odorless. Waters off the coasts of Peru and Chile are excellent for fishing. The annual catch of Peru alone is about 7 million tons, most of which is now exported as fertilizer and food for animals.

Fish flour has been produced for experimental studies in both these countries. They could become manufacturers of this product for human consumption.

Many Latin American governments have, since 1956, taken advantage of the offer of the U.S. Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Development (earlier called the Committee for National Defense) to collaborate in assessing the nutritional state of their countries. Health teams from the United States work with local personnel, examining individuals, sampling food from home kitchens, analyzing food distribution, and determining ways to improve the country's nutrition.

The white hospital ship *Hope* (health opportunity for people everywhere) has docked at Peru and Ecuador during her worldwide mercy voyages, and next year will drop anchor at Nicaragua. Her staffs on ship and on shore conduct health education programs. Her milk plant, said to be equal to 2,500 cows, reconstitutes dry milk. To obtain it, mothers must attend nutrition classes. Edith S. Clark, *Hope*'s director of nursing, says that one mother was so grateful for the improvement in her baby that she tried to give it to a *Hope* worker.

Many devoted hands and minds are at work. But their effect in this enormous, craving land is a light sprinkle of raindrops, vitalizing spots here and there, when what is needed really is a saturating flood.

Education could be that flood. About 45 percent of Latin America is illiterate. School enrollments are far below what they should be.

Operation Ninos (ninos means children), the food-for-peace child-feeding program, is luring children to school with snacks and lunches. Begun in 1954, the project uses food from the United States. Through volunteer agencies, local governments, and teachers, it now helps feed one-third of Latin America's schoolchildren, serving them as little as a cup of milk or as much as a full hot meal. Some school kitchens are no more than an oven formed by three stones. The workers' instruction manual indicates the rudimentary level on which the program operates:

"A sturdy aluminum cup is an all-purpose utensil that will stand up under hard treatment. A spoon can later be provided to eat food from the cup if this seems desirable and funds permit."

Although recipes are not exactly the gourmet type, they are planned with good nutrition in mind: bulgar wheat pilaf, peanut soup, cornmeal fruit pudding, cereal pie with meat, molasses milk.

By serving milk and food in schools, malnutrition and illiteracy are attacked simultaneously. Hungry students are inattentive and learn slowly.

Parents who never sent their children to school before now want them to go. School lunches are credited with doubling rural school attendance in Peru, cutting absenteeism in Bolivia from 38 to 2 percent, and adding 8 pounds in 4 months to third-graders in Chile. Many youngsters get their only wholesome meals, their only milk, at school.

A questioning of Brazilian students revealed that for breakfast 2 out of 10 had nothing, 3 had just coffee, 4 had bread and coffee, and only 1 had more than that. Now a basic meal is enjoyed by 3 million schoolchildren in that country and by 12 million in Latin America as a whole. Gardens kept by students demonstrate home gardening methods and provide vegetables for the meals.

Health centers, mobile units, and river boats reach children who are not in school and—just as important—they reach their parents, who may need education too. Some mothers, tied to tradition, lose two or three children before daring to try new lifesaving foods. Some tell their sons that only sissies drink milk. Some paint their breasts with vile-tasting substance to repel their infants.

A farmer may sell his eggs, chickens, or milk (protein desperately needed by his children) to buy larger caloric quantities of food. Corn, rice, wheat, potatoes, cassava, beans—these satisfy hunger for a low price. If he slaughters one of his few precious animals it is likely to be prime one, leaving the scrawnier ones for breeding. Andean farmers are repeatedly told, "Eat the small potatoes and use the big ones for seed," but they do just the opposite. Can farmers at starvation's brink gamble with alien methods which some tall stranger assures them will pay off in the future?

There may still be skeptics who think, "Things can't really be as dismal as all that." Surely, a farmer with initiative, who cannot make a go of it in one place can move elsewhere, for Latin America is still in the pioneer stage—a big, beautiful, thinly settled land. However, the best land is already under production, much in large ranches and plantations. Ninety percent of the agricultural land is owned by 10 percent of the landowners. About a third of Latin America is dry. Mountains rumple Central America and western South America, and much more land is dissected badly. The luxuriant rain forests? Deceptively infertile. Soils are leached and eroded by year-round rains, and clearings are overrun with insects and weeds. What marginal land remains is far from market and requires energy—as well as capital—to develop.

Yes, the destitute farmer can leave his wornout plot of ground—even though several children are buried there; even though he cannot read; even though he has no money and his wife is pregnant; even though his creativeness is dulled by the drugging coca leaf used since childhood to deaden hunger pangs, or by alcohol, or the greater depressant, failure.

Why not go to the big city? Latin America has 10 cities over a million, several over 3 million. With their modern architecture, bustling thoroughfares, and handsome, healthy people they beckon promisingly. Work must be there.

But throngs of other farmers are migrating to cities too. Unskilled, illiterate, and poor, they cannot easily find jobs or even a place to live. In magnificent Caracas, a metropolis of more than a million and a half, 65 percent of the inhabitants are squatters. On the farm a family might have had access to some vegetables, fruits, and animals, but here with little money they are restricted even more to starchy staples. And poverty does not prevent children from being born.

Urbanization is accelerating. Fewer hands are left on the farms. If farmers do increase their yields their own families can in most cases consume the increase. Incomes of unskilled city workers are pitifully low. There is less food to be bought and little to buy it with. Should a family's income rise, many things beside proteins and vitamins must be paid for—clothes, a home, furnishings, a few luxuries—and so the diet remains meager.

The skeptic still has reason to doubt the extent of the children's suffering when he looks at the vital statistics. It is true that death rates of Latin American children are dropping dramatically. For instance, from about 1948 to 1962 the infant montality rate (deaths of infants under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births) dropped from 102 to 70 in Mexico, from 78 to 42 in Puerto Rico, from 147 to 117 in Chile, from 105 to 70 in British Honduras. But these are still high compared with United States' 25, Canada's 28, and the United Kingdom's 22. Goals are set to bring these rates lower still.

To conduct a health program in a hungry land without increasing food supplies proportionately is to invite disaster. And disaster is at the door. Each saved life is an added drain on the available food. Yet who would even think of retarding medical and technical progress? Plans are to step it up.

We see the ironic truth: The more we help, the worse the hunger situation becomes.

Death rates fall fast. Birth rates remain frighteningly high in a fertile, youthful population. No wonder there is panic at the prospect. Ultimately, we trust, all countries will find a way to feed themselves properly, but what of the meantime? It is the children who will suffer most.

Some look to industrialization as the quick solution because it can increase a nation's buying power while it lowers birth rates. Japan and Great Britain are often cited as classic examples of countries where industrialization solved the overpopulation problem. But no nation has successfully industrialized without first having had a sound agricultural base. The British and Japanese are some of the world's most expert agriculturalists. Except for certain limited regions and large commercial enterprises, Latin America's agricultural base is poor, even primitive.

Land reform, which will eventually give more land to the small farmer, progresses slowly, and while it takes place agricultural production will be disrupted as new patterns and techniques are put into operation.

Change will take time. Meanwhile malnutrition slithers along—killing, crippling, stunting, weakening, and mentally numbing, through one generation after the other. A country's outlook is a composite of the outlook of its people individually. How much more vigorous, progressive, and satisfied a country would be if the bulk of its citizens grew to full stature with strong bodies, healthy ambitions, and normally happy dispositions.

Food is not all youngsters need for the good life. If they do manage to keep alive and healthy, can their other requirements be met? Will their environments be uplifting ones where characters can develop in healthful channels too? Will rescued lives find opportunity, stimulus, and fulfillment?

PULASKI DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today is Pulaski Day, a day during which we express our gratitude to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life on October 11, 1779, to help us achieve our independence.

In a proclamation that today, October 11, 1965, be set aside as Pulaski Day in Connecticut, Gov. John Dempsey pointed out:

The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I heartily concur with Governor Dempsey's thoughts on why we should observe Pulaski Day and I ask unanimous consent to have the Governor's proclamation printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN DEMPSEY, GOVERNOR, STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Our Nation will ever be grateful to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life for the cause of American independence in the historic siege of Savannah on October 11, 1777.

A fearless champion of liberty in his native land before he generously offered his services to the struggling Colonies, General Pulaski, a brilliant strategist, brought strength and inspiration to the Colonial troops in their long battle to establish an independent nation.

The General Assembly of Connecticut, mindful of the esteem in which the name of General Pulaski is held, has directed that a day be set aside annually to honor the memory of this gallant officer. Accordingly, I hereby proclaim Monday, October 11, 1965, to be Pulaski Day.

The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I urge that national and State flags be displayed on public and private buildings in Connecticut on Pulaski Day and that schools and civic organizations conduct appropriate memorial exercises.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 25th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States the 190th.

JOHN DEMPSEY,
State of Connecticut.

By His Excellency's command:

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR REPORTS ON WORLD FOOD CHALLENGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor, which I have long regarded as one of the world's greatest newspapers, has given careful attention in recent weeks to the world food and population crisis. I have especially appreciated a report by the distinguished journalist, Saville R. Davis, on my efforts in this field which appeared in the October 4, 1965, issue of the Monitor, and a supporting editorial in the October 7 issue. A third article, entitled "Experts Warn of Global Hunger Challenges," appeared in the October 4, 1965, Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that this piece be printed in the RECORD:

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

EXPERTS WARN OF GLOBAL HUNGER CHALLENGES

WASHINGTON.—What happens when soaring world population crosses the line of food production? Some experts here think it has already happened.

Maduri is a 7-year-old girl in Rajpur, India. The village had 400 people a generation ago; today 700. Maduri is small for her age, has big hungry eyes. She has never had a square meal. Foreign experts look and sigh.

Carlos Busto tries to support five ragged children in a shack in northeast Brazil. His situation is abject—desperate even.

The country imported 3 million tons of wheat last year. Yet the soil is rich. It is a classical example of unused potential.

In Egypt the great Aswan Dam is rising. When completed it will add 2 million arable acres on either side of the Nile. Engineers hail it "to feed the hungry." But by the time the dam is built, the new acreage will not be able to feed the new population.

IRONY SEEN

So it is around the world—Turkey, China, Africa. A terrible irony is that almost without exception Communist countries which rebelled against deprivation now import food more and more. It is true of China and the Soviet Union.

The forthcoming world hunger may be the single most important fact in the latter part of the 20th century, demographers here say. It will be, they argue, unless something is done quickly.

A world famine, experts say, doesn't "start"; it has no fixed time of beginning. There was no "start" of the New York water shortage, for example. What happened was that New Yorkers suddenly discovered a condition that was there already.

World hunger is present today. One international food agency (Food and Agricultural Organization) estimates 10,000 fatalities a day due to malnutrition.

CRISIS SIGHTED

By 1980, Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, says that 1 billion more people will have to be fed. Primarily they will be in underdeveloped, hungry countries.

Swedish Economist Gunnar Myrdal puts the acute stage closer. "Five or Ten years," he told a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. "I am frightened," he added.

Thomas M. Ware, head of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation testified here in June before a Senate subcommittee:

"Very few grasp the magnitude of the danger that confronts us * * *. The catastrophe is not something that may happen; on the contrary, it is a mathematical certainty that it will happen."

VIEW SHARED

This view is commonplace among anxious agronomists and economists.

The U.S. Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, testified that approaching world famine threatens "the most colossal catastrophe in history."

When world famine is discussed experts are talking about an area that embraces one-half the earth's population. It is too big for most people to grasp. They tend to survey country by country—Algeria, for example. Algeria is going through characteristic post-independence adjustment difficulties. Result: Food production per person is down one-sixth in the early sixties over the early fifties.

It is not fashionable to say famine is inevitable or to admit that it is already here. Most experts simply call the situation explosive. They think they can hear a ticking. Will somebody defuse the bomb?

TIME FACTOR ACCENTED

"Famine is not inevitable," Lester Brown says, "but it's going to take a real step-up to prevent it. The critical thing is time."

Take India, for example.

India and the United States have about the same acreage under cultivation—350 millions. But India's grain yield per acre is a fourth of the American. The United States has only 4 million farmers, India 60 million. Over 60 years India's grain yield rose by only 3 percent. Officials hope to add 6 million acres in the next 15 years. That's 0.2 percent a year. But India's population is growing 2 percent a year—10 times as fast.

The U.S. reaction to this problem has gone through four phases:

First came straight compassionate food exports. Millions of tons have been sent. Public Law 480 ("food for peace") passed in 1954. Ten years later it was almost universally recognized that just exporting food wouldn't do the trick. Population grows faster.

KNOW-HOW EXPORTED

Second came exports of fertilizer, insecticides, and know-how. The hungry countries often have good soil. Let them grow their own food, not import it. But population grew faster.

The third stage came 2 weeks ago. Instead of sending fertilizer in bulk, send money and credits to build local plants. This is still going on. Population is growing faster.

Now is the fourth stage. President Johnson both in his State of the Union message, and at the 20th-anniversary meeting of the U.N. cited the need to cope with population. Now, increasing efforts by the United States to help hungry lands are adding the element of family planning—birth control.

Nobody knows the ending of the story. Nobody can turn to the back of the book of world hunger and see how it turns out. But the plot line is plain; accelerating births bring hunger; hunger brings turmoil; turmoil brings war.

The affluent United States can draw no iron wall around itself. As Barbara Ward, the British economist put it, the economic gap is steadily growing; a gap, she said, "between a white, complacent, highly bourgeois, very wealthy, very small North Atlantic elite, and everybody else."

AMERICA: LAND OF THE FREE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, once again our President has established that this land where our forefathers sought their freedom from oppression and tyranny will remain the land of the free.

Fidel Castro, of Cuba, made a statement the other day saying those Cubans who wished to leave the way of life he has imposed on them will be able to leave the island.

President Johnson answered affirmatively, and in the best tradition of this country.

He said, in ceremonies at Liberty Island, with Ellis Island and the magnificent symbol of the Statue of Liberty in the background, that the people of Cuba who seek refuge here will find it.

The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed will be upheld.

Those in Cuba who seek freedom may now "make an orderly entry into the United States."

The U.S. emphasis will be on orderly movement, and the President is asking the Department of State to seek through the Swiss Government the agreement of the Cuban Government in a request to the President of the International Red Cross Committee.

The request is for the assistance of the Committee in processing the movement of refugees from Cuba to Miami.

Miami will serve as a port of entry—the temporary place for refugees as they move on to settle in other parts of the country.

The President has asked all States in the Union to join with Florida "in extending the hand of helpfulness and humanity to our Cuban brothers."

Here again is an example of how America can grow stronger—by extending a hand of fellowship to men and women who declare their devotion to freedom by their action, not just by speech.

We grow not by being selfish and content with the status quo—but by initiative and positive actions of faith.

Now, America opens its arms and its hearts to those Cubans who have been separated from their loved ones, and to those who want to live and work in this atmosphere of freedom. Here, it is what the man can do that matters.

As Americans we know that it is not just enough to be strong. We want to be strong, and also to be able to say to the oppressed: Welcome, come in to the land of the free.

It was my privilege over a period of several years to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary. During that period a number of hearings were held across the country to analyze the effectiveness with which Cuban refugees were resettled, and resettled, indeed, at points which one would think, by virtue of language, local conditions, and even climate, were not conducive to success. Actually, the reverse was the case. Our efforts were dramatically successful.

In Michigan, the Cuban refugees have settled in the region of Grand Rapids in the number of more than 300. There are more than 1,000 Cuban refugees in the entire State of Michigan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram sent to me by Jose Tagle, a leader in the resettlement in the Grand Rapids Cuban community, reacting to the President's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 3, 1965.

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Cuban families in Grand Rapids will support their relatives coming from Cuba please be our leader in getting them out of there according to the President's speech. Your presence here will be helpful.

JOSE TAGLE.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Senate is in the process of deciding one of the most basic issues ever to face our form of government and our economic system.

It is an issue which needs the very careful consideration of every citizen of the United States because it involves the rights of every citizen of the United States who works for a living or who is dependent upon our economy for his livelihood.

I am strongly opposed to limiting debate in any form on this question because I am confident that when the people of this country have considered all of the facts involved they will strongly oppose Congress taking any action that would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have always felt that the Federal Government should refrain as much as possible from intervening in the relationships between organized labor and management in this country.

To me, it is completely contrary to the free enterprise system when any person, whether he be on the side of labor or management, is required to join any organization in order to pursue his work or his profession.

Because of the basic principles involved, I am perfectly willing for the Senate to remain in session on an around-the-clock basis for the rest of this year and next year, if necessary, to prevent the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Because of my deep feelings regarding this matter, I will vote against limiting debate on the question.

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

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

Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Senate will be in order. Personnel around the wall will take seats and cease their conversations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to consider and nothing more. It has been properly signed. There has been an intervening day under the rule. That motion, therefore, is properly before the Senate for a vote at 1 o'clock, after the Vice President or the Presiding Officer ascertains that a quorum is present.

The purpose, of course, of the cloture is to end debate on the motion to consider 14(b). There is nothing unusual about this continuing discussion on the motion to take up. It has been done many times. I believe the Senate anticipates that when that motion is made on a highly controversial bill that is the very point at which the issue will be joined.

The motion to proceed to consider is debatable, but when adopted, the bill then would be subject to amendment. I would anticipate that there might be as many as 50 or more amendments offered to the Taft-Hartley Act of various shades and descriptions.

The rather interesting fact under the rule must be remembered that when an amendment has been offered and has been discussed, it is then subject to a tabling motion, and that shuts off all debate.

Under the motion to consider, we are free to debate and to get this story out to the country.

There is a better reason for opposing cloture, and that is that up to this time we have had about 18 hours of discussion, and no more. That goes back to Monday of last week, when I opened the discussion on the motion to take up.

But I recite this for the RECORD because, unless my figures are incorrect—and I do not believe they are—we had 37 days on the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1960. There were actually 74 days after House passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was before the Senate for a period of 57 days. The satellite bill was before the Senate for a period of 18 days. I did not check the voting rights bill, but there was quite an intervening time before it came on for action.

It would be singular, indeed, if the Senate imposed upon itself a gag under which, if adopted, each Senator would have 1 hour and no more; he could not transfer his hour; he must either take it, or the hour is lost. If every Senator took his hour there would be only 100 hours and no more. That is a short period because there are speeches prepared and ready that would take 5 hours, 6 hours, and 7 hours.

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who was Governor of his State when the Right-To-Work Act was signed in that State, is prepared to speak at length.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who has been waiting, has a 6- or 7-hour speech. He is waiting patiently for his opportunity to be heard. There is a long list, because Senators are beginning to hear from the country.

The job we are trying to do for the right of all to work, to live, to survive, and perhaps to start on some of the union abuses would be rather cavalierly

shut off if the cloture petition were adopted.

When I mention the distinguished Senator from Texas, I call attention to the fact that on the 24th of September the distinguished Governor of Texas appeared before the Executives' Club in Chicago. Knowing about that club, I presume that at that luncheon 1,500 persons were present.

In the question period this question was asked:

I know you have stated your position on Taft-Hartley and the poverty program. Could you state your position specifically?

Governor Connally, in his second term as Governor, elected last November by 73 percent of the vote in Texas, responded:

Yes, I have taken the position specifically, as I did when I ran for Governor in 1962, as I did on our State program in 1962. I am for retention of 14(b) in the Taft-Hartley Act. I see no justification whatsoever for its repeal. I am as concerned and interested in the working people of Texas as any union leader in that State. But, I can assure you that the fact that we have—that we are one of the 19 right-to-work States in this Nation, that it has not in the least hampered the activities of the unionman, his wages, his standard of living, or his welfare. I think if the leaders themselves will get out and do the job without asking the Government to do it for them, they can make progress. I am not against the unions; I am for them. But I think they are going to have to hoe their own row just like a lot of the rest of us do.

That is the Governor of Texas speaking, the Governor of the great State which gave us the great President of the United States who occupies the White House, except for an interim period while he is in the hospital.

I say now what I said to his staff this morning and yesterday, and when I talked with him before he went to the hospital: that our prayers are with him.

What a colossal mistake it would be because when a vast segment of freedom is at stake, when the right to work is at stake, and when the principle is at stake, we have a duty, Mr. President, to cite our case.

Under the rules of the House, the bill was gagged, and it could not be amended. What a crying shame it would be if the Senate did not take abundant time to educate the people on the bill. Education takes time.

The Governor of Texas, when he stood before that group in Chicago, said he looked at the Gallup poll recently, and that 8 out of 10 who responded to that poll thought that Texas was a desert; that it was flat; that it was barren; and that it had no water.

That is great talk, but Texas has more water than any State in the Union, except Alaska, and up there I suppose it is frozen half of the time.

That indicates what has to be done in an educational effort in order to present an abstruce problem to the attention of the people. We are beginning to make some real progress in that field. We seek only to present the facts; to present the truth to the people.

This is the country of the people. It does not belong to the unions. It does not belong to the Congress. It belongs to the people and they are not only entitled to be heard, but they have got to be heard because much is at stake.

Mr. President, when the first national headquarters of the American Federation of Labor was dedicated in this city many years ago, inscribed on the cornerstone was the following:

This edifice erected for service in the cause of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity.

What is at stake before us is the whole question of freedom, and it cannot be lightly disposed of or swept under the rug. So I reaffirm that when we make our fight on the motion to consider the bill, that is the proper place for those who believe a great stake is involved to make the fight, so that they will not be jeopardized at a later time by amendments, by motions, and by the employment of the tabling process, because I have seen how that procedure works in committee and on the Senate floor, and I prefer uninhibited debate now, at this point, on the motion to consider.

I fervently hope and trust, for the sake of the country and for the sake of the people, that the cloture motion will be rejected and that untrammeled debate can go forward in the interest of truth and in the interest of light.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, of the time remaining before 1 o'clock, 3 minutes be allotted to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Oregon for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall support the cloture motion. Since 1947, this issue of so-called right-to-work laws has been debated in the Senate of the United States. Every Senator knows the pros and cons of the issue.

The Senator from Illinois talked about the country belonging to the people. The Constitution also belongs to the people—and to all the people. In 1947, I led the fight in this body against segmentizing the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. That is exactly what the Congress did when it passed the Taft-Hartley law including a delegating to the States of certain powers reserved to the Federal Government under the interstate commerce clause. What is involved in this issue is whether there shall be a uniform application of the interstate commerce clause among the 50 States, or whether 19 States shall be permitted to take advantage of an unfortunate delegation of power to the State by Congress under that clause. Such a delegation of interstate commerce authority to the States permits them to maintain the shocking low labor conditions that they maintain under right-to-work laws to the competitive disadvantage of employers in high-labor-standard States.

The Senator from Illinois cites the Governor of Texas as being in support of right-to-work laws. I shall cite Texas as an outstanding reason why the right-to-work laws should be repealed. Texas maintains some of the most shocking low labor standards in this country. For years, Texas has been taking competitive advantage of high-wage-paying employers in the Northern States. I shall give a sordid example of what the Governor of Texas is maintaining in his State.

In Texas, every morning trucks leave to cross the river into Mexico. Mexicans are loaded onto those trucks and are brought across the river and through the gate of low-labor-standard textile factories in Texas. These migrants have daily immigration permits which allow them to work in Texas and live in Mexico. They are hauled to work each morning and back home each night. Those factories have been moved into Texas from the New England and other high-wage-paying States. That is an example of what can be accomplished in States which have the so-called right-to-work laws. These Mexican workers are exploited by Texas employers with the full knowledge of the Governor of Texas. This truck transportation system is so devised as to prevent these workers from being approached by union organizers. This is part of the right-to-work law union-busting system. The Governor of Texas is notorious for his advocacy of low labor standards in Texas in order to pirate away from high-labor-standard States industries and plants such as are involved in the Mexican worker textile sweatshops in Texas. Some other industries are involved too.

As a Senator from Oregon, I can testify that my State is confronted with the same unfair competition from Southern right-to-work States in the lumber industry.

To the senior Senator from Oregon, the issue is very clear. It is whether we shall apply the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution uniformly across the country by having Congress take back the unfortunate power it delegated—mistakenly, in my judgment—in 1947. The time for us to do so is now. By our vote we should make perfectly clear that we intend to reestablish the uniform application of the interstate-commerce clause among the 50 States and stop the so-called right-to-work law States from taking advantage of workers by maintaining low labor standards, such as are so prevalent in Texas. Texas is a good example of what I mean.

The time has come for the Senate to apply cloture today. In spite of everything the Senator from Illinois has said, what he really designs is to kill the bill by dilatory tactics known as a filibuster, irrespective of the adjectives he applies to describe his tactics.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana until 1 o'clock.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me a minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since last Friday, I have been a little gun shy. I must admit that I have no rabbits to pull out of my hat. The only thing I am interested in is votes; and the only factor which will decide the issue before us, and the substance, as well, if we ever get to it, will be votes—nothing more, nothing less.

In my opinion, every Senator has his mind made up as to how he will vote on the question of cloture; and if by chance cloture is invoked today, how he will vote on the question of the passage of the bill to repeal section 14(b). So we must face up to the realities of the situation and recognize them.

I hope we shall move away from the emotionalism involved in this issue and will recognize the facts for what they are and treat this subject accordingly.

Mr. President, it is possible, as some persons have contended, that Friday's vote was rendered meaningless by its unanimity. So far as the majority leader is concerned, he prefers to believe that the Senate does not deliberately engage in meaningless gestures. On Friday the Senate was provided with an opportunity to get off the issue of section 14(b) by a simple tabling motion. The Senate chose not to put the motion aside. It chose not to do so by a unanimous vote.

The majority leader takes Friday's vote at face value. Insofar as the majority leader is concerned, therefore, that vote was, in no sense, without meaning. On the contrary, it has been immensely helpful and the leadership is most appreciative.

In all frankness, if the motion to table had carried on last Friday, the majority leader was prepared to recommend immediately that the Senate pass over this issue for the session. On the other hand if the motion to table had been defeated by a slim majority, the Senate would have remained in a difficult predicament. The majority leader would have been hard-pressed to decide whether the margin against tabling warranted an effort to invoke cloture on a simple procedural question of whether the Senate would take up H.R. 77.

But the vote on Friday was such as to resolve all doubts on the matter insofar as the majority leader was concerned. Indeed, when unanimity against tabling was indicated in the early stages of the tally the majority leader drew from his pocket a cloture motion. The motion had been prepared in advance but was unsigned because, I confess, that until that moment I did not quite know what to do with it. Once the vote began to be recorded, however, it was clear what had to be done with it. The motion was circulated among the Members while the vote was in process and, before the tally was complete, the requisite signatures had been obtained.

It was possible, therefore, for the majority leader to move without waste of time at the conclusion of the tally to give substance to the overwhelming, indeed, unanimously indicated inclination of the Senate, as expressed in the vote against the motion to table.

The Senate, in effect, had said—indeed the minority leader did say it—that it did not want to leave this issue. So, in accommodation, the majority leader offered the motion for cloture. He offered it, in the first place, to make sure that he had heard correctly and, second, to act on the Senate's indicated wish in the only procedural way which is believed practical at this time.

The nature of the predicament and the need for a cloture motion becomes clear in the light of the proceedings on the floor during the last 2 weeks. Ten days is a lavish and wasteful expenditure of the Senate's limited floor time of any simple procedural question, which usually takes 10 seconds or less. Indeed, during this session of Congress many complex pieces of legislation have been completely disposed of in a fraction of that time. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, was both novel and controversial; yet the motion to proceed to its consideration was passed by the Senate in less than a minute. Similar swift treatment was given to the procedural question of taking up the proposed constitutional amendments on reapportionment and on Presidential inability. The same is true for Appalachia, poverty, and aid to education, to name but a few. That is part of the background for the vote which is about to be taken. Here is the rest.

On October 1, 10 days ago, the majority leader moved that the Senate turn to consideration of H.R. 77. It was an entirely orderly and routine procedural motion. The bill, itself, had passed the House. It had been considered at length by the appropriate Senate committee and reported favorably. It had been on the Legislative Calendar for a month. What was there to debate on the question of taking up this measure? Whether it was too late in the session for a major and controversial issue of this kind? Whether the Senate should take up some other bill first? Whether the Senate should adjourn? These, indeed, would have been legitimate matters to discuss in an orderly fashion prior to a vote on the motion to take up H.R. 77; an hour or so might have reasonably been consumed in the process. But these matters were not discussed at all, except as they were mentioned by the majority leader on Monday. On the contrary, a long and continuing tirade on the evils which would attend the repeal of 14(b) was launched even though the Senate had not yet decided to consider H.R. 77.

I submit that that is not useful and pointed debate. That is an unconscionable delay on a procedural question for the purpose of obfuscating the issue of substance. If it is not a filibuster, it is, to say the least, a prefilibuster.

And so, on October 5, 5 days ago, the leadership indicated its concern to the Senate over the delay in reaching a decision on the simple procedural question of taking up 14(b). At that time, the Senate was asked, via the tabling motion, to give the leadership some guidance as to its wish on the sole question of taking up 14(b). The majority leader was at great pains to point out that what was involved was in no way a test of sentiment on the issue of 14(b) itself.

Therefore, on Friday, the distinguished minority leader whose own position against repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the tabling motion, so that the matter would not be put aside. And the majority leader, whose own position in favor of repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the motion to table so that the matter could be moved forward in an orderly fashion. The Senate responded magnificently to the appeal of the joint leadership.

In the vote which is about to be taken, the Senate will be able to make clear that it does not toy, as some have suggested, with the hopes of millions of Americans who are members of the great labor unions of the Nation. The Senate can make clear that, regardless of how it may feel on the issue of 14(b) itself, it does not make light of their sincere petition by dabbling in parliamentary parlor games. The Senate can make clear that labor is entitled to a fair and decent consideration of an issue of great importance in labor-management relations duly and properly brought before the Senate, even as corporations are, even as the aged and the poverty stricken are, even as immigrants are and even as racial minorities are.

The Senate can make this clear, in the only way that it can be made clear at the present time, in the judgment of the majority leader, by voting to invoke cloture on the simple procedural motion of taking up H.R. 77.

I stress again that this vote will not, any more than the motion to table on Friday, bind anyone for or against repeal of 14(b). What it will do—and let there be no doubt—is to determine whether or not the Senate means to get down to business on the issue of 14(b) itself or to pass over it. On the basis of the performance of the past days, the majority leader, in all frankness, sees no other rational way at this time in which this point can be nailed down except via the path of cloture on the single issue of whether or not to proceed to consider H.R. 77.

So, Mr. President, at 1 o'clock, thanks to rule 22, and the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader on Friday, a significant moment of truth will have arrived for the Senate.

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

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

Under rule XXII the Chair lays before the Senate the pending motion to bring

to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77. A two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting, a quorum being present, is required for this motion to carry.

Under the rule, the clerk will now call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

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

[No. 286 Leg.]

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Under the rule, a yea-and-nay vote is required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A "yea" vote would be in favor of cloture, and a "nay" vote would be against cloture. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has properly stated the present situation. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If they were present and voting, they would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

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

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 287 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Bartlett	Javits	Morse
Bass	Kennedy, Mass.	Moss
Bayh	Kennedy, N.Y.	Muskie
Burdick	Kuchel	Nelson
Case	Long, Mo.	Neuberger
Church	Long, La.	Pastore
Clark	Magnuson	Pell
Cooper	Mansfield	Proxmire
Dodd	McCarthy	Randolph
Douglas	McGee	Ribicoff
Harris	McIntyre	Smith
Hart	McNamara	Symington
Hartke	Metcalf	Tydings
Inouye	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Jackson	Montoya	Yarborough

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Fulbright	Scott
Brewster	Gore	Young, Ohio
Cannon	Gruening	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, there are 45 yeas and 47 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to consider H.R. 77.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Vice President has just stated the question. We shall continue with the debate.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 5, strike out "five", and insert "three".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services, to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed three years, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what the business before the Senate is?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the bill about?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to state the purpose of the bill. Its purpose is to permit the Administrator of the General Services Administration to enter into contracts with private concerns over the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings, for periods not to exceed 5 years.

The House amended the bill and changed it from 5 to 3 years. I have suggested that the Senate accept the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments of the House are concurred in.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PELLY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes.

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. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee appointed by the Committee on the Judiciary to take the testimony on the Morrissey nomination to a Federal judgeship be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am firmly opposed to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I take this position as a member of the Senate Labor Subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill, as a resident of the State of Arizona with an elective responsibility to the people of that State, and as an individual American citizen who is firmly convinced that the vast majority of my fellow citizens object strenuously to being forced to join any kind of an organization in order to secure or retain a job.

We have come down a long and controversial road to the point where we can now conduct what I trust will be a thorough discussion of this issue.

In traveling down that road I have been repeatedly impressed by public reaction—by the hundreds of polls, thousands of newspaper editorials, and by private letters from concerned citizens who urge this body to reject the repeal amendment.

I regret that not all of my colleagues have had an opportunity or the time to read these pleas to the Senate for our help in retaining this fragment of our vanishing individual freedom.

We have a war against poverty—a war on waste—a war on ignorance—and a war on ugliness and pollution. All of us have heard about these widely publicized wars.

What we are discussing here, however, is a war against freedom.

This is a war we should avoid at all costs—a war that is totally uncalled for—a war generated by minority greed and a lust for power over many thousands of our people.

It is a war most Americans do not understand—and will not support if they do.

I propose to begin speaking about it in some detail, but not merely as a perfunctory task to comply with the obligations of my office. My approach is that of a deeply concerned citizen who has gone through previous campaigns in similar wars against freedom of choice in this great land of ours.

At the beginning, I want to give Senators a brief capsule summary of the origin and history of the right-to-work law in my State of Arizona.

It was adopted as an amendment to our State constitution in November 1946, as a result of a citizen initiative campaign to put the question on the ballot. The people approved it by a margin of approximately 62,000 to 49,000.

Again in 1948, after pressure from organized labor, the question was put before the people on a one-man, one-vote basis in a statewide referendum. This time the voters expressed themselves even more emphatically by a margin of nearly 87,000 to 60,000 in favor of voluntary unionism.

Four years later, in 1952, a related initiative measure to prohibit secondary boycotts and regulate picketing was placed on the ballot. This time the electorate was even more decisive. They adopted the measure by a count of 115,000 to 67,000.

This brief period of Arizona's history coincided with the beginning of our State's tremendous postwar expansion.

Yet is is significant to note that despite substantial increases in the numbers of registered voters from 1946 through 1952, the relative strength of compulsory unionism supporters declined in all three elections, while the majority percentage increased each time.

My discussion of this period is based on my own personal experience and observations. These events occurred while I was in private business and active in the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, where I had the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Industrial Development Committee.

Later on, it was my privilege to serve three terms as Governor of my State, and this permitted me to gain more firsthand knowledge of labor-management relations in Arizona and the progress of our economy.

I am proud of what Arizona has accomplished in those years. With all due respect to other States, the record demonstrates that Arizona's economic growth rate since the end of World War II has been one of the highest in the Nation.

It is difficult to appreciate or understand what has happened in Arizona without some facts and figures to illustrate the development. Let me cite just a few of the outstanding statistics to put the situation in proper perspective for the Senate.

For many years prior to World War II, Arizona was known as the 3-C State—for copper, cotton, and cattle. Tourism gradually developed into a fourth major element in our economy.

Dollar income from manufacturing climbed 178 percent since 1946. Manufacturing forged into first place in 1958 and has been the No. 1 element in our economy in Arizona ever since. Manufacturing employment has increased by 329 percent.

The last 5 years also have witnessed a strong comeback of our mining industry, principally copper, to the point where last year it accounted for more than a half-billion dollars.

Nearly 3,000 more persons are working today in Arizona mining jobs than were employed 10 years ago. This enabled Arizona to maintain its position as the producer of more than half of our domestic copper supply—more than all other States in the United States combined.

The copper figures are important because the mining operations are heavily unionized. The mine, mill, and smelter workers have strong representations, as do the AFL–CIO unions, the independent machinists, and others.

I could go on citing figures until the listener went to sleep and I ran out of breath. They would boil down to the simple fact that in this postwar era Arizona has been among the national

leaders in just about every major economic index of growth.

To put it another way—we now have more people working at more jobs producing more goods and earning more income than at any previous time in Arizona's history.

No doubt everyone is familiar with most of the standard arguments in the organized campaign to belittle right-to-work laws. Some are plain distortions of the truth. Others simply have no basis in fact.

I will cite an example.

In a recent radio broadcast, the president of the Communications Workers of America charged that right-to-work laws attracted only "cheap" industries to a State.

I will answer that. So far as Arizona is concerned, I would mention names: RCA, Motorola, General Electric, Reynolds Metals, Sperry Phoenix, Hughes, Goodyear, Aerospace, Unidynamics, Spreckels Sugar, Emerson Electric, Airesearch, and many others.

It is common knowledge that these are among the leading industrial names in the world.

It would require another 10 minutes just to read off the names of new companies that have located in Arizona in the last 5 years, because there are 280 of them.

We know these companies have located in Arizona because of the many advantages our State had to offer. We also know that many of them have long histories of effective partnership with union workers.

In short, the record is quite clear that Arizona's right-to-work law has not hampered the legitimate and useful function of collective bargaining in our State.

The right-to-work law has not acted to unfairly restrict normal growth in union membership in proportion to the gain in population and total work force.

I cite AFL–CIO membership for example.

The Labor Department began keeping figures on AFL–CIO membership in 1958. I have been informed by the Department that AFL–CIO locals in Arizona claimed approximately 40,000 members in 1958.

By 1962—the last year for which the figures are available—the total had increased to about 76,000. I read from an article appearing in the Arizona Republic of June 11, 1965.

UNIONS CLAIM GAIN OF 4,200 IN VALLEY

AFL–CIO unions in the valley now represent about 4,200 more workers than they did 6 months ago at the outset of a drive to "organize the unorganized."

This was announced last night by Robert Hutto, president of the Phoenix-Maricopa County Federation of Labor, during a training conference for union leaders in the laborers union hall.

The campaign, slow in getting off the ground in its initial state, is gaining momentum, Hutto indicated.

Cited as one of the brightest spots of the movement were efforts of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, directed by National Representative Nick Pinto.

Since last November 1, Hutto said, about 220 Phoenix city employees have joined local No. 317 of the federation. Beginning June 1, when an intensive drive to organize city hall employees was started, a daily average of 10 persons joined the union, Hutto reported.

About 66 new members have been signed up among various State agencies. In one case, in which no previous membership existed, a new local charter will be issued, said Hutto, a Democratic member of the Arizona House of Representatives.

The federation drive will climax with a mass meeting of city, county, and State employees at 8 p.m. next Tuesday in the laborers union hall. Speakers will include James McCormack, federation area director, and Daniel V. Flanagan, of San Francisco, AFL–CIO regional director.

Among victories enumerated by Hutto in elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board was that of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers at the Westinghouse Electric Corp. maintenance and repair plant.

Another gain for the AFL–CIO, Hutto stated, was a unanimous vote for the United Packinghouse Workers at the Phoenix plant of the Lewis Food Co., which he said is noted nationally for its opposition to unions.

The Communications Workers of America, whose present membership in Arizona is dominated by employees of Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., is working on a "large target," which Hutto declined to name.

The actual number of workers who have signed union cards since the campaign began, the labor council president concluded, "doesn't tell the whole story." Since last January, he said, unions have made significant inroads which are expected to pay big dividends in the future.

President Johnson promised in his state of the Union message to submit proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b). But the President was very careful to use the word "changes" and not the word "repeal."

Regardless of the semantics, however, organized labor has interpreted this as a promise. They have made repeal of 14(b) their No. 1 objective in this Congress.

Furthermore, they now believe they have enough political muscle to get the job done.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to make my position very clear.

To me, the issue at stake here is a fundamental human right—not just special interest legislation. It involves the right of any individual to join—or not to join—a labor union.

I should emphasize that right-to-work laws in 19 of our States are laws for individual worker freedom. Other States have statutes that would be revoked if section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed.

They are not laws against unions, no matter how much propaganda is put out to the contrary.

To classify these right-to-work laws as antiunion is a complete misrepresentation of the laws and the facts.

Yet the union leaders have been beating the drums loudly for repeal of 14(b) this year—louder and stronger than ever before.

Notwithstanding this there appears to be a growing opposition throughout the country to these demands of labor leaders.

Many Senators and Representatives already have expressed themselves strongly in favor of retaining section 14(b).

Some spokesmen for organized labor would have the country believe that right-to-work laws are a relatively recent development—just one of the many things they do not like about the Taft-Hartley Act.

What they do not talk about is the fact that voluntary unionism laws—in one form or another—have been around long before the Taft-Hartley Act.

Labor leaders have always referred to the Wagner Act of 1935, for example, as the "magna carta" of organized labor in the United States. They acknowledge it as one of the historic milestones in the progress of unions—and indeed it was.

But I believe the people of this country should be reminded that under the Wagner Act itself the States had the right to adopt laws prohibiting the compulsory union shop.

Furthermore, 11 States adopted such laws before Taft-Hartley was even considered.

Not only that, but the right of the States to adopt such laws under the Wagner Act was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Algoma Plywood case. The late Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote the opinion.

Now, after all these years, we hear complaints about the alleged unfairness of section 14(b).

There is evidence recently of growing citizen opinion against any effort by Congress to further infringe upon the right of States to legislate in this field.

The results of several surveys recently support this and I know others are going to discuss this in depth.

In my judgment, unions have no inherent right to expand by forcing new members to join.

They can and should grow, but only if they can convince, not coerce, the worker that his best interests will be served by joining the union.

This takes performance—not persuasion by the force of an unfair law. Senators know that in their home towns and States an individual businessman or firm cannot be forced to join an organization. It is necessary to convince prospective members that it will be worth their while to join and participate.

The situation is no different with unions. They must earn their way.

To me, this is the fair way, the American way.

Mr. President, the bill should be defeated because it is wrong in principle and cannot be justified by the facts. It would not meet any demonstrated national need; on the contrary, it is the product of a long, expensive propaganda campaign by organized labor officials to gain dictatorial economic and political power through the force of Federal law. Even the proponents of this bill concede it would give virtual monopolistic power to unions. This proposed legislation would, if enacted—

First, compel American working men and women to join unions, or to pay money to unions against their will and beliefs;

Second, compel workers to join even in many instances where a majority involved do not desire "union security" clauses in their contract or in fact do not even desire union representation;

Third, lessen the initiative of union leaders to work for the benefit of employees in all the States;

Fourth, make national policy a principle contrary to that of other leading democratic countries including Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany, in each of which compulsory unionism is prohibited by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions;

Fifth, provide organized labor with the additional economic and political power to secure its real objective—abolition of the ban on the "closed shop";

Sixth, result in a tremendous increase in strikes, picketing, and violence in the 19 States which now have right-to-work laws;

Seventh, deprive 50 States of their traditional and historic American right to prohibit all forms of compulsory unionism; and

Eighth, adversely affect the interests of small business.

There are many other compelling arguments against the bill. Considered together, they present an overwhelming case for retention of section 14(b) in the National Labor Relations Act.

The fundamental issue posed by the bill is the freedom of an individual to join—or not to join—a labor union. It involves the freedom of association guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. In effect, it translates into the question of whether Congress should compel millions of Americans to pay tribute to a labor organization in order to earn a living for themselves and their families.

This is a basic civil rights question and not merely a matter of labor legislation. Proponents may argue that a union shop contract does not force any individual to actually join the union to retain his job; the requirement is merely that he must pay dues. In practical terms, the distinction is absurd.

A direct illustration of this point is afforded by longstanding and documented practices of the American Federation of Musicians. No member of a local musician's union may exercise his freedom of choice to work with any nonunion musician without forfeiting his own union membership, and in turn, his opportunity of earning a living. Nor may a nonunion musician work with union members merely by tendering dues; he must, in fact, belong to the union before he can work with a union group.

This is true throughout the entertainment industry, irrespective of the usual 30-day decision period granted new employees under union shop contracts in other fields of employment. In virtually every field, many pressures, both direct and subtle, are brought to bear on the new worker in a union shop to join the union regardless of any personal reasons he may have for not wanting to join.

The attention of the Nation has been focused for an extended period on the subject of civil rights—and rightly so. A historic and comprehensive law on this subject was passed last year. Congress has followed that with a law to guarantee the constitutional right of every qualified citizen to register and vote.

Yet the passage of the bill would take away an equally important, if not paramount, right of all Americans. All other individual liberties and civil rights long cherished by the people of this Nation have little value if a person can be forced to pay money to a union to keep a job.

Many times in our history we have sent American people to die in defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. Americans are being killed today in the jungles of Vietnam to defend this principle. What a tragic paradox it would be if Congress were to withdraw individual liberty at home while we are defending it abroad.

The repeal of section 14(b) would further erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field. Not only would repeal nullify "right-to-work" laws which are now part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States; it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this vital aspect of labor-management agreements.

The passage of the bill would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or labor codes of their States. This vital area of local and State concern would be preempted by the Federal Government and could be relinquished only by a subsequent act of Congress.

I repeat—it should not be forgotten that voluntary unionism laws preceded the Taft-Hartley Act. Even the Wagner Act, justly regarded as their Magna Carta by organized labor, clearly did not prevent States from adopting right-to-work laws, and, indeed, some of them did. The courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of such laws.

Furthermore, the people of the several States now have the power, as they should have, to modify or repeal any existing State law or constitutional provision at any time. One of the former right-to-work States, Indiana, did just that earlier this year, and the opponents of H.R. 77 have no quarrel with the people of Indiana on that score. We respect their right to make that decision for themselves.

The fact that repeal of right-to-work laws carried in Indiana and five other States over the years and failed in Iowa and Wyoming, for example, reflects honest differences of opinion among the States which should be respected. To repeat: The people of any State with a voluntary unionism law can readily bring about its repeal at any time they may desire. This remedy is always available to the people.

There is much to be said for diversity rather than conformity with respect to State laws on union security agreements. This land remains a collection of striking State and regional distinctions which, far from weakening the Nation, contribute much to its strength and progress.

Repeal of section 14(b) would trample on the remaining sovereignty of the 50 States. It would further accentuate the already alarming trend toward an oligarchy of big business, big labor, and Big Government in which the larger public interest and the interest of the individual worker are subordinate to the special privilege of a minority.

Congress has a solemn obligation to consider the views of the citizens who elect its Members. "Representative government" means what it says, or at least it should. And in the case of this particular bill, there can be no doubt that a substantial majority of the American people oppose it.

Recent national polls by Samuel Lubell, Louis Harris, and Opinion Research Corp.—three of the most reputable organizations in the field—show that upward of two-thirds of the voters oppose compulsory unionism. The Gallup poll of June 15, 1965, supported this conclusion and also disclosed that a majority of the public believes unions already have too much power.

Mr. President, I shall cover what happened in my own State of Arizona. After the right-to-work law had been overwhelmingly passed, the union officials decided that they would seek to do away with the right-to-work law. So they, by a referendum, secured by an appeal to the legislature, had this matter placed on the ballot. They naturally worded it in wording that would be extremely beneficial to the union position.

The people turned this referendum down by an even greater vote than had been obtained when the bill was originally passed, even though that referendum was so worded as to put the right-to-work law in the worst possible perspective.

It had been said, when the right-to-work law was originally passed, that it was passed by means of wording which, it was claimed, portrayed the measure as giving the people a right to work which was different from that which actually existed in the law. Even though that referendum was placed in the perspective most favorable to the union, it was even more overwhelmingly defeated than it had been prior to that time.

Mr. President, from my own experience I feel it is quite evident that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is not antilabor or antiunion. It affords a great protection to American workingmen.

In my experience as a State official, I had the privilege of working with both union and management officials. There was a statewide strike in the State of Arizona in 1959. It was my privilege to consult union and management officials to determine whether I could bring them together after the strike had continued for an undue length of time.

I brought the union and management officials to my offices at 7:30 one morning and asked them if they would start negotiating. At that particular time, they had not met for 11 days. I did not find it disadvantageous because of the right-to-work law to get them together to start negotiations. In fact, I felt that they were ready and willing to negotiate and needed only encouragement.

I emphasize this because I believe that it illustrates that we can negotiate, we can have adverse opinions, and we can still get together, in a right-to-work State as well as in a non-right-to-work State.

I do not believe that the statement that the existence of this section hinders labor negotiations has any significance.

It is significant to note that 42 percent of union members themselves agreed that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, providing for the establishment of right-to-work laws, should be retained. This fact was very much in evidence in my State from the experience I had as Governor.

Augmenting these widely known national polls are many selective State polls which reflect similar public sentiment. Editorial opinion in the Nation's press also is heavily arrayed against repeal of 14(b). Even such usually divergent publications as the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune agree that 14(b) should remain the law of the land.

By all accepted techniques of measuring public opinion, including a heavy volume of constituent correspondence, there is a distinct national consensus against repeal of this provision of law. At no point in the hearings before the subcommittee was any evidence put forth to justify overriding the clearly expressed will of a majority of Americans on the issue. Repeal of 14(b) would be an obvious and flagrant disregard of the will of the people.

Congress, by law, and the courts, by upholding many questionable decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, have already granted many special privileges to organized labor during the last three decades. Many of these advantages conferred upon trade unionism by law are not enjoyed by any other private institutions or economic interests in our society. For example:

Unions are largely exempt from application of the antitrust laws.

They are immune, in many instances, from the issuance of Federal court injunctions.

They can compel employees in 31 States to pay dues to the union in order to hold their jobs.

They can—and certainly do—use funds which their members have been compelled to contribute as a condition of employment, to finance political campaigns opposed by some of their membership.

Some unions for many years have practiced racial discrimination in determining who shall be allowed to join.

They have the exclusive right to act as collective bargaining agents even for those employees who do not want to be represented by the union.

Added to this list are a growing number of NLRB decisions which have vastly increased the scope and power of union authority. For example:

In the Wisconsin Motors case—145 NLRB No. 109, 55 LRRM 1085—the Board specifically upheld the right of a union to fine members for exceeding union-imposed production quotas.

In the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. case recently—149 NLRB No. 10, 57 LRRM 1242 affirmed by the court of appeals—the Board held that a union member could be fined and threatened with legal action to collect the fine if he exercised his right not to respect a picket line.

Earlier this year, the Board held that an employer who moved his apparel manufacturing company from New York to Florida must bargain with the union in Florida, even though the union cannot prove it represents a majority of the workers in the new location.

Aside from this tendency of the NLRB to regard itself as an advocate of the unions instead of as an impartial administrator of the law, many large unions over the years have not demonstrated the responsibility that should accompany the extraordinary privilege they have.

Consider the staggering loss to the economy from industrywide strikes in which the public interest was not represented at the bargaining table. Consider the unreasoning opposition of many union officials to the technological change which is necessary for survival in a competitive market. And finally, consider the violence and corruption disclosed by work of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in recent years.

Given this record, it is difficult to understand how the granting of additional coercive power would result in more responsible statesmanship by unions.

Unions represent only about 17 million workers in the United States. By contrast, more than 53 million workers do not belong to any union.

Many of these nonunion workers are employed by the millions of small business enterprises which are such an integral part of the Nation's economic and commercial structure. They are the ones who would be hit hardest by repeal of 14(b).

Giant corporations in basic industries can meet monopolistic union power at the bargaining table with at least some degree of equality. This is not true for the independent small employer, who may be starting a new enterprise or struggling to survive on a thin profit margin in a fiercely competitive field.

It is this small employer—and there are approximately 4 million of them—who can be put out of business or ruined financially by powerful union officials. There are many small contractors in the right-to-work States, for example, who operate an open shop and thus afford an opportunity both for apprentices to learn a trade and for skilled workmen to work. They would soon be eliminated if 14(b) is repealed.

Adoption of H.R. 77 would directly contradict long-established Federal policy to encourage and support small business in this country.

The Secretary of Labor has based his arguments for repeal of 14(b) on philosophical rather than economic grounds. This is understandable in view of the fact that proponents of repeal have no solid economic ground to stand on. The same statistics used for years by union spokesmen in their campaign to discredit right-to-work laws can be turned around and exploited with even more weight to support retention of such laws.

For example, it is true that some Southern States, only recently embarked upon industrialization programs, have wage scales ranging below the national average because of the relatively large proportion of rural and farm labor in their population. But it is also true that in the seven right-to-work States outside of the South earnings of production and manufacturing workers surpass the national average.

Furthermore, there is hardly any accepted index of economic growth in which the rate of gain in the 19 right-to-work States does not exceed that of the remaining States. The union contention that voluntary unionism laws tend to depress wages simply ignores the facts.

Take the State of Arizona, which has a right-to-work law, and compare it with our neighbor New Mexico, which permits compulsory unionism. They are neighbors of approximately equal size and similar in resources. They are approximately the same age, having been admitted to the Union in the same year. Both have approximately the same support so far as Federal programs are concerned. The State of Arizona, with a great mining industry, produces, as I have stated, more copper than all the other States in the United States. But New Mexico has even a greater dollar-volume industry, the oil and gas industry. So we have two States that economically and in many other respects are very similar.

Ten years ago, the average wage rate of a production worker in New Mexico was $85, and in Arizona it was only $82. Now, in 1965, 10 years later, the average production worker in New Mexico receives an average weekly earning of $90, but in Arizona the figure is up to $111. As I stated, New Mexico has compulsory unionism, Arizona has voluntary unionism.

The economic progress, or lack of it, of any State or region is compounded of many complex factors. It is quite clear that State laws relating to union security agreements are at best only a minor one of these factors.

I am not stating that progress in Arizona has been so much more rapid than in New Mexico because we have voluntary unionism, but I am saying that the attitude of the people, as indicated by their desire to have voluntary unionism, has contributed in that regard In other words, there has been greater encouragement for industry in Arizona than there has been in the wonderful State of New Mexico.

I could illustrate what has happened in many of the other States. Senators have heard remarks to the effect that our right-to-work States pay starvation wages. I have stated the average weekly earnings of production workers in Arizona—$111. In some of the non-right-to-work law States, the wages are far below $111. Let us pick out some of the New England States. We have Connecticut, $109. We have Maine, $83—I am cutting off the fractions; it is $83.84, but if I said $84, the difference would still be manifest. Rhode Island, $85, or almost $86. Vermont, practically $90. Massachusetts, $96. Compare this to $111 in Arizona.

So, Mr. President, it is not factual when people say that in the right-to-work-law States starvation wages are paid.

In the highest three States in the Nation, so far as the wages of production

workers are concerned, we find the right to work in our State to be in second place with a wage rate of which we are very proud; namely, $121.52 a week.

Returning to the Southern States, we are proud of what has been happening there. We know that over the years they have not been industrialized, that they have been agricultural States in most instances; but since they have begun industrializing, they have made more rapid progress than other States of the Union. I am pleased that that has come about, because it is extremely important to realize that the Southern States are making progress and that most of them have right-to-work laws.

Union leaders and the labor press generally have characterized section 14(b) as a major obstacle to their continued progress. Yet, there are no facts anywhere in the record to support this contention.

The combined population of all 19 right-to-work States represents only a small portion of the total population of the country. An even larger proportion of the Nation's industrial plant is located in the 31 States which now permit union-shop agreements. It can even be demonstrated in some right-to-work States—Arizona, for example—that unions have gained members in recent years. I quoted those figures a short time ago.

The available studies and information on union membership present an understandably mixed growth pattern. Rapid technological change typified by automation, new patterns within old industries and competitive market conditions are by common agreement the major impediments to continued union-membership growth in most fields.

Some unions have maintained or improved their relative position since 14(b) was enacted, while others have not. It would appear that the absence or presence of right-to-work laws in the States has been of little consequence.

The truth is that neither unions nor companies they bargain with have any inherent right to grow or any guarantee of success in our economic system. Both must earn their way.

This Nation was founded by men and women who wanted to escape compulsion and seek opportunity. The maximum amount of individual liberty consistent with the public interest is guaranteed in our Constitution and exemplified in the diversity of American life and the multitude of voluntary associations in our society. Repeal of 14(b) would arbitrarily restrict individual freedom in the most basic way; namely, by prescribing conditions of employment for millions of Americans.

Compulsion in the trade union movement has been opposed on principle by some of the greatest leaders of organized labor, such as Samuel Gompers, as well as by the foremost jurists of this century. One of the most ardent supporters of trade unionism, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, argued forcefully against compulsion. Summing up his views on the subject, he once wrote:

> It is not true that the success of a labor union necessarily means a perfect monopoly. The union, in order to attain or preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness: neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists.[1] Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

The case against compulsion also was put persuasively in recent times by another Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg, who spoke from a background of experience as union attorney and also as Secretary of Labor. He was quoted at a 1962 meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees by the Washington Daily News as follows:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility, and your own achievements.

Mr. President, that is the way most organizations function. Civic organizations earn the right to expect members to join, pay dues, and participate in the activities of such organizations, by rendering a service. I feel that unions should earn that same right. They should render a service to their members, to justify their becoming dues-paying members of the organization.

There is another aspect of compulsory unionism which deserves mention. In 1950, the CIO expelled several unions because they were either led or controlled by Communists.

Some of these unions survive today with hundreds of thousands of members for whom they are the legal bargaining agents. They have not been readmitted to the AFL–CIO. The result is that thousands of loyal Americans are being compelled to contribute their dues money toward the support and propagation of causes they detest.

It is extraordinary that exponents of what is today called the liberal philosophy should wish to diminish individual freedom of association by Federal statute instead of to preserve it.

In this connection, the following article was published on August 11, 1965, in the Valley Monitor newspaper in McAllen, Tex. I will read it in its entirety:

> A month or so ago, before the House passed a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, a special subcommittee on labor held hearings on the proposal. Among those who appeared to speak out against repeal was LaRue Berfield, a man who had been fired from his job for refusing to join an organization the Attorney General had charged was subversive. Here's what he had to say:
>
> "My name is LaRue Berfield of Driftwood, Pa. I faced the hard choice of joining a union I believed to be Communist-dominated, or being fired from my job at a plant where I had worked for 19 years, with time out for combat duty in the Air Force in World War II.
>
> "The choice was forced upon me when the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, known as the U.E., entered into a so-called union shop contract with my employer, the Sylvania Electric Co. plant at Emporium, Pa., in 1958.
>
> "I had been a member of the U.E. when it was expelled by the CIO on grounds that it was Communist dominated. The U.E. had been classified as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General.
>
> "I took an active part in an unsuccessful fight to have the U.E. replaced by the newly chartered International Electrical Workers (I.U.E.) in a national labor board election. As a result of this, I wound up being expelled from the union, but still was able to hold my job because there was no union shop agreement at the plant at that time.
>
> "Eight years later, the U.E. and Sylvania signed an agreement with a compulsory union membership clause and I was subsequently notified by the company that I must join the U.E. or at least pay dues. I refused to do either and was fired from the job I had held so long.
>
> "I did not pay dues to this union because I felt that in so doing I would be supporting a Communist-dominated organization under the guise of a labor union.
>
> "I am sure that any American citizen would agree that it is wrong to force any citizen of our Nation to, in any way, pay tribute to the Communist conspiracy that exists in our Nation, no matter under what guise it may lift its ugly head.
>
> "I was a member of my local school board and the civil defense organization. I would have had to resign from these positions because I took loyalty oaths in both cases, swearing that I have never been and would not be a member of an organization advocating the overthrow of the Government. It was a choice between keeping a job and betraying those oaths. I chose not to violate these oaths, even though it cost me my job.
>
> "I can't understand why our laws do not protect an American citizen from being forced, at the expense of his job, to join and support an organization dedicated to the destruction of our American Government.
>
> "Unable to obtain redress under Federal labor laws, I took my case before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose members expressed sympathy and promised to do what they could by way of seeking remedial legislation. Press reports quoted members of the committee saying I was a martyr of a legal system which protects those who associate with Communists, but not those who oppose such association.
>
> "I have no desire to be classified as a martyr. I only want my constitutional rights as an American citizen to be protected, but more importantly, I want to preserve those rights for my children.
>
> "Things were not easy in that period after I lost my job and 19 years of seniority with one company. Today, my wife and I own and operate a service station and grocery store in the small town of Driftwood, Pa. We put up with a lot of hard work and long hours, but we are getting along all right now.
>
> "I submit to you that if the State of Pennsylvania had a right-to-work law that I would not have had to suffer this injustice. I feel that the repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act would be a grave blow to my hopes for the protection of my constitutional rights and those of my children."

When this company did not have a union shop, this gentleman had the privilege of working there without paying tribute to any organization. This is true of any of the right-to-work States. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is

[1] Quoted by the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his concurring opinion in American Sash & Door Co., 335 U.S. 538–559, which upheld the constitutionality of Arizona's right-to-work law.

repealed, this freedom will be taken away from them.

The people of the States which have right-to-work laws in some respects are in the same position as the people in States which do not have right-to-work laws so far as section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is concerned. If it is repealed, they will be precluded from taking any direct action in regard to labor legislation.

Regardless of the activities of union organizations, or business organizations, many people take it for granted that all unions are good unions. This is a false premise, as I have illustrated, because a Communist-dominated union cannot be considered a good union. Not every business organization can be assumed to be a good organization, either. We have laws and rules and regulations concerning their operations, and the States have the privilege of passing additional legislation regarding business operations. The people should retain that same privilege so far as unions are concerned.

As it now stands, an individual can go to his legislator in my State—he may go to his Senator or his House Member—and give his views as to actions of a union, or of a business organization, and his voice will be heard. If he had a just cause—if necessary, he could have others join him—the people could have an initiative that would provide for the changes that would be necessary to give protection to the residents and workers in that State.

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

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, his good State, the State of Arizona, has a constitutional provision including the right-to-work principle. Is that correct?

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, it was perhaps the second State to adopt such a constitutional provision.

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State which I happen to represent in part having been the only State to precede it in that course.

Mr. FANNIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that citizens in the Senator's State who wanted to repeal the constitutional provision have on one or more occasions requested that the question be submitted to the people, and upon the submission, the people, after reexamination, could have changed their verdict if they cared to do so?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator from Florida is correct. It has been before the people three different times. The second time it was before the people it was initiated or referred to the people as a result of the union officials deciding that they wanted to repeal that law. It was overwhelmingly approved again, by an even greater vote than at its initial passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. If that is true, those who feel that they are aggrieved by the right-to-work law and its presence in their constitution or, for that matter, in their statutes, will have ample opportunity to have their grievance heard and to have a resubmission, with the election of their legislatures, if it is a statute matter, and by a referendum back to the people in the event it is a constitutional matter; and they have not hesitated to do that on three occasions in the fine State which the Senator represents.

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one more question to ask. As his State of Arizona has grown so rapidly and improved, and increased in stature and national importance, has the Senator felt that in the wages paid to workers, in relation to population, and in every other way, any handicap was visited upon his State by the existence of the right-to-work provision in the constitution of the State?

Mr. FANNIN. I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Florida asked me that question because it gives me the opportunity to say that in the first 6 months of this year the AFL–CIO has been boasting about having a greater increase in union membership in Arizona, percentagewise, than any other State in the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I am not surprised. That indicates, does it not, that union members of good standing, loyal to their organizations, have not felt any unwillingness to come into his good State, but to the contrary have gone there in large numbers, have joined unions, and are prospering at the present time under the right-to-work provision in his State constitution?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct. I would add to the words of the distinguished Senator from Florida that the unions have performed a service for the members and earned the loyalty of those members, instead of being compelled to do so.

I feel that we shall have far better unions so long as the unions must perform a service to justify a member joining. If there is compulsion, members will not have interest, will not care, and though they will be good members, they will not get the service which they deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that comment.

Is it not true that the officers of unions know that in order to enlarge their membership, they have to show service, they have to show fine values rendered to their membership, and they are put on notice to do that?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that with regard to unions, they have been performing in many instances better than others. Many have good management, and those which do not have good management improve. Right-to-work laws have not been a deterrent; they have been of assistance to the working people of our State.

I feel confident that our growth has been greater because of the right-to-work law, because of the attitude of the people. It has not been that firms did not go there because we had a right-to-work law. They went there because, as I explained, the right-to-work law indicates the political attitude and the business attitude of the people of that State.

Rather than twist it around, as many have done, the right-to-work laws bring industries into the State. They bring industry to the State because of good management, good political atmosphere, and good business atmosphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the good wages paid.

Mr. FANNIN. And the good wages paid.

I would say to the Senator from Florida that his State is one of the best examples. They have some of the finest industry in this Nation because they have not catered to low-wage industry.

There are electronic industries, industries that do research and development, and some of our finest services such as technical development, and aerospace development. Because of the attitude of the public, and because they have had good laws, and business concerns that are practical, additional concerns have been brought to the State.

I commend the Senator for that service which has been rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for these gracious remarks.

I cannot help but say, before I take my seat, that I think the great progress and the great and permanent prosperity which have been accomplished in his State with the right-to-work provision in its constitution, and also in the State of Florida, with a similar provision in our constitution, clearly disprove the contention of those who say that right-to-work provisions are found hand in hand with poor wages and slack industry, and with little appeal to either businesses or people to come in and settle there. I believe that fact is about as clearly disproved by the record in his own fine State and in the State of Florida.

Unless I incorrectly remember the census data of the past few years, Arizona and the State which I represent, in part, have, first one and then the other, been No. 1 in the States of the Nation in gain of population and other means that have to do with their prosperity and their attractiveness to good people.

While I am sure he would not give full credit for that to the right-to-work provision in his constitution—just as I would not in Florida—I wish to say that not only has it not been a handicap, but I believe it has been an added industrial attraction. I believe the fine records made by these two States clearly show that in the right-to-work provision there is a fine value in any good State interested in progress, and development, and freedom of its citizens.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator for the information.

I wish to answer the question which the Senator posed in regard to the fine economic position of his State with some figures as to what is happening in Florida. I would like to boast about it especially, for although we are not neighboring States, we are in a similar situation and our climates are similar. We like to boast that our climate is like that of the State of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will never yield the floor while the Senator is talking in such kindly fashion about my State. Proceed at will and at great length.

Mr. FANNIN. The following information discloses what happened in the State of Florida:

From 1953 to 1963 nonagricultural employees increased 69.5 percent. What does that mean? In non-right-to-work States it increased 9 percent. In new manufacturing jobs it increased 78.2 percent. In non-right-to-work States there was a minus 7.6 percent. In production workers there was a 51-percent increase in Florida and a minus 14 percent in non-right-to-work States. People have sought to have industry come into a State which pays good wages and has good working conditions. There was an increase of 86.4 percent against 27.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Per capita personal income increased more than the national average: 35.7 percent to 35.4 percent. Personal income is more than double what it is in non-right-to-work States—136.7 percent against 60.2 percent.

Hourly earnings by manufacturing workers increased 57.3 percent, against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. Value added by manufacturing increased 202.7 percent, as against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. That is the highest in the Nation.

Population increased 105.9 percent. That is another illustration of the point brought out by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We are proud that our State is going along with his State. That was against 26.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Bank deposits, of course, are very important to all of us. That was 137.3 percent, more than double the 63.5 percent in non-right-to-work States.

Motor vehicle registrations, which indicate the prosperity of the people, were 109.8 percent, as against 44.3 percent.

All the way through the list I could continue to illustrate what is happening. I know that the Senator is proud of what has taken place. The attitude of the people has been expressed by a willingness to have the right-to-work law to protect the people and to give them the privilege of making decisions one way or the other. They can do away with the right-to-work law or take care of it under present conditions. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed they will not have that privilege.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for putting those facts in the RECORD relative to my own State. Similar facts could be placed in the RECORD with reference to the State of Arizona.

I wish to add one additional fact which I think illustrates the great growth that my State has had.

I had the honor of being inaugurated as Governor in 1941. The census of 1940 showed a little less than 2 million people in the State of Florida.

That population has been trebled since that time, and the annual estimate as of July 1, 1965, is 5,805,000. Florida has risen from 27th State among the States in population at that time to 9th State now.

Again, I hurry to say that the right-to-work provision is not the sole reason for this growth, but it has helped to create the fine atmosphere and environment under which great growth and prosperity have been possible, just as the same values have been created in Arizona by the same right-to-work principle.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator from Florida. I commend him for assisting in bringing forth the benefits that have accrued to his State by the attitude of the people. This is expressed in their retention of the right-to-work law.

With respect to the contention that workers are unable to obtain redress under right-to-work laws, what has happened to the gentleman whom I mentioned, who has carried the fight through, is indicative of what has occurred in many other cases throughout the Nation. When people make the argument that right-to-work laws do not give protection to workers, we should refer them to what happened in this individual's case. It is significant.

Mr. President, several nationwide polls have shown that between 65 and 70 percent of the people favor retention of the right-to-work clause, but Washington observers predict its passage. If the provision is stricken from the lawbooks, Congress will be responding to pressure from President Johnson who promised big labor it would be repealed in return for support of his candidacy for the Presidency. Repeal will not reflect the will of the majority.

The only reason stated by the President in his message of May 17 recomending repeal of 14(b) was that repeal would eliminate conflicts between varying State laws. This feeble argument has no merit. No evidence was put forth to suggest that any such alleged conflicts have in any way damaged the public welfare. Moreover, the same argument could be used with better logic to demand a Federal right-to-work law banning compulsory unionism in all 50 States.

It is illuminating to recall what the President was quoted by the Dallas Morning News as saying in a Senate campaign speech on August 10, 1948:

> I have never sought, nor do I seek now, the support of any labor bosses dictating to freemen anywhere.

So although we have heard much about what was said by Governor Connally, of Texas, in support of the right-to-work law in his State, and about his appeal to Members of Congress to support the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, we also have a statement by one of Governor Connally's close associates, our President, in this regard.

Yet in their public statements many union officials have repeatedly declared they believe the administration is obligated to support repeal of 14(b) in return for the material contributions made by organized labor in the 1964 election campaigns. They are entitled to this opinion, but the administration obviously is under no such real obligation, since the President's popular and electoral vote majority was among the largest in our national history.

The President is elected to serve as the Chief Executive for all Americans. Neither he nor the Secretary of Labor should be under any obligation to serve as a pleader for special interests. Neither should organized labor expect further privileged status under law.

Mr. President, none of the various arguments advanced for compulsory unionism bear up under analysis. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, for example, has contended that right-to-work law unfairly restricts freedom of contract between employers and unions. This overlooks the fact that Federal laws already have severely restricted employers' freedom of contract in dealing with unions.

"Yellow dog" and "sweetheart" contracts have long been prohibited. No employer may bargain for wages or working conditions below minimums established by Federal law. And there are substantial restrictions on employer freedom in communicating management's views to employees during representation or bargaining procedures.

The freedom-of-contract argument and its companion majority rule contention both ignore the fact that minorities in our system of government have rights which cannot be bargained away by majorities. Moreover, the record discloses many instances where unions have acquired exclusive bargaining status without any election whatsoever. Nor for that matter is the question of a union shop demand always put to the union membership for a vote.

As for the oft-repeated "free rider" argument by organized labor officials, it should be remembered that labor actively sought the privilege of exclusive bargaining agent for all employees of a unit, union member and nonmember alike. Labor willingly assumed the responsibility for representing nonmembers.

The fallacy of the free rider argument was well stated by Donald Richberg in his book "Labor Union Monopoly." Mr. Richberg wrote:

> The unions took away by law the right and freedom of individual employees to contract for themselves, and now the unions demand that nonmembers be compelled to pay for having their freedom of contract taken away and exercised against their will. The nonmember is not a free rider; he is a captive passenger.

It has also been suggested that repeal of section 14(b) would contribute to increased stability and peace in labor-management relations. That kind of peace and stability can be found in a prison.

The truth is that the repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land as individual employers and employees struggled to resist coercion by powerful unions. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

Organized labor, representing approximately one-fifth of our work force, has expended millions of dollars in a propa-

ganda campaign to create a simulated demand for repeal of section 14(b). Yet the evidence unquestionably shows a strong majority of the American people want section 14(b) retained.

Mr. President, amid all the arguments involved in the pending issue, the one which assumes prime importance is individual freedom. Section 14(b) makes it possible for the people of the States to act to preserve the vital ingredient of personal liberty in labor-management relations, repeal would destroy this freedom of choice.

A national policy of compulsory unionism would place the United States in a position contrary to that of virtually all Western European democratic nations. Compulsory unionism is prohibited either by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany. By adopting this bill the United States would aline itself with the Soviet Union and other totalitarian regimes where labor freedom does not exist.

Finally, a word about organized labor's real objective, the closed shop. This form of union security, made illegal by section 8(a)(3) of the Taft-Hartley Act, requires a prospective employee to be a member of the union before he may be hired. When this arrangement is accompanied by the "closed union" (a union which does not admit new members) the power of the unions becomes overwhelming.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO said:

> A closed shop—and an open union—is from our point of view a more desirable situation. The union shop permitted by the Taft-Hartley Act is not ideal from our standpoint, but rather, as was well understood, at the time, is itself a compromise.

That is in the record.

However, the legitimizing of union hiring halls, preferential union hiring and practices followed in the building trades, printing trades, shipping and the entertainment industries amount to a "closed shop."

The union campaign for repeal of section 14(b) started with the passage of Taft-Hartley, grew upon failure to repeal this law in 1949, and blossomed to full fruit after the last national elections when union leaders claimed that they then controlled a sufficient number of Members of Congress in both Houses to obtain repeal. If successful in the Senate as they were in the House it is predicted that the campaign for the "closed shop" will immediately commence.

Compulsion is alien to our heritage and does violence to one of the American citizen's most basic and cherished human rights. Congress cannot preserve freedom by extending it to a few while denying it to many. This is the reason why the Senate should reject H.R. 77.

For the convenience of the Senators and to assist them in understanding the issues involved I will list some of the arguments for repeal advanced by the administration and spokesmen for organized labor. Following this listing there is presented a refutation of each argument. References are to the record of hearings on this legislation before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor.

First. All other provisions of the National Labor Relations Act apply uniformly in the States and that accordingly a uniform national policy should be adopted in the area of union security.

Second. The "free rider" argument.

Third. Section 14(b) prevents freedom of contract as between employers and unions.

Fourth. Union security provisions make a very real contribution to industrial peace and union responsibility.

Fifth. The Railway Labor Act permits union security agreements.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951 when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organizations, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry.

(1) ALL OTHER PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAW APPLY UNIFORMLY IN THE STATES AND, ACCORDINGLY, A UNIFORM POLICY SHOULD BE ADOPTED IN THE AREA OF "UNION SECURITY"

Even assuming, for purposes of debate, that there is virtue in uniformity, this argument does not stand up under investigation. The Supreme Court has held that State boards may enjoin "quickie" or intermittent strikes, can regulate the conduct of strikers on picket lines, and that State courts may entertain suits for breach of collective agreements (336 U.S. 245; 346 U.S. 485; 368 U.S. 502).

Section 14(c) of the present law permits the States to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes even in industries affecting commerce if the board has relinquished jurisdiction.

Section 18 of the Fair Labor Standards Act allows the States to impose higher wages or shorter workweeks than are prescribed by that act.

Section 603(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act preserves State laws regulating the actions of union officials and the remedies available thereunder to individual members.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 gives wide latitude to the States to legislate in the area of racial or religious discrimination in the field of employment.

In the National Labor Relations Act, "union security" is not applied alike to all employees. A special rule applicable only to the construction industry is written into section 8(f) of the act. The act similarly abandons uniformity in section 8(e) which writes in special rules regarding "hot cargo" arguments applicable to both the construction and garment industries. Since the garment industry centers largely in New York it follows that here is an exception which is principally applicable in just one State.

Workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation benefits vary from State to State. The States also have varied laws about injunctions in labor disputes, about payment of wages, about employment of minors and females, and many other matters that affect the employer-employee relationship.

The Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act recognizes authority of the State when it provides in section 16(a) that States shall not be prevented from obtaining information regarding a plan in addition to that required by the Federal act.

Without further examination of the exceptions to uniform national policy, we go to the heart of the matter and say we believe that the States still have some rights. If there is to be legislation limiting or guaranteeing freedom of association, let it be by State action as the Founding Fathers intended. As the Founding Fathers drafted it, the Constitution guaranteed to the States and to the people the unused reservoirs of power and authority. As a nation we suffer from too much centralism already. Let us keep a little power in the States, and thus give a small nod of respect to the Constitution as written and intended.

We have examined in vain the record of testimony before the subcommittee to find any citation of problems created by the lack of uniformity on "union security." There are none. Proponents of repeal of 14(b) rest on the mere statement that there is someting good about uniformity.

(2) THE "FREE RIDER" ARGUMENT

Almost every proponent witness appearing before the subcommittee stressed the argument that every employee's wages and working conditions are fixed by union contract and that, therefore, as a beneficiary of this contract, he should contribute his share of the cost of union representation.

The argument ignores the fact that employees in a competing nonunion plant are frequently better paid. It assumes that the wages and fringe benefits of the worker in the union plant would be less if it were not for union negotiations. Obviously, this applies only to the less skilled, less dexterous, or less diligent members of any working force, for an employer could afford to pay more to the more competent workers, were it not for the union goal of uniformity in job rates. Moreover, almost all union contracts have seniority provisions which require the newly hired to be laid off first and the older to be rehired first. Young workers or new workers in industries where there are frequent layoffs simply do not benefit by union representation.

Consider also the fact that many nonunion employees have serious doubts whether excessive union demands are in their ultimate best interests, particularly when they are involved in costly long strikes over issues where they do not stand to gain. For example, where the

issues—union shop, checkoff, maintenance of membership, and so forth—result in a strike, the employees have much to lose and little to gain. Employees may choose not to join for many reasons apart from the dues requirement. To list a few: Confidence in the leadership of management, objections to the union leadership; or objections to the union policies.

In fact, 39 million of 56 million workers in nonagricultural establishments have not joined unions, and this has not been due to a lack of opportunity to do so.

The American Farm Bureau Federation in its testimony on this legislation asks some very pertinent questions:

First. Does the member benefit when the union supports political causes he abhors?

Second. Does the member benefit when the union helps elect political candidates to whom he is opposed?

Third. Does the member benefit if the union prices him out of a job?

Fourth. Does the member benefit if the union destroys his employer?

Fifth. Does the member benefit if the union falls into the hands of criminal elements, racketeers, or subversive elements?

Sixth. Who is to decide whether or not the individual benefits—the union or the individual? The McClellan committee hearings document these reasons for concern.

The free-rider argument is basically unsound because throughout America many voluntary organizations carry on meritorious work which benefits many persons who contribute neither financial or other support. Fraternal organization, churches, civic and political organizations are examples. Any organization so lacking in the confidence of its members that it can exist only through the protective cloak of compulsion rests on such insecure foundations that it needs a reappraisal by its membership.

Proponents of the bill also use a secondary argument, that the law requires a union to represent all employees in a bargaining unit—members or not. This is hypocritical. Unions have steadfastly insisted that the union be the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees. They have resisted all suggestions that the law of exclusive representation be modified.

If a union serves the persons in the bargaining unit it represents wisely and unselfishly, it will have no difficulty in maintaining a strong and nearly universal membership.

(3) SECTION 14(b) PREVENTS FREEDOM OF CONTRACT AS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND UNIONS

This argument could be dismissed with the simple observation that we are concerned here with the protection of the rights of employees. They and they alone are affected by union shop agreements. Freedom of contract between employers and unions has no relevance here.

However, it is interesting to look at the record to see what freedom of contract has meant in non-right-to-work States.

The testimony of small retailers establishes that the word "freely" is a grim joke. There is bargaining on wages, working conditions, and fringe benefits. There is no bargaining on the union shop. The employer is reduced to the position of saying yes or no. If he says no and sticks to it, he must expect a strike or picketing. A retailer is vulnerable to strikes and picketing. When his store is shut down or his customers do not cross a picket line, he loses customers which he may never regain. Thus, he is easily forced to agree to compulsory membership and the dues checkoff.

Too often employers quickly agree to compulsory membership contracts in exchange for a better break on wage and fringe benefits. Thus the employees lose.

Consider this testimony of a small businessman:

The bargaining which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to just does not exist at the small business level. Experience has shown that a union demand for a compulsory membership contract is invariably accompanied with threats of the most drastic economic reprisals upon the employer if he does not accede to the demand. This bargaining, which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to, is comparable to a situation where a highwayman puts a pistol at your head and says I want to bargain with you for the contents of your wallet. The small businessman yields on the union shop just about as willingly as the highwayman's victim gives up his money.

The American Farm Bureau Federation testified during the hearings that:

It is bad enough in principle to force a person to join a good union. But what shall we say to a law which forces a worker to belong to some of the racket-ridden unions investigated by the McClellan committee? Yet, monstrous though it may be, this could be required everywhere if section 14(b) should be repealed.

The printing industry went on record as follows:

Very few small companies can afford an extended strike on a union shop issue, as the bulk of orders which come to a printing plant—legal briefs, periodicals, timetables, have a deadline. A suspension of operations means that these customers will go to a nonunion plant, and possibly will never return. But if these employers yield to the union shop demands, it means that every one of their workers forced into membership will also be trapped by the union rules on jurisdiction and other practices which drive up costs and prices in this highly competitive industry.

The Associated General Contractors made this observation:

The act allows construction contractors and the construction unions to make prehire agreements; that is, before there are any employees on the job. The prehire agreements can, of course, contain union shop provisions, unless banned by the States. Construction workers coming on the project will be required to join the union at the end of 7 days. This means it is a "closed shop" in our industry which is also known for its closed unions.

The manufacturers made this point:

The major impact of this legislation would fall on medium and small sized companies which could not possibly withstand the assault of such organized power in a demand for a union shop and compulsory membership. Thus you come to the "agreement" between a union and an employer entered into under the coercion of a potentially ruinous strike and without regard to the ultimate desires or wishes of the employees who will be compelled to sign up or look elsewhere for a job.

(4) "UNION SECURITY" PROVISIONS MAKE A VERY REAL CONTRIBUTION TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE AND UNION RESPONSIBILITY—LET US EXAMINE THIS FALLACY

In support of this statement Secretary of Labor Wirtz said:

The resultant assured continuation of the union's status removes one of the most serious sources of bitter labor-management suspicion and conflict. Without such a clause, union energies better devoted to making a cooperative bargaining relationship work for the mutual benefit of the employer and employees are likely to be drained off in abrasive defensive efforts—guarding against willful attrition, continuous organization of newcomers, watchfulness against antiunion solicitation.

Thus, the Secretary of Labor departs from the role of a neutral Government official to that of the all-out advocate of the union shop.

It cannot be denied that the employer who agrees to the union shop has made his job of employee relations easier. But that is not the point of this dissent. I believe the welfare of the employees is the paramount consideration. The abuses which flow from compulsory unionism are felt principally by the individual worker at the local level, and for this reason it is felt that they create essentially local problems which should be dealt with by the States on the basis of their special knowledge and judgment as to what is necessary in the best interests of their people.

My colleagues in the Senate are urged to read the statements of 22 individuals relating their personal experience with union shop conditions in the hearings. Their stories illustrate the frustration and helplessness of union members who are unable to do anything about the corruption, mismanagement, and abuses of power which exist under union shop conditions.

Many unions in many plants have 100-percent membership without the compulsion of union shop contracts. They have sold themselves to their members. I agree with the statement:

Good unions don't need compulsory unionism, and bad unions don't deserve it.

Proponents of repeal argue that this legislation would not require anyone to join a union—all an employee has to do is tender the dues and initiation fees. This argument ignores the practicalities of the matter. For example, the American Federation of Musicians do not permit their members to work with nonmembers and the nonmember can tender dues as often as he pleases, but he will not work because he cannot work alone.

Moreover, it is not true that all an employee has to do is tender initiation fees and dues. His job also depends upon his payment of special assessments. In 1948 as a result of a ruling of the Department of Justice, unions were given authority to classify whatever special assessments they wished to levy as dues by the simple subterfuge of amending their

constitution. Union hiring halls and agreements giving preferential employment to union members have been legalized by the Supreme Court.

Secretary Wirtz's statement might well have read that existing law permitting union security has produced long and costly strikes. I refer my colleagues to the hearings, pages 118–119 and 195, for illustrations of long strikes on this one issue.

(1) THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT PERMITS "UNION SECURITY" AGREEMENTS

Prohibitions against all forms of "union security" agreements and the checkoff were made part of the Railway Labor Act in 1934. The 81st Congress repealed this prohibition. The report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommended this action because the committee believed that railway unions should have the same freedom to negotiate union shop conditions as unions representing employees in industry generally—page 3, report 2262, 81st Congress, 2d session. The report is silent on section 14(b). The report states:

> It is the view of our committee that the terms of the bill are substantially the same as those of the Labor Management Relations Act as they have been administered and that such differences as exist are warranted either by experience or by special conditions existing among employees of our railroads and airlines.

While the committee did not develop the point, the "special conditions" could only have reference to the fact that railroads are instruments of interstate commerce and many of the employees move daily between States.

It is interesting to note that at least one railway union president opposed the amendment. The president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers said that his union for 25 years had held to the position that it was such an outstanding organization that men should seek its membership. He "did not want any compulsion; he did not want any closed shop; he did not want any union shop"—May 1, 1950. Hearing To Amend Railroad Labor Act, page 86.

The statement that the Railway Labor Act permits union shop contracts in all States has little relevance to the issue now before us.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951, when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement, workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified that:

> Over 97 percent of the 46,146 elections which were conducted went in favor of the union shop, and 91 percent of the almost 6 million employee votes cast in these elections were in favor of the union shop.

To the Secretary, these figures demonstrate that the American workingmen overwhelmingly favor the union shop.

The figures, like most statistics, do not tell the whole story. Only a small percentage of the establishments in this country which now have compulsory membership provisions in contracts were ever the subject of these popular referendums. It must be remembered that because such polls were taken only upon the petitions of labor organizations, the union officials rarely picked any establishment where they were not sure to win. In cases where the Board has entertained deauthorization petitions from dissident employees—and it takes a 30-percent showing to file—the results of such balloting indicate a disillusionment with compulsory unionism. Of the 34 such referendums conducted in 1964, 67 percent resulted in a majority vote for revocation of the union shop. In 1963 unions lost 71 percent of such elections.

It should be noted that these deauthorization proceedings have every force working against them. Employees cannot campaign for deauthorization in the shop or plant. They can hardly campaign at the union hall. The employer cannot assist or even suggest such without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. Advocates of deauthorization can expect threats and abuse and future retaliatory action from the union. Their employers, fearing union pressures, may be expected to make every effort to discourage deauthorization campaigns. It is surprising that such elections ever occur.

The Secretary's statistics are also debatable when one considers the timing of those union shop authorization elections. They were held after the union had already become the bargaining agent by certification or recognition. They were held before bargaining began. The issue in those 1947–51 votes was bargaining power. They were sought by the union to demonstrate a show of strength to the employer. Employees were propagandized to insure a belief that a strong vote for union shop was the way to win wage and benefit demands at the bargaining table.

The report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations dated December 31, 1948, discussed the problems involved in the union shop authorization (section 9(e)(1)). While this was only a little over 1 year after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, that committee recommended the amendment which became law in 1951. The reasons for its recommendations were: First, many elections were being held where there was already a contract with union security provisions; second, unions were requesting authorization elections in situations where they have reason to believe they have the best chance of success; third, the practical difficulties of conducting such elections where employment is intermittent, most often in the building trades; and fourth, the cost of such elections was average 40 cents per vote.

In any event, the results could have been expected. The Smith-Connally Antistrike Act, which during World War II required an employee vote to authorize a strike, resulted in a similar statistical record. Although the ballot was worded to the effect, "Do you want to interfere with the war effort by going on strike?" in almost every case the employees nevertheless voted overwhelmingly to authorize the strike. The reason then, as in 1947–51, was that the real issue was bargaining power with the employer.

I believe that forcefully brings out the manner in which union members accepted this prerogative. They felt it gave them the opportunity to express themselves so far as bargaining power over the employer was concerned.

The Smith-Connally votes do not prove that employees wanted to go on strike during the war and the 1947–51 votes do not prove the employees wanted a "union shop."

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

The only conflict which proponents were able to cite was in the political arena when States pass or attempt to pass right-to-work laws, Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> It is time to put an end to fruitless and acrimonious political controversy by adopting the rule of uniformity.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO, said:

> There have been innumerable legislative contests and in 13 instances referendum votes—all accompanied by highly emotional charges and countercharges, which, quite apart from the merits of the case, did not contribute to labor-management peace or stability in the States involved.

This type of "conflict" can hardly be persuasive to any Senator. To abolish it would be to demolish democracy itself.

If "conflict" means that the States do not have uniform laws, the field of "conflict" covers innumerable subjects as broad as the body of laws of any given State.

I could cite eight definite reasons for the differences in the laws of the various States. I could refer to my State of Arizona, which has more Indians than any other State in the United States. In one county of our State there are approximately 26,000 Indians and 6,000 non-Indians. I would not like to have the same rules and regulations apply to the organization or the hiring of Indian people, to dictate to them the conditions under which they can work, as would apply in an industrial area of our land. Those people are not in a position to meet those conditions. If we based all of our laws on a basic uniformity it would be a definite injustice to these people. They have not had an opportunity to go forward as many people in our great Nation. I would oppose any attempt at uniformity to bring them to apply to any metropolitan center of a highly industrialized area.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> There is no violation of freedom in a minority's having to accept a majority's fair judgment fairly arrived at. There is no "right" of minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The view of a few who oppose belonging to a union or to any other organization as a matter of conscience or religious principle must be accommodated to the obligations of living together, and is respected to the fullest practical extent in section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The Secretary's argument on "majority rule" is quoted in full text because it is believed that he is wrong both in the principle he states and in his assertion that in the majority of cases there is an expression of desire by a majority.

In the first place in talking about majority rule the Secretary and union spokesmen erroneously assume there is no difference between public government and private labor organizations, so far as power over the individual is concerned. Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

I wish to emphasize that statement: Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

If a minority of employees does not want to be unionized, no democratic principle will support action which compels that minority to join the union of a majority. Second, although a properly constituted government may take some rights from an individual under the principle of majority rule, even in this case there are certain basic rights which cannot be taken from him. It takes a compelling national purpose to deprive an individual of a basic right.

Mr. Justice Jackson eloquently expressed this when he stated:

> The very purpose of a bill of rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship, and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to votes; they depend on the outcome of no elections (speaking for the majority in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette,* 319 U.S. 1187).

I cannot agree with Secretary Wirtz that a great national purpose would be served by requiring American workingmen to join unions even if the majority will it. In the case of the Government a majority decision may decide issues. It should never decide who shall join what private association.

This country has been moving rapidly forward in the area of civil rights and civil liberties, the motivation being the result of personal convictions, legislative action, and court decisions. Repeal of section 14(b) would be a long step in the other direction.

While the United States regards itself as and hopes to convey the impression abroad that it is the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, the passage of H.R. 77 can only be regarded as a rejection of voluntarism. We would become the only major power outside of the Iron Curtain to permit compulsory unionism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany.

The majority-rule argument can also be shown to be fallacious on other grounds. Unions and employers customarily enter into union shop contracts without ever having obtained an expression of the desires of the majority of employees in the bargaining unit. Even in the best run unions, the business agent presents proposed demands in a package at a meeting of employees—in almost all cases just those who are already members attend—prior to bargaining. Then in bargaining, everything is bargainable except the union shop. That is a "must". The employer agrees or a strike is called. An attorney-witness before the subcommittee described a 427-day strike in Kansas City, Mo., where the sole issue was "union shop." After the strike the employee union leader admitted on the witness stand that he did not even know what the term "union security" meant.

As a matter of fact, it is even possible for a worker to be forced into a union by so-called "majority rule" where there has never been a majority of employees even wanting union representation. During the hearings witnesses pointed out that the National Labor Relations Board has circumvented the elections provisions of the act to require bargaining on the basis of union membership cards by what it calls the Joy Silk and Bernel Foam doctrine. It is submitted that the use of card checks to determine a majority can be justified only in the most extreme cases—cases where the employer is guilty of gross misconduct. This is so because cards can never be a reliable indicator of employee intent. Employees sign cards believing the purpose is only to obtain an election at which time they will have an opportunity to express their real intent. Cards may be signed today by a group of employees who next week may change their minds on union representation. Cards are signed because of various pressures—some, just to please a friend. Many cards are forgeries. It is no answer to say that motivation may be inquired into on the witness stand because few people wish to admit that they did not know what they were doing or yielded to pressure in signing a card.

The whole practice is detrimental to employee rights. He is prevented from hearing both sides of the question of representation which occurs if an election is held. He becomes a victim of the union shop in many cases where there has never been a majority of employees desiring union representation. Card checks are the handmaiden of "sweetheart" contracts where the employee loses wage increases and benefits and the opportunity to choose a different union to represent him.

Thus, the arguments of majority rule fail in every respect.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organization, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry:

There was an attempt to show that right-to-work laws cause migration of industry from non-right-to-work States with resulting loss of jobs. This was an argument without supporting proof.

This subject is much misunderstood, and many people who have discussed it in recent weeks have been under illusions. They have considered that in the right-to-work States starvation wages have been paid. They have not taken the time to determine how their particular States stand in relation to the right-to-work States. I gave statistics, and I shall submit more, covering that particular item. But in making the determination, it was found that of the top 15 States, in relation to wages paid, 6 are right-to-work States. One of the right-to-work States is the second in the Nation so far as wage payments are concerned. But such statistics are not valid in proving arguments one way or another. Even if statistics were available in all categories, they would be meaningless, because an employer may move his business for myriads of reasons.

There have been movements both to and from right-to-work States, between right-to-work States and between non-right-to-work States. The National Labor Relations Board has extremely few "runaway shop" cases—it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to move his business to get rid of a union.

The subcommittee was presented with many tables of statistics on wage rates and on union membership in the various States by both proponents and opponents of repeal of section 14(b). From these, one may logically argue that there is or is not motivation for an employer to move to a right-to-work State. Statistics were also offered on man-days lost by strike in the various States from which one might argue that there is motivation to move to States where there are fewer strikes.

When one makes comparison between two States, the statistics lose their persuasiveness.

Compare Arizona with the neighboring State of New Mexico, which does not have a right-to-work law. Similar in size, climate, and resources, 10 years ago the average weekly earnings of a worker in New Mexico was $85 compared to $82 in Arizona. Today the average wage in Arizona is $111 a week compared to $90 in New Mexico.

I do not feel, as I stated before, that this is occasioned merely because one State is a compulsory-union State and the other is a voluntary-union State.

The AFL–CIO gained 36,000 members in Arizona between 1958 and 1962, and gained 5,000 members in New Mexico during the same period. Later I give statistics showing that gains in the year 1965 have been highly significant in my State of Arizona.

In 1964, Arizona ranked 13th and New Mexico ranked 36th in average hourly earnings in manufacturing. I do not say that this is due merely to the right-to-work law. However, I emphasize over and over that the States which have right-to-work laws have been seeking industries. They have had a good political climate, and a good business climate. I believe that this is important.

I believe this indicates that a State is a right-to-work State not because it wants to take advantage of the working man, but because, in most cases, the people involved look favorably upon industry and want industry to come to that State.

That is proved by the statistics, if we want to accept the statistics as proof. The per capita personal income in Arizona was $2,218 for 1964, and it was $2,010 in New Mexico for the same year. Incidentally, both those States have a

large Indian population with a very low per capita income. I believe that we are on about the same percentage basis in this relationship.

Arizona has more Indians than has any other State in the United States. The State of New Mexico is second in that regard. That does affect our per capita personal income. In New Mexico—as an example, to show that compulsory unionism has not been beneficial, strikes accounted for 69,300 man-days idle in Arizona and 93,500 man-days idle in New Mexico.

If we look back over the years, we see that we have had a better relationship between mangement and labor and a far better situation with reference to union activities in the State of Arizona, which is a right-to-work State.

The value of these statistics is diminished by the fact that they do not show the number of employees belonging to affiliated unions, such as the Mine Workers, the Teamsters, and a large body of independent unions. Statistics reflecting such total membership are not available.

Another factor should be noted when examining tables of union membership. Under the act a union is certified to represent all employees in the bargaining unit. Since union shop is forbidden in the 19 right-to-work States, there are more nonmember employees represented in such States. As pointed out by Mr. Biemiller, it should also be remembered that total union membership declined between 1958 and 1962. Total membership fell from 17.1 million in 1958 to 16.6 million in 1962. However, this is not true today. The union membership has increased and the statistics show now that it is at a high point.

While Mr. Biemiller is able to make the overall statement that percentage drop was greater for the right-to-work States than for States without right-to-work laws, reference to some individual States demonstrates that there must have been factors other than right-to-work laws operating to create losses and gains. Among the non-right-to-work States, for example, Michigan lost 50,000 members, Ohio lost 250,000, California lost 200,000, Vermont lost 500, Illinois gained 50,000, Massachusetts gained 125,000, and Washington gained 150,000, Tennessee lost 25,000, Iowa lost 30,000, and there were no changes in Alabama, Arkansas, and North Carolina.

Senators are urged to examine the tables of strikes and man-days lost for the 4 years, 1960–63, for the various States. It is interesting to note that when the States listed above were considered, gains and losses in union membership bear a close relationship to the number of strikes and man-days lost.

Statistics from the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce for the decade ending in 1963 indicate that determinative factors of an expanding economy such as wage improvements, increased number of production workers, greater capital investment, larger bank deposits, accelerated personal income, and other similar indexes of increased prosperity showed a greater percentage rate of increases in right-to-work States than in either non-right-to-work States or the national average.

Mr. President, I shall read a few statements from individuals whose testimony was given before our committee.

This is a statement of John Seeley, of California. It reads as follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN SEELEY, SEPULVEDA, CALIF.

It was almost exactly 2 years ago that I walked for the last time out of the gates of the Douglas Aircraft Co. plant where I had worked for 27 years. An old union man, I had taken my stand on the principle that no man should be forced to join or pay fees to a union except by free choice. I knew it meant the loss of my job and I was fired.

I had helped organize one of the first unions in the Douglas plant at Santa Monica, Calif., years ago—the Aircraft Workers Union. Later, during World War II, I was a member of a CIO union at the plant and served as an assistant shop steward. Those were voluntary unions, which employees were free to join as they chose. I believe in that type of union.

But when the International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO) demanded of Douglas an "agency shop" contract, under which every employee of the plant had to either join or pay fees to the union, I was one of hundreds of other Douglas employees who fought against it because they believed it was wrong. We organized the Douglas Employees Right-To-Work Committee and did all we could to prevent imposition of the "agency shop," but were defeated.

After the signing of the "agency shop" contract at Douglas, I was 1 of 25 or 30 employees who stuck by their guns and refused to pay forced tribute to the union—even though they knew it meant their jobs.

Speaking of those who accepted the "agency shop" against their beliefs, I found that most people can't afford the luxury of integrity.

When I received official notice that I had to pay a fee to the union or be fired, I went to call on the president of the company, Donald W. Douglas, Jr. Told that Mr. Douglas was not in, I left my 25-year pin with the secretary. Later Mr. Douglas called me to make sure he understood the company's position and my rights under the contract. I assured him that I did. Asked why I had returned my 25-year pin, I replied: "I don't want the pin any longer because I can't wear it with pride."

During my 27 years in the Santa Monica Douglas plant, I worked in almost every phase of tool and diemaking. My last assignment was in a department where highly skilled men were building special machinery. My supervisor gave me the highest rating in the plant.

I hold no resentment against my employer, or even the union—only against the compulsion which I feel is robbing rank-and-file workers of their freedom and is hurting the union movement.

Today I am employed as an instructor at the North American Aviation Co. My duties include use of a special skill I possess in teaching classes for the deaf.

I continue to fight against compulsory unionism. I serve as a director of the organization, California Employees for Right To Work, which is working toward adoption of a law to make compulsory union membership illegal in that State.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of of quorum.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before doing that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a quorum call?

Mr. FANNIN. I withhold my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to ask a question or two of the Senator from Arizona.

Before doing so, however, I wish to state that he has made an excellent analysis of the situation. The Senate is favored with his statement, because the Senator from Arizona speaks with authority, having served as Governor of his State for a long enough period of time to have had the benefit of an opportunity to observe precisely what has happened on the industrial scene, the labor scene, and the economic scene, as affected by the law in effect in his State, and is in a good position to predict what the impact and effect would be should repeal occur.

The question which I should like to put to the Senator from Arizona has to do with work stoppages. There was a comment by him as to the greater number of work stoppages in non-right-to-work States than in right-to-work States such as his own. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether, in his State, there has been the same experience that we have in this Senator's State of Nebraska, where, for the 11-year period from 1952 to 1962, the percentage of estimated total working time lost due to stoppages was 0.118, while during that same period of time nationally, the percentage of estimated total working time lost was 0.303, a figure not quite but nearly three times as great.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, therefore, whether there was a similar experience in his State.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his question, as well as for the information regarding his State. I am proud of what has happened in Nebraska, just as I am proud of what has happened in Arizona, both being right-to-work States. I have carefully checked the figures over the past 5 years, and the record is highly encouraging. We find that Arizona has been fortunate in having fewer work stoppages than most of the States of our Nation. I cannot say that we have the fine record that Nebraska has, but we do have an outstanding record as compared with the other States of our Nation; and I am pleased that in our area, we have proved that in comparison with New Mexico, our neighboring State, we have had far fewer work stoppages and fewer man-days lost by strikes than has that State.

So although we have not maintained such a fine record as have the people of Nebraska, whom the distinguished Senator represents, I am proud of the record of our State.

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

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for another question.

Mr. HRUSKA. It has been called to my attention that in States which permit what we call enforced unionism, that is, where they do not have right-to-work laws, the work stoppage record is nearly twice as great, through time lost as a result of strikes and other labor

stoppages, than in States where right-to-work laws exist. I know that the Senator, being a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, has come across figures of that kind. The percentages which I have are 0.09 in all States which ban compulsory unionism, compared with 0.14 in the remaining 31 States—not quite twice as much, but nearly so.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether that is his recollection, and whether that is the information which was developed during the course of hearings on the bill.

Mr. FANNIN. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct. I have here the record on the economic progress in the various States of our Nation. The Senator's information is correct. We are proud that that is the record and has been the experience in the right-to-work States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not true that often in work stoppages and strikes, strikes not necessarily caused by it but nevertheless prolonged by it, the issue of enforced unionism was the issue which caused the work stoppage, and that that is one of the prime reasons for the more adverse record on work stoppages in States where that can be done?

Mr. FANNIN. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. He has brought out some very valuable information, which discloses that a better working relationship exists between unions and management in States which have voluntary unionism.

The record of time thus lost through strikes, as shown by the statistics the distinguished Senator has mentioned, is very impressive, and it is encouraging to see that the record in right-to-work States is still improving. That is highly commendable.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the attitude of the people is reflected, in States which have voluntary unionism, in the better relationship which has accrued to them as a result of their working together, because the union management of a voluntary union is, by necessity, compelled to provide service to members to a much greater degree than in the case of a compulsory union.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator very much for his responses to my questions, and congratulate him on the clarity of his statement, made, as it is, from his vantage point of authority.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 77, a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In all my years in public life, Mr. President, I have never seen an issue upon which there was a more confused public debate, upon which misunderstanding was so rampant, upon which there was so much heat and so little light as there is on the so-called right-to-work issue.

Perhaps one reason for this is the fact that the right-to-work dispute has absolutely nothing to do with anyone's right to work.

What it does have to do with is labor's and management's right to negotiate a union security agreement. That right it gives a State the power to deny.

I come from a State that has never enacted a right-to-work law. The proposed repeal would not affect Alaska, or 30 of the other States, in any way. In these States labor and management in a given plant have an unfettered right to determine whether they want a union-shop or open-shop arrangement. They are free to decide either way.

It is only in the 19 right-to-work States that labor and management are forbidden this choice. There they are compelled to operate under the open shop.

The repeal of 14(b) would simply remove the State's power to impose this sort of arrangement.

It would not end the open shop or establish the union shop. It would merely guarantee that in all States labor and management are free to determine which arrangement they prefer.

I find it difficult to understand why advocates of the right-to-work clause argue in the name of freedom. It seems to me that they are instead arguing for a compulsory situation which restricts the free bargaining process.

Now if we wanted to talk about the freedom of the working man, about the right to work, we might talk about a number of things.

We might talk about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and certain NLRB or court decisions which provide that no person shall be denied employment or union membership because of race, creed, or sex.

We might mention the numerous statutes which provide that a union shall preserve the liberties and serve the best interests of its members. The law completely bans any arrangement whereby a man may not be hired if he is not a union member. It provides that a union shall not bargain on behalf of a body of workers unless it represents a majority of them, as determined by free elections. It provides that union members shall not be compelled to participate in union activities nor to pay excessive dues and fees. It prohibits unions from denying membership to workers for reasons other than their failure to pay uniformly required dues and fees. All this effectively precludes unions from denying or burdening a laborer's right to work.

We might look at the restraints placed upon employers to guarantee that they shall not discriminate against union members in their hiring and firing practices, that they shall not impede legitimate labor activity nor refuse to engage in bargaining. We might indeed look at the wage and hour guarantees, the fair-labor standards, and the job security agreements to which management has agreed, largely because of the growth and strength and activity of the labor movement.

We might talk about all these things if we were interested in the right to work.

But we would not talk about right-to-work laws.

The only person to whom a right-to-work law conceivably gives a right to work is the person who would choose to work in a unionized plant, who would reap the benefits of past and continuing union activity, and yet who would choose not to pay the dues that maintain the union. The argument in favor of a compulsory open shop sometimes makes little more sense than suggesting that the person who participates in a company's health or retirement program should be "free" not to pay the requisite fees. The union shop does not compel active unionism. It merely provides that each shall share in the financial maintenance of union benefits.

But the point is not to defend the union shop—though I think it undeniable that such arrangements have contributed immensely to the welfare of the working man. The point is not that union shops are good and open shops are bad. The point is that labor and management should be free to negotiate whichever kind of arrangement seems best for a given situation. That freedom 19 States have seen fit to deny through the powers granted them under 14(b).

14(b) represents an unwarranted exception to the national labor policy outlined in the Taft-Hartley Act. It provides for the irregular and arbitrary intrusion of State law into a delicate field otherwise preempted by Federal statute. It disturbs the balance of interests represented by the otherwise uniform regulation of labor and management policy and practice.

The progress of the working man and the operation of the free bargaining process have been inhibited in 19 States by misnamed and misguided right-to-work laws. The repeal of the clause which made such restrictions possible is long overdue.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

[No. 288 Leg.]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the 47-to-45 majority vote today was to me a clear demonstration that the Senate prefers to postpone until next year the issue raised by the proposal to repeal section 14(b). I am fairly certain that, before the end of this week, the Senate will go on to other matters and that the present attenuated discussion will come to an end. However, until the signal is given, it remains the responsibility of those who oppose the repeal of section 14(b) to continue to discuss the measure.

I rise tonight for the first time in my Senate career to participate actively in such an extended debate. I do so, fully convinced that the cause which I defend is supported by a large majority of the American people.

In my own State, which has a right-to-work law, made possible by section 14(b), the available figures are quite dramatic.

The mail which I have received from Utah shows that 83 percent of the people who write me oppose the repeal of section 14(b) and only 17 percent favor it. This is a 5-to-1 margin.

The mail that I am beginning to receive from outside my State is running more than 98 percent in opposition to the repeal of section 14(b).

When we take all this mail and average it out, the average is 87.5 percent against, and 12.5 percent for, or a ratio of 7-to-1.

Two great Americans, both from Illinois, have brought the issue into sharp focus. Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the greatest defender of freedom this Nation has known, described the American political system as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." His definition left little room for private forms of government, special interest groups, and compulsion. The other man of whom I speak is the distinguished minority leader from Illinois, whose leadership and courage in this battle will go down in history as a classic defense of freedom, and under whose leadership I am proud to serve.

The issue of 14(b) is, of course, a power grab by certain labor bosses who have called at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and at the offices of certain Congressmen and Senators to collect their political I O U's for the 1964 elections. This fact has not escaped the attention of the American people and the American press. It was placed clearly in focus by the distinguished minority leader when, upon being asked if he had enough support to mount a successful drive against the repeal of 14(b), replied that he did, but even more importantly, he knew that those Congressmen and Senators who opposed compulsory unionism also had the country in their corner.

Mr. President, what a comfort it is to know that out in the States, the cities, the towns, villages, farms, factories, and offices of America, at least two-thirds of the people believe that this cause is just and that section 14(b) should be preserved. At a time when consensus has come to mean so much to some Americans and to one in particular, I find it difficult to understand how this classic case can be ignored, but ignored it is. But not for long, for our people are becoming aroused and are beginning to speak. I feel that if the discussion of this proposal is to be dropped for the remainder of this session, that by the time we come back in January, that voice will have made itself so clear that the proposal to repeal section 14(b) cannot be passed.

Let me point out for the sake of those who, for obvious reasons, choose not to listen to what the citizen of my State have said regarding compulsory unionism. Every Utah newspaper of which I have a record has spoken in favor of retaining section 14(b). The largest broadcasting firm in Utah has spoken against compulsory unionism. Other people, business leaders, farmers, teachers, housewives, young people and more workers than some would care to admit, have spoken.

I received a very interesting postcard today. Its writer said that he had been urged to send to me a postcard asking me to vote for the repeal of section 14(b). He said:

> I have followed your political career and I have known how you stood from the beginning. And I am sure you are not prepared now to desert the principles for which you have stood so long. And even though I don't agree with those principles, I hope you have courage to stay with them.

Utah is the one State in the Union the majority of whose citizens have always belonged to the same church. Therefore, the leaders of that church, when they speak, are entitled to special attention.

Our church leaders, whose right to present their point of view to Congress has been attacked by some of their own members who serve in this body, have joined hundreds of other churches in opposing this form of compulsion over the individual.

It has interested me to know that 28 different religious organizations have taken a position on the repeal of section 14(b). Most of these organizations have opposed its repeal during the hearings held on the measure in the House and in the Senate.

Yet when the Mormon Church leaders made their views known, certain Members of Congress refused them a decent hearing. In my office, Mr. President, the voice of the people of Utah is being heard. The people of my State, by the latest count of telegrams, letters, and postcards to which I have referred, oppose repeal of section 14(b) by a margin of nearly 5 to 1. How can I ignore the people I was elected to represent? They know that the central issue in this debate is individual freedom. They have not chosen to ignore this glaring fact.

Mr. President, let us examine the issue in its historical perspective. Let us look back into the history of American political development. Let us examine the writings of the men who attended the birth of this Nation and those who wrote its Constitution. Let us examine the great issues of the Civil War and issues of our own industrial and political development to see whether or not the forces of freedom or compulsion were the victors.

A candid examination will, of course, show that throughout our history as a Nation there have been forces which would reduce freedom for self interest, but I think that our general approach, as a people and as a Government, has been to favor freedom over compulsion.

It should never be forgotten that one of the first acts of defiance in recorded American history was the refusal by certain members of the established churches in England to be subject to the dictates and will of a private organization. Rather than submit, they left for the New World with all its uncertainties to forge a new land of religious and political freedom. For 170 years these people underwent the long and agonizing process of developing and cultivating the forces of freedom. It was a time when further contests over religious freedom and between private power centers were fought. It was also the time when this Nation saw the establishment of human slavery, where one man's life came to be the property and subject of another man. We are, Mr. President, still attempting to eradicate the problems caused by this tragic institution.

After 170 years as British colonies, our people made the historic decision to declare their independence. It was an event dedicated to the proposition that:

> All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure their rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Then as now, Mr. President, the central issue was life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These were God-given and unalienable. They remain so today. I submit that to force a man to join a private organization and to force him to pay money to it against his will is a violation of these great principles.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson and those great men who signed the Declaration clearly, emphatically, and correctly declared that government was instituted to preserve these rights. It follows then that its task is not to destroy them. Yet this administration and those elected officials, who would force compulsory unionism upon the American people would do just that. Is it liberty if a free man must become a member of a private organization to earn his livelihood? Is this administration now about to place certain shackles on the "pursuit of happiness"? Can a man obtain this worthwhile objective in life if he must pay tribute to a private organization and to private individuals? Mr. President, we outlawed this principle of individual servitude a century ago. Let us not reinstitute it under the guise of "labor peace" and the erroneous claim of the "free rider."

From Independence Hall our people, cast upon their own resources, stumbled through 11 years of independence without a constitution or a strong central government. This was rectified at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 after which the finished Constitution was sent to the various States for ratification. Here it met resistence of the American

people because it did not contain what most Americans considered the necessary safeguards to individual freedom. Consequently, the first 10 amendments were submitted to the States in 1789 and finally became law in December 1791. This Bill of Rights was no outline of government powers or government responsibilities. It was a limitation or prohibition against Government interference with the rights which are enumerated therein. Let us examine two of those articles as they bear upon the issue of compulsory unionism.

Article I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Mr. President, I believe, and reason supports me in this argument, that if a man is guaranteed the right to exercise religion, it follows, as night follows day, that an American is also free not to practice a religion.

Because he is free to speak, he is also free to remain silent. Because he has the right to express freely his views in the press, he also has the right to refrain from using the press. Now the classic as far as this debate is concerned is the right of the American people to assemble peaceably. Has anyone ever stopped to think that most of our assemblies and associations are of a private nature? The authors of this amendment were concerned over the right of Americans to assemble in their churches, in their clubs, in their public squares, and in their private homes.

Is it not obvious, Mr. President, that an American who has the right to join a church also has the right not to join a church? If he chooses to join a club, he may also choose not to join. If there is a public rally in the city square and he chooses to attend, he may also choose not to attend. If his friends gather in a private home, he may attend, or he may stay away. Is a labor union any different? I believe it too is a private organization. It too can assemble. The first amendment is one of its guarantees. But is it not quite obvious that an American who chooses freely and independently not to join a church, a club, a PTA or attend a public meeting, should also be free to choose not to join a private labor organization? Have we come to the point, for the sake of political debt, that we are about to qualify the first amendment at the cost of personal freedom? This administration would do it. The labor bosses would force it. But, Mr. President, the American people would not. The people of Utah would not. For the last 10 years the legislatures in the State of Utah would not. They knew that they represented the people of Utah and not just the labor bosses.

Let us turn to the fifth amendment, Mr. President. Here the Congress is prohibited from depriving any American of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. Money is property. If Congress is forbidden from taking an individual's property without due process, how can anyone justify the taking of a man's property, against his wishes, by a private organization and by private officials to be used for purposes which he opposes? How far have we come in the loss of individual freedom?

Those who advocate the repeal of section 14(b) base their arguments mainly upon the need for a uniform and national labor policy. This, they argue, is possible because Federal law is supreme and State laws should not be permitted to override the Federal laws. Of course, this position is based largely upon the commerce clause in section 8 of article I and the supremacy clause of article VI. This power, no one denies, belongs to the Congress. But I emphatically deny that this power to regulate commerce gives Congress the right to override and set aside the rights guaranteed under the first and fifth amendments. These are individual rights which Congress shall not bridge. Have we forgotten about the ninth amendment? Let us put it in the RECORD:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

These take precedence over the power of Congress to regulate commerce. Congress, in violation of these rights, may not give private labor organizations the power to force membership in private organizations and allow labor bosses to take a man's private property and deny him the right to earn a livelihood under the guise of the commerce clause. Mr. President, this poor clause has been stretched, abused, and maligned in the past, but this is taking the matter much too far. The commerce clause was never intended to nullify the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Someone may question my use of the term "involuntary servitude," but in order that this may not be misunderstood, let us examine its meaning and compare it with "compulsory unionism."

On the 13th amendment, one the leading law journals, the Journal of Public Law, volume 6, 1957, had this to say about compulsory unionism and involuntary servitude:

[From the Journal of Public Law 6, 1957]

(By Jack P. Ashmore, Jr.)

The amendment is directed not only toward slavery but also against serfage, vassalage, villeinage, peonage, and every other form of compulsory labor. In striking down an Alabama statute making it a crime not to carry out the labor condition of a contract, the Supreme Court held that the statute violated the 13th amendment since all mandatory servitude is prohibited except as punishment for a crime. Of course, the Hanson situation is not "mandatory" in that the individual does have the choice of working elsewhere. But realistically is this a choice? "Necessitous men," it has been said, "are not free men." Can a personal right, a right which Justice Douglas called "the most precious liberty that man possesses," be denied on the ground of such a weak alternative? In large measure, forcing a person to join a union is a form of latter-day bondage.

The first item to examine is the basic and all-important requirement in the lives of all men, that of earning a livelihood and sustaining life itself. Without the compensation which one derives from holding a job, it is, Mr. President, impossible for a man and his family to pursue happiness, enjoy liberty, and even to sustain life. How then can a man who does not work enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

In this light, let us then examine the sad and deplorable similarities between involuntary servitude and the un-American and morally wrong principle of compulsory membership or service in private organizations, such as unions, businesses, or any other group of private individuals who would compel membership and dues payment against the free will of an individual and against his God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and to assemble or not assemble peaceably.

May I, for the sake of accuracy, give the Webster definition of these two words:

Involuntary: (1) done contrary to or without choice. (2) Compulsory: not subject to control of the will.

Servitude implies in general lack of liberty to do as one pleases, specifically lack of freedom to determine one's course of actions and conditions of living.

Let us measure the two—involuntary servitude and compulsory unionism. Under the terms of compulsory unionism, a man is allegedly required to join a union in order that he may share the economic costs of collective bargaining. First, therefore, we must measure the few dollars involved against the fact that a man is forced against his will to join a group which he may oppose and which often acts contrary to his self-interest by conducting strikes, and so forth. How in the name of liberty can anyone make a choice for the few dollars involved? Mr. President, the free exercise of thought, independent judgment, the free will, each separately and all collectively are worth much more to each American than the few dollars which the union bosses are trying to demand from the nonunion employee.

Unions claim that a nonunion man should help pay the cost of collective bargaining. Are the unions claiming that they cannot afford to carry on this function as a private organization? Are they asking the American people to forget about the huge sums of money that unions have available to them for operations completely unrelated to collective bargaining?

Mr. President, the American people are not blind. They know that the unions are extremely wealthy and have no cause to gripe about the lack of funds available to bargain collectively for nonunion members, a right which the unions themselves demanded under the Wagner Act and left intact by the Taft-Hartley law. This is not a matter of simple economics. It is a case of pure power grab based on coercion which would destroy some of the most basic of American freedoms.

During the past week we have read about Federal Government employees' unions who feel that if section 14(b) is repealed, they will then move to have the right to collect dues from all Federal em-

ployees, just as is done by unions representing employees in private collective bargaining.

If this happens, of course, the unions will have taken over a part of the fundamental sovereignty of the American Government.

Let us measure the paltry few dollars the unions would gain against the evil consequences a man must face if he chooses not to knuckle under to demands of the private union organization. Under the terms of union shop, he can be fired from his job if after 30 days he refuses, by exercising his free will, to join this private organization. Consequently, his ability to earn a livelihood can be cut off. This the unions would do for a paltry few dollars. Has a man's right to earn a livelihood become less important than the demands for a few measly dollars? Let us measure those few dollars again against the fact that by forcing a man to join a private organization we would be depriving him of his right under the first amendment to join or not to join a private organization. Mr. President, have we as a Nation come to the point where we will sell our rights under the first amendment for a few dollars in union dues?

Again, let us weigh the circumstances of forced union membership and how it requires a free man involuntarily to serve masters and causes which he opposes. The American people know that a unionman's dues are used for many purposes other than collective bargaining. He is not only paying a union leader's salary, he is also, in a few cases, paying for a union leader's vacation, for his mansion, for his liquor, for his limousine, and in a few cases, for his corruption. But beyond this, an unwilling union member is also paying for the election of some public officials whom he may oppose in principle, or for other reasons. He is helping to pay for the printing of propaganda sheets, the contents of which he may oppose. He is forced to help pay for lobbying agents and lobbying projects which are often contrary to his convictions. His very involuntary membership in this private organization requires him to serve, with his own dollars, to pay the debts and costs of people, projects, and policies which he in his own mind opposes.

Mr. President, in the past, we have permitted only the duly elected representatives of our republican form of government to exercise this power. Are we now foolishly about to give a blank check to a private organization to do it, also? The whole concept of compulsory unionism, therefore, is closely related to the involuntary servitude expressly outlawed by the 13th amendment, in that certain free men are forced to support with their property private causes of private individuals against their own free will.

Mr. President, involuntary servitude can take many forms, and it was not long after the 13th amendment went into effect that it was violated, if not in letter, in the spirit. All American history students know that the industrial power of the North was one of the major reasons why the Civil War was won by the northern armies. After the war was concluded, this industry, new and largely unregulated, began to expand and give to the American people an improved standard of living which has gradually come to be the standard of the world. This long process of development, however, was not without its black pages. The growth of American industry carried with it the employment of children, which was very often a matter of abuse, the creation of large trusts and monopolies, and the emergence of something akin to private economic governments. The evils, Mr. President, were there and our Government and people were eventually moved to the point of eradicating most of the evils.

In 1890 the Sherman antitrust law was passed which reduced some of the power of the large corporations. In 1938 the child labor laws were finally accepted by the Supreme Court. This must be considered one of America's most humane pieces of legislation. In 1932 the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed which outlawed the "yellow dog" contracts. What did these laws do and how do they affect the current debate? No one can deny that the circumstances under which children worked in the 50 years preceding the child labor laws were deplorable. To a certain extent they were in a condition of involuntary servitude. They were paid a very small wage, worked extremely long hours, and often forced to perform the most dangerous and unpleasant tasks. They could do little to improve their conditions and economic requirements quite often precluded their quitting the job. Technically, of course, there was no involuntary servitude, but in many ways they were slaves to the industry they served. The child labor laws, both State and Federal, went far to correct this great injustice.

About this same time, Mr. President, the American labor movement, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, was beginning to organize itself in order better to deal with the problems the individual workingman faced vis-a-vis industry and management. One of the big problems which they had to combat was the yellow dog contract, an agreement which abridged the right of an employee to join a union. This was a major issue. I fully believe that the right to organize and to join a private organization, such as a labor union, is guaranteed by the first amendment which, as noted above, provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people to assemble peaceably." This, the Federal Government found necessary to guarantee in 1932. This simple fact I do not dispute. On the other hand, I say, and the American people back us in this demand, that if a person has the right to join a union, he also has the right not to join a union. Mr. President, why in the name of human freedom must the yellow dog contract be reinstated, in reverse, this time against the man who chooses not to join a union. Somehow in the course of time the men who now claim to be leaders in the American labor movement have repudiated the advice of their most distinguished predecessor, Samuel Gompers. Have they forgotten the sound advice he gave regarding union membership when he said:

> I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principle of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible. * * * No man shall be deprived of livelihood for his family because of employment conditional upon membership in any union.
>
> There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons unexplainable to us does not join a union of labor. This is his right no matter how morally wrong he may be. It is his legal right and no one can or dare question his exercise of that legal right.

James F. Byrnes, a famous man of our own times, said:

> A workingman must have the right to join a labor union. It is equally important that a worker have the right to refuse to join a union, and no government or union should have the right to force him to join in order to get a job.

The Charter of the United Nations, section 2 of article XX, provides:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Gompers was speaking in the great tradition of America, a tradition based upon the time honored and wise premise that private organizations under no circumstances can compel membership, collect dues, or demand financial support for private causes which a private citizen may oppose. Mr. President, how wise he was. How foolish are those who would destroy this tradition and sell the American workingman into a situation akin to involuntary servitude, subject to the dictates of private and ofttimes corrupt labor bosses for the very essence of life, the right to earn a living. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We have fought this war in the past and have won. We are fighting it now, and because all America backs our cause we shall win again.

From the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Congress moved to the Railway Labor Act, originally passed in 1926 and amended in 1931. The basic premise of this statute was that compulsory membership in railroad unions was undesirable. Wisdom and constitutional rights prevailed. Then in 1935, Congress acted again on the subject of compulsion and passed the Wagner Act. This time, however, the forces of freedom, constitutional rights, and commonsense, gave way to the forces of compulsion, forced memberships, and those who would ignore the first and fifth amendments. Unions were permitted under Federal law, unless a State acted otherwise, openly to compel a man to join a union in order to get and hold a job. This mistaken concept was not permitted to remain unchallenged, however. In 1944, Americans in several States began to challenge this violation of freedom, and eventually in that same year two States adopted right-to-work laws, which the Wagner Act sanctioned.

These laws, Mr. President, were fair and reasonable. All right-to-work laws now existing in 19 States are also fair and reasonable. Did these new laws say

to the unions "You cannot organize yourself nor can you bargain collectively"? Absolutely not. Rather, in keeping with the traditional fairness of the American people, these laws encouraged, as have most labor laws, the right of private individuals to join together in a private association designed to improve themselves. They did not trample on the rights of labor. They did not attempt to destroy what was acknowledged then and now as a great American institution and contribution, the organized labor movement. What these laws said, and rightfully so, was that the labor unions could not coerce a man into joining what is admittedly and legally a private organization. What these right-to-work laws said to organized labor was that "Your drive for members is just, but under no circumstances will you as private individuals be permitted to abridge the God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of free Americans."

What these laws were saying to the labor unions is that "If you have got a service to sell to the great Americans who man the machines, build the buildings, operate the transportation system and industries, and perform the honorable tasks of labor, you had better get out and sell it to these men and women on its merits. You had better convince them in the marketplace, as free men traditionally have done in America, that your service is worthy of their consideration, acceptance, and financial support. What you had better do is get out and serve the public and the union member in such a way that he will see the worth and benefits of union membership. You had better get out there and sell your product voluntarily, because as Americans we neither believe, nor will we condone, the claim that a man can be compelled to join your private organization or pay you his money against his will. You had better do this on a voluntary basis because this is the American way, and the Constitution protects a man against the coercive practices now being pursued under the Wagner Act."

What these laws were saying to the unions was that we do not allow our churches to force a man into membership or donate to the cause, even though it would be nice to save all men's souls and enjoy the increased donations for new buildings and to assist the poor. What is more, our churches have not even asked for this power. How could they? The Master whose Gospel they teach set them an example of freedom. In his finest hour, the Humble Carpenter of Nazareth never went beyond the practice of persuasion in trying to convince His fellow men that His teachings would bring a better life now and in the hereafter. Mr. President, is it not quite evident that if all men could be forced to adhere to a church that the world might be a better place or might seem to be a better place? Yet in the wisdom of our Maker this has not been done.

What these laws are saying about the unions is that we do not permit the Elks or the Eagles or the Kiwanis or the Rotary or anyone else to compel membership because it would be morally wrong. They, too, are private organizations and people daily benefit from their activities, but these organizations are not crying for the right to compel membership. What these laws are saying is, "You have no reason to compare your cause with the integrated bar associations simply because in most cases they are an arm of the State governments designed mainly to regulate a profession."

What these laws are saying to the unions is that Americans have always judged a man by his service and on his merits. If we do not like a certain company or its products, we buy those of another one. This makes the business and the salesman whose product and service we have rejected work a little harder to regain our allegiance and our sale. No coercion here, Mr. President.

What these laws are saying to the unions is, "We will defend to the end your right to organize and bargain collectively, but we deny your demands that it be based upon coercive membership, upon destruction of our freedom of choice."

What these laws are saying, Mr. President is, "We believe that a union has every right under the Constitution to organize and deal with the management collectively, but you had better do it standing on your own two feet without the assistance of a Federal crutch. You had better realize that you are no longer a struggling, young labor movement fighting for your very existence. You are now a fullgrown labor organization, and it is time that you came to respect the freedoms and rights of all men as espoused by Samuel Gompers."

It was under these circumstances, concern for individual freedom, that the Congress wisely considered a national law which would permit the States to protect the rights so aptly described by Gompers and guaranteed by the Constitution, particularly, the first and fifth amendments. It had been a long contest, Mr. President, between the forces of freedom and those of compulsion. To preserve freedom is never easy and the watch must be eternal. Under the Wagner Act the forces of compulsion had scored a sad, but temporary victory. For 9 long years the American workingman, without choice of the exercise of his free will, was forced to join a union in all States in order to get a job. The American people, who had taken time out to fight a long and difficult war for the preservation of freedom around the world, after the war were turning to the task of building the peace, and as they looked around it became apparent that some changes had to be made for the cause of individual freedom right here at home. The result was the Taft-Hartley law, which was a great blow to the forces of compulsion and a great victory for the cause of individual freedom and the Bill of Rights.

Now, Mr. President, what does Taft-Hartley really do? First it permits, as did earlier legislation, labor unions to represent all employees, union and nonunion in the collective bargaining process. Do the American people know why this right was placed in the law? It was placed in the law because the labor people insisted that it be there. Dead, gone forever, soundly beaten, and refuted, therefore, should be the labor cry of "free rider." The nonunion man is really a "captive passenger." He has no right to bargain himself with his employer. I suggest, therefore, that the next time a union leader cries "free rider" to the American people he be asked to explain in the same breath the meaning and legislative history of this practice.

Mr. President, what does 14(b) itself say? It says:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such executive or application is prohibited by State law or territorial law.

I quote, Mr. President, from the conference report on the Taft-Hartley law:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in those States illegal. It was never the intention of the National Labor Relations Act, as is disclosed by the legislative history of that act, to preempt the field in this regard so as to deprive the States of their powers to prevent compulsory unionism. Neither the so-called closed shop proviso in section 8(3) of the existing act nor the union shop and maintenance of membership proviso in section 8(a)(3) of the conference agreement could be said to authorize arrangements of this sort in States where such arrangements were contrary to the State policy. To make certain that there should be no question about this, section 13 was included in the House bill. The conference agreement, in section 14(b), contains a provision having the same effect. (H. Rept. No. 150, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 60.)

Let us also examine what Senator Taft said about 14(b) during the Senate discussion on the conference report:

> I merely wish to make it clear that in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the Senate, we stated that in our opinion there was nothing in the bill as originally reported by the committee which in anyway would invalidate the provisions of a State law prohibiting the closed shop. That statement appears in the committee report to the Senate, on page 6. In it we pointed out that when the National Labor Relations Act was enacted, it was made clear in the report at that time that the proviso in section 8(3) was not intended to override State laws regulating the closed shops.
>
> In other words, the whole spirit of the Wagner Act and its provisions would prohibit a closed shop, because it prohibits discrimination against people who are not members of labor unions. In order to preserve that right and to keep the Wagner Act itself from abolishing the closed shop everywhere, it was necessary to write in this provision (in sec. 8(c) permitting the closed shop). But that did not in any way prohibit the enforcement of State laws which already prohibited closed shops.
>
> That has been the law ever since that time. It was the law of the Senate bill; and in putting in this express provision from the House bill (sec. 14(b)), we in no way change the bill as passed by the Senate of the United States. (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6679.)

Mr. President, by tacit admission the Federal Government was saying to the States that in the field of union membership, Federal law was not supreme. How could it? How can the laws regulating commerce overrun the Bill of

Rights? The Wagner Act recognized this and the Taft-Hartley Act simply restated it in clearer and broader terms. By its own admission the Federal Government was saying that it would be wrong for a union to be able to compel membership. In terms not open to doubt, the Congress was saying that the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce was subordinate to the power of the States to guarantee the individual rights of the first and fifth amendments. What was really needed then and now was a Federal right-to-work statute which would guarantee organized labor the right to sell its services freely to the American workingman, who would be left free to accept or reject the services on their merits. The Taft-Hartley law, however, left this open to the States alone and 19 States currently are protecting those basic rights of the individual.

The Taft-Hartley law was simply restating the essence of the State laws banning compulsory unionism. It took no right away from labor. Rather it took away, in part at least, an unnecessary and in my opinion an illegal Federal crutch. Did it, Mr. President, deny labor the right to organize or bargain collectively? Did 14(b) take away the ultimate weapon of labor, the strike? Did 14(b) really hamper the growth of the labor movement. No, Mr. President, it did not. We know it did not, labor knows it did not, and the American people know it did not. What Taft-Hartley was saying to labor was a good old American standard: "Freedom had better be the foundation of our labor policy whether you like it or not and you had better get out there and sell your service and your program on its merits. You had better leave a man free at least in those States which will guarantee his freedom, to make a voluntary choice, to exercise some free will in this matter of union membership."

What Congress was saying, Mr. President, was that the pendulum of compulsion had upset the forces of freedom and that the time had now come as it had in 1607, 1776, 1791, 1865, 1890, and 1938—child labor laws finally upheld—to redress the balance in favor of freedom. What the Taft-Hartley law was saying was that we had better start guaranteeing in part at least the freedoms of the first and fifth amendments. Mr. President, is there anything wrong with that? I do not think so. The American people do not think so.

Now, Mr. President, may I give you the views of two Americans, who in their lives as public servants have been very close to the American Labor movement. The first is an American who is currently very much in the national spotlight and one who has just recently helped to achieve a great victory for world peace. Speaking to a group of government labor leaders in 1962 in his capacity as Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg said:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements * * * from my experience representing the trade union movement this is not a handicap, * * * This is a great advantage * * * you have an opportunity to bring into your organization people who come in because they want to come.

If voluntary membership is desirable in government unions why is it not desirable in private unions? Perhaps this debate before the America people will answer that question.

There has been much said by the unions leaders regarding the principle of majority rights. Perhaps it would be well if this subject were openly and honestly discussed. Then maybe the confusion which has surrounded it would no longer be so great. From the beginning our own modern political system, the principle of majority rights has played an important role. James Madison in the 10th Federalist paper examined this problem in great depth. Acknowledging that majorities and factions were necessary and operative in our body politic, he examined the dilemma which the country faced:

> By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amount to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community.
>
> There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other by controlling its effects.
>
> There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction; the one by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions and the same interests.
>
> It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire and ailment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty which is essential to political life because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

It is truly amazing, Mr. President, how accurately James Madison described the present controversy of union membership in the United States.

To Madison the problem was factions, which experience shows can be a minority or a majority, each of which can be motivated by a common passion or interest. Now the labor union leaders are indeed a faction. They are also a minority and even the total union membership in the United States is a small minority of the total population. Now these union leaders have in fact attempted to secure passage of legislation; namely, the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which is adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community. Below we shall examine a little more closely what and how these interests and rights will be affected. But first let us examine the basic claims of this minority faction. First they argue that union membership is based upon the time-honored principle of majority rule itself. This is basically true. However, what is never admitted is that this is a situation where majority rule operates in a private environment. Can anyone honestly say that under the circumstance of private majority rule, the majority should continue to bind the minority, to the point of denying a man his job? This, Mr. President, is a vote on membership in a private association. We cannot, therefore, in good conscience and honor permit the majority of workers in a plant to force the minority to join their private association. The Congress can, of course, guarantee the majority the right to associate and organize, but this is the ultimate of its authority. A second question arises of equal importance. Can the Senate, bound to uphold the Constitution, permit a majority of private citizens to deny someone, or the minority, certain public and inalienable rights which, according to article 9 of the Constitution, are not to be abridged even by Congress? Are we as a body of duly elected public servants about to give this liberty destroying power to a private group? Are we about to succumb to a tyranny of the private labor union majority over the minority whose rights are publicly guaranteed? Not if I can help it.

Mr. President, this minority faction, the labor bosses, has through various means, but particularly through the use of union dues as political contributions, extracted from a majority of the Members of Congress, a commitment to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law thereby giving their private majorities a liberty destroying power. For the sake of the people, perhaps this relationship between the minority faction of labor bosses and the majority of Congress should be explained. It is like the old mule. Labor is now demanding a repayment for past election contributions and is also reminding the representatives elected by all the people that future campaign funds would disappear if labor demands are not met. Thus the labor bosses not only carry a carrot, they also carry a whip. Senators have no doubt heard it cracked over the heads of two great Senators already. Now they have no doubt heard some of the proponents of repeal say that the majority of the Members of Congress favor repeal, so why not let the majority vote on the issue and settle the matter? The sad truth is that the majority which voted to repeal in the House did not represent the majority of the people in the United States. The purported majority in the Senate also fails to represent the entire American people. Has this body failed to recognize the wishes of the people? Have we come to the point where we are about to inaugurate "Government of the factions, by the factions, and for the factions?" I want to say in the Senate Chamber today that in this case the only majority will that has any efficacy in this debate is the majority will of the American people. They have wisely and loudly made their views known, and it is ironic that their cause, constitutionally supported and founded on liberty, is being defended by a minority. But right is on our side. The large majority of the American people know that their position on section 14(b) will preserve liberty

rather than destroy it. Therefore, we can justly and legally dismiss the demands of a minority of labor bosses and base our position upon the will of the American people, which has been spoken to all who would hear. Loudly and clearly they have told us through letters, telegrams, editorials, columns, and in person that they stand for freedom. Freedom of all Americans to join a union or not to join a union as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. President, the subject of voluntary unionism is closely tied to several constitutional amendments. Liberty is a major issue in each one, according to Mr. Ashmore:

Other possible constitutional objections include the 9th, 10th, and 13th amendments. The content of the ninth amendment and its historical background definitely seem to indicate that it was intended to be a protection of individual personal rights as distinguished from public or collective rights. As a recent commentator on that amendment says, "Whenever we lost the distinction between individual liberty and the necessities of the general welfare the virtue of our form of government is lost * * *." But as that same commentator says, this amendment has been largely forgotten and has received no significant interpretation. Based, thus, on present doctrine it could not be used in the context of the Hanson case.

Much has been said by the unions of the power of Congress to regulate national labor policy. In fact many of those in Congress have based their support of repeal of 14(b) on this premise. I have argued that the freedoms of the first amendment take precedence over the commerce power. Mr. Ashmore takes a similar position:

Although the clear and present danger test may have been watered down somewhat in recent years, nevertheless it does indicate that invasions of first amendment freedoms must be justified on the basis of grave dangers to interests which the state may lawfully protect. Whether those freedoms are given a preferred position or not, it takes a strong case of public necessity in order to uphold an interference. As Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in *Whitney* v. *California*, these freedoms are subject to restriction only "if the particular restriction proposed is required in order to protect the state from destruction or from serious injury, political, economic or moral."

Mr. President, I turn to another distinguished American who is currently serving this Nation in high office. Writing as a university law professor, W. Willard Wirtz, our incumbent Secretary of Labor, eloquently defended individual freedom against the inroads of private power centers in an article in the Louisiana Law Review in 1952:

Here is no invitation to even the slightest heresy. Powerful private organizations must be recognized, under present circumstances, as having some of the same essentiality to capitalism and democracy as do the agencies of government. But no institution has any significance except as a means to the end of individual satisfactions, and of these we count freedom the greatest, both for itself and for what it, in turn, produces. It is devotion to the basic democratic ideal which demands emphasis today upon the increasing evidence that individual freedom can be either enhanced or destroyed by either public or private group force. Not fear, but caution, comes from the realization that democracy's destruction in other nations has been less a consequence of an incumbent government's tyranny than of some private group's uncontrollable ascendancy.

Then Mr. Wirtz begins to examine the problems posed by private associations and membership therein. His comments regarding freedom, group membership, and the ballot box are particularly noteworthy.

W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, volume 13, 1952–53:

The American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Elks and the Moose are the very embodiment, in our thinking, of our privilege as individuals to choose our own company. It is a basic assumption in American traditions and emotions that any group power other than that which funnels through the public election booths is part of democracy's private functioning—part of the exercise of freedom rather than in any sense a threat to it.

Next, Mr. Wirtz examines the problem of restraint on the part of government and private officials. His views seem to underscore the need of some kind of counterforce to government and private agents.

More generally, and most basically, this record appears to confirm those doubts, mentioned at the outset, as to whether our concern about the threat of group force to individual freedoms has been broad enough. It seems to emerge as a relatively obvious proposition, not just of logic, but now of actual experience, that the danger of group force does not depend upon whether the agency exercising it is called "government" or a "labor union" or a "corporation," or a "momewrath;" it depends rather upon the degree of counterforce which operates against it. All that we have long recognized about the concentration in "the Government" of power delegated by individuals begins to appear equally true of concentrations of power resulting from similar delegations to any agencies. The question is not who has the power, or whether his use of it is in an exercise of "sovereignty" or of "free enterprise." Private group agents manifest no more self-restraint than do public group agents. The only question, in either case, is what outside restraints are operative. (W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, vol. 13—1952–53.)

Mr. President, if government will not serve as a counterforce to the private agents and groups in our society, what check or balance is there for the labor union? Of course, the finest and most effective would be the right of an employee to withdraw while still retaining his job. This would force the union officials to care and be concerned over the welfare of the individual employee.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stands in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEIF ERICSON DAY AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Saturday I was invited to go to the World's Fair in New York, and particularly to the Danish Pavilion—which pavilion was filled with other Scandinavians at the time—and participate in making the annual Leif Ericson Day Award.

The Leif Ericson Foundation, a nonprofit foundation, gives this award each year to worthy people throughout the world who excel in the pioneering spirit. This is, of course, based upon the fact that Leif Ericson was a great pioneer himself and was the discoverer of America. Several people of Italian descent were present who had some doubts about this.

It so happens that Leif Ericson Day, which was on Saturday, is followed on tomorrow by Christopher Columbus Day. These dates fall rather closely together.

Many years ago the Senator from Washington introduced a resolution, with many cosponsors, to provide for a Leif Ericson Day. The Senate passed that resolution last year. Last Saturday was the first official Leif Ericson Day.

The award was given to Dr. Albert Schweitzer before he died this year. This necessitates that we, at some future time—although the award was publicly announced on Saturday—present the award posthumously. Either his sister or his daughter will come to America at the proper time and accept the award.

An amazing historical discovery has been made since Saturday pertaining in the matter of the discovery of America.

Many historians and others have participated in this discussion over the years. Some sound historical facts have been revealed concerning Leif's two voyages to the United States. Apparently definite proof has now been discovered. This was announced today in this morning's Washington Post and, I suspect, in all the other newspapers throughout the country.

It was pointed out in an article on the first page of this morning's Washington Post that:

An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.

In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, a research was conducted by Yale University and British museum scholars.

This research disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere based upon the travels of Leif Ericson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Leif Ericson Hailed as Discoverer—America of Vikings Shown on Pre-Columbian Map," appearing in this morning's Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LEIF ERICSON HAILED AS DISCOVERER—AMERICA OF VIKINGS SHOWN ON PRE-COLUMBIAN MAP

(By Howard Simons)

An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.

In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, Yale University and British museum scholars yesterday disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere. It is based on the travels of the intrepid Leif Ericson.

Ingredients for the incredible tale of the map's existence and discovery include two 11th century Viking explorers; a Papal emissary to the Tartars of Ghengis Khan; an unknown 15th century scribe; three ancient manuscripts; worm holes; and a book dealer in New Haven, Conn. A dash of absurd coincidence completes the recipe.

It was in October 8 years ago that the map's existence came to light. New Haven bookseller Laurence Witten dropped by the Yale University Library to show Scholars Alexander O. Vietor and Thomas E. Marston a new acquisition from "a private collection in Europe."

A slim volume, bound in recent calf, the book contained a hitherto unknown account called the "Tartar Relation," of John de Plano Caprini's mission to the Mongols in 1245–47, and a world map including Iceland, Greenland, and Vinland.

Map and seemingly unrelated text appeared authentic. Yale scholars judged that both were written by the same hand somewhere in the Rhineland about 1440—50 years before Columbus set sail.

Still, there were puzzling features about the volume. Why didn't the worm holes on the map and the "Tartar Relation" match? More disconcerting, how could the scholars account for the statement on the first leaf of the map: "Delineation of the first part, the second part (and) the third part of the Speculum"?

"Mr. Vietor and I believed," relates Marston, "that until these two factors could be satisfactorily explained, the map would remain suspect, no matter how convinced we were of its genuineness."

Six months later Vietor and Marston got their answer in a bizarre act of chance.

In April 1958, Marston received a catalog of manuscripts for sale by a London bookseller. To add to a collection, he went off to cable an order from Bruni't translation of Plutarch's lives of Cicero and Demosthenes.

On his way to place his order, Marston leafed through the catalog again. He spotted a copy of a portion of Vincent of Beauvais' Speculum Historiale, an encyclopedia of world history first published in the early 13th century.

As an afterthought, Marston ordered the Vincent.

Three weeks later two manuscripts arrived in New Haven. Marston invited Witten to examine them. Witten asked if he could borrow the Vincent and Marston readily agreed.

"That evening," says Marston, "I did not return home until after 10 o'clock. I had hardly entered my house when the telephone rang. It was Mr. Witten, very excited. The Vincent manuscript was the key to the puzzle of the map and the Tartar Relation. The hand was the same, the watermarks of the paper were the same; and the wormholes showed that the map had been at the front of the volume and the Tartar Relation at the back."

RELATIONSHIP SWORN

Obvious now was the physical relationship of the three documents. Once they had been bound together; the Vincent Speculum between the map and the account of Carpini's mission to the Mongols. Sometime later, the manuscripts were separated and rebound into the two volumes now in Yale's possession.

This story and the detailed account of 7 years of painstaking research to authenticate and determine the origin of the map are told in a handsome, 291-page book entitled: "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation." The book is being put on sale today by Yale University Press—2 days after Leif Ericson Day and on the day before Columbus Day.

The account of scholars Vietor, Marston, R. A. Skelton, and George D. Painter about the map's genesis and its relation to the text—much of it based on educated assumptions—amounts to this:

Between the years 1000 and 1004, Leif Ericson and the lesser known Viking explorer Bjarni Herjolfsson voyaged from Norway to Greenland and then chanced upon America, which they called Vinland. The discovery was recorded in Norse sagas. And though no Norse map charting the discovery ever has been found, it is conceivable that such a map or maps do exist.

CARPINI MISSION

More than 200 years later, in 1245, Pope Innocent IV sent Franciscan Friar Carpini on a diplomatic mission to the Mongols in Asia. On Carpini's return journey he and other members of the mission lectured extensively on their experiences. One of these lectures, by a Friar Benedict, was copied and edited by a C. de Bridia. De Bridia's transcription thus became the original Tartar Relation.

Two hundred years after that, a church council was held in Basel, Switzerland. This important meeting stretched from 1431 to 1449. Church dignitaries from throughout Europe gathered to spread their ideas of intellectual history.

Sometime during the meeting an unheralded monk was assigned the task of copying a world history. He bought some parchment, "definitely second quality, perhaps the best he could afford," and began his task. At times, it was tedious and frustrating. The monk ran into a rough hair that bothered his writing and tried a finer pen. From time to time he used different inks.

His was not an original history. Rather, the monk copied a portion of Vincent's Speculum and the Tartar Relation that had been put together by someone else, perhaps in the 13th century, with the map added in the early 15th century.

RELEVANCE NOTED

How had the three documents originally come together? The most plausible explanation, according to the scholars, is that an early historian saw the relevance between the Tartar Relation and that portion of the Speculum that dealt with Carpini's mission and bound them together.

Then, much later, came the map as a product of a cartographer asked to illustrate the twin accounts of Carpini's mission. What this cartographer did presumably, was to stretch the mid-15th century knowledge and view of the world across his map—from the Asia of Carpini to the America of Leif Ericson.

What happened to the original text and map is not known. The scholars hold forth the prospect that it or even more revealing maps still exist; hidden away in someone's bookshelf as was the Vinland Map and Tartar Relation.

MAP OF "VINLAND"

The map, itself, which will be exhibited at Yale University Library, is done in brown ink on a piece of parchment measuring 11 by 16 inches. Europe is easily recognizable. Africa and Asia are much less so. But it is the upper lefthand area of the map that is most significant.

Here is Iceland, an uncannily accurate representation of Greenland and a large island labeled "Vinland." This is the America discovered by Leif Ericson and Bjarni Herjolfsson, according to the legend on the map. Scholars suggest that the two large river inlets cut into "Vinland" are the Hudson Straits and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Together, the Yale and British Museum researchers tried every imaginable way to authenticate the map and text short of subjecting them to modern scientific tests, which would destroy parts of the manuscripts.

BACKS VIKING THEORY

Nonetheless, the scholars are convinced that map and accompanying text are genuine; products of a hand that flourished at least 50 years before Columbus "rediscovered" America. Accordingly, the scholars take the view that the map proves claims of America's discovery by the Vikings.

Moreover, speculation by the scholars raises these possibilities:

That the hypothesis of a 12th century Norse settlement in Vinland now deserves serious consideration and further search.

That Columbus and other early explorers either heard about or saw copies of the Vinland map or similar maps of America based on Norse accounts before embarking for the New World.

Columbus Day may never be the same.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we cannot print the map. However, the map is reproduced in full in this morning's Washington Post and in other newspapers throughout the United States. It shows the voyages of Leif Ericson. Apparently this is now real, definite, and uncontroverted proof of his travels to what we now call the United States of America and the North American Continent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an address delivered by me on Saturday on the occasion of the annual Leif Ericson Day Award to Dr. Albert Schweitzer. I would not do this for myself. The speech does not mention the Senator from Washington, but does mention Leif Ericson and Dr. Schweitzer and his fine work.

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

PIONEERING FOR THE FUTURE

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON)

It is a singular honor to have the opportunity to address you on the occasion of the presentation of this fine award to such an outstanding man.

It is altogether fitting and proper that Dr. Albert Schweitzer receive the award that bears the distinguished name of Leif Ericson. Each risked his personal comfort and his personal safety to advance the cause of mankind. Leif Ericson opened new worlds of abundance to burgeoning early man, and he and his followers penetrated to the very midwestern North American frontiers—where my ancestors proudly trace their Viking heritage. Albert Schweitzer lived an example of humanity to his fellowman as he devoted his inestimable talents to bringing Christianity and a modicum of modern medicine to the remote regions of Central Africa.

Dr. Schweitzer was a true pioneer, in every sense of the word. His accomplishments—his findings, his writings, his teachings, and his care for the ill and the infirm, are well known. Whether writing a definitive biography of Bach, or a sensitive portrayal of Christ, his achievements were always memorable. Yet, the glory in which we rejoice is not the achievements themselves, but the contributions to the immortality of all mankind, in theology, medicine and in music. Popular acclaim and public recognition were sedlom Dr. Schweitzer's reward, although they were his for the taking.

It was a further measure of his humanity and humility that he preferred to employ all his energies and his hours to his chosen tasks, which certainly must have been drudgerous, dreary and often discouraging, rather than bask in the applause of other men.

He sought judgment not for himself, but for the fruit of his works. It is that basis upon which we must bestow honor on Dr. Schweitzer.

Still, one might well ask, "Just what did Dr. Schweitzer accomplish in one small leper colony in the middle of a continent across the world from Western civilization? Wasn't it really a waste of a long life of a man who was acknowledged to possess vast abilities?" In the answer to those questions lies the identification of Dr. Albert Schweitzer as a pioneer for the future of humanity. First, we must count as positive achievements the medical relief and the spiritual and cultural guidance he administered to his followers. But his contribution to the immortality of all mankind, which is the essence of true pioneering, is discernible in his example for present and future generations. His dedication of a life that, beyond question, could have produced for him a level of social and material security in the first rank stands as a monument to selflessness and humanity in a world too often characterized by self-service and a total absence of concern for one's fellow man.

I hope his story will be told and retold, so that it may serve as an inspiration for others to follow. He has lighted the way along the path of conviction, of belief that man is capable of compassion unknown in the lower forms of life, as no other person has done within our memory. He is the pioneer who calls to the attention of the timid, of the unconcerned and uncaring, that there is a route through the wilderness of a life devoid of meaning to a greater and extradimensional life that sparkles with purpose and with quality. I hope, and I am certain, that among those who will pause to listen to the story of Albert Schweitzer, there will be some who will reflect, and then will perceive that Dr. Schweitzer realized pinnacles of satisfaction and contentment, in an environment outwardly brutish and primitive, that most of us will never enjoy in our rose-scented, cushionaire drive through life. These incisive listeners will properly regard Dr. Schweitzer as the pioneer who blazed for them the trail of a meaningful life of service, of compassion, and of feeling.

According to Viking legend, and I am proud to claim the heritage of descendants of those brave and fearless Scandinavians, Leif Erikson was a powerful, fierce, and dauntless warrior and adventurer. He was a pioneer in the classic tradition, braving the unknown in boats and under circumstances that would deter ordinary men from confronting perils that were both known and understood. Erickson was fierce; Schweitzer was gentle, Erikson lived the tempestuous life of an adventurer; Schweitzer lived the quiet life of a healer and a teacher, Erikson was motivated by desires for conquest, acquisition, and adventure; Schweitzer sought only to conquer illness and spiritual defects. Yet, they shared an indomitable spirit that made them oblivious to adversity and seemingly insurmountable obstacles. With both Leif Erikson and Dr. Albert Schweitzer the result was the same. Each made it possible, by his life and his example, for mankind to advance. Leif Erikson encouraged further exploration and inhabitation. Of course, the tangible result of that encouragment was the development of the North American Continent.

Dr. Schweitzer has encouraged a commitment to the improvement of the quality of life for mankind everywhere. However, it is up to us to provide the tangible result of Dr. Schweitzer's encouragement.

For, we, too, are pioneers—all of us. Giants like Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer have attained the stature of symbols, whose virtues we pursue and strive to attain. In my home city of Seattle a large and handsome statue of Leif Erikson stands at the water's edge and surveys with a steady gaze the incoming waters of the vast Pacific Ocean. In that symbol there is an enthusiasm for and a confidence in what the future will bring, if only we follow the pioneering course.

We Americans are a nation of pioneers. Every elementary school student learns of the hardships and uncertainties our Founding Fathers endured in the Jamestown and Plymouth settlements, how their journey across the sea in search of individual freedom was regarded as folly by the well-placed gentry in the Old World. Truly the pioneering spirit dominated the personalities of those hardy families who clung to life and liberty in the face of hostile natives, unrelenting forces of nature and designing foreign monarchs. Yet they not only survived, but they prospered, and confounded those they left behind with the resiliency and strength of the human spirit.

Then, as their numbers and prosperity increased, strife with heavy-handed rules across the seas induced a bold Declaration on Independence. And again, they were successful, much to the surprise of the rest of the world. That done, they set out to establish a government that dared, in Thomas Jefferson's words, to "let dissenters stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reaon is left free to combat it." Can it be doubted that this was a pioneering venture in popular government? Yet, the descendants of these industrious patriots were not content to live in conditions made by and for an earlier generation, and the westward movement began. No one needs to be reminded of the difficulties, despair, and heartbreak experienced by those who undertook the long and arduous trek across the Mississippi, through the Great Plains fraught with danger from hostile savages and merciless drought, and up and over the formidable Rocky Mountains to the fertile valleys of the Pacific coast. We are as familiar as we are proud of the everyday heroics of these American pioneers of the last century, and the better remembered names: Jim Bowie, Linus Rawlins, W. C. Cody, the Donner party, Fort Laramie, symbolize for us the pioneering spirit that has always been ours.

We Americans unquestionably pioneered the presentation to the world of the age of nuclear physics. Of course, from our present and limited vantage point we often are tempted to regard that pioneering venture as a mixed blessing, presaging an uncertain future. But it is this very uncertainty of the future that emphasizes both our most recent pioneering achievement and our role as pioneers for the future.

I repeat, we are all pioneers. The future is as exciting as it is challenging. In America alone the prospect of growth and change is staggering. A prominent research economist reports that by the year 2000 there will be 150 million more Americans than there are now. Such a population increase will produce a demand for two homes, two schools, two hospitals, etc., for every one we have today. In other words, as President Johnson has said, in the next three decades—decades, not centuries—we will have to build another America. Five times as much electricity as the present production will be required. There will be 244 million cars on our streets and highways, and urban development and highway construction will devour 33 million more acres of land.

Therefore, while we thrill to the explorations of celestial reaches of outer space, and to probes to the darkest depths of the ocean floor, there is much pioneering waiting for us in the social sciences. While present-day pioneers of space must journey far above the earth and far below the surface of the oceans Leif Erikson so daringly crossed, and Albert Schweitzer forsook the more pleasant circumstances of 20th-century civilization for the difficulties of a more primitive existence, many of us daily pioneer from our armchairs, in offices in the commercial world, in academic institutions and research centers, and in legislative halls in Washington, D.C., and across the land.

Massive technological breakthroughs in the physical sciences are reported with breathtaking frequency and rapidity. New uses for computers and refinements in computer technology are continuously contrived. From astrophysics to zoology, the sciences are contributing to man's potential development.

Yet all these pioneering advances in pure science remain to be translated into solid improvement in the lot of the human race by those of us engaged in the social sciences and the humanities. It is what we do with these new and better tools the scientists provide for us that really counts.

Each time a business executive makes a decision relating to a new use or adaptation of automation techniques, he is pioneering in a small way. When a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America shows a local farmer how to improve his crop and his land through contour plowing, he is pioneering. When a researcher at a great university arrives at a tentative conclusion after observing the effects of air pollutants on a rabbit under controlled conditions, he is pioneering. And each one of them is making a contribution to the future of mankind, in the same manner—if not to the same extent as Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer. All of them identify with some facet of the aspirations of man: cultural, social, material, spiritual. The point is, you, too are pioneers in your daily affairs. Although the rugged, heroic individualism in the sense that we think of Leif Erikson no longer characterizes leadership, still the same necessity for an individual dedication and perseverance and determination are crucial to success and progress: In addition to Albert Schweitzer, the names of Dag Hammarskjold and Admiral Rickover quickly come to mind as contemporary pioneers who possess those attributes. To pioneer for the future we must do as these leaders have done, and you are doing in your own ventures, be unafraid to forsake a harbor of security and to embark upon the treacherous seas of the unknown.

Those of us who have devoted our energies to the governing of our vast and growing society like to believe we are sometimes pioneers, too. Many words have been written and spoken about the enormous quantity of important legislation we have enacted in this Congress, and I believe our record is a good one. And you know, we have done a little pioneering in the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, too—the committee I serve as chairman. This session, for example, we authorized a study of new and revolutionary concepts in high-speed ground transportation, that will perhaps result in the development of a system of rapid transit that will transport large numbers of people up and down the east coast at speeds of up to 400 miles an hour. Also, in this session of Congress, the Senate unanimously passed our bill to make possible the development of new programs and techniques in the exploration of the oceans. Through that action we hope someday in the near future to be able to utilize fully the manifold resources buried in the sea—to use them for the further advancement of mankind. Right now the potential of oceanographic research and employment is barely underway.

Just a few years ago, you may remember the Commerce Committee initiated the action that led to the formation of the Communications Satellite Corp., which has now made possible live television transmission from one continent to another. That certainly was a pioneering step.

Compared with the fundamental issues and questions confronting us in the Congress in the next few years, these present

and recent achievements will pale into lesser shades of significance. Although Leif Ericson pioneered for material gain and adventure, and Albert Schweitzer pioneered for physical and spiritual advances, we are pioneering for all the future. And we will need all the help we can get from the business and academic worlds.

Our ancestors came to America and then moved on westward to escape various oppressions, to maintain independence and individuality, and to avoid the pressures of the industrial revolution. We still covet the same values, but the problems seem to be ever-more complex, and we must continually renew our resolve to prevail. Although the environment has changed, and the dangers appear in new and more subtle forms, the individual qualities required for triumph have not changed. The same spark and courage that Leif Ericson had on his perilous voyages must accompany us as we pioneer for the future.

The multitudinous technological breakthroughs that I mentioned earlier demand that we answer new questions about the quality of human life, about relationships between man and man, and man and his environment that never before were ours to control. We must delineate anew the responsibilities of private individuals, the responsibilities of private associations and groups of individuals, and the responsibilities of government. We are forced to fit new and startling concepts into value systems that were constructed long before such scientific developments were ever contemplated. For example, biologists report the day is not far when we will be able to influence the traits and intelligence and personality characteristics of unborn infants, and perhaps even create life itself, artificially. Although our first reaction may be to recoil in horror at the prospect of such a "brave new world," someone must reach some conclusions and establish some guidelines, all within the framework of our reverence for the sanctity of the individual and devotion to democratic principles. Is it for some government agency to prohibit any such further biological experimentation? That would only impose a temporary delay, and be a suppression of truths already discovered. History has amply shown us the futility of attempting, by sovereign order, to close doors science has opened. What, then is the proper approach? Should government, in the name of all the people, assume any role at all? Or should government retire to the sidelines and permit private interests to make all the decisions concerning the very personalities of the next generation of Americans? If government does have a role, what is it? What are the criteria? How do we equate personal freedom of the individual with the ability of a single mortal man to determine what characteristics an unborn person shall have?

Additionally, we are told the future promises us the power to control the weather, and even the climate. Who should decide if we have rain on the Fourth of July? Should it be the National Safety Council, with an eye toward keeping motorists off the highways? Should it be the Congress, with some Members representing constituencies that rely heavily on tourism, with others representing agricultural areas badly in need of rain? Should we refer the question to a national election each week or each month? Or is this an individual decision?

International complications aside, what will we do with the moon once we establish regular passenger and freight service to that curious place? Will it be placed under public ownership, on the theory that public funds provided the means to establish the link, or will we put it up for grabs, like the Oklahoma Territory, to maintain consistency with our principle of private property?

Or, in a more personal sphere, is there a government function in the life of the individual as he finds more and more leisure time available? Is there a public interest in the utilization of the time that has been released to the individual through the progress of automation? Are some decisions we once believed to be reserved for individuals now a matter of public concern?

We must recognize these problems, must face up to them, and must do our best to resolve them. There is no doubt that we are pioneering for the future when we approach any one of these modern, complex issues. Perhaps a resolution of one or more of them will occur when we in Washington decide that we should not participate any further in the particular matter. But that, too, will be pioneering, for we will be affirmatively declaring that this is a matter for determination in the private sector of our society, and is not properly within the jurisdiction of government.

Ladies and gentlemen, the problems Leif Erikson met were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems that Albert Schweitzer faced were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems we all face together are difficult, but, working together, facing decisions in government, and in business, and in academic research and civic activity, we must and will, succeed.

Thank you.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on having his position sustained by this recent discovery.

The Senator from Washington has made a study of this matter for a number of years, and has written articles to the effect that Leif Ericson had, in fact, discovered the United States.

It appears from the article which the Senator has just caused to have printed in the RECORD that hundreds of years before Columbus is reputed to have discovered America, Leif Ericson had discovered Greenland and sailed from there across a large body of water and discovered an area that he described as Vinland. Apparently no one realized at that time that Vinland was the North American Continent, and that it was thought to be merely a remote place beyond Greenland. Apparently no one grasped the significance of what had been discovered. It was felt that this was perhaps a big island, such as Iceland or Greenland, when, in fact, Leif Ericson had actually made a landing on North America.

The maps, to which the Senator has referred, have apparently been completely authenticated. The writers, writing one or two hundred years before Christopher Columbus discovered America, had actually had maps and discussed the discovery of Vinland by Leif Ericson on his voyages.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Yale and British museum scholars came to the further conclusion that the circulation of this map—and in those days many of the stories were passed by word of mouth—probably led to discussions with other mariners from Portugal and other European countries, who believed that this land did exist. Those people became enthusiastic over hoping that they could find out about it, which they did.

The old Norwegian sagas—and I have read many articles in fine publications such as the Sons of Norway Bulletin, the Order of Vasa, or some such magazine—has been an area of great research. I believe this authenticates the claim for Leif Erickson's discovery when Yale and British museum scholars categorically say that this map is correct. I am sure that they have nailed it down as much as historians can.

There is a great deal of history involved in this.

We talk now about changing weather conditions and the fact that the world weather seems to run in cycles. In those days Greenland was actually green. The first Christian church was established in Greenland by Leif's mother. Leif's father and mother were kicked out of Norway by the king because they were pagans. They finally ended in Iceland. They first fled to Ireland. One can stir up a great argument concerning St. Patrick's Day by suggesting that Leif's grandfather ruled Ireland for some period of time and then was kicked out of Ireland.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, were they related to the O'Murragh clan by any chance?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. They went to Scotland, and then to Ireland, and then ended up in Greenland, which they explored in almost open boats. Of course, the boats of Columbus were not too seaworthy either, as one can see from examining the replicas. They ended up in Vinland. On the second voyage, according to the sagas, they lived on a part of Long Island. No one knows the location. It could have been Martha's Vineyard. There were a great many wild grapes in the place. That is what the name Vinland comes from. They had trouble with the Indians, as most of those first pioneers did, and finally sailed back again. Because they were not in communication much with Europe, since they had been banned from coming back to Scandinavia, I suppose their maps and accounts encountered difficulty in being communicated throughout Europe.

But everybody is happy now, and reconciled to the fact that Christopher Columbus and Leif Ericson both were the discoverers of America, and John Smith, of course, was its first permanent settler.

We take great pride in those Scandinavians, because they were adventurers. They moved a great deal by sea. They could hardly sit still; they were going all the time. A well-known fact in history is the invasion of what is now Normandy by Scandinavian warriors in boats. The Irish became a little tired of them, apparently, and kicked Olaf the White out. He went to Scotland and had terrific battles there, as was typical.

So I am glad that we have both a Columbus Day and a Leif Ericson Day, and history now seems to be settled, unless the Irish come up with some voyage prior to the time of Leif Ericson, perhaps by some leprechaun who might have come here, stayed a while, and then left; I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY. No doubt the Senator will yield for the suggestion that the consideration now would be to join the Scandinavians with the Spanish and the Italians; and we Irish will join such an association if the others will let us have first place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana for placing in proper perspective some of the pages of our country's history. Though I think we have created no history here, I thank the Senators for correcting some erroneous impressions which may exist.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to receive this support, because our next project is to have an appropriate statue of Lief Ericson erected in our Nation's Capital, down by the Potomac.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA AND EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months I have been doing all in my power to persuade our Government to drop a foolish, self-defeating restriction against the exchange of American wheat for Russian gold. That 2-year-old administration ruling requires that if the Russians or certain other Soviet-bloc countries in Eastern Europe wish to buy our wheat, they must pay premium shipping rates on 50 percent of it by utilizing higher cost American ships. This restriction is applied only to wheat and only to wheat sold to Russia and Eastern Europe. It has the effect of pricing our wheat out of a market that is now netting Canadian wheat farmers and exporters hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

I regard the continuance of this barrier as the most obviously harmful and ridiculous policy now being pursued by our Government. It hurts every American and helps not one single American citizen, except our cartoonists who are beginning to see it as an appropriate theme for biting cartoons. It costs American wheat farmers $200 or $300 million a year in lost sales, it damages our balance-of-payments position to that extent, it costs our taxpayers continued farm storage and farm program costs for surplus wheat that we could otherwise exchange for urgently needed gold, it denies our exporters, our railroad industry, our dockworkers, and others profitable labor. It generates not one dime of business for the maritime unions who are insisting on it. It does permit a handful of maritime labor leaders to demagog on a phony issue. But it gives the maritime workers and their industry 50 percent of nothing since it kills our sales opportunities in Eastern Europe and Russia and therefore, we are shipping no grain to these countries in our ships or in any other ships.

Furthermore, it is a violation of our commercial treaties with 30 nations and of the U.S. Export Control Act. A resolution introduced by Senator SYMINGTON and me has led to hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A majority of that committee has found the restriction to be not only wrong on legal grounds, but harmful to the interests of the United States. Eleven members of the committee signed a letter to the President dated October 7, the basic facts of the letter being supported by other members of the committee, urging that the restriction be dropped, not only on legal grounds, but more significantly because it is in the national interest to drop it.

As the committee's letter to the President put it:

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

The letter was signed by Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, and FRANK CARLSON.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 7, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodities in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious, also, that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, and FRANK CARLSON.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the hearings conducted by Senator FULBRIGHT and the members of his committee on this issue. I commend them for their thoughtful conclusions and ask unanimous consent that the letter of the committee to the President be printed at this point in the RECORD.

My belief that continuation of the requirement that 50 percent of wheat sold to Russia be carried in U.S. ships is costing the United States tens of millions of dollars in wheat trade is strongly supported by an article in the current Southwestern Miller. The Miller carries an article from New York, reporting on an unexpected address of Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev to the Communist Party Central Committee, indicating that Russia still needs more wheat, and some high-grade wheat, to avoid a bread shortage.

The story confirms an estimate I have cited previously that the Russian shortage is still at least 3 million tons, of 110 million bushels. It is quite probable that the Russian shortage may still be as high as 6 million tons or something over $300 million in potential sales in this current purchasing year. I ask unanimous consent that the Miller article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

MARITIME LABOR LEADERS DICTATE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am a longtime supporter of a strong mer-

chant marine. Furthermore, I believe that in a democracy, spokesmen for our merchant marine industry should properly participate in full and frank public discussion and debate of both foreign policy and domestic issues. I am disturbed, however, by the threat of certain maritime labor unions to go beyond the debate and the exercise of their democratic right to criticize the adoption of certain policies. They are using their union power to subvert American foreign policy—to force their mistaken views on the Nation.

The Washington Post, in an editorial of Tuesday, October 5, called the conduct of the maritime unions "blackmail." The editorial points up an aspect of these maritime union activities which cannot be taken lightly, for here is a challenge to the execution of adopted foreign policy decisions made in the national interest. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the attitude of certain maritime labor leaders on this issue was revealed in a story in the Baltimore Sun of October 6 under the byline of Helen Delich Bentley. Reporting on a recent meeting of a joint maritime labor committee, the article said:

> The joint maritime labor committee, headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association, went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.
>
> "We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

Mr. President, I believe that it is inconceivable that a group of labor leaders would deliberately set aside American foreign policy decisions merely because they do not happen to like them. I do not think our Government can tolerate such a lack of patriotism. No matter how these labor leaders try to mask their efforts in some kind of anti-Russian position, what they are basically taking is an anti-American position. One is hard pressed to imagine a more unpatriotic act than a deliberate pronouncement of influential labor leaders that their unions will not load wheat to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe even though our Government has decided officially that it is in our interest to do so.

I do think, Mr. President, that the maritime industry has a legitimate concern about its future economic well-being. That is why I have always supported the Cargo Preference Act, which is of great value to our maritime industry. Under the Cargo Preference Act, 50 percent of our food-for-peace shipments are carried in American ships. That is perfectly proper since these shipments represent either gifts or concessional sales of American wheat and other farm commodities. These are not regarded as normal commercial sales and as such, they do not come under the terms of our commercial treaties with other countries. These shipments generate 25 percent of the entire income received by the American merchant fleet. They represent 100 percent of the cargo carried by many of our bulk carrying grain ships. It would be a disastrous blow to the merchant marine if these food-for-peace shipments under the Cargo Preference Act were lost to American industry.

Let me make it very clear that while I do not favor applying the Cargo Preference requirement to normal commercial sales of the kind that are proposed in Eastern Europe and to the Soviet Union, I do favor very strongly continuing the food-for-peace Cargo Preference principle. I have felt for some time, based on conversations with maritime industry leaders, that the real reason labor leaders are opposing the removal of the restriction on sales to the Soviet Union is that they fear this will eventually lead to the loss of the Cargo Preference Act. For that reason, I would like to suggest, as I have previously in private communications, that the administration give assurances to the maritime industry that the Cargo Preference Act will be continued as it relates to food-for-peace shipments. Such assurances should be coupled with an announcement that the administration is dropping the 50-percent shipping requirement on commercial sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This kind of package announcement would provide adequate assurance that the valuable Cargo Preference Act will not be jeopardized by removing the totally worthless 50-percent shipping requirement on Soviet sales.

I strongly urge that some such package announcement be made by the administration at an early date, in the interest of the merchant marine, in the interest of American farmers and taxpayers, in the interest of the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and, indeed, in the interest of a commonsense commercial and foreign policy for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Bentley's article referred to above be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 6, 1965]

SHIP POLICY CHANGE HINTED ON WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The White House is seriously considering removal of the American-flag shipping restriction regarding the sale of wheat to Russia, it was learned today from high administration sources.

"This is so even though the President knows that not a bushel will be loaded once the requirement that 50 percent move on American bottoms is lifted," is was said.

About the same time that the White House discussions were revealed, the Joint Maritime Labor Committee—headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association—went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.

WE WILL NOT DEVIATE

"We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

When the emergency meeting was first called, the AFL–CIO joint committee had intended to concentrate on the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, which it condemned today. However, in the interim, Gleason said he was tipped off that something was about to happen on Russian grain by a telephone call from Washington last night.

EXPECT MOVE IN SENATE

Labor officials today thought there might be a move by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to have the Senate rescind a resolution it had passed nearly 2 years ago calling for the use of American ships in transporting one-half of any wheat sold to Russia.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted last Friday to call for the lifting of the American-flag stipulation. However, as far as could be learned late today, its action has not yet been transmitted to the White House.

Most of the Senate committee members are from States with large agricultural interests all of which are condemning the American merchant marine for wanting to move part of the goods—at a higher rate than foreign ships.

BENEFIT HELD DOUBTFUL

The pressure to lift the 50-percent restriction has been tremendous even though top Government officials and a spokesman for the wheat interests testified before Senate committee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, that they did not know whether the Russians would buy a single bushel from the United States if the ship-American restriction was removed.

The State Department also has been applying extreme pressure on the administration to wipe out the 50-percent stipulation.

In testimony before the Fulbright committee last month, Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated that policy concerning the Russian wheat movements would be forthcoming soon.

Gleason indicated today that he was having trouble getting his dockers in Duluth, Minn., to load Canadian wheat moving through there aboard Canadian ships bound for Montreal, where the wheat would be reloaded aboard oceangoing vessels, primarily Russian, bound for Communist bloc countries.

Russia purchased 217 million bushels of wheat from Canada August 11 and additional amounts from Australia and Argentina earlier that month. Ever since the American wheat interests have been complaining about and attacking the shipping restriction.

Because American-flag shipping costs are higher, the freight rate aboard American ships ranges from $3 to $7 a ton higher on wheat. Supposedly the higher price makes American wheat undesirable, the agricultural interests contend, while maritime and labor sources argue that the Russians are going to buy wheat from the United States only as a last resort regardless of what the circumstances are.

The joint labor committee was born as a result of the initial boycott against Russian wheat movements in February 1964. All segments of the maritime labor movement have participated in it ever since.

The President's Maritime Advisory Committee also was formed at the same time; its establishment was part of the agreement reached between President Johnson and George Meany, AFL–CIO president, when it was determined that 50 percent of all Russian and Communist agricultural sales then and in the future would move on American-flag ships.

"If we give in on the wheat, then we might as well fold up, because that gave us our start," Gleason declared.

"My people don't want to load anything for Russia anyhow and if they thought the American ships were not benefiting in the least from it, they'd balk regardless.

"The Great Lakes longshoremen feel that some of the Canadian wheat is going to help North Vietnam and Cuba and they don't like being a part of it whatsoever."

EXHIBIT 1

HINT OF ADDED RUSSIAN WHEAT BUYING NEED—COMMUNIST PARTY CHIEF TELLS CENTRAL COMMITTEE "IMPROVEMENT" IS NEEDED TO INCREASE BREAD SUPPLY "QUALITATIVELY AND QUANTITATIVELY"

NEW YORK, October 4.—In an unexpected address on the state of the Soviet agricultural economy to the Communist Party's Central Committee last Wednesday, Leonid Brezhnev, party chief, hinted that the wheat Soviet Russia already has bought from Western nations might not be sufficient to prevent a bread shortage and that further purchases would be undertaken.

Mr. Brezhnev told the policymaking committee that the party and the Government "envisage further improvement in supplying the population with bread, both qualitatively and quantitatively."

MIGHT NEED AS MUCH AS IN 1963–64

According to some Moscow observers, the present Government may need to purchase almost as much as the 12 million tons bought from Western sources in 1963–64 under the leadership of Premier Khrushchev. Thus far, Russia has bought about 9 million tons from Western countries for 1965–66 delivery.

"Mr. Brezhnev's statement was a hint that this summer's wheat purchasing efforts had already failed to meet the goal of enough bread for the population during the coming year," said Stuart H. Loory on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune in Moscow.

Because the Khrushchev purchases came rather late in the 1963–64 crop year, shortages of bread did develop during that year. The present Russian leaders began their 1965–66 buying program much earlier in an effort to avoid a similar situation.

BUREAUCRATIC BRAKES ON AGRICULTURE

In his address to the Central Committee, Mr. Brezhnev also criticized bureaucratic inference with agricultural progress in Russia, particularly for giving priority to industrial advances. "The tendency has not been overcome to improve other affairs, to balance the figures at the expense of agriculture, to infringe on the interests of the collective and state farms," he said. "And this happens despite the absolutely clear-cut decisions of the March plenum of the Central Committee."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 5, 1965]

BLACKMAIL ON WHEAT

In threatening not to load wheat sold to the Soviet Union if the requirement that 50 percent of it be carried in American ships should be lifted, the maritime unions are attempting to blackmail their own Government. The telegram to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Thomas W. Gleason, Chairman of the Joint Maritime Labor Committee, is clothed in all sorts of patriotic anti-Communist sentiments. But in fact it amounts to an unconscionable attempt to dictate foreign policy so as to preserve union perquisites.

If the United States were engaged in a total boycott of Communist countries, as Representative FEIGHAN among other advocates, restrictions on grain shipments might make some sense. But this has never been American policy, because we have found nonstrategic trade to be a useful door-opener. At the same time, because of the higher cost of the shipping requirement, we make sure that we can't sell the wheat we are perfectly willing to sell for hard currency. Thus we administer a good stiff uppercut to our own jaw.

This constitutes, really, an ineffective subsidy of the merchant marine and maritime unions at the expense of the wheat producers—and of the balance-of-payments position, which would be improved by dollar exports. It may be technically true that no country has recently expressed interest in American wheat—because of the cost. But there are sizable grain deficits in the Soviet Union and several countries of Eastern Europe. Meanwhile Canada, Mexico, and other grain exporting nations get the market at a time when expanded American trade might be a significant lever.

It is within President Johnson's power to end this artificial requirement imposed by President Kennedy at the behest of the unions during the 1963 wheat deal with Russia. Similar restrictions in another context inhibit the effectiveness of our economic aid to free nations by reducing their purchasing power. If there is reason to subsidize the merchant marine, better ways can be found—and the new maritime policy now under study might offer an opportunity to develop them. For the administration to yield to this blackmail would be to invite every other special interest to put its oar into the conduct of foreign policy.

THE CONNECTICUT RIVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Hartford Times has performed another great public service for Connecticut, New England, and people concerned about preserving and restoring our natural beauty everywhere. On October 5, 1965, the Times published a special 12-page supplement called "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste." The articles and photographs in that section graphically illustrate the tremendous need for action in saving one of the most precious assets of the Northeastern United States—the Connecticut River.

I pay special tribute to Ivan Robinson, the Times reporter who wrote the stories. Mr. Robinson traveled the length of the river, flew over it and interviewed those who know the river, care about it, and have plans to clean it up. He talked to sportsmen, officials of the State and Federal Governments, boaters, and countless others. And out of his experience he has written a compelling account of the history, the potential—and the sad neglect—of the Connecticut River.

I also saluate Times photographer Charles Vendetti, whose pictures add so much to the impact of the Connecticut River story. All those who want to restore the Connecticut to its former glory and who want to save the beauty we have left owe a debt of gratitude to the Hartford Times, Editor Robert Lucas, and those who made the Connecticut River special supplement possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONNECTICUT—RIVER GOING TO WASTE

(By Ivan Robinson)

(NOTE.—How dirty is the Connecticut River? Why clean it? What's being done? What must be done? To find the answers, Times Staff Writer Ivan Robinson and Photographer Charles Vendetti traveled the river by boat, walked its banks, scouted it from Long Island Sound to the Canadian border in a low flying airplane. Newsman Robinson talked to a wide cross section of people concerned with the river—officials in Washington and four Connecticut Valley States, conservationists, skindivers, fishermen, boaters, sanitary engineers. The result is this special section, a comprehensive view of the Connecticut River and its pollution problems.)

THREE CENTURIES AFTER BLOCK—A NEED FOR REDISCOVERY

The Connecticut River was 70 million years old when Adrian Block, the Dutch explorer, discovered it in 1614.

On February 2, 1900, a mere 286-year speck later in its lifetime, it had become so polluted and full of disease that Connecticut's State Health Department declared it an "open sewer," unfit to drink from or to swim in, and Hartford stopped using it as a water supply.

At fault: The 368 towns, 3,000 industries, and 1.7 million persons that followed Block's little ship, the *Restless*, into the 400-mile valley.

Also to blame: The frontier philosophy that America's riches were inexhaustible. Natural resources like rivers, forests, and fertile soil were to be exploited until they choked up, petered out or blew away. There were always more next door—up north or out west.

Now the picture has changed. Connecticut and her valley neighbors—Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire—are taking a harder look at the long untidy river they have been treating as a sewage canal for so long. The reasons are obvious:

The river is a future source of drinking water.

It must meet the needs of a burgeoning population for places to swim, fish, picnic, and go boating.

A clean river will be a big boost to commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

The river deserves to be cleaned up for its own sake, as natural beauty in our midst.

The Federal Government is ready to step in if the States don't do the job.

It is certain the river will have to be used eventually—experts say in 20 to 35 years—as a drinking water supply. Reliance on upland reservoirs, a Yankee peculiarity, is becoming a worrisome luxury. There won't be enough to go around someday and, despite our druthers, we'll have to start drinking "second-hand" water.

The current 4-year drought and New York City's water panic have spotlighted the problem.

But water famines come and go. The real crisis is in the population boom. About 1,680,000 persons now live in the Connecticut Valley in all four States. By the year 2000, the figure is expected to nearly double to 3,110,000.

Water use will surely more than double. Americans, who already use more water per capita than any other people, are continually buying more heavy-use appliances like air conditioners and dishwashers and building more swimming pools.

The average person in the Hartford area used 50 gallons a day in 1960. By 2000, he will be using and estimated 73. Factories, stores, government buildings, parks, and unmetered users now account for another 69.7 gallons per capita daily. By 2000, their use will total 84.

It will take more water to feed, clothe, entertain and inform the 2000 population, too. It takes 5 gallons to process a gallon of milk, 600,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber, 2.5 gallons to make a phonograph record and 150 gallons to make a 5-pound Sunday newspaper.

The Hartford Metropolitan District Commission's water supply, which will reach a maximum storage capacity of 60.5 million gallons in 1968, will be unable to meet the demand in 2000. Like others along the Connecticut River, it will undoubtedly be tapping the stream at its door.

The river is a reliable faucet. Its average flow is 11 billion gallons a day. During the lowest flow ever recorded (1,060 cubic feet a second Aug. 28, 1949), it was still delivering 700 million gallons a day past Hartford. The MDC's peak daily demand is 73.5 million gallons, or about 10 percent of that record low flow.

Since most of the water used by homes and industry ends up in a sewer line and back into the river, the effect on the river's level would be negligible.

Other cities have been taking their drinking water from rivers for years out of necessity. Los Angeles pipes it from as far away as the Colorado River and is now looking 800 miles to the north to Washington's Columbia River. Here in the East, Lowell, Mass., has started taking water from the Merrimack River, treating out the pollution from paper mills and upstream cities.

At the moment, the cry for recreational space is more insistent than that for drinking water. Families tired of bucking the traffic to the shore or to the lakes scattered around Hartford want a place near home, like the river, where they can fish or swim.

"Cleaning up the river," said one boatowner, "would be like adding 120 miles to the State's coastline if you count each bank."

The public's feeling against swimming in the river is strong. There's no law against it, just State and local health advisories. But few swim in it.

One of the best beaches on the river, in fact, is a lovely strip of sand in South Glastonbury and its sole occupants are cows, which amble down from a nearby farm, lie in the shade of trees along the bank, wade in up to their ankles and sometimes, health warnings notwithstanding, take a drink.

One longtime Hartford resident said people used to swim by the hundreds on the first sandbar north of the city's Riverside Park until typhoid fever struck some of them in the 1920's.

"That's when the swimming really stopped," he said.

Now at Riverside Park, the no swimming signs are in both English and Spanish and the children swim only in the pool.

A Puerto Rican boy, asked what the "Se Prohibe Nadar" signs means, replied, "No swimming. The river's too dirty."

But some people are forgetting what this boy has learned.

A Windsor Locks father lets his children go swimming near the upper end of the canal, as he did when he was a boy. "I just tell them to keep their mouths shut," he said.

Water skiing, a contact sport, is common downriver from Hartford and swimmers can be seen diving from moored boats, especially in Hamburg Cove and other places below Middletown where the water looks cleaner.

"Five years ago," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer for the State health department, "we didn't seriously consider cleaning the river for swimming again because nobody was interested in swimming there. Now people are getting interested and, whether we want them to or not, they're going into the water."

A new public park has sprung up on the west bank in North Cromwell, made from sand recently dredged from the channel. Upriver, there are riverside parks everywhere. The stretch below Northampton is busy with a large marina and a combination campside and beach. There are boats above every campsite and beach.

Joseph N. Gill, State commissioner of agriculture and natural resources, has estimated that pollution of the Connecticut River is costing this State at least $840,000 a year in recreation dollars, half of it from swimming alone.

His figure is based conservatively on getting a capacity crowd of 140,000 persons on 12 days during the recreation season, paying an average of 50 cents a day for facilities.

"It's a shame," said Bernard W. Chalecki, director of the State boating safety commission, "that a river consisting of half the best waterways in the State is not being used."

Mr. Chalecki said lakes are highly developed and crowded with boats, causing conflicts between boaters and the cottagers who have invested money there for peace and quiet.

"The river, on the other hand, is not populated," he said. "Boats pretty much have it to themselves."

An estimated 5,000 to 7,000 boats now use the river on a good weekend day. Ten years ago, the number was half that. Ten years from now, it is expected to be double.

Most of the boating along the stretch in Connecticut is below Essex, from where a boat can easily get to the sound. When small craft warnings are flying at sea, the river gets even more play.

To meet the demand, the State has built nine public boat launching areas between Old Saybrook and the Enfield Dam to supplement about 30 marinas, town facilities and yachting clubs.

The Enfield Rapids and the shallows north of the Bulkeley Bridge prevent anything except rowboats and canoes from going farther upriver during most of the year. In the spring, when the water is high, some Massachusetts boatowners take their craft down to the sound, using the Windsor Locks Canal to bypass the rapids. They bring them back up in autumn after heavy rains.

Dredging the river to make it navigable all the way to Holyoke Dam would attract even more boats since it would connect its two largest cities on the river, Hartford and Springfield.

The idea, still alive through dormant, has been talked about since the turn of the century.

Bulkeley Bridge, opened in 1907, was designed as a drawbridge, in fact, because the Federal Government felt the river was navigable in theory above Hartford.

The 100-foot steel draw was eliminated at the last minute and a ninth stone arch (the first on the Hartford side) went up in its place. Hartfordites had convinced Washington the draw was a waste of money. Their main argument: Of the 11 bridges between Hartford and Holyoke, only one—a railroad bridge to East Hartford—was a drawbridge and its draw was partly over dry land.

A clean river, besides becoming a highway for pleasure boats and a source of drinking water, would also be an important resource for commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

Fish, finned or shell, have a tough time surviving in polluted waters. They can't spawn on a riverbed thick with sludge. They can't find the insect larvae and other food that usually lives in clean water. And they suffocate because human waste and other organic material deplete the oxygen in the water in the process of breaking down.

Fish kills occur periodically in the river. They usually happen in hot weather when the water is low, the ratio of pollution high, and the water warm and less oxygenated.

The State board of fisheries and game has the power to haul into court anyone who pollutes the water badly enough to cause fish kills. But, because so many factors may be involved, it doesn't try too often.

One kill wiped out so many fish it was impossible to count them. They lined both sides of the river for miles. The estimate was tens of thousands. No legal action was taken, however, because no one could tell who or what was to blame.

One reason for this stalemate in fighting pollution is the tide. The Connecticut River is affected by Long Island Sound tides all the way to Hartford, where it falls and rises an average of 1.2 feet twice a day. (The range is 3.4 feet at the mouth.)

"Tests have shown," said Cole W. Wilde, the board's chief of fisheries, "that if you throw a cork into the river at any point below Hartford it will drift back and forth seven times before finally staying below that point."

It's difficult, therefore, to tell where fish were killed. The spot where they are first seen belly up can be miles from the pollution.

Salmon and shad were once plentiful in the Connecticut River. Settlers used to catch 40-pound salmon with torch and spear as far upriver as Lancaster, N.H., 300 miles from the sound.

The salmon were so thick, noted one historian, that " a man could walk from bank to bank on their backs if he was wearing snowshoes."

Shad, often called "the poor man's salmon," also were numerous. At one time it was against the law in Connecticut to feed bonded servants the cheap fish more than three times a week.

The small number of salmon and shad today is blamed by pollution foes on the foulness of the river. Mr. Bampton says, however, the decrease results from the many dams that have been built, preventing these anadromous fish from going upriver to spawn. His department has been building fishways to overcome this problem.

The shad run, although smaller than in colonial times, is still substantial. For Connecticut it is a $13-million-a-year industry when you count manpower, boats, and tackle involved. The commercial catch has averaged 98,200 fish a year; the sport catch 27,200.

Amateur shad anglers spend 14,000 mandays a year wetting their lines at Enfield Dam. Most of the sport catch is taken between there and Wilson and between Holyoke Dam and the mouth of the Chicopee.

No fun fishing

Shad now go as far as the dam at Deerfield, thanks to an elevator built for them in 1955 at Holyoke Dam. The elevator carries up 30,000 shad a year.

As for other fish, any kind found in other waters in the State can be found in the Connecticut. These include trout, largemouth and smallmouth bass and great northern pike as well as the more pollution-resistant rough fish like carp, eels and suckers.

Taking a fish from the river is one thing. Eating it is another.

"A fish caught between Middletown and Hartford," said Mr. Wilde, "has a high flavor of petroleum. Cook it and it smells like you are frying gasoline." It is ironic that the Latin name for the kind of shad found in the Connecticut is alosa (shad) sapidissima (tastiest).

Local Tom Sawyers know the score. Wrote a Cromwell fourth grader earlier this year in a letter to the editor about the river: "It is

not much fun to go fishing in it because you are never sure what the fish have been eating."

Shellfish, which siphon huge amounts of water through their systems and screen food out of it, are seriously affected by pollution. Shellfish areas are closed off every year by the State health department to prevent people from getting hepatitis, an intestinal disease.

Connecticut oyster growers, who farm about 67,000 acres, transplant their oysters on Long Island for final maturing before market. It takes an oyster about 2 weeks to flush the Connecticut pollution from its system.

The net worth of Connecticut's shellfish crop (both clams and oysters) is $550,000 a year. The emigrant oysters are worth another $1.5 million but are credited to New York's economy.

Saving the river as a future water supply appeals to planners, as a recreational area to boaters and swimmers, as a fishing ground to fishermen, but saving it for its beauty appeals to all. Significantly, "The Long Tidal River," a film about the history and abused beauty of the Connecticut, drew more viewers at the Plaza 7 Arts Festival this summer than a documentary about President Kennedy.

Everyone who has seen the river beyond Hartford's roller coaster highways and equally view-proof bridge railings has a warm feeling for it, highly personal and deeply felt.

The reason may be partly psychological. Man has always been fascinated by water, which is why he builds fountains, vacations at the shore and travels hundreds of miles to see Niagara Falls and why his children run delightedly toward it when they first see it.

The Connecticut is undeniably beautiful meandering through the meadows of Massachusetts or surging into the sea at Old Saybrook. In purer days, travelers extolled it as one of the world's three most beautiful rivers, along with the Rhine and the Hudson. It is a comfortable river, tree-lined, always twisting and turning in surprising ways, seldom treacherous, never too broad to overwhelm. It is the kind of little river the American essayist, Henry Van Dyke, wrote about.

"A river is the most human and companionable of all inanimate things," said Van Dyke. "Little rivers seem to have the indefinable quality that belongs to certain people in the world—the power of drawing attention without courting it, the faculty of exciting interest by their very presence and way of doing things."

Beauty may be antipollutionists' biggest selling point in the fight to clean up the river. The public's need and desire for it is becoming an immeasurable political force which has just started being tapped by President Johnson's Great Society plans, Connecticut's open space program and, more recently, Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF'S campaign to make the river a national parkway.

Herculean task

Hercules, when he had to clean up the huge Augean stables, simply diverted two rivers through them. He didn't have to clean up the rivers afterward. This sort of super-Herculean labor is what the four valley States now face. Among their problems:

Places like Chicopee, Mass. (population 61,550) that still dump all their sewage raw into the river.

Places like Hartford which, as part of a metropolitan sewage district that serves eight towns of about 350,000, gives its sewage only primary treatment, which is 35 to 50 percent effective.

Combination sewers that carry both sewage and storm waters. During rainstorms, when these sewers are roaring full, the treatment plants are bypassed to avoid overtaxing their limited capacities and the whole load goes into the river.

Low river levels in the summer, accentuated by old industrial rights such as those of the Holyoke Water Co., which literally turns off the entire river on weekends.

The abundance of papermills (11 between Northampton and Hartford alone), discharging thousands of tons of fiber waste each day.

Textile and chemical plants streaking the river with dyes and poisonous substances, some so new and complex that no one knows how to treat them.

Pesticides, herbicides, and other agricultural control chemicals, also complex, from the farms that cover about 25 percent of the valley.

Barges and boats discharging human waste and leaking oil and gasoline.

How polluted is the Connecticut River?

"The Long Tidal River," the popular film by conservation-minded businessman Ellsworth Grant, of West Hartford, has given popular currency to the phrase, "the world's most beautifully landscaped cesspool."

William S. Wise, director of the State water resources commission, contends the statement is not based on one iota of fact and has enormous eye and ear appeal for the uninformed. But it's easy for a layman to agree with Mr. Grant.

In the stretch between Hartford and the Massachusetts line, an observer will see many signs of our effluent society—streaks of oil and dye in the river as well as flotsam from riverside dumps, paper and other material of dubious origin, spongy cakes of yellowish grease, strange plastic pellets, and an overall peppering of scum.

In inlets like Wethersfield Cove, he may see men raking up filth that has washed up on the beaches after a rainstorm and he will see algae slime at the waterlines of the 50 or so pleasure boats moored there, a sign of organic matter in the water.

A typical reaction was expressed by a Simsbury man who was on an afternoon cruise with his family on the riverboat *Dolly Madison*. "I don't know how bad it is exactly," he said, leaning over the rail and studying the water, "but I would never let a child of mine go swimming in it."

Those who must go swimming in it, skindivers who recover bodies from the Connecticut River, take every precaution.

Already protected by typhoid and tetanus shots they usually get boosters after working the river. On the job they wear basketball sneakers because, if they don't sink up to their waists in the bottom muck, they are sure to step on tin cans, wire fencing, car parts, refrigerators or oil drums.

After a river search they rush for the showers for a thorough scrubbing—of themselves—to prevent infection, and of their bright orange rubber suits to prevent rot.

Pollution experts, going beyond sight and smell, have drawn up objective yardsticks to measure contamination.

An ABC report-card grading is used by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, a group formed in 1947 by interstate compact and made up of the six New England States and New York.

The commission's designations:

From Northampton to the mouth of the Farmington River in Windsor and from Hartford to East Haddam—Class D (good only for sewage and industrial wastes, power, navigation and some industrial uses).

From Northampton to Massachusetts' north boundary, from East Haddam south to the Sound and along the brief stretch between the Farmington River and Hartford—Class C (good for boating, irrigation of crops that must be cooked before eaten, habitat for wildlife and food and game fish, industrial cooling and most industrial uses).

The river has not yet been classified in Vermont and New Hampshire. Indications are it will be class C in the more developed stretch below Lebanon, N.H. Above Lebanon, it will be class B (Good for swimming, irrigation and esthetic value and for drinking if filtered and chlorinated.)

Obviously, most of the pollution is in the class D waters between Northampton and East Haddam The concentration, as a U.S. Public Health Service team found in October 1963, is in the Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee and Hartford areas.

Sampling along the 62 miles between Hatfield just above Northampton and the Rocky Hill-South Glastonbury ferry 12 miles below Hartford, the team noted sharp increases downstream in coliforms, the rod-shaped bacteria typically found in human waste.

Such bacteria, if they come from a diseased person, can transmit disease to someone else. Organisms that have escaped sewage treatment and found their way into streams, according to one study, have included the bacteria of typhoid, paratyphoid, cholera, salmonellosis, tuberculosis, anthrax and tetanus; all the known viruses including polio, and tape, round, hook and pin worms and blood flukes.

Nowhere did it find the coliform count below 1,000 per 100 milliliters of water (about half a cup), the Connecticut standard for swimming.

The count totaled 31,000 above Northampton, reached a peak of 947,000 where the Chicopee River enters the Connecticut from the east at Chicopee, dropped to 315,000 at the State line and 41,000 above Hartford, then jumped again below Hartford to 162,000.

Noting that the count at the State line was 315 times the swimming standard, the team reported: "Anyone ingesting a single drop of water at this point would have swallowed at least 26 bacteria that originated in excreta that entered the river in Massachusetts."

Sewage from Hartford and East Hartford, given only primary treatment, made conditions farther downriver just as unpleasant.

Below Hartford, the team said, a drop of water contained 33 fecal bacteria, "of which not more than one probably originated in Massachusetts."

Foul bottom

Massachusetts accounted for 63 percent of the bacteria load along the 62-mile reach and Connecticut for 37 percent. Biggest sources: Hartford, 31 percent; Springfield, 20; Holyoke, 13, and Chicopee, 13. Fifteen other towns accounted for the remaining 23 percent, with no one town exceeding 6 percent.

The Connecticut River is also loaded with solids—and not just the silt that makes the Mississippi River "too thick to navigate and too thin to cultivate."

The Public Health Service team discovered that 145,000 pounds a day entered the river in Massachusetts and about half that in Connecticut.

Massachusetts industries accounted for 22,300 pounds. Sources were 10 papermills (46 percent), three syntehtic chemical plants (also 46 percent) and a brewery, a rendering plant and a textile mill. Connecticut's only industrial source, a Windsor Locks papermill, discharged 900 pounds daily.

Organic or decomposable solids giving off gas bubbles and the rotten-egg odor of hydrogen sulfide totaled 63,600 pounds daily. Much of them settled to the bottom and formed a sludge.

"In the areas of major sludge deposits," said the team, "decomposing clumps and rafts of sludge boil to the water surface, buoyed by gas bubbles of decomposition. These unsightly masses decrease the esthetic appeal of the stream below Holyoke and in the vicinity of Springfield."

Such muck cannot support insect larvae and other fish food but sludge worms thrive on it.

The team counted eight sludge worms per square foot on the relatively clean bottom above Northampton, 1,408 at the mouth of the Chicopee, 994 at the State line, 50 above Hartford and 211 below Hartford.

It found only three per square foot below Holyoke. "Conditions in the major sludge deposit were so foul," it observed, "that even the worms could not thrive here."

In short, the team found that nearly two-thirds of the sewered population of 734,265 between Northampton and South Glastonbury might as well have been dumping raw sewage straight into the river.

The pollution in the river was equal to the waste from 412,910 persons in bacteria, 444,600 in suspended solids and 559,010 in biochemical oxygen demand (the amount of oxygen required by organisms to break up organic matter).

More recent, though less comprehensive, measurements of Connecticut River pollution echo the 1963 report. Little, if anything, has changed.

In the face of all this pollution, State agencies are making headway but their work is slow, cumbersome, and often timid.

Their most optimistic forecast is that it will take another 10 years to clean the river—and then only to swimming condition above Holyoke and below East Haddam. The stretch between, passing by Springfield and Hartford, will be good for noncontact recreation like boating.

Of the four valley States, Connecticut is unquestionably the leader in fighting water pollution.

Its first action was in 1886 against Meriden for dumping raw sewage into the Quinnipiac River. This led to construction in 1891 of the State's first treatment plant, a simple sand filter system.

Connecticut courts ruled early against pollution (*Morgan* v. *Danbury*, 1963), declaring that a property owner along the river had a right to expect clean water and that this right was more important even than a city's need to use a stream for sewage disposal.

One cannot, said the courts, deprive another of his property without compensation "on the plea that the injury to the one would be small and the advantage to the other, or even to the public, would be great."

The general assembly subsequently sent four study groups into the field—in 1897, 1913, 1917, and 1921. They all reported pollution was bad and getting worse. So in 1925, the assembly passed antipollution laws and created a State water commission to administer them. Connecticut became the third State in the country to have such laws, after Rhode Island and Pennsylvania.

At this point, as a result of 40 years of study and court actions, certain fundamentals had been established. As seen by Merwin E. Hupfer, the commission's principal sanitary engineer, they were:

The State has the power to direct treatment by a municipality.

Private riparian rights, even though small, cannot be abused, even for public benefit.

Primary emphasis should be on municipal sewage discharges.

Pollution affects more than public health.

Correction of problems should be systematic, constructive, and reasonable.

The program should protect existing pristine water.

Industrial pollution should also be controlled by the State.

The commission of three men—increased to seven in 1957 when the agency was renamed the Water Resources Commission and took over supervision over flood control, water policy and dams—was given the power to call a polluter to a hearing and, if necessary, order him to correct the pollution and get a court injunction to stop him from polluting. New pollution after 1925 was prohibited unless the commission found it in the public interest to permit it.

Soft sell

Armed with a strong law and backed by enlightened courts, the commission had an attack of benevolent fuddy-duddyism. In its first biennial report, it noted two possible courses:

To rely on the authority conferred by law and, after proper investigation, to issue orders to eliminate specific causes of pollution.

To "attempt by education and personal conference to develop a sentiment calling for correction and, by assistance to and cooperation with both industry and communities, and in bringing about the desired results."

The commission chose the second, which was like David laying down his sling and inviting Goliath to talk things over.

It has spent the last 40 years alternately cajoling and threatening towns and industries, doing research for them on their treatment problems, wrestling with him—first attitudes, trying to pry sewage plants from the bottom of their priority lists, waiting out long delays and trying again.

At the same time, it has tried to get the most possible use out of the river. It has allowed pollution, for example, where it felt a nuisance would not be created or where natural purification should take care of it. The dump on the East Hartford side of the Charter Oak Bridge, which has a permit from the commission to be on the waterline, is an example. So are some new apartments on the bank in Warehouse Point, which received permission this year to discharge partly treated sewage until that community builds a treatment plant.

Commission Director William S. Wise's definition of clean water is "what is practical to get under existing conditions."

The commission has picked up its sling, the hearing process, 61 times since 1925, always as a last resort. (The first time was in 1932.) The hearings resulted in 42 orders against polluters who remained uncooperative—towns in 34 cases, industries in 8. Five orders were appealed—two by towns, three by industries. The commission was upheld in each case.

The persuasion technique has worked of course.

Statewide, 95 percent of all human waste running through sewers from towns and cities is treated and 52 percent of all industrial waste.

On the river, every community provides at least primary treatment except Warehouse Point, which has delayed because half its sewage comes from a State facility, the receiving home for children. The State this year agreed to pay its share and plans are proceeding. Industrial pollution on the river is relatively small and sporadic although it includes disturbing elements such as paper fiber, acids, dyes and, in Middletown, blood and offal from a slaughterhouse.

Of the 59 Connecticut towns in the watershed, 56 either have plants, are planning them or don't need them. The remaining three are Colchester, Avon and Chester, which need them but have not committed themselves to construction.

Persuasion has shown results but it has taken the commission 40 years to get this far. That is a long time, even considering delay caused by the depression, World War II and the Korean war. The commission has just started its "second phase"—getting all towns to build secondary plants and to chlorinate the treated effluent.

Target dates are 1968 for chlorination and 1975 for secondary treatment. This would make the river swimmable below East Haddam and good for boating and other noncontact recreation above.

In Massachusetts, sources of most of the industrial pollution and two-thirds of the human waste contamination in the river, control measures along the Connecticut did not start until 1945. Before then, Massachusetts considered the river, along with the Merrimack, an "industrial stream" only. Its pollution was not banned in Boston.

Of the 99 Massachusetts towns all or partly in the watershed, only 10 had treatment plants in 1945. Now 24 have them and at least 4 others are planning them.

Nine towns are dumping raw sewage into the river and need plants but have no plans for them.

Chicopee, with 61,500 persons, is the biggest offender. It has plans for a $3 million plant at the mouth of the Chicopee River and for $5 million worth of sewers, including interceptors to connect Westover Air Force Base. It failed to get 50 percent Federal aid under the APW (Accelerated Public Works) program for depressed areas because the money ran out.

"Now," said a Massachusetts State official, "Chicopee won't go with 30-percent Federal aid under Public Law 660 (the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956). It's waiting to see if more Federal aid will become available."

"We should be referring Chicopee to the Attorney General," said Worthen H. Taylor, chief sanitary engineer of the State's public health department and head of its antipollution efforts.

Also on the verge of legal action is Westfield (population 26,000), which so far has given only lip service to correcting its pollution. It received a study report from a consulting engineer a year ago, has gone no further.

Athol (population 10,000) is another problem town. It has started new plans for a treatment plant after its old ones became outdated. The six other problem towns, all small, are Orange, Erving, Hatfield, Palmer, Wilbraham, and Templeton.

ACTION UPRIVER

The two large Massachusetts cities of Springfield (population 174,000) and Holyoke (population 53,000) are polluting the river but are taking corrective action. Springfield is studying ways to improve the effectiveness of its two primary plants. Holyoke has completed a primary plant and is planning sewers to pick up waste from 65 percent of its population.

Like Hartford, the big and old Massachusetts cities have their problems with combination sewers. The expensive job of separating these into storm and sanitary pipes is a long way off. As a result, heavy pollution will occur in heavy rains when the sewers are filled and the treatment plants must be bypassed. But, fortunately, this usually occurs in early spring when the river is not used for recreation.

In New Hampshire and Vermont, where the population served by sewers is small and river pollution has never been extensive, control measures on the Connecticut River began even later than in Massachusetts.

The two Upper Valley States started their major effort in 1957, after 30-percent Federal aid (up to $600,000) for building town treatment plants became available under the Water Pollution Control Act.

Unlike Connecticut and Massachusetts, both provide further incentive with State aid. New Hampshire pays 40 percent of a town's cost and Vermont 20 to 45 percent, with more going to poorer towns under a 1965 law. To be fair to towns that already had plants, New Hampshire made its aid retroactive to 1947, the year it passed its first antipollution laws.

As Connecticut has started to do this year (under public act 465, enacted July 1) and

Massachusetts has done since 1961, the Upper Valley States allow local property tax exemption for industrial pollution abatement equipment.

Before 1957, only three Vermont towns had treatment plants, none in the Connecticut River watershed. Less than 5 percent of the sewered population was served. Today, the State has 24 plants serving 73 percent. The only city in the Connecticut River watershed that has a plant, however, is Brattleboro (population 6,355) and its plant is inadequate. Of the other 115 towns in the watershed, 2 others are planning to build plants and 8 need them but have not approved construction.

The only pollution court case pending in Vermont involves a dairy in the Lake Champlain Valley.

R. W. Thieme, director of the State's pollution control agency, the three-man water resources commission, said money has been the big problem. The no-action town represent only 4 percent of the sewered population, he said, and they will probably move now that up to 45 percent State aid is available.

Mr. Thieme believes, however, that some pollution should be allowed since the river's natural purification process can take care of a certain amount.

"Vermont has no coastline," he said, "so industry must have the capacity to use its inland waters. It's either that or we will wind up doing nothing but entertaining tourists."

In New Hampshire, of 94 towns in the watershed 7 have plants and 11 are planning or building them. Eight other towns need plants but have not gone beyond preliminary studies.

William Healy, director of the State's water pollution board, said no legal action has been necessary since Federal aid became available.

"The towns are well acquainted with the need," he said. "The drought has emphasized the need for preserving water quality. So now it's just a matter of timing and priority."

JOBS AHEAD

With neighboring Vermont also focusing its efforts on the Connecticut River now, said Mr. Healy, the waterway should be up to class B standards from Canada to the northern Massachusetts line in 10 years.

To get a clean river by 1975—swimmable everywhere except between Holyoke and East Haddam and possibly a few industrialized areas in Vermont and New Hampshire—the States have three jobs to fulfill:

Optimum sewage treatment. The cost: $90 to $100 million each to Connecticut and Massachusetts, $35 to $50 million each in Vermont and New Hampshire.

Chlorination, which Massachusetts is now doing during the recreation season, May 1 to September 15, and which Connecticut hopes to start doing by 1968.

Constant and forceful pressure on industries to clean up their pollution.

If the States fumble or advance too slowly, the Federal Government is in the background ready to pick up the ball. Washington has become avidly interested in natural resources as a result of the New Frontier and Great Society programs.

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF's bill to save the Connecticut as a national parkway and recreation area, if passed, is sure to hasten its cleanup as would another bill of his to increase Federal aid for town sewage plants from $100 to $400 million a year.

Washington's big stick, however, is the Muskie bill (S. 4), now up for action in Congress.

The bill, introduced by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, with Senator RIBICOFF among the cosponsors, would strengthen the Federal role in pollution control by taking it away from the Public Health Service, a branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and giving it to a new HEW branch answerable directly to the HEW Secretary.

This would be recognition of a view the States have been reluctant to accept—that water pollution is more than a health problem, that it affects welfare as well.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, authorized the HEW secretary to set Federal standards for clean water. The States have opposed this, fearing that Washington will not make allowances for local conditions—that is, the practical need of a town or industry to pollute and a river's ability to absorb this pollution. The House, going along with the States, amended the Federal standards out of the bill and threw it to the compromise committee.

On September 17, the committee recommended passage of a compromise on standards—allowing the setting of Federal standards only if a State does not set its own standards by June 30, 1967, or if a State's standards are not adequate.

State officials, who feel they are doing a good job, would prefer to see Washington provide money but otherwise keep hands off. They subscribe to a statement of the engineers joint council:

"Pollution of water should be regulated at the lowest governmental level adequate for the particular situation. Federal jurisdiction and participation should be limited to the administration of existing laws and to research investigation and guidance upon which sound State laws and local regulations may be based."

"If interstate pacts can't get the States together," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer in Connecticut's State health department, "then we need Federal legislation. But we don't need it every time somebody complains. Let's not insinuate that the program will be lost without the Great White Father in Washington."

Mr. Wise, who joined Connecticut's water resources commission as an associate engineer in 1928 and has been director since it was reorganized in 1957, believes in that agency's stability and has been critical when Washington looked over its shoulder.

Of the 1963 Public Health Service report on pollution in the river, Mr. Wise said:

"It does not represent a balanced picture of the river's condition but purports to show it in the most unfavorable light. It leaves the inference that pollution has robbed the river of all its normal useful purposes.

"It emphasizes recreational uses but it ignores the fact that, in the reach above Hartford, shallow water, exposed riverbed, shoals, topography and physical conditions greatly restrict its use for waterborne recreational activities during most of the recreation season.

"It appears to discount the habits and customs of the large percentage of people in this area who prefer sandy beaches and salt water to muddy riverbeds even if the fresh water is clean.

"It neither presents meager data nor offers criteria in support of its conclusion that the river's condition endangers the health and welfare of the people of Connecticut, nor does it offer any interpretation of that statement.

"It * * * ignores the impractical aspects of controlling the frequent contamination of the river during periods of rain and natural drainage from the many municipalities and agricultural lands located along its banks.

"Finally, the report does not acknowledge the progress that has been made in pollution abatement along the entire river, the activities which are now directed toward accelerating these programs or the policy for achieving the ultimate goal—a river of beauty, utility, and enjoyment."

Mr. Wise advocated continued State control with Federal financial help. "Money," he said, "is the critical need."

"We believe in State authority," said Mr. Taylor in Massachusetts. "We like to take advantage of natural purification. The Federal Government would raise a river to its highest use."

Mr. Thieme, of Vermont, said parts of the Connecticut River should be like the Ruhr Valley, which is often cited as an example of industry and beauty living together.

Francis J. Lariviere, executive secretary of the New England Interstate Pollution Control Commission, feels Federal intervention will mean waste.

"An industry or an individual can do the pollution control job cheaper," he said. "When a State or a Federal agency enters the picture, you get a lot of people just looking over other people's shoulders."

And costs will rise, he said, because technology and construction will not be able to keep up with the outpouring of money from Washington. With jobs for all, competition will disappear and bids will be higher. A study, he said, has shown that bids in the accelerated public works program were 30 percent above normal.

A group of Congressmen opposing Federal standards, led by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, said in a report:

"Standards of water quality are concededly badly needed but should be established by the State and local agencies, which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of establishing and enforcing stringent standards of water quality."

Furthermore, the group said, authorizing the HEW Secretary to set standards would discourage the States from developing their own plans and standards and it would give a single Federal official the power to establish local zoning measures since he would be controlling use of land in watershed areas.

There are many arguments in favor of Federal power, however.

President Johnson himself proposed it last February 8 to Congress in his message on natural beauty. He urged legislation to "provide, through effective water quality standards, combined with a swift and effective enforcement procedure, a national program to prevent water pollution at its source rather than attempting to cure pollution after it occurs."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in a statement before a congressional committee early this year, criticized the traditional State view that some pollution should always be allowed.

"For too long," he said, "even so-called good waste disposal practice has been geared merely to the concept of limiting pollution loads to the assimilation capacity of streams. This is a negative approach. We must begin now to adopt a positive approach to insure clean water."

Senator RIBICOFF, champion of the Connecticut River, has emphasized that the States must stop looking at pollution as a limited health and welfare problem with the focus on disease prevention.

"I will say to my good friends in the State agencies," he said here in January at a meeting of fish and game commissioners, "that pollution which prevents a man from fishing or a child from swimming or a teenager from water skiing or a family from going to the beach for a Sunday picnic certainly has affected the welfare of the people of Connecticut and I am pleased to note that the Federal officials agree with that interpretation of the term."

Mr. RIBICOFF has also noted that "prospects of Federal action seem to expedite compliance, oftentimes in situations which have dragged through State and local courts for years."

"The complaint about invasion of States rights," said the New York Times in an editorial, "is the rallying cry of the chemical,

leather, paper, steel, power and other industrial firms that oppose Federal action because they find it much easier to put pressure on State and local governments."

Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field, said in a talk with the Times in his Washington office that the States fear of an insensitive big brother in Washington is baseless.

"Anyone can stop pollution by denying industry and population," he said. "Our challenge is controlling them. We are not dealing with pollution in a vacuum. Our job is to help people. One way to help people is to make sure they have jobs."

Mr. Stein believes each waterway is unique and should be treated that way.

"All we ask," he said, "is that once a State agrees to a standard it should be lived up to. You can't set a 25-mile-an-hour speed limit and let a few people go 45."

Even Mr. RIBICOFF doesn't expect perfection.

"It would be unrealistic," he said, "to expect to restore the river to the pristine condition of bygone days (when Adrian Block sailed it). It would be defeatist, however, not to hope and to work to restore it to a condition that will permit men and women, boys and girls, to find recreation—for many of them release from the pressures of crowded city life."

Increased Federal action, whether the States like it or not, is coming. There is talk in Washington of a "massive" antipollution effort in Congress next year, now that President Johnson has gotten his top priority medicare and civil rights programs.

Bills are already in the works. The Muskie bill is one. The Ribicoff parkway and increased aid bills are others. Also proposed—by Representatives JOHN S. MONAGAN and ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, as well as others—is legislation to increase Federal aid in various ways and to give industries a 3-year tax writeoff on antipollution equipment. The momentum comes from a renewed interest in natural beauty in outdoor recreation, awakened by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Meanwhile, the pace of State programs is quickening. The evergrowing need for the Connecticut River as a recreational strip, a place of beauty and eventually a water supply is a reality that can no longer be denied. The heavy pollution that now defiles it, everybody realizes, will have to be cleaned up.

This generation, as a result, may be the lucky one that sees the river again as Yale President Timothy Dwight did in the early 1800's. He wrote:

"The purity, salubrity and sweetness of its waters, the frequency and elegance of its meanders, its absolute freedom from all aquatic vegetables, the uncommon and universal beauty of its banks—are objects which no traveler can thoroughly describe and no reader can adequately imagine."

TO THOSE WHO CARE—THE BEAUTIFUL

Seen from a low-flying airplane, the little pond in the northern tip of New Hampshire seems insignificant. Boggy, half full of vegetation, its couple of acres hidden in scrub spruce, it is a puddle misplaced high on a mountainside.

It is the source of the Connecticut River.

Called Fourth Connecticut Lake, the pond is the first accumulation of water that will flow 404 miles through four States—New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. A drop of rain that falls here eventually ends up in Long Island Sound. A drop that falls 600 feet away, on the north side of the ridgeline that forms the Canadian border ends up in the St. Lawrence and the sea at the heart of Canada's Maritimes.

Fourth Lake is perched on Mount Prospect, 2,600 feet above sea level. It is surrounded by wild, wooded, bear and moose country. At the foot of the mountain is the only building around, a red-roofed customs house flying the Canadian maple leaf.

"Almost the only sound that relieves the monotony of the place," wrote a New Hampshire geologist, "is the croaking of the frogs, and this must be their paradise."

From Fourth Lake, the river—at this point merely a stream a man can straddle—tumbles half a mile to the Third Connecticut Lake, which spreads out at the base of the mountain 500 feet below. It flows on through Second and First Connecticut Lakes and then Lake Francis. From the air, it appears only as a narrow cut in the trees where it links the lakes.

The river bears the mark of man almost from the beginning. Route 3 winds along Third Lake into Canada. There are power dams on Second and First Lakes and Lake Francis. The first community on the river in Pittsburg, N.H., a lumber town whose small white houses stretch out below the Lake Francis dam, 20 miles downstream from the source.

At Pittsburg, the Connecticut stops being a lake connector and becomes a full-formed river. Here, where log drives to Massachusetts were staged as late as 1910, the river gurgles over a rocky bed, ankle deep and 30 feet wide. It has already picked up its characteristic tea color from tannin, the strong dye in the vegetation along its banks.

The river at Pittsburg begins its long, enchanting, winding way to the sea between the Green Mountains of Vermont on the west and the White Mountains of New Hampshire on the east. It will play, as one writer said, the roles of "damsel, vixen, lusty matron and eccentric dowager."

It will go through a watershed of 11,265 miles (twice the size of the State of Connecticut) and through a country that is 67 percent forest, 23 percent farmland, and 10 percent towns, cities, roads, lakes, and rivers. It will spill over some 16 dams on its main route and will pick up water from 16 major and many minor tributaries. The width of its valley will generally run from 20 to 50 miles. The river itself will rarely get wider than 2,000 feet. In the watershed are all or part of 368 towns—94 in New Hampshire, 116 in Vermont, 99 in Massachusetts, and 59 in Connecticut—and about 1.7 million persons.

At West Stewartstown, N.H., 11 miles from Pittsburg, the river takes a sharp bend southward and assumes the grave responsibility of dividing New Hampshire from Vermont. The line runs, not in the middle of the river, but at the waterline on the Vermont side, so anyone wishing to fish on the river must have a New Hampshire permit.

As testimony to the mountainous terrain, the river drops 1,500 feet by the time it reaches West Stewartstown. The descent from here on is gradual—200 feet in 50 miles.

The first industry on the river is New Hampshire's largest, the Groveton Paper Co. in Groveton, about 70 miles from the source. Here, logs jam the river from bank to bank, waiting to be processed into pulp. Two mountains of logs on the shore tower over nearby houses and a tiny covered bridge. Waste taints the river a greenish white.

Twenty miles south of Groveton, the Connecticut swells into a lake behind the upper dam at Fifteen Mile Falls. Power from this and the lower dam lights lamps as far away as Boston. Barnet, at the foot of the falls, was the extreme head of navigation in the early 1800's although the practical limit was Wells River 12 miles downriver.

Between Barnet and Hanover, home of Dartmouth College, the river takes some dramatic turns, sweeping in great oxbows and turning on itself to form shapes that look like pretzels and the longhand "e."

The river is so crooked, an ancient local historian once wrote, that a hunter could "stand in New Hampshire, fire across Vermont and lodge his ball in New Hampshire again."

A few more industries appear on the reach south to the Massachusetts line, mostly on the New Hampshire side—paper and textile mills in the Claremont-Newport area and paper mills and a tannery in Hinsdale.

The first sign of sewage—cigarettes in pools of waste—shows up between Bellows Falls and Brattleboro, just before the river enters Massachusetts at Northfield. Yet, there is attraction here. At Bellows Falls, the loitering stream becomes a foaming torrent in a narrow, rocky channel, rushing and leaping in zigzags to a grand finish 50 feet below. (A historian with a penchant for exaggeration wrote over 150 years ago that the speed and pressure of the water were so great here "between the pinching rocks" that an iron bar could not be forced into it). Brattleboro is where Rudyard Kipling lived for a while and wrote "Captains Courageous."

When it enters Massachusetts, the river is tranquil again. Now in one of its most attractive phases, it turns through lush fields, cleaves a chasm of rock and winds through a quilt of vegetable and shade tobacco farms. At Turners Falls, it plays a joke and actually flows north for a short distance, then settles down to cleave the green-rock gorges of Deerfield and flow by Mount Sugarloaf into the land of the dinosaurs around Northampton (the footprints are still visible).

The river idyll, fairly consistent all the way down from Canada, comes to a stomach-turning halt at Holyoke, which Author William Manchester of Middletown, who followed the river a few years ago, calls the "eyesore of the valley."

"Here," he said, "the river plunges 60 feet and an intricate, century-old system of canals provides power for paper factories which repay the Connecticut River by defiling her waters and blighting her banks with Dickensian tenements."

No far below on the opposite bank, where the Chicopee River enters from the east at Chicopee, the Connecticut gets slugged with its heaviest dose of pollution. Human waste from Chicopee, North Wilbraham, Ludlow and Westover Air Force Base raises the bacteria count to 947,000 per 100 milliliters (half a cup), or 947 times the maximum for swimming. Here also are the most sludge worms, which thrive on organic wastes that have settled to the bottom. Fifty-four percent of all industrial wastes discharged into the river between Northampton and Rocky Hill enter here.

The Connecticut River is virtually a sewage canal from Holyoke to the State line.

It spills over its last fall, the 4-foot Enfield Dam, just after crossing the line, cleans itself a bit along the 5-mile Enfield Rapids thanks to natural purification and dilution from the relatively clean Farmington River, then gets belted again by pollution from the Hockanum River, Hartford and East Hartford.

At Hartford, the river begins to live up to its name, Indian for "long tidal river." Tides here average 1.2 feet between high and low water.

Hartford founder Thomas Hooker is probably whirling in his grave behind Center Church at the way the city has turned its back on the river. In his day, it was the lifeline to the sea and the highway to the frontier up north. Columbus Boulevard, now walled off from the river by dikes and highways, was then a river road connecting Hartford with the other two settlements of Windsor and Wethersfield.

The river was vital to transportation of freight and passengers right up to 1931, when the city of Hartford stopped making overnight trips to New York. Its heyday was in the early 1800's, when 60-foot flatboats negotiated the canals and rapids all the way to

Barnet, Vt. Before the Windsor Locks canal was built in 1829, goods were taken to Warehouse Point at the foot of Enfield Rapids, stored there and eventually taken by wagon to boats above.

Tall-masted vessels stood two and three deep in the Hartford harbor in the days of sail. To the frustration of skippers, a sailing ship took 2 weeks to get from the West Indies to Old Saybrook and another 2 weeks to sail up the winding river to Hartford. Wethersfield, a privateers' nest in the Revolution, became a trade center because the river then looped south there (in what is now Wethersfield Cove), the straw that broke many a captain's back.

From Hartford to Middletown, the river is surprisingly empty of activity. The banks are thick with uninterrupted foliage. Civilization seems far away. But the reason is simple: The banks are low and level and flood danger is high, so construction has been light and most of the land is used for farming.

At Middletown, the river's principal port in the late 1700's, the river gets busy again but does not suffer too much pollution. Middletown treats and chlorinates its sewage. Chances are good the river will become suitable for swimming again below East Haddam.

From Middletown southward, the Connecticut is as lovely as anywhere in its upper reaches. And it has the added appeal of salt marches below Hamburg, where the river becomes briny 7 miles from the sound.

This is the stretch that impressed Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall on his recent river trip in connection with the proposal to make the river a national parkway.

The banks along these last 25 miles of river are full of attractions—the Goodspeed Opera House at Middletown, four shoreline State parks, Gillette Castle high on a hill at East Haddam, a mixture of modern and colonial homes and numerous boat moorings.

Selden Creek, making an island of Selden Neck just below Hudlyme, invites the canoeist or small boat owner to explore its long, narrow channel, which divides marshes from wooded cliffs.

At Old Saybrook, the river completes its long journey and empties into the sea, pouring a daily average of over 11 billion gallons of fresh water into the sound. Because of the Saybrook sandbar, curse of ship captains since colonial days, the Connecticut is unique among rivers in not having a major city at the mouth.

From the little mountainside pond near the Canadian border to Old Saybrook, the river rarely loses its charm. Those who get to know it invariably agree with a historian who wrote in the early 1800's:

"This stream may perhaps with more propriety than any other in the world be named the Beautiful River."

"YOU CAN'T SEE A FOOT IN FRONT DOWN THERE"

Hartford police skindivers know what it's like to swim in the murky, dirty Connecticut River. They go in it to recover bodies, guns, and loot.

"We have to go in," said Lt. Robert Pilon, head of the 13-man team. "The bottom is so covered with debris it's impossible to grapple."

Swimming for them is anything but carefree. They have to worry about disease, equipment damage, debris, and turbidity.

The men guard against disease by having typhoid and tetanus shots periodically and, usually, boosters after they have been in the river. Even then, some have gotten sick. The bacteria in the river can also cause dysentery, diarrhea, and other illnesses.

Equipment must be carefully tended. Suits will rot if the algae is not scrubbed off soon enough or thoroughly enough. An air regulator, a vital device which a diver treats like a fine Swiss watch, can be wrecked by the oil that streaks the water.

To protect themselves against debris, the divers wear basketball sneakers and work from boats instead of wading out from shore. If they're lucky, they don't get snagged on the car parts, refrigerators, fencing, tin cans, wire, oil drums, and other junk on the bottom.

The river's turbidity—a tea-colored opaqueness caused partly by vegetation and partly by pollution—defies countermeasures.

"You can't see a foot in front of you down there," Lieutenant Pilon said. "Lights don't help. You have to search by feel."

Training Officer Dennis Hurley said that 5 feet down, a diver can no longer see daylight overhead.

"He has to rely on his bubbles to see which way is up," he said, "but he has to look quick. The bubbles are only visible for about a foot."

Divers always maintain positive buoyancy when they're working in the Connecticut. This enables them to float up if they get into trouble.

In contrast, the diver's train in the No. 5 reservoir in Farmington where a man working on the bottom 50 feet down can be observed from the surface. In a search for bodies in a mica quarry in Cromwell a few years ago divers could see daylight 70 feet overhead and could see 15 feet ahead of them, despite the unreal glitter of myriad specks of mica in the water.

The turbid river hides bodies well.

Two years ago, a boy drowned at Hartford's Riverside Park and disappeared. A diver, taking part in his first search for a body was groping blindly along the bottom muck when his hands suddenly touched the boy. The diver panicked and shot to the surface. Although the location of the body had been pinpointed and other divers went down repeatedly, it could not be found again. Six days later, it came up downriver.

CHEAP SEWAGE TREATMENT

Cities looking for a cheap but efficient way of treating their sewage may find the answer in an ancient resource, coal.

The Rand Development Corp. of Cleveland, seeking new markets for the coal industry, believes it has found an important one in sewage treatment.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Washington thinks it may be a breakthrough, has awarded Rand a $617,000 contract to build a small pilot plant.

"It's the kind of idea that is so simple it could be great," said Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field. "It's like the paper clip. You wonder why nobody ever thought of it before."

Activated charcoal has been tried in the past as a final polishing-off agent in the filtering process, Mr. Stein said, but nobody had thought of using it at the beginning.

Basically, Rand's idea is to grind coal down to the graininess of sugar and then filter raw waste through it.

A 1,500-gallon-an-hour plant it has been operating for the last 20 months in Cleveland has removed 80 to 85 percent of organic matter, 90 percent of detergents, 85 percent of phosphates, and 100 percent of odor.

What's more, the coal can still be burned after it has become saturated. A city can thus reduce costs by selling it to powerplants or using it itself.

Rand estimates it will take 5 tons of coal to treat a million gallons of sewage.

The Hartford Metropolitan District's big sewage plant at Brainard Field treats an average of 39 million gallons a day, so would need 195 tons of coal daily.

But the MDC would have no trouble getting rid of the coal. The Hartford Electric Light Co.'s powerplant at South Meadows uses an average of 1,000 tons daily, and its Middletown plant uses 3,000 tons a day. Each plant has equipment to grind the coal down to the graininess of talcum, the consistency at which it is blown into the boilers to be burned.

A Rand official said operation costs have not been figured out yet, but will certainly be less than that for the activated sludge process, a secondary treatment with which the MDC is experimenting as a possibility for its Hartford plant.

The Hartford plant now gives primary treatment—chopping up and removing large material from sewage, taking out grit and settling out the suspended solids. The method is 35 to 50 percent effective in cleaning polluted water.

The most popular form of secondary treatment now—the kind used by the MDC in its new Poquonnock plant—is the trickling filter method. In this treatment, the primary effluent is further cleaned by spraying it through a rotating boom over crushed rock inhabitated by bacteria that oxidize organic matter.

The activated sludge process, and its modifications, contact stabilization and step aeration, oxidize the primary effluent by bubbling air up through it, much as a pump does in a home fish aquarium. They are about 85 percent efficient.

Metcalf & Eddy of Boston, MDC's consultant engineers, have estimated it will cost $7,322,000 to add secondary treatment to the Hartford plant.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RIBICOFF

I commend the Hartford Times for its concern with the future of the Connecticut River.

As you know so well, the Connecticut River is a priceless heritage—not only for Conecticut but for New England and the Nation. But if future generations are to enjoy its beauty, all of us—public officials at the Federal, State, and local levels, industry, private organizations, and concerned individuals—must work together to clean it up and preserve its scenic splendor.

Cleaning up the river is more than a matter of beauty. In 15 years, the Connecticut River will be one of our most important sources of life-giving water—for drinking, for industry, and for the hundreds of uses of our urban civilization.

Time is running out and, for these reasons, I have moved on two fronts: To establish a Connecticut River National Parkway and Recreation Area; and to quadruple the Federal effort in water pollution control.

I intend to do everything possible to have my bills enacted into law, but it will take public awareness and cooperation to insure that the efforts to save the Connecticut River are successful. I take off my hat to the Hartford Times for the great contribution it is making to the battle.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have now reached the time at which the Senator from Utah was authorized by the majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess. Therefore, under the authority given me by the majority leader, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

U.S. MARSHAL

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, vice Thurgood Marshall.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE

Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Harry Lee Walker, resigned.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan, vice William M. Rountree.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972. (Reappointment.)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971. (Reappointment.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Edward L. Bailey to be lieutenant commander, and ending Charles H. Leckrone to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 24, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Frank C. Morgret III to be lieutenant, and ending Stephen L. Richmond to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Horton Salutes Polish Americans on Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Count Casimir Pulaski came to these shores to serve the cause of freedom by fighting in the American Continental Army commanded by Gen. George Washington. He received an appointment from the Continental Congress as one of Washington's cavalry commanders, and distinguished himself in many engagements with the enemy. While leading an attack to relieve the captured city of Savannah, Ga., he received the wounds from which he later died on October 11, 1779. It is the anniversary of the death from battle wounds of this great American patriot, and this great Pole, Casimir Pulaski, that we observe here in this Chamber.

He fought the Russian domination of Poland, and he fought the British domination of America. It is his memory and his achievement in these causes that we celebrate today on the 186th anniversary of his heroic death.

His military career in America was tragically short. In September of 1777, Pulaski served with Washington at the battle of Brandywine, and fought with great distinction. He commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton, and later at Flemington. He served with General Wayne in scouting for supplies for the starving troops at Valley Forge.

In March of 1778, Pulaski was asked to organize an independent cavalry corps. He established headquarters at Baltimore from which he was sent to protect American supplies at Egg Harbor, N.J., where his legion was ambushed and defeated because of information given to the British by a deserter. Indian massacres in the Cherry Valley caused Pulaski to be sent to Minisink on the Delaware River. After 3 months there he was ordered to go to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina.

He arrived at Charleston in May of 1779, and was defeated by the superior forces of General Provost. Joining General Lincoln and the French fleet in their attack on Savannah, he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, and fell gravely wounded. He was removed to one of the ships of the fleet, the *Wasp*, whose surgeons were unable to help him, and he died on board.

His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans, whatever their descent may be. Polish Americans should take special pride in the fact that at the time of the birth of the American Republic a Pole was at the head of an heroic cavalry charge against the enemy of this new country dedicated to liberty. Since those days, Polish Americans have made many contributions to American struggles against tyranny. In so doing they have followed the example set for them and for all Americans by the brave Pulaski.

Americans of Polish descent, like their great hero, Count Casimir Pulaski, have died in the defense of freedom while fighting in the Armed Forces of the United States. During the height of the fighting of World War II, President Roosevelt recognized the extent of the service and sacrifices made by Polish Americans when he told the Polish American Congress in Buffalo on May 28, 1944, that, "All of us are proud of the unsparing efforts of this group of Americans in our war effort, at the front, in our factories, and on our farms."

Some Polish American mothers had as many as 11 sons on active duty at the same time. It is estimated that from 900,000 to 1,000,000 Americans of Polish descent saw active duty in our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force during the Second World War. Over a hundred Polish American priests served as chaplains. Whether they were on the battlefield or on the home front, Americans of Polish descent served the United States during the war with a full measure of devotion, just as they do today. Then, as now, they were true to the momory of Pulaski.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, by Presidential proclamation, and especially in my home State of New York, by gubernatorial proclamation, this day, October 11, is being observed as Pulaski Day. For their pertinence to my remarks and their further tribute to the memory of this great Polish patriot, I am pleased to include the text of President Johnson's and Governor Rockefeller's proclamations.

PROCLAMATION 3665—GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY, 1965, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas Casimir Pulaski, Polish patriot and valiant defender of freedom, offered his services to the Continental Army during the American War for Independence; and

Whereas Congress acknowledged his brilliant military leadership at Brandywine by awarding him the rank of brigadier general and allowing him to form an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which won acclaim as Pulaski's Legion; and

Whereas this year marks the 186th anniversary of his death from wounds received while leading a cavalry charge during the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas it is proper that the American people continue to pay grateful tribute to General Pulaski for his heroic sacrifice in freedom's cause, and to the manifold and continuing contributions of Polish Americans in the defense and progress of this Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Monday, October 11, 1965, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day. I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in

honor of the memory of General Pulaski and the noble cause for which he gave his life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this third day of August in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 190th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION

October 11, 1965, will mark the 186th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, Brigadier General of the Continental Army. Wounded at the Battle of Savannah while leading a cavalry charge, this gallant leader of Poland's fight for independence gave his life in order that America might be free.

If General Pulaski were alive today he would see the Nation he helped to create grown to be the richest and most powerful country in the world. He would expect it to be a haven for those who seek liberty and a champion of those who are oppressed.

Today Poland, the land of General Pulaski's birth, his homeland for which he fought unsuccessfully as head of the Confederation of Bar, is once more under the domination of the foreign power whose shackles he had sought to remove. Pulaski's spirit is still alive in his people here and overseas. Poland was not lost in Pulaski's day. It is not lost today.

On this occasion therefore, in honoring the memory of one of Poland's most illustrious sons, we call upon all who love freedom to remember in their prayers and resolves the gallant people of Poland—still our allies in our efforts to preserve freedom wherever it is found in the world.

New Yorkers of Polish origin quite properly commemorate General Pulaski with parades and other appropriate festivities.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim October 11, 1965, as Pulaski Day in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this 16th day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Rural Youth in a Changing Environment—A Report by Ruth Cowan Nash, of the National Conference, Sponsored by the National Committee for Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the first national conference on the problems of rural youth in a changing environment was held at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater in 1963.

The objectives were to bring into national focus the complex problems of youth; to understand what causes these problems and to provide suitable answers.

Many of the Nation's top educators participated in this conference, including Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, and conference cochairman.

Mrs. Ruth Cowan Nash, an able author and also a West Virginian, edited the report of the conference which provided a factual summary. Considerable attention was given to the needs of special groups, including Negro, American Indian, Spanish-American youth and also children of migrant workers. The recommendations of the conference are presented in "Rural Youth in a Changing Environment," and there is also an interesting "Profile of the Rural Juvenile Court Judge," included in the Appendix.

Winthrop Rockefeller, chairman of the conference, in his keynote address stated that he was gratified in the answers of youth relative to self-employment or working for the Government or a large corporation. The individualism of the majority came out when they replied that they would rather be on "their own," and Mr. Rockefeller admired the spunk of this generation. He said:

Today, young people by and large are literate, intelligent, vibrant with courageous response to life. They are challenged by an educational experience that far exceeds anything which confronted past generations.

Many students from varied backgrounds were interviewed in a study analyzed by Dr. William Osborne, Arkansas State Teachers College. From these interviews came an insight into the thinking of rural youth—their views, fears, challenges, and hopes of the future.

As Dr. Miller stated:

Rural young people are acquiring skills and work habits to go with them which, to considerable degree, may not relate to aptitude or aspiration; may not be realistic in terms of employment in or out of the rural community, and in fact, may be oriented to jobs or occupations that are obsolescent and disappearing.

This characteristic is rooted in the very complex nature of values in the rural community, in the lagging aspirations of the family, in the quantity and quality of educational and other community services, and in the presence of special features of the community expressed through race, minority groups, and the extent of delinquency and retardation.

Since the rural child is up against the natural reality of family, community, and kinship, we must face the possibility that the range and quality of his visual and verbal impressions, in and out of school, tend to limit his knowledge about alternatives in work as in other fields, to reduce his ability to deal with abstractions and concepts, and to emphasize a probably inward-facing disposition toward change.

If this characterization is correct, we must conclude that rurality exacts the price from its young of relatively less awareness of the nonfarm world.

From this frank discussion, the conference gained an insight into the types of adversities rural youths face.

The postconference activities included reports, one of the foremost being the strengthening of our schools. This is so fundamental to an increased awareness and with the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was considered in the Senate Subcommittee on Education of which I am an active member, our schools will be strengthened.

Among other suggestions were: First, increasing the awareness of rural youth; second, mobilize the rural community for action; third, initiate and expand related educational programs; fourth, improve programs in guidance and counseling; fifth, expand opportunities for employment; sixth, provide necessary community services; seventh, foster moral and spiritual values; eighth, assist in adjustments to urban living and to conduct appropriate research.

The areas of concern in West Virginia were education, prevention of dropouts, and youth employment, as well as the development of human resources and economic resources. Also needed are ways of extending basic services to remote areas and job training, not for specific skills that may become obsolete, but to train young people to live in an era of change and in urban situations. The latter is being accomplished by the Job Corps centers, exemplified by two now functioning well in West Virginia, and more being planned for our State.

Memorial Dedication to the Late B. Carroll Reece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be present yesterday, October 10, at the memorial dedicated to the late B. Carroll Reece who served the First District of Tennessee so faithfully for more than three decades.

First elected to the 67th Congress, Representative Reece served, except for two short periods, until his death on March 19, 1961. He is well remembered as a dedicated statesman and Republican who also served as National Republican Chairman during 1946–48.

I would like to share with my colleagues the excellent remarks of another outstanding Republican, JIMMY QUILLEN, who gave the dedication speech. Those of you who served in Congress with Mr. Reece will be especially interested in this fine tribute by our colleague, Mr. QUILLEN.

I am indeed honored to have the privilege of being here today and to have this opportunity of participating in the dedication of the B. Carroll Reece Memorial Museum and Archives, a lasting memorial to our beloved friend.

My feelings are so profound because I know that Carroll Reece would be especially pleased to have this building, which is named in his honor, located on the campus of East Tennessee State University and in the district that he loved so well. He was always interested in the growth of East Tennessee State College, as he knew it, and he would have been extremely proud to have known it as a university.

I know, too, that everyone who is here today shares the same pride as I do in the dedication of this living memorial.

It is not only a memorial to Carroll Reece—it is also a tribute to his loving wife and helpmate through all of his trials and tribulations, his successes and his glories, the Honorable Louise G. Reece, who is with us today. It is also a tribute to their lovely daughter, Louise, and their lovely grandchildren, who are also present.

A former university professor himself, Mr. Reece watched closely the developments in American education when he left the college classroom to serve his country and his district in the Halls of Congress. One of his strongest desires was that our educational system would instill in our people those virtues which build strong and noble characters. He insisted that "freedom was for strong men," and that each man must accept the "moral responsibility to be free."

Carroll Reece could well ask and expect the virtues he did of our people because he practiced them so well himself. For he was a man of great faith, of outstanding personal courage, both in war and in peace. He also was a man of great intellect and unquestionable integrity. He had a wonderful sense of humor and there was no bitterness ever in his heart toward those who did not agree with him. If there was ever a gentleman in the truest sense of the word, it was Carroll Reece. The charm of his manner, the warmth of his friendship, and his straightforward character inspired confidence and courage. He gave of himself without reserve and he was unafraid.

If we recall for a moment the inspiring story of his life, we will think first of that large but proud family from which he went forth into the world to become nationally, yes, even internationally known. His life exemplifies that a man from lowly beginnings can attain majestic heights.

One of 13 children, he pursued his education from Watauga Academy to Carson-Newman College, and then on to New York University for the study of law, and to the University of London for advanced study. When he completed his graduate studies, he returned to New York University as an assistant instructor. But his patriotism and loyalty to his country soon drew his path to the U.S. Army.

During World War I, Carroll Reece bravely fought on the front lines for 210 days. Rising from the rank of private to lieutenant, he was appointed to command the 3d Battalion of the 102d Regiment at the very moment in 1918 when the fighting was most intense. He performed so well, so bravely, and with so much soldierlike ability, that he was awarded an extraordinary number of decorations and citations.

Both France and the United States commended him for his "energy, initiative, and military ability of a high order." He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Purple Heart, and many more. He was personally cited for his bravery by General Pershing and Marshal Petain.

When he returned to civilian life, he became the director of the School of Business Administration of New York University. Later he passed the Tennessee bar. He was also a successful banker and businessman.

But his greatest accomplishments will be those he made as he served our country and the people of the First District as a Member of Congress. His interests were the hopes and desires of his people, for whom he labored for over 40 years—as Congressman and as national chairman of his party. His success and his glory followed from the unselfish way in which he worked for others.

He entered the Congress as the youngest Member of either House, and throughout his long and noble career, he practiced the motto which he proudly displayed on the wall of his office, a motto to challenge us all in every endeavor of life—"Nothing is politically right which is morally wrong."

Mrs. Reece, after serving out the unexpired term of her husband, gave me the motto and I have it proudly hanging on my wall, as a remindful testimony.

One of Mr. Reece's greatest assets was the lovely and wonderful lady he married, Louise Goff, whose father and grandfather served in the U.S. Senate, and who was ever at his side as his stanchest supporter, his gracious hostess, and loving companion. Intensely interested in the political affairs of the Nation, she was for him a wise counselor and devoted wife.

Carroll Reece used to tell me about some of his heroes, the greatest of whom was Andrew Johnson, the 17th President of the United States. During Mr. Reece's last campaign, he told me he was writing a biography of President Andrew Johnson and that he had spent years researching the facts.

Mrs. Reece had this biography, "The Courageous Commoner," published in 1962, and it is truly one of the most interesting biographies of Johnson that I have ever read.

This month his second book, "Peace Through Law," is scheduled to be published.

Carroll Reece was a scholar and he loved the art of politics. But his greatest love was for the people of the first district; his greatest joy was in serving them. I remember when I rode around with Mr. Reece during many of his campaigns. He would point to the hills, or down into the valley, or to the distant mountains, and say: "My friend lives there." He would call his friend by name and tell how he had written him about a problem. Mr. Reece believed that if it was important enough for his friend to write him, it was important enough for him to try to help in every way that he could.

And he did help thousands and thousands of people, not only in the first district, but throughout the country as well.

He was not one to speak of the things he did for others. He did not have to; for the people spoke, and still speak, about the wonderful things that he did.

His love for his people was returned by them many times over. Their love and respect sustained him in his efforts to keep the Nation strong and free, and it led him to ever stand up for their interests, even to the very end. Early in 1961, when he was deathly ill, he left his hospital bed to go to the Capitol for a vote, because the well-being of his people was so important to him. Such devotion to others is rarely seen among us.

On his passing, his colleagues in the House said: "A sturdy oak has fallen," and such was our feeling when the news reached us here in the first district. Yet his memory lingers on in the hearts of all of us.

This museum will perpetuate this memory for generations yet to come. And this perpetuation will be the most fitting honor for B. Carroll Reece, for whatever memorials we dedicate, whatever monuments we erect, none will speak more eloquently than those he built himself in the hearts of men.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Pulaski Day is significant in the history of the United States and also in the history of civilization. Casimir Pulaski in his career both in his native Poland and as a general in the American Revolution, was a champion of freedom. He fought for the independence and the importance of the individual as a necessary element in the building of a free society.

It was his devotion to liberty which prompted Pulaski to aid in the fight for American independence. It was in fighting an invasion of his homeland that Pulaski gained the military experience which so well served our country in the American Revolution.

Pulaski reflected the spirit of his ancestors and the tradition of liberty which had prevailed in Poland throughout the centuries, despite its domination politically by surrounding enemies. He was unwilling to submit to the yoke of Poland's oppressors.

Still in pursuit of a noble cause, Count Casimir Pulaski left his ill-fated country and came to America. He joined the army of George Washington in 1777. Distinguishing himself in the battle of Brandywine, he was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by Congress. He fought at Germantown and in the battles of the winter of 1777–78, sharing the hardships and near desperation of Washington's troops during severe conditions that tested to the utmost the endurance and the devotion of all who survived.

As brigadier general in the American Army, Pulaski raised the mixed corps which came to be known as Pulaski's legion, and with which he defended Charleston, S.C., in May 1779. That fall he was mortally wounded at Savannah, Ga., and died in the service of our country on October 11, of that year.

His gallant, distinguished, and honored part in our fight for independence which our country has continued to enjoy, it was a part in that greater and continuing fight for the freedom of all mankind.

On the 186th anniversary of his death, we honor this great patriot, both for his service to his native Poland and to the United States of America, the Nation for which he gave his life.

Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley Recipient of Council Maritime Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion before to call to the attention of Members of this body the exceptional work being done by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, in reporting and assessing activities of the maritime industry.

As was to be expected, her excellent writings have gained recognition far beyond the confines of the great port of Baltimore. On Sunday last Mrs. Bentley

was honored by the Maritime Port Council of Greater New York Harbor at its annual dinner at the Americana Hotel where she was the recipient of the council's Maritime Service Award.

I am sure I speak for my associates of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee when I say that Mrs. Bentley is doing an enormous service to America's maritime industry, and to the entire Nation, by her accurate, knowledgeable reports of what the U.S. merchant marine is accomplishing, what our shipping means to the national economy and what irreparable damage could be done to that economy if the ill-conceived proposals that have been put forward lately by the maritime task force and others who fail to understand what a basic need there is for a virile shipping and shipbuilding industry adequate to serve American commerce as well as the defense need of our country in war or emergency.

Turmoil in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the aftermath of the revolt in Indonesia demonstrates the great complexity of trying to deal with nations in such political turmoil, especially when local Communists are a part of the turmoil.

President Sukarno has been one of the most persistent and acid critics of the United States and particularly of our interest in Asian affairs. While his policies have frequently been in harmony with Communist objectives, he has not seemed to be simply subject to the orders of either Moscow or Peiping.

His power has rested largely on a delicate balance between the Communist forces and the anti-Communist military forces. In the past, if one element seemed to gain in prominence, Sukarno would try to regain a balance by aiding the other side.

The attempted coup, about which facts are still sketchy, was originally supported by the Indonesian Communist Party—PKI. At least six top military commanders were brutally murdered, including the chief of staff of the army, Achmad Yani.

Sukarno disappeared for a brief time, but then announced that he was safe and in command. The military forces, despite the loss of some of their leadership, had put down the revolt. It would seem that Sukarno would be in their debt.

Yet, within a few days, he had a cabinet meeting, following which the Deputy Premier, Subandrio, a strong leftwinger himself, indicated to reporters that there was little rancor at the Communists who had supported the revolt.

To the contrary, the impression was conveyed that Sukarno was impatient with the army for cracking down on the Communists.

It was said that Sukarno sought foremost an atmosphere of calm, in which he would seek political solutions to the problems raised by the attempted revolution.

When asked if the murderers of the generals would be punished, the reply was that Sukarno "does not condone murders" but that "it is a political problem which he will deal with later on."

The question then arises as to whether this answer will satisfy the army officers whose colleagues were slain.

To most people, it is fantastic that a president would be making up to the forces which had supported an effort to overthrow him within 2 weeks of the event. The most obvious explanation is that Sukarno is trying to reestablish the balance which allowed him to remain in power.

Perhaps he was glad to see the army cut down, although recent reports had indicated it was the Communists who were gaining in power.

There have also been many reports about Sukarno's poor health, and some have indicated his health was so bad as to seriously affect his judgment.

The political disputes are heightened by the religious hostility of some to the Moslem dominance in the country, which sometimes is expressed as Communist loyalty.

The United States would have little reason to mourn the passing of Sukarno from power, but we are always led to wonder what might come in his place. It could even be worse. However, reports have come from Indonesia of crowds cheering the United States. It is gratifying to know that, in spite of mountebanks and dictators who seek to stir up their countrymen against us, and in spite of all our own errors, there always seems a residue of good will for us among the common people.

First Monument to Unknown Confederate Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, of course, we are all proud of our congressional districts and the county in which we have lived all of our lives. I am from Obion County, Tenn., with Union City as the county seat. We have the distinction there of erecting the first monument in the Nation to the Unknown Confederate Soldiers.

The monument was dedicated nearly a century ago, some 4 years and 3 months after the War Between the States. It was rededicated last year in Union City. The ceremonial, arranged by Rebel C. Forrester, Jr., and Mrs. Robert W. Wood, was held on March 22, 1964, on a Sunday. The date was 2 days short of the 100th anniversary of Confederate Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest's recapture of Union City from the Federals.

An account of historical first monument to Confederate Unknown Dead was reprinted in the Union City, Tenn., Messenger of March 23, 1964. In part it reads:

> The cemetery was planned to accommodate the Confederate dead buried all over the county, and when it was finished, these bodies were disinterred and reburied there. * * * This (the first) dedication took place 4 years after the Civil War when purses were short but sentiment high.
>
> There are 31 graves in the cemetery, arranged in circular form around the monument, grouped into the four corners. * * * Each grave is marked by a small white headstone.

The date of the dedication of the memorial is definite, prior to any other group monument to Confederate dead. But the date of the erection, before the dedication, has not been established from the last account.

In the survey to find the first Confederate Monument to Unknowns, two organizations assisted, the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission and the hundred odd Civil War Round Tables of the World. Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., Executive Director of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission carried a request in the Newsletter for information. None of the State directors of centennial commissions reported a monument earlier than that in Union City.

I wrote to all the round tables, as well as the entire membership of the District of Columbia Civil War Round Table. Replies from several States did not reveal any earlier monument to unknown Confederates. The replies on the subject were from:

California: Lt. Col. Willard L. Jones, Sr., USA, retired, and Earl H. Study, APO San Francisco.

District of Columbia: Dr. J. Walter Coleman, staff historian, National Park Service; Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina; E. L. Forrester, the then Representative from Georgia; Victor Gondos, Jr., editor, Military Affairs; Herbert E. Kahler, chief, Division of History and Archeology, National Park Service; Capt. F. Kent Loomis, Acting Director of Naval History; Linda M. Miller, secretary of the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District; the then Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa; and Gen. U. S. Grant III orally through Elden E. Billings of the Library of Congress.

Florida: Dana B. Johannes, Clearwater.

Maryland: Col. Charles J. Norman and John M. Hardy, Silver Spring.

Mississippi: Dr. William D. McLain, president of the University of Southern Mississippi and adjutant-in-chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, Hattiesburg.

North Carolina: John R(ebel) Peacock, High Point.

Ohio: John R. Hood, Jr., and Bob Younger, Dayton.

Pennyslvania: Kittridge A. Wing, superintendent of Gettysbury National Park.

Virginia: J. F. Featherston, sponsor of the Prison Civil War Round Table,

Richmond; Charles E. Gage, Falls Church; Capt. O. A. Kneeland, USN, retired, Arlington; Rear Adm. Thomas L. Wattles, USN, retired, Alexandria; Claude S. Williams, Warrenton; and Francis S. Wilshin, superintendent of Manassas Battlefield Park.

West Virginia: Ralph W. Donnelly, Huntington.

The Tennessee Civil War Centennial, Stanley F. Horn, Sr., as chairman and Campbell H. Brown, executive director, issued a "Directory of War Monuments and Memorials in Tennessee." It carries a picture of the Obion County, Union City, monument with these overlines:

In Confederate cemetery. Inscription reads: "Unknown Confederate Dead."

"Erected through the efforts of the Union City and Obion County citizens.

"Dedicated October 21, 1869."

The Problem of Organized Dog and Cat Stealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, every day that passes there seems to be more and more attention focused upon the vicious problem of dog and cat stealing all over the United States and their sale to various institutions to use them for experimentation and research.

In connection with this practice, there appeared an article in the Parade magazine of October 10, a Sunday supplement to many newspapers and, here in Washington, a part of the Washington Post, which covers this subject quite thoroughly in the space limit given to the author to comment on this problem.

Under unanimous consent granted to me, I would like to have this story inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would also like to have, as part of my remarks, the text of my bill (H.R. 10743) included with this article so that the animal lovers across the Nation would be cognizant of the efforts we are taking in Congress to combat this evil.

The material follows:

ANIMAL LOVERS: BEWARE THE PET THIEVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rustlers as vicious as any who ever roamed the Old West are preying on the Nation's pets. Organized dog- and catnaping rings are stealing animals all over the United States and selling them to hospitals and research institutions. They are making millions by bringing heartbreak to children and elderly and lonely people as well. These pet smugglers are also guilty of the most callous cruelty to animals imaginable.

A congressional committee recently heard one dog-and-cat farm in Pennsylvania, described as an animal "Dachau," as horrifying as the notorious Nazi gas-chamber camp. Investigators found 700 dogs jammed into a dozen 10-foot-square pens. One pen contained more than 70 dogs, so closely packed they couldn't even wag their tails for their rescuers. Some 400 cats were crammed into stacked chicken crates. Dead and diseased animals lay among the living.

Worse, pet rustling is subsidized indirectly by the taxpayers. That is why, in recent years, it has blossomed from a penny ante crime to its present astounding proportions. Originally, dogs and cats were stolen to be resold as pets or to be returned for the rewards. But the increasing use of animals in medical research has created a boom market, not only for strays but for any cats and dogs that can be delivered. Few questions are asked and fewer answered once a collar has been removed.

Last year laboratories and hospitals receiving Federal research grants spent between $30 million and $50 million on dogs and cats. More than 1.7 million dogs and 500,000 cats were sold to tax-supported institutions. One Federal agency alone, the Poolesville, Md., Animal Center of the National Institutes of Health, spends more than $100,000 a year on dogs and cats.

With such money in the market, supply is bound to meet the demand. Result—wholesale pet smuggling has been reported in most of the 50 States.

IN GOOD FAITH

Most persons do not dispute the need for animals in medical research. Immense benefits in human health have come from such experiments. When laboratories buy animals for research, they do so in good faith. Many suppliers are also reputable breeders and brokers.

Yet investigators believe the overwhelming majority of the dogs and cats that wind up in medical tests are strayed or stolen pets. Once snatched, they are quickly whisked out of the State to make tracing more difficult. To further confuse the trail, they may change hands a number of times. Most transactions are in cash with no meaningful bills of sale. Identifying tags are immediately removed and destroyed.

Ultimately, the animals wind up at pet auctions. Sometimes dogs and cats are sold by the head, more often by the pound. The going rate is about 10 cents a pound. Puppies and kittens fetch as little as 10 cents apiece.

The rustlers have become increasingly brazen as their profits have zoomed and their smuggling networks have become more elaborate. One mother in Arlington, Va., watched a dognaper get out of his truck, stride boldly into her yard, snatch a pet right out of her small son's arms, then beat it down the highway. Bravely, she gave chase in her car and so harried the dognaper that he finally pulled up and released the puppy.

But the owners of most stolen dogs and cats never see their pets again. A 77-year-old lady in Utah watched helplessly as a dognaper enticed her pet out of her yard. A wheelchair patient last month phoned the New York Humane Association to report the loss of her dog. "Is there nothing you can do?" she pleaded. Elaine Beck, a Columbus, Ohio, dog trainer, recently wrote to the U.S. Humane Society—"We in Columbus are having such a wave of dognaping we are almost desperate."

The rustlers have many ruses. If the coast seems clear, they may simply grab pets off the streets or out of yards. Female dogs are used to entice male dogs into wire cages. Meat scraps and dog candy are also used as bait. A Jacksonville, Fla., rustler painted his truck to look official, complete with the lettering "animal shelter" on the sides. Then, posing as a dogcatcher, he used phony pretexts to take pets from their owners.

Some dealers go from door to door pleading for pets to make needy children happy. No child will ever see these animals; they will die on the operating table if they don't die from starvation and cruelty before they get there. A New York high school teacher, who rustled pets as a profitable sideline, trained his 6-year-old daughter to beg for cats, saying her parents needed them to catch mice on their farm.

KENNEL GIMMICK

Other rustlers operate behind the front of kennelkeepers. They advertise, offering to board pets while their owners are away. The hapless owners, upon their return, are told with many regrets that their pet became unmanageable and escaped, or had to be destroyed as an act of mercy after contracting virulent distemper.

Many successful pet peddlers, with money to bribe, have persuaded keepers of dog pounds, animal shelters and even humane societies to sell them pets under the counter. One dog dealer, who tried to bribe Frank Whelan, superintendent of the Freeport, N.Y., animal shelter, claimed two other Long Island animal shelters were smuggling dogs to him. One had used the bribe money to pay for an addition to his house; the other to build a swimming pool.

But in Whelan, the dog dealer picked the wrong man. Not only was Whelan aware of the cruelty in the illegal pet traffic, but only a few days earlier, a collie from the shelter, Shep, had roused Whelan and his wife in time to pick up their 5-year-old son and escape from their burning apartment building. Shep led them to safety. Pretending to go along with the dealer, Whelan helped to convict him on a charge of commercial bribery.

A veteran Connecticut State detective, who broke up a dognaping ring and recovered a number of stolen pets, declared tersely, "I've worked on every kind of larceny, but dognaping is about the meanest. It's tough for parents to tell a 4-year-old that his dog has been taken."

Can the vicious pet rustling racket, with all its animal and human cruelty, be curbed? And can this be done without depriving medical science of much-needed research animals? A current bill would require all dealers to be licensed and inspected for humane conditions. The Agriculture Department would also set standards for transportation, as it does for other livestock. Dealers would be required to house each animal for 5 days, which, coupled with strict provisions for recording the description and origin of each animal, would at least help owners to recover pets that have disappeared.

A dog is a man's best friend, but there are times when a dog needs a friend.

H.R. 10743

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to protect the owners of dogs, cats, and other animals from theft of such pets and to prevent the sale or use of stolen dogs, cats, or other animals for purposes of research and experimentation, it is essential to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals by persons or organizations engaged in transporting, buying, or selling them for use in research or experimental purposes.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, or corporation;

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture;

(c) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof;

or within any territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

(d) The term "dog" means any live dogs of the species Canis familiaris for use or intended to be used for research tests or experiments at research facilities.

(e) The term "cat" means any live domestic cat (Felis catus) for use or intended to be used for research, tests, or experiments at research facilities.

(f) The term "animal" means any vertebrate animal.

(g) The term "research facility" means any school, institution, organization, or person that uses or intends to use dogs, cats or other animals in research, tests, or experiments, and that (1) purchases or transports such animals or certain of such animals in commerce or (2) receive any funds from the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof to finance its operations by means of grants, loans, or otherwise.

(h) The term "dealer" means any person who for compensation or profit delivers for transportation, transports, boards, buys or sells dogs, cats, or other animals in commerce for research purposes.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any research facility to purchase or transport dogs, cats, or other animals in commerce except from a dealer licensed in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell or offer to sell or to transport to any research facility any dog, cat, or other animal to buy, sell, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce or to another dealer under this Act any such animal, unless and until such dealer shall have obtained a license from the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe pursuant to this Act, and such license shall not have been suspended or revoked.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall promulgate standards for the humane care of animals by dealers. The term "humane care" shall mean the type of care which a responsible and conscientious owner would ordinarily provide for an animal kept as a household pet to prevent the animal's suffering, sickness, injury, or other discomfort and shall include but not be limited to housing, feeding, watering, handling, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, and separation by species, sex, and temperament both in the dealer's facility and in transportation. The sale, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce or to another dealer of any sick, injured, unweaned, or pregnant animal is expressly forbidden.

SEC. 6. All dogs and cats delivered for transportation, transported, purchased, or sold in commerce or to research facilities shall be identified by a photograph or by such other humane and painless manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 7. Research facilities and dealers shall make and keep for a period of no less than two years such records with respect to their purchase, sale, transportation, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals, as the Secretary may prescribe. Such records shall include a bill of sale for each animal and any collars, tags, or other identifying equipment which accompanied the animals at the time of their acquisition by the dealer. The bill of sale shall contain such information as shall be prescribed by the Secretary. Any bill of sale which is fraudulent or indicates larceny of any animal shall be grounds for prosecution and revocation of license called for in section 14 and for the penalty called for in section 12. Records made and kept by research facilities shall be open to inspection by representatives of the Secretary or to any police officer or agent of any legally constituted law enforcement agency.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall take such action as he may deem appropriate to encourage the various States of the United States to adopt such laws and to take such action as will promote and effectuate the purposes of this Act and the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the various States in effectuating the purposes of this Act and any State legislation on the same subject.

SEC. 9. No dealer shall sell or otherwise dispose of any dog, cat, or other animal within a period of five business days after the acquisition of such animals. Representatives of the Secretary, any police officer or agent of any legally constituted law enforcement agency shall assist any owner of any animal who has reason to believe the animal may be in the possession of a dealer in searching the dealer's premises, after obtaining the proper search warrant from the local authorities in whose jurisdiction the dealer's premises are located.

SEC. 10. Dogs, cats, and other animals shall not be offered for sale or sold in commerce or to a research facility at public auction or by weight; or purchased in commerce or by a research facility at public auction or by weight. No research facility shall purchase any animals except from a licensed dealer.

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules, regulations and orders as he may deem necessary in order to require compliance with the standards for the humane care of animals called for in section 5 and all other purposes and provisions of this Act. Such rules, regulations, and orders shall be published within a reasonable time after enactment of this Act.

(a) Representatives of the Secretary shall inspect dealer's facilities no less than six times a year to determine whether the standards and other provisions of this Act are being complied with. The Secretary shall also require the regular inspection of transportation of animals by and from dealers to research facilities and may delegate that responsibility to law enforcement officers of the States or to agents of any legally constituted law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 12. Any person who violates any provision of this Act shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than $10,000 and to the revocation of the license described in section 4 and shall not be eligible for another license under this Act. The penalty created by this section shall be recovered by civil action in the name of the United States in the circuit or district court within the district where the violation may have been committed or the person or corporation resides or carries on business; and it shall be the duty of the United States attorneys to prosecute all violations of this Act reported by the Secretary, or which come to their notice or knowledge by other means.

SEC. 13. When construing or enforcing the provisions of this Act, the act, omission, or failure of any individual acting for or employed by a research facility or a dealer within the scope of his employment or office shall be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such research facility or dealer as well as of such individual.

SEC. 14. If the Secretary has reason to believe that a dealer has violated any provision of this Act or the regulations promulgated thereunder, the Secretary shall suspend such dealer's license temporarily, and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, shall revoke such license if such violation is determined to have occurred. The Secretary shall also suspend temporarily the license of any dealer prosecuted for cruelty under the laws of any of the States for the prevention of cruelty to animals and in the event of a conviction under any of such laws of the States, the Secretary shall revoke the dealer's license.

SEC. 15. If any provisions of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of any such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 16. In order to finance the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall charge, assess, and cause to be collected appropriate fees for licenses issued to dealers. All such fees shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after enactment.

Leif Erikson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, official recognition of the magnificent achievement of Leif Erikson finally came last year when the President, acting under the authority of a joint resolution approved by Congress in the 2d session of the 88th Congress, proclaimed October 9, 1964, Leif Erikson Day. The terms of the resolution authorized the issuance of a similar proclamation each year, and therefore one was issued again for this year's Leif Erikson Day.

In the committee hearings that were held last year on the resolution, the evidence relating to Leif Erikson's discovery of the North American Continent was adduced by expert witnesses. Foremost among these was Dr. Helge Ingstad.

For years, Mr. Speaker, scholars have pored over the literary evidence that exists for the discoveries in America by the Norsemen. There have been areas of disagreement, especially concerning the year of Leif Erikson's landing on our continent and the location of that landing here. The location of Leif's Vinland has been fixed by scholarly authorities at various points, but there has been no dispute about the fact that Leif did land at least once on the American continent, and did spend some time here, probably staying over the winter, and returning to Greenland in the spring.

Now we have the corroboration of the recent announcement of the existence of a map of Vinland by two Yale University professors and of recent archeological investigations under the sponsorship of the National Geographic Society conducted in northern Newfoundland. On November 5, 1963, Dr. Helge Ingstad announced the discovery of the ruins of a Viking settlement predating Columbus' voyage to the New World by 500 years. His results were supported by experts of the National Geographic Society, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Prior to excavating the site of L'Anse Aux Meadows, a small fishing village near the northern tip of Newfoundland, it was Dr. Ingstad's belief that Leif Erikson's "Vinland" was farther north than the alleged locations in Cape Cod, Mass., or in Rhode Island, places where wild grapes grow, the grapes and vines believed to

have been referred to in the name "Vinland." Dr. Ingstad's belief was based on an old map, and on the linguistic research of a distinguished Swedish professor who had asserted that the first syllable of "Vinland" might refer to grass rather than to wild grapes.

Mr. Speaker, the remains of the settlement which Dr. Ingstad found show that it was built like those which have been uncovered in Greenland. It was occupied for only a short time. The proof that the settlement was Viking in origin rests on carbon-dating evidence, together with the nature and details of the structures which Dr. Junius Bird, of the American Museum of Natural History, has said, "clearly cannot be attributed to either the Indians, Eskimos, or later European inhabitants of the area." He also stated his belief that "the settlement is of pre-Columbian Norse origin."

Dr. Henry B. Collins, an anthropologist of the Smithsonian, has stated:

All of the evidence points to a Norse settlement, and there is no contrary evidence.

The primitive smithy and the deposits of bog iron found at the site also confirm the Viking origin of the settlement. Dr. Collins has pointed out that Eskimos and Indians, both prehistoric and modern, "had no knowledge of extracting iron from the bog deposits." The Vikings did. Collins said that later Europeans never used the technique, and that therefore the inference that the Norsemen had been there was strong indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the Vikings were unexcelled as seafarers. There can be no assertion that it was in any degree unlikely that they made the voyage from their Greenland colonies to the mainland of America because of any lack of seamanship. They often sailed directly over the open ocean from Greenland to Scandinavia, as did Leif Erikson on several occasions. This distance is greater than that from Greenland to New England, and the course covered from Greenland to Scandinavia is through one of the most turbulent bodies of water in the world, the northern reaches of the Atlantic.

Centuries later, the descendants of the Vikings crossed that same Atlantic to America. The contributions to the growth of the United States by the men and women of Scandinavia who came here as immigrants have been immense. Their descendants have continued that great tradition and even improved upon it, at the same time never forgetting how much their greater achievements owe to their forebears' sacrifices, iron will, determination of purpose, keenness of mind, moral fervor, and devotion to God, country, and family. In their achievements they have followed the precedent established for them by their first countryman, Leif Erikson.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that I joined with a majority of the Members of Congress who, aware of the great contributions made to our national life by Americans of Scandinavian descent, wished to honor the achievements of this distinguished group by officially observing Leif Erikson Day under the terms of the resolution for which they voted. A long and difficult legislative effort was required before the vote approving the resolution, but with the support of many thousands of Americans, those who were of Scandinavian descent, and those who were not, we won an eventual and deserved success.

Americans of Scandinavian descent, like their great hero, Leif Erikson, were men and women who made their way to the New World despite all hardships and dangers. They shared in the building of our Nation, and bequeathed their traditions to the Scandinavian Americans of the present day. On their own day, on Leif Erikson Day, I salute the industrious, thrifty, law-abiding, dependable, honest, intelligent, warmhearted, and progressive Scandinavian Americans.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to be able on this occasion of the 186th anniversary of the death of that great Polish American hero, Casimir Pulaski, to pay tribute to the great achievements in this country of Polish Americans.

The Polish contribution to American life extends back to the time of the earliest voyages of exploration. Poles have participated in every American conflict. They made notable contributions to the American revolutionary effort. At the time of the Civil War there were some 30,000 Poles in the United States. Of this number, 4,000 fought in the Union Army and 1,000 in the Army of the Confederate States. When President Lincoln made his appeal for volunteers, typical of those who responded was General Krzyzanowski, who distinguished himself at the Battles of Cross Keys, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg. He was appointed the first Governor of Alaska, served in Panama, and died in 1887; in 1938 his remains were transferred to the Arlington National Cemetery. Polish-Americans have fought in the Spanish War, both World Wars, and the Korean War. Their heroism is one of the great parts of the tradition of the Polish people in America.

Pulaski Day will be celebrated throughout the country to honor Casimir Pulaski, a man who was a patriot of Poland and the United States. He fought both Russian and British tyranny. The celebration of this hero's dedication and devotion to the cause of freedom will be fervently observed by Polish Americans across the land, and in those celebrations will be shown the talent for organization that is a characteristic attribute of Polish Americans.

The devotion to the United States and to its institutions felt by Polish Americans is in the tradition of the great Pulaski who came to these shores to serve the cause of freedom in General Washington's Continental Army.

The man whose heroism we celebrate today, was born at Podolia, Poland, on March 4, 1748. As a young man, after acquiring military experience in the guard force of Duke Charles, of Courland, he joined his father, Count Joseph Pulaski, in active rebellion against King Stanislas Augustus. Pulaski's military exploits were heroic, and for a time were successful, but his forces were eventually defeated and scattered, and his family's estates were confiscated.

He fled to Turkey where he tried in vain to persuade the Turkish Government to attack the Russian enemy. He then went to Paris where he met the representatives of revolutionary America, Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, who wrote to General Washington in Pulaski's behalf.

Arriving in Philadelphia in the spring of 1777, he joined the Continental Army as a volunteer and distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine. Four days after the battle, on September 19, he was appointed a brigadier general by the Continental Congress and given command of the cavalry. He next took part in the Battle of Germantown on October 4, 1777. He then resigned his command, and in a letter to Congress in March 1778, suggested the formation of an independent corps, a suggestion that General Washington approved.

After Pulaski's letter had been read on March 28, 1778, the Continental Congress passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That Count Pulaski retain his rank of brigadier in the Army of the United States, and that he raise and have the command of an independent corps to consist of 68 horse, and 200 foot, the horse to be armed with lances, and the foot equipped in the manner of light infantry; the corps to be raised in such way and composed of such men as General Washington shall think expedient and proper.

This corps, afterward known as Pulaski's Legion, was officered principally by foreigners serving enthusiastically in the American cause. It rendered important service in the southern campaigns of the Revolutionary War.

Pulaski arrived at Charleston in May of 1779, where he was defeated by the superior forces of General Provost. He then joined General Lincoln and the French fleet in their attack on Savannah, bravely charging the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, and falling gravely wounded. He was removed to one of the ships of the fleet, the *Wasp*, where he died on October 11, 1779.

Pulaski Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1965, we observe the 186th anniversary of the death of the gallant

young Casimir Pulaski, who took his mortal wound in leading his troops in an attack upon the British at Savannah, Ga. Pulaski is a patriot justly remembered with affectionate admiration, both by Poland and by America, since he devoted his life, his fortune, and his outstanding military talents, first to the the service of his native Poland, and, after tragic defeat in that effort, to the service of the cause of liberty in America. He was consistently, through two glorious careers in his one short life of 31 years, a devoted soldier of liberty. Though he did not live to see the victory of the American cause for which he gave his life, he ranks high among the architects of that victory, and the battle in which he fell was one of the last efforts of the fading British power in America.

Pulaski is rightly remembered today as one of the shining heroes who came voluntarily, from many nations in the old world, to aid the new birth of freedom on our continent. He is remembered, too, as a worthy representative of Poland, and one to whom Americans of Polish descent can look back with pride. Every American shares in the heritage of Pulaski's daring and devotion, and every American owes much to the military skill and organizing genius that Pulaski devoted to the cause of the American Revolution. America will live in glory as long as her people cherish the ideals for which the heroic Pole, Casimir Pulaski, lived and died.

Sugar Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the Sugar Act amendments bill is a terrible one. As written, the bill is obscure and confusing. Once understood—and I confess I have spent a lot of time trying to understand it, even partially—it appears to have almost nothing to recommend it.

In effect, the bill makes sure the American consumer will be forced to pay unnecessarily high prices for sugar, at a time of inflationary pressures and rising food costs.

According to figures I obtained yesterday from the Agriculture Department, the present world price for sugar is around $2.20 per 100 pounds. To this should be added 96 cents per 100-pound charge for duty and freight charges. This makes the operative world price of sugar delivered at American ports around $3.16 per 100 pounds or $63.20 per ton. The present American price—a price subsidized by Government legislation—is $6.85 per 100 pounds or $137 per ton. The per ton differential which the American consumer is forced to pay is $73.80.

In real terms, this means a lot, particularly to the American consumer. A housewife pays 11 cents for a pound of sugar in a store in Detroit but just across the river in Windsor, Canada, she pays only 8 cents. Canada does not go in for legislating high prices for the consumer.

As my distinguished colleague, PAUL FINDLEY, has pointed out, this legislation would impose a terrific burden on the U.S. taxpayer. With a $73.80 per ton price differential between world and subsidized domestic sugar prices, and assuming a 10-million-ton sugar consumption in America in 1966, this bill will cost the American taxpayers $738 million next year.

This bill will authorize the sugar program for 5 years. If prices average out at present levels, this means that the program will cost the American taxpayers nearly $3.7 billion.

The implications of this bill abroad are nearly as disturbing as they are at home. Supposedly, paying foreign producers a subsidized price for sugar brought into America is one way of improving living standards abroad. Proponents of this bill argue that the sugar quota is justified by the "trade, not aid" philosophy.

This may be so, and it may be that American money from sugar purchase finds its way into the pockets of those who really need it. But I doubt it. In foreign countries, most sugar refineries and a substantial part of the land used for growing sugarcane are owned either by large corporations or very wealthy individuals. Some of these corporations are American-owned, which puts the U.S. Government in the uncomfortable position of subsidizing an American company, with a foreign aid justification. Regardless of American corporate involvement, sugar money does not really get down to the peasants; it stays in the hands of the rich, of the oligarchs, and of the big shots. Usually it then finds its way out of the country, into a numbered bank account in Switzerland. If this program really is foreign aid, I would like to see someone explain just how it aids those who really need it.

As presently written, this bill continues the American quota for Haiti at the same levels set in the past. If we assume a total American sugar consumption of 10 million tons, Haiti's quota under this bill would be 32,603 tons. At the $73.80 per ton price differential, this bill would subsidize the Haitian economy to the tune of $2,406,101.40.

Over $2 million subsidy to a dictatorship. Although not all this money may wind up in the tills of the Duvalier government, it certainly helps it out. Mr. Speaker, it seems curious to me that innocent American children, as they lick their artificially high-priced lollypops, may well be subsidizing the witch-doctor dictator of Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, all these things stem from the bill before us today. It was conceived in confusion, compiled in obscurity, and concocted by high-priced lobbyists. It will legislate high prices for the American consumer. It will subsidize the landlords abroad. It will divert money to Switzerland. But most of all, it will add yet another push to what I fear is a developing pattern of inflationary pressure in America. Food prices are up; this bill will insure they will stay up. I think the bill as drafted is entirely wrong, and I urge its defeat.

Congressman Annunzio's Remarks at Wreath-Laying Ceremony at Pulaski Statue, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our colleague and friend, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, was asked to participate in a commemorative ceremony at the Gen. Casimir Pulaski statue in Washington today.

Each year, the Congress pays tribute to the great heroes of American history and this year is no exception to this honored tradition. Congressman ANNUNZIO spoke at the commemorative ceremony on Pennsylvania Avenue and paid tribute to Casimir Pulaski for his courage and his outstanding contribution to our American victory in the Revolutionary War.

General Pulaski inspired his men and his Nation and it is a pleasure to bring Congressman ANNUNZIO's remarks to the attention of my colleagues today, as we commemorate the death of one of America's noblest patriots.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ANNUNZIO's remarks follow:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO AT LAYING OF THE WREATH CEREMONIES AT GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI'S MONUMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON OCTOBER 11, 1965.

I want to express my deep appreciation to Charlie Burke and to all of you for inviting me to participate in this year's ceremony honoring the memory of the great patriot and brilliant military leader, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who assisted the Americans in their fight for freedom during the Revolutionary War.

Casimir Pulaski was born in the Province of Podolia in 1748, and from his earliest childhood, demonstrated the qualities of organization and leadership which were manifested all his life. Before he reached the age of 20, he had organized a small group that fought valiantly to prevent the partition of Poland. However, his efforts were to no avail, and he barely managed to escape with his life.

In 1777, he met Benjamin Franklin in Paris, and Franklin was so favorably impressed, he gave Pulaski a letter of introduction to Gen. George Washington. It was Washington who suggested to the Continental Congress that young Pulaski be entrusted with the grave responsibility of reorganizing the American cavalry forces. This Pulaski accomplished with such skill that he was placed in command of all our cavalry forces, and proceeded to distinguish himself in every subsequent encounter with the enemy.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, there exists a large Polish population. In fact the Poles com-

prise the largest single ethnic group in my district. I have lived among the Polish people, I have nieces and nephews who have Polish fathers, and I am proud of my close affiliation with the Polish people.

From this close association, I have come to know the Poles as a courageous people, as a dedicated people, as a patriotic people, as a religious people, and as a warm and loving people. Their courage in the face of tyranny has been demonstrated time and again over a span of centuries, their dedication to their principles has not faltered in the face of overwhelming odds, their patriotism has been manifested in their continuing struggle for a free Poland, and their devotion to their church and to their families is evident to us all.

All of these characteristics serve to make up an extraordinary people, and General Pulaski, as a descendant of the extraordinary Polish people, is a man to be remembered with pride and gratitude. In 1779, at the age of 31, Pulaski gave up his life on the battlefield while leading his famous cavalry legion in driving the British out of Savannah. He neither lived to see victory achieved on that battlefield, nor did he live to see America win her fight for independence, yet his valiant efforts were instrumental in establishing this wonderful country of ours which recognizes and upholds the inherent dignity of man and the fundamental rights of the individual.

I am proud to join you at this monument to commemorate the 186th anniversary of General Pulaski's supreme and inspiring sacrifice in the age-old struggle for freedom and liberty. Once again, thank you, for giving me the opportunity to join you in paying tribute to this great man.

Being an American "Square"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the evening of October 8, I happened to see a portion of a nationally televised program known as the "Jimmy Dean Show" over one of the leading networks. Jimmy Dean, a country-western singer, closed his program with a short speech, in which he said some people would call him "square," perhaps, but he was "going to do a little flag-waving."

And he did. He sang a song, which I must agree some people today might have called "square." It was a patriotic song. It included the line:

What can I do for America, after all she's done for me?

I want to commend Jimmy Dean for singing this song and for daring to be "square" on nationwide television. The lines of the song reminded me of President Kennedy's famous words:

Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country.

What a comparison between Jimmy Dean's short, sincere talk and his song and the federally sponsored program "It's What's Happening, Baby" that was aired some months ago. As I recall it, the message of that program was simply "ask what your country can do for you."

It is good to know that some young people in our country can still stand up and "wave the flag a little." If they wave it, we know they will save it, as many thousands of their fellow young Americans are doing today in Vietnam.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my fourth and final rollcall report on the 1st session of the 89th Congress closes the door on what is perhaps the most productive period in the history of the world's greatest legislative body. But we would be in error to evaluate our work simply in terms of productivity. How much we have done is not the measuring device which should be applied. It is the quality, not quantity, of what we have done that the people should and must judge us by.

As we stand on the threshold of adjournment few of us would look back and comment that we are completely satisfied or completely disappointed with Congress' record. I supported many measures which were adopted and I supported some which failed of enactment. Likewise, I opposed some which received approval and I opposed others which were successfully blocked. Each of us racked up similar legislative box scores for this is the very essence of democratic lawmaking, and not one of us would have it any other way. In the legislative game those who hit a thousand are losers just as surely as those who bat zero. Call it consensus, compromise, accommodation, middle-of-the-road-ism, or what you will. I choose to simply call it good government.

In my judgment, adjournment is overdue. I think that perhaps we have done too much too fast. Before the second session convenes in January it behooves Congress to minutely assess its past actions so that it may carefully chart a future course. Continuing on a dead run at this year's legislative pace would be a disservice to the Nation. As the distinguished Senate majority leader recently pointed out, Congress has the duty and the authority to examine the effects of laws it has enacted with a view to correcting them, if necessary. When we return to this Chamber in 1966 we should spend the year viewing and correcting—if necessary. Hopefully, little correcting will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, my rollcall report includes commentary on the following: repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; the farm bill; immigration reform; the Automotive Products Trade Act; Republican obstructive tactics; establishing the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities; post office employees and political patronage; the effort to unseat the Mississippi delegation; House Resolution 560 regarding Latin America; amendments to the Bank Company Holding Act; aid for rural water and sanitation facilities; home rule for the District of Columbia; the Federal pay bill; highway beautification; and the sugar bill.

ROLLCALL NOS. 208 AND 209—REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. Speaker, perhaps no issue of this session has aroused more emotional fervor both on and off Capitol Hill than the proposed repeal of section 14(b)—the so-called right-to-work provision—of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Opponents of repeal mounted a costly propaganda campaign designed to distort the issue and hide from the public the facts necessary to form a reasoned opinion on H.R. 77. To a large extent this powerful lobby was successful and the public should know exactly how it has been misled.

Few persons realize that the Taft-Hartley Act as originally proposed in 1947 by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which Senator Robert Taft was chairman, did not contain section 14(b). This section was first proposed in the House and the legislative record of its birth is so obscure that its conceivers cannot even be determined.

Senator Taft's view on the union shop—which right-to-work laws prohibit—is summed up in his statement of May 9, 1947:

So I think it would be a mistake to go to the extreme of absolutely outlawing a contract which provides for a union shop, requiring all employees to join the union, if that arrangement meets with the approval of the employer and meets with the approval of a majority of the employees and is embodied in a written contract.

But, Mr. Speaker, State right-to-work laws, which are permitted by section 14(b), do absolutely outlaw the union shop. Repeal of 14(b) would therefore restore the Taft-Hartley Act to the form which was intended by Senator Taft, a man who was vitally concerned throughout his life with the protection of individual freedom.

As was Senator Taft, I am opposed to right-to-work laws because they deprive the working man of certain decisionmaking and bargaining powers which are his by right. By their very nature, these laws produce definite inequities in their application both among individual workers and among the 50 States. The repeal of 14(b), on the other hand, would not encroach upon the right of individuals to choose their conditions of employment. It would insure that right.

That 14(b) deprives employers and employees of decisionmaking is clear. The first consideration is one of semantics: a right-to-work law guarantees no one the right to work. A right-to-work law means a ban on the union shop within a State, a weapon which 19 States currently use to pirate industry and jobs from prosperous States like California by exploiting cheap labor and undermining the legitimate efforts of organized

labor. I hasten to point out that the people of California, believing in the principal of free collective bargaining between employees and employers, went to the polls in 1958 and overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to establish a right-to-work law in our State. The repeal of 14(b) will have no effect on existing California statutes or on relationships between management and labor.

I realize that many people who object to repeal of 14(b) are convinced that it would mean unrestricted compulsory union membership for all workers in any industry organized by a union. This is simply not so. It is the closed shop—not the union shop—which requires employers to hire applicants who are union members. The closed shop is now outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act and it will continue to be outlawed even after 14(b) is repealed.

It is the union shop—not the closed shop—which right-to-work laws destroy. Assume, for example, that workers in a certain industry decide they want a union, that an election is held according to National Labor Relations Board regulations, that the election shows a majority of employees favoring the union shop, and that employer and employees subsequently reach a free and voluntary agreement in favor of a union shop. It would then seem completely unreasonable and undemocratic to deny them the right to do what the majority by legitimate means had elected to do. Yet this is exactly what right-to-work laws do—deny workers the right to have a union shop if they so desire.

The National Labor Relations Act does not require membership as such in a union as a condition of employment in a union shop. No one is required to take an oath or obligation to the union, to attend union meetings, to participate in picket lines, or to engage in other union activities. What is required as a condition of continued employment in a union shop is a tender of nominal dues and initiation fees that are not excessive or discriminatory. Thus each employee bears an equal part of the cost of the collective bargaining unit that the law says must represent him equally with other employees in seeking worker benefits. It is simply a case of requiring those who share in the benefits to also share in the responsibilities.

ROLLCALL NOS. 243–244—FARM BILL

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that nature seldom makes a fool. She merely furnishes the raw material for a do-it-yourself job. And a do-it-yourself job the House did with passage of this year's legislative monstrosity known as the farm bill, perhaps the most complex and costly package of poor proposals which any Secretary of Agriculture within memory has had the audacity to thrust upon the Congress.

I do not profess to be an expert on all the incredible provisions of the bill, and I doubt that anyone can claim to know all of its ins-and-outs. There are so many special interest subsidies for so many products grown, plus an abundant share for those not grown, that it is impossible to conclude that the overall public interest was considered when the package was glued together. Some solace can be had, however, in the knowledge that the original proposal's most odious section, the infamous bread tax, became unglued and fell by the legislative wayside before any votes were taken. And while this fantastic scheme to line the pockets of wealthy wheat growers by tapping the pockets of consumers was given up as a sacrifice for votes needed to effect passage, the entire bill was so impure that it could not be made pure even with elimination of its most objectionable feature.

What were the remaining impurities? A tome is required to spell them all out but I will attempt to hit the high—or more accurately, low—points in a few paragraphs. The farm bill calls for spending more than $18 billion over 4 years on programs that have failed in the past, are failing today and are doomed to fail tomorrow. As just one example, examine the feed grains program, started in 1961 as an emergency measure.

This year the Department of Agriculture is spending more than $1.5 billion for feed grains, not for growing or storing, but to prevent growing. Known as the land retirement program, it is billed as an effort to cut supply and bring it into balance with demand. The $1.5 billion retired 36 million acres. The taxpayers, in other words, rented the land from farmers so that they would not reap a harvest which would only add more feed grains to already overburdened and costly storage facilities. According to reliable crop reports, this year's feed grain production is going to hit the highest level in history. Why? Because price support levels are attractive enough to cause farmers to use more and more fertilizer and other scientific methods to boost the output of acres still under cultivation. This same boondoggle approach to solving problems of the farm economy is also used for cotton and wheat—and with the same disastrous results.

As has been pointed out by former Budget Director Kermit Gordon, about 80 percent of our assistance goes to the 1 million farmers whose average income exceeds $9,500. The other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2.5 million farmers.

Four years from now the Treasury will be $18 billion poorer, large corporate farming complexes will be almost that much richer, the small farmer and sharecropper will still be in the grip of poverty, and the country will still be in the grip of the vicious cycle that we call a farm program.

I could, and probably would, support a well-conceived farm bill which introduced a gradual phaseout of these uneconomic and costly subsidies, even if the plan was spread out over many years. It would be foolish to expect that we can get out of the mess we are in overnight. But we have to start crawling out of this almost bottomless pit sometime, instead of slipping deeper and deeper each year. Until the Congress creates a program aimed at taking us up instead of down I will continue to oppose.

ROLLCALL NOS. 248 AND 249—IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. Speaker, being a cosponsor of the immigration reform bill which abolishes the discriminatory national origins quota system I was elated that the measure received overwhelming approval by the Congress.

As I noted when I introduced the bill many months ago, it does much to restore our traditional attitude on a fundamental issue, an attitude which prevailed among countless generations of Americans who labored long and hard to make this country great. That attitude did not ask an immigrant from where he came or how he spelled his name. It was an attitude—a way of life—perhaps best summed up in these words with which we are all very familiar:

Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

And if it was found that an immigrant did—and could—indeed want to do something for his adopted country, he and his family were given an opportunity to carve for themselves a safe and secure place in the American community.

However, Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this traditional attitude was amended when discrimination was written into law. It became official policy to welcome immigrants only if they came from the right country or were of the right nationality. Among those nationalities not considered right were Japanese, Polish, Spanish, Italian and Greek, to name just a few of many.

The measure which we have now approved erases discrimination from our immigration law and writes into it a policy compatible with our historic traditions, a policy which is committed to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Bigots and extremists of the rightwing variety bitterly opposed passage of the bill and laid down a propaganda barrage designed to foster the false impression that the proposal would open the floodgates to hordes of undesirable aliens and spies and inundate the country with unemployables. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The overall annual immigration total is increased only slightly above its existing level of 158,361. The new limit would be 170,000 persons, an increase of only 11,639 souls in a country with a population nearing 200 million.

It is also important to note that future immigrants will be selected on a first come, first served basis with preference given to those with special skills and talents which will enrich the whole spectrum of our national life. No individual will be permitted into the country without a certificate from the Secretary of Labor guaranteeing that no American will be displaced from his job if entry is granted. Intending immigrants will also have to prove that they will not become public charges. Contrary to the allegations of its few but vocal opponents, the bill contains safeguards designed to prevent exactly what its critics claim it will promote.

I was disturbed that the bill was amended on the floor to include a provi-

sion which I fear will damage our relations with other nations of the Western Hemisphere. Under the so-called MacGregor amendment, the United States will, for the first time in 40 years, set a ceiling on the number of Mexicans and other Latin Americans who can emigrate to this country. During this critical period in our relations with Latin American nations, I think it very unwise to create more ill will among peoples who already have grave questions about our basic attitude toward them.

During the past 40 years we have not placed barriers on Latin immigration to the United States and now is the wrong time to implement such a policy. Not only is it bad timing, but it is unnecessary. Over the past 10 years regular immigration from other countries in the hemisphere has averaged 110,000, a figure less than the ceiling of 115,000 which the MacGregor amendment imposes. And the ceiling does not include the spouses, children, and parents of persons who are American citizens. According to reliable estimates, this group could account for an additional 25,000 immigrants annually which in effect boosts the MacGregor figure to 140,000, or 30,000 more than the current immigration rate.

As I said, the amendment was ill-advised because of our delicate position in Latin America, a position made even more precarious by the incredible resolution which the House adopted on September 20, a matter which I will discuss later in this report.

ROLLCALL NO. 255—AUTOMOTIVE TRADE ACT

Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Automotive Products Trade Act proponents failed to give a satisfactory reply to the question: To what extent will this agreement result in exporting U.S. automobile parts manufacturing firms and the jobs of American workers to Canada?

Although an effort was made to mask H.R. 9042 as legislation designed to promote free trade and thereby strengthen the domestic economy, the facts contradicted the claim and I was constrained to vote against the bill.

It was less than 2 years ago that the Studebaker Corp. closed its automobile plant in South Bend and moved its operation to Canada. More than 7,000 American workers lost their jobs and Canadian employment increased by a similar figure. I predict that we will soon see Canadian plants, currently operating well below capacity, increase their production and sell on the American market cars which cannot be absorbed in Canada. There will be no U.S. duty on these automobiles and thus they will be sold here at prices substantially below what they are going for in Canada. This can hardly be called selling at the fair market value.

My record clearly indicates that I support free trade legislation and the gradual reduction of tariff barriers. But the act cannot be interpreted as a free trade agreement since only certain Canadian manufacturers and subsidiaries of American automobile firms are eligible for duty-free imports. It is discriminatory legislation designed to benefit America's auto giants—Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, and American Motors—at the expense of smaller independent auto parts producers. An automotive parts dealer in Canada, for example, will be able to import parts from the United States duty free—but only if he is dealing with one of the Big Four. Yet the small American parts dealer importing Canadian-made products will have to pay the regular tariff.

H.R. 9042 also violates our Government's established policy of liberal multilateral—not bilateral—trade relations based on the most-favored-nation principle. All countries which subscribe to the General Agreements on Tariff and Trade have a right to be accorded the same treatment as Canada.

I can still remember when Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, formerly top executive at GM, said:

> What is good for General Motors is good for the United States.

I did not believe it then and I do not believe it now. The Automotive Products Trade Act is good for GM, but it is bad for the United States. The fact that the proposal is also good for Canada does nothing to mitigate its negative effect on our country's economy and its work force.

ROLLCALL NOS. 258–293—21-DAY RULE

Mr. Speaker, in my periodic rollcall reports I do not normally discuss House activity which occurred while I was attending to important business in my congressional district. But conscience does not permit me to observe without comment the irresponsible tactics which were employed by the Republican leadership in their ill-advised effort to prevent the House from working its will on September 13.

I cannot recall any other time during my tenure as a Member of this body when the opposition has displayed such flagrant contempt for the legislative process and the rules under which it functions. We have only to examine what took place on the floor of the House on September 13 to verify the validity of this observation.

Let us briefly review the record:

On opening day of the 89th Congress the House voted to reinstate the 21-day rule which permits its 435 members to determine whether any piece of legislation, approved by its standing committees, shall be brought to the floor for debate and vote—rather than have that legislation killed by failure of the Rules Committee to act upon it. In other words, the House decided that it would no longer tolerate tactics designed to keep it from working its legislative will. And it wrote that decision into the rules under which we operate.

On September 13, under the 21-day procedure, four rules were sought in the House which, if approved by majority vote, would permit consideration of four pieces of important legislation—The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1965, amendments to the Bank Company Act, establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, and the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965.

On August 3 the Committee on Rules was asked to permit the Equal Employment Act to come to the floor. On June 21 a rule was requested on the Bank Holding bill. A rule was sought on July 14 for the Arts and Humanities legislation. On August 16 a rule was requested on the Federal pay bill. None of these rules was granted.

It is regrettable but very revealing that the chairman of the Rules Committee, responding to criticism from highly respected Members of the House, declared:

> Why should we be kicked around in this way by picking up all the garbage out of the Rules Committee in instances in which the 21 days have expired and dumping it on the floor of the House on one day?

Mr. Speaker, I would not presume to speak for other Members of the House, but I view it as a direct insult to the American people and their elected representatives when legislation which is reported from committee after many hours of public hearings and careful deliberation is referred to as "garbage."

With this appraisal of important bills it is no wonder that the House found it necessary to resurrect these measures from the legislative graveyard known as the Rules Committee.

It was because the House decided that the time had come to work its will, not on "garbage" but upon matters of vital concern to the American people, that the Republican leadership engaged in its disgraceful obstructive tactics on September 13.

A front page story in the Washington Post summed it up this way:

> When the House adjourned at 12:30 a.m., after a 12½-hour session and a recordbreaking 22 rollcalls, the only forward motion had been adoption of resolutions permitting Democratic leaders at some future date to call up for House action four bills stuck in its Rules Committee.
>
> Republicans—frustrated by their yearlong winless record, opposed to the 21-day rule and several of the bills, and irritated at being tossed such a big load of work on a Monday in mid-September—began a series of stalling tactics when the House met at noon.
>
> The coalition forced repeated quorum calls, demanded that the entire Journal of the previous day's session be read and insisted upon rollcall votes on such usually pro forma motions as "dispensing with further proceedings" under the quorum calls.

Mr. Speaker, it was a wise man who said: "As I grow older I pay less attention to what men say. I just watch what they do."

If my Republican colleagues are really sincere in their alleged desire to promote a vigorous two-party system in this country, they will do well to reflect upon what the wise man said.

ROLLCALL NO. 301—ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. Speaker, having introduced a bill on the opening day of Congress calling for establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, I was elated that more than 100 Members subsequently joined in cosponsoring similar legislation. The fact that the President saw fit to include the measure as a part of the administration's specific legislative proposals was also a source of great satisfaction. The

bill, however, cannot be interpreted as a partisan effort. It was President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals which stated in a 1960 report:

In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences.

Most opposition to the bill focused on the old bugaboo with which we are all familiar: Federal aid means Federal control. Not only has this mothworn charge been refuted time and again by the facts, but it is interesting to note that in recent years it has rarely been leveled at programs designed to aid the sciences. Yet it was dragged out against the arts and humanities, despite the clear wording of section 4(c) of the bill:

In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, or curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association.

The Foundation receives additional independence through the provision permitting it to receive private donations and gifts. Thus the private sector gains a vested interest in insuring that the Government keeps its hands off the freedom of the individuals and institutions to be assisted.

Briefly put, the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities is being established to develop and promote a broad national policy of support for the arts and humanities. The National Council on the Arts through its endowment will provide matching grants to groups and individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts for the whole spectrum of artistic activity, including construction of necessary facilities. The National Council on the Humanities will provide nonmatching grants and loans for research, award fellowships and grants to institutions and individuals for training, support publication of scholarly works, provide for the exchange of information, and promote understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

Few Americans would quarrel with these goals and the means which the Congress has devised to achieve them.

ROLLCALL NO. 303—POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 574 was a Republican effort to strike back blindly at the Post Office Department for its stupid and ill-advised effort to dispense patronage to Members of Congress who represent both political parties. I voted against the measure for one reason only: caught in the vicious political crossfire would be thousands of innocent victims whose only offense was that they happened to be postal employees during a period when some temporary jobs were being handed out as political plums.

Although he was very tardy, the Postmaster General, a few days before this resolution was brought to the floor, directed all postmasters to release the names of summer or temporary employees to anyone who asked, including newspapers. Thus, the information which the resolution sought to make public was already available to any interested party.

The information which would have been supplied under the blanket resolution would include the names of all persons employed by the Department from May until September. Publication of the names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would infer that all of those persons, thousands of them, were employed solely because some Congressmen got them the job. This was certainly not the case, yet the innocent would have suffered along with the guilty had the resolution carried.

If nothing else was gained from the resolution, I hope it taught the Post Office Department a needed lesson, a lesson which I as an individual Member of Congress unsuccessfully tried to impart this spring. When I received a call from the Department advising me that a certain number of summer jobs would be available in my district, and that I should submit names of persons to fill these jobs, I firmly stated that I found the offer offensive and wanted no part in such an odious operation. I also warned the Department to steer clear of my congressional district if it decided to implement its patronage program for if I learned of any hanky-panky the boom was going to fall.

I had occasion to drop it only once when a postmaster in my district informed me that he had been forced to hire a person who had been recommended by a Member of Congress. That employee was on the job exactly 2 days before he was fired at my insistence. The word must have spread in a hurry because I received no further complaints from postmasters.

ROLLCALL NO. 307—MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker, after the unsuccessful effort to unseat the Mississippi delegation, syndicated columnists Evans and Novak in a perceptive analysis of the issue summed up the feelings of many Congressmen who have championed civil rights: "I've never seen people so hard to say yes to." The reference was to members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party which led the drive to unseat. The columnists explored many facets of this emotion-laden issue and I would be happy to provide a copy of the article to any constituent who requests one.

During debate on the resolution it was declared in support of unseating that every Member must face his moral responsibility to the great democratic processes of our Nation. It was said that once the "technical and legal points" were argued and assessed, there still remained an overriding consideration—the moral issue.

I was disturbed to see this argument put forth with such a casual dismissal of law. In my judgment, the primary moral issue facing every Member every day is his dedication to technical and legal points—the very guts of the great democratic process—as opposed to how he, as an individual, might feel about the rights and wrongs of any secondary moral issue, in this case the systematic disenfranchisement of Negroes which I personally abhor.

It was precisely this issue which prompted Congress earlier this year to produce the Voting Rights Act. We took our personal convictions on a moral issue and wrote them into the technical and legal points which are now a part of the great democratic process. Henceforth, in the area of voting rights, morality will no longer be a sometimes thing—as it was in the Mississippi challenge. Morality in voting practices is now an alltimes thing—not because every American agrees with the provisions of the Voting Rights Act, but because all Americans are morally bound to respect the law of the land.

I was concerned, however, with the poor manner in which the House Administration Committee, the Clerk of the House, and the Democratic leadership handled the Mississippi challenge. I question the need for the delays which took place, the need for limiting the hearings to 3 hours, and the unavailability of the hearing record to every Member who had to sit as a judge on the challenge. And I resent the secrecy which accompanied the hearings. It seemed to me there was a need for further investigation and amplification. Thus I supported the effort to recommit the resolution for further study and when this unrecorded vote failed to carry I voted to dismiss the challenge as it then stood. The issue developed into a standoff when the resolution was amended on the floor to delete the statement that the Mississippi Members were entitled to their seats.

As one of the Nation's leading newspapers noted editorially, the House action was clearly one of expediency:

Ordinarily this would be an inexcusable course of action * * *. But the challengers had no valid claim to election. If the Mississippi seats had been declared vacant in these circumstances, the House would have acquired an obligation to vacate seats in other States which have systematically disenfranchised Negroes. Such drastic action could not reasonably be taken at a time when the whole picture of Negro voting in the South is undergoing revolutionary changes because of the new Voting Rights Act.

ROLLCALL NO. 310—LATIN AMERICA RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 560 has been universally condemned, to put it mildly, and rightly so. Regrettably, only 51 of my colleagues in the House joined me in opposing the measure while 312 Members supported it. As one of this country's leading newspapers summed up the situation:

Cry "communism," and the House of Representatives seemingly is ready to rush pell-mell over almost any cliff.

But not all of the blame for this foreign policy disaster should be heaped upon the House. The State Department must also stand accused of retreating from our country's longstanding treaty commitments to the nations of Latin America. I am still trying to get an acceptable answer from the Department on why it so blindly went along with a "sense of the House" resolution which suggests, authorizes and even importunes each sovereign state in the Western Hemisphere to violate its solemn obligations under the Rio Treaty and under

the charter of the Organization of American States. The resolution does this by declaring that each nation—not only the United States, but each nation—is free, in the opinion of the House, to unilaterally interfere—including the use of armed force—in the domestic affairs of its neighbors if, in its sole discretion, it suspects there is too much subversive Communist activity in a neighboring state. In other words, the House has called for anarchy in this hemisphere. And I would only remind my colleagues that it is but a brief period before the soil of anarchy sprouts the weeds of communism.

The State Department's schizoid stance on a foreign policy position with such grave consequences cannot be completely erased by its action subsequent to the shock waves which hit Washington, although I am pleased to see the Department is moving to try and correct the damage which it helped wrought. As one perceptive newsman observed in writing a recent story on the subject:

> The State Department, having marched up the hill behind a controversial House resolution on Latin American intervention, marched down again yesterday by joining a Senate drive to counteract the House action.

But it is no credit to the administration or to the State Department that it was a Republican Senator who took the lead in trying to untie the knot which the House resolution put in our relations with our allies in Latin America.

Hopefully, the Senate will promptly adopt a resolution, and send it to the House for its concurrence, which conforms with the OAS position for action against Communist aggression. The Senate resolution should reaffirm that U.S. policy is unchanging in its support of democratic social and economic reform in Latin America. It should emphasize that the United States believes in collective action as the best method for combating hemispheric crises. It should make clear beyond any doubt that this Nation respects the principles of nonintervention unless specifically requested to intervene as we were in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, it always saddens me to see this legislative body take precipitous action, especially when this body erroneously but consistently refers to itself as "deliberative." Bringing up House Resolution 560 under suspension of the rules, a procedure which bars amendments on the floor, and then giving opponents of the measure only 8 minutes in which to state their objections can hardly be described as "deliberative."

Let us be blunt but truthful. The House was sold a package wrapped in red, white and blue—a package which turned out to be a can of worms. If a vote was taken today on the resolution I doubt that its sponsor could round up 52 supporters. We all have 20–20 vision when it comes to hindsight. Hopefully, the day will soon arrive when the cry of "communism" will not blur our legislative foresight, and 20–20 vision before we act will restrain each and every one of us from again rushing pell-mell over almost any cliff.

ROLLCALL NO. 320—BANK HOLDING ACT

Mr. Speaker, there was scant controversy on the aim of H.R. 7371 as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was clearly and carefully designed to plug a loophole in the 1956 Bank Holding Company Act which permits the Du Pont Estate in Florida to control 31 banks with deposits of more than $600 million, as well as a number of nonbanking businesses, including the Florida East Coast Railway, the St. Joe Paper Mill Co., and various real estate interests. Like other large holding companies already regulated under the 1956 act, Du Pont would have to choose to divest itself either of its bank or nonbank holdings. The Congress has long decreed that it is a sound principle that banking and nonbanking activities should be kept apart to avoid conflict of interest, and I subscribe to that principle.

But I also subscribe to the principle that Congress should not act on the spur of the moment and enact sweeping legislation which could adversely affect large segments of the business community, without first giving the business community an opportunity to present its views before congressional committees. This is the principle which was at issue on the only recorded vote on H.R. 7371. I supported that principle and I regret that I was not joined by a majority of the House.

I think this body was ill-advised in adopting the Bennett amendment and thereby bringing under the act some 340 holding companies which were never given their day in congressional court, as it were. And when I speak of 340 holding companies I am speaking of thousands of stockholders who believe in our free enterprise system, citizens who were denied the opportunity to state fully and fairly their case for exemption. In my judgment this principle is no less important than the principle that banking and nonbanking interests should be separate and distinct. It is for this reason that I opposed Mr. BENNETT'S sweeping amendment.

ROLLCALL NO. 322, RURAL WATER AND SANITATION

Mr. Speaker, no one can quarrel with the objectives of legislation designed to provide Federal loans for the improvement of rural water supplies and waste disposal systems. I was constrained to vote against H.R. 10232, however, because in my opinion we already have many programs operating which accomplish the same purposes set forth in the bill. This measure is clearly a duplication of effort, another addition to what is rapidly becoming a bureaucratic hodgepodge of agencies all doing the same thing. There is a serious question as to whether the sewage provisions of the bill do not overlap the authority of the Community Facilities Administration. And the 1965 Housing Act authorizes grants for water facilities in communities of any size. This would certainly include rural communities.

It seems to me that the House, in adjournment-fever haste, feels it must legislate in every single area so that it can hold up its record and say, "See, there is something in here for you, too. And if you do not believe it just look at the title of this bill which we have passed." The fact that we should legislate by content, not title, seems to matter little when we are gathering material for postsession speeches to the folks back home. Being 1 Member of only 10 who voted against the bill, my vote was obviously merely an expression of discontent with this type of lawmaking.

ROLLCALL NOS. 336 AND 339, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. Speaker, it would do little good to recount here the series of events and the intricate political and parliamentary maneuvering which led to defeat of a meaningful home rule bill for the District of Columbia. Suffice it to say that the House was denied a chance to vote on a good piece of legislation, H.R. 11218, the compromise version of Congressman MULTER'S original proposal, H.R. 4644. We had to settle for registering our position on the Sisk bill, a weak measure which I predict in the long run will do little or nothing to bring the citizens of Washington closer to self-government. I grudgingly supported the Sisk amendment after earlier having voted against it simply because it was, however weak, the best that could be obtained at that time.

The Sisk proposal would permit the citizens of Washington to hold a referendum to see if they want home rule, as if there were any question about the matter. This referendum would include the election of a board to draw up a city charter to be submitted to the voters for approval at another referendum. The rub is that this electoral decision would be subject to congressional veto, the same type veto which the Congress now holds over all affairs in the District of Columbia. This can hardly be termed self-rule.

On the other hand, H.R. 11218, the bipartisan bill, was truly in harmony with the American concept of self-government. It would have established a home rule formula which would automatically go into effect if approved by the voters. It would have permitted nonpartisan elections for a mayor, city council, board of education and a nonvoting delegate to the House. Because so much of the taxable property in the District is owned by the Federal Government, the bill also provided for annual congressional approval and appropriation of the tax assessments. This indirect taxing of Federal property is exactly the same principle that applies to the impacted school funds that are received by nearly every school district in the 25th Congressional District each year—an in-lieu payment on nontaxable Federal property.

The local government structure which would have been established by this bill can in no way be described as radical—unless we are to apply the term to every city government from Maine to California. Yet opponents of home rule declared that it was extreme, that self-government was unnecessary because Washingtonians could look to a generous and paternalistic Congress to shower favors upon them. Ironically, it was the ultraconservatives who parroted this theme the loudest. In doing so they showed a complete lack of understanding

of man's whole political history: no matter how benevolent an autocratic society—be it left, center or right on the political spectrum—the people prefer democratic self-rule.

During a 70-year period in the 1800's when the United States was still basking in the newness of independence—a period which included the administrations of Presidents Jefferson and Madison—the citizens of Washington had self-government. The Senate has voted on six different occasions for a return to this cherished principle. The House has yet to do so and I am deeply disappointed that during this session it passed up an excellent opportunity to correct a grievous wrong.

ROLLCALL NOS. 342 AND 343, FEDERAL SALARY ACT

Mr. Speaker, House passage of the Federal employees pay bill was a follow-through on a commitment which Congress made in 1962 when it embraced the principle of comparability—Government employees should receive pay comparable to that of private industry for the same type of work. Concerned that too many well-trained and experienced Federal workers were leaving Government because they were unable to support their families on the poor pay, we sought to stem the flow by promising 1.7 million of our fellow Americans a fair shake from the paymaster. This we have tried to do in H.R. 10281, and although we did not quite deliver all that was promised and due we made a big leap forward.

But we must remember that the job is not yet finished. The lower levels on the Government pay scale, who comprise a high percentage of the total, will receive a wage boost sufficient to bring them up only to the Bureau of Labor Statistics index for February–March 1964. This means that they are still more than a year behind comparability. We are granting a 4-percent increase when the market dictates that 7 percent is needed to achieve comparability. The middle and upper levels are lagging about 3 years behind the private sector.

Importantly, however, the bill incorporates an automatic feature which will be triggered in October 1966, 1 year after the effective date of the House-approved 4-percent raise. This feature is based on a two-part formula: a cost-of-living adjustment computed on the basis of comparability with private enterprise for 1 year, and an increase at each salary level equal to one-half the amount by which Federal pay now lags behind comparable civilian pay. It is impossible to predict exactly what next year's pay boost will be, but we are assured that there will be an across-the-board raise.

Another important provision of the bill deals with overtime and holiday pay for postal employees, perhaps the most dedicated and hardest working single group in our Government's ranks. Thousands of postal substitutes are working 70 and 80 hours a week at straight time pay. We are long overdue in cutting out this reactionary practice and I am hopeful the Senate will accept our proposal to guarantee all postal field service employees time and one-half for work officially ordered in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. The House bill also decrees that employees who work on legal Federal holidays will receive double time, with double time and one-half for Christmas Day. Other sections of the bill provide increased allowances for uniforms, a system of severance pay, and relocation expenses for postal workers displaced by the ZIP code and sectional center system.

Just one word, Mr. Speaker, about the recommittal motion which killed the proposed legislative machinery that would resolve forevermore the question of salaries for Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, Federal judges, and other Federal executives.

As Congressmen we are the only persons in the Federal Government who are called upon to set their own salaries. Over the years too many in this body have failed to take a stand on the matter, not because they doubted a salary increase was justified, but because they feared reprisals at the polls. A majority of the Members finally screwed up enough courage in the last Congress to substantially increase salaries in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It was the first time in 9 years that Congress had the guts to do so, and it was precisely because raises were so long overdue that they were so substantial.

Nevertheless, this year we had an excellent chance to break the shackles which bind us to the archaic and embarrassing practice of establishing our own pay. This would have been easily accomplished by tying any future raises to the whole Federal salary structure: when comparability raises were provided to civil service employees all along the line a proportionate increase would also be granted to members of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It was a simple solution to Congress' historic problem.

ROLLCALL NOS. 356 AND 357, HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Control the signs and hide the junk,
It's all we ask or seek.
Behind yon hill the sun has sunk,
We hardly had a peek.

Mr. Speaker, my poetic effort is meant to counter allegations by opponents of the Highway Beautification Act to the effect that the only person interested in its passage was the First Lady. I would merely remind those who hold this view that the vast majority of motoring Americans consider the principle of controlling billboards and junkyards along our major highways a very worthwhile one. It was President Eisenhower, not Lady Bird Johnson, who in 1957 and 1958 submitted to Congress specific recommendations for billboard control, recommendations which were much more stringent than those enacted by the National Legislature.

It is only the unfortunate blind who have traveled this wide and wonderful country who have not been appalled at the garish clutter of signs which sock the eye from every direction, obliterating the scenic wonders which the Creator made for all men to enjoy. While billboard entrepreneurs have an economic right to hawk their wares, I also believe that the motoring citizen whose tax money has been invested for him in a vast network of Federal highways has a right to some relief from the hucksters of the road. We have long regulated airwave frequencies so that the amateur radio operator down the street does not interfere with our favorite television viewing. The Nation's highways, like its airways, are public property and it was time Congress decided that the motorist is also entitled to some degree of scenic viewing.

The Highway Beautification Act gives full consideration to enhancing our highways, while properly balancing this factor with legitimate business and industrial operations adjacent to these highways. Examination of the act's provisions attests to the equitable balance which was achieved: on-premise advertising is fully authorized and not subject to Federal regulation, as is outdoor advertising in commercial and industrial areas, either zoned or unzoned. With these exceptions, billboards will be excluded within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way along interstate and primary systems.

The exercise of zoning authority is left entirely with the States and local governments. Existing signs which are in control areas will not have to be removed for 5 years, and just compensation will be paid to sign owners and to property owners on which the sign is located. Motels, restaurants, service stations and other businesses catering to the motoring public will be assisted by official signs at appropriate places giving specific information, including names and brands, of interest to the traveler.

Public hearings will be held in each State before specific rules and regulations are promulgated, and before the Secretary can cut a State's apportionment of highway funds by 10 percent for failure to control billboards and junkyards an opportunity for a hearing will also have to be granted. If the decision is adverse to the State it can receive full judicial review in Federal court.

Control the signs and hide the junk,
It's all we ask or seek.
Behind yon hill the sun has sunk,
We hardly had a peek.

With enactment of the Highway Beautification Act it should not be very long before American motorists get more than a peek.

ROLLCALL NOS. 363 AND 367, SUGAR ACT

Mr. Speaker, take almost any derogatory adjective in the dictionary, apply it to H.R. 11135, and you have my definition of the sugar bill—a measure that will cost American consumers at least $2 billion over the next 5 years. Paying through the nose would be an understatement of fact. Not only will consumer dollars be used to pay a high subsidy to foreign sugar producers, but this economic felony will be compounded when the subsidies jack up the price of sugar at the grocery store.

I suspect the average housewife is unaware that sugar is one of the most rigidly controlled commodities on the kitchen shelf. H.R. 11135 specifies the exact sugar tonnage which can be produced and marketed by domestic growers, and it fixes the number of tons that

foreign countries can ship to the United States. When the foreign sugar arrives at U.S. ports, the producers receive a large subsidy. To determine the amount we have only to know that the average world price for raw sugar last month was 1.8 cents a pound, and that foreign sugar producers were paid 6.85 cents per pound for raw sugar delivered to New York. This means that the American consumer is now forking over to foreign producers a bonus of about $100 for every ton of sugar which they deliver to the United States. No wonder, then, that this year 29 foreign countries hired high-priced lobbyists in an effort to get a sugar quota assigned to them or to get their present quotas increased.

Supporters of the sugar bill tried to strengthen their arguments with the nonsense that it was a form of foreign aid. This is utterly ridiculous. Foreign aid is designed to benefit the people, not multimillionaire plantation owners, large corporations, and foreign dictators. In the Dominican Republic the tyrant Trujillo amassed a personal fortune of $800 million with profits from his sugar quotas. "Papa Doc" Duvalier is doing the same thing today in Haiti. In fact, very few of the countries on the quota list qualify for aid under our foreign assistance criteria. In the Bahamas, for instance, Owen-Illinois, which has a plant in my congressional district, would be the sole beneficiary of a $1 million annual subsidy for 5 years. This company has never produced sugar but now wants to go into the sugar business in a land where sugar has never been grown. Their lobbyist succeeded in securing a 10,000-ton special quota for Owen-Illinois.

Arguments that American consumers would be without sugar if the bill failed to pass were also without foundation in fact. Under existing legislation the current quotas would continue to apply if the House had voted down the proposal. With the defeat of H.R. 11135, we could then have come up with a bill which would have permitted domestic sugar producers to expand their output with no ties to foreign quotas.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

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

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

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our sustaining faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest by foolish futility in this dangerous and desperate day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

In a day of ruthless aggression and of savage violence, of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants here in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just; their hope in Thee an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of such days as these Thou art making all things new.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1320) to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H.R. 10497. An act to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11428. An act to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront;

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 10497. An act to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11428. An act to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront;

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONTANA: SITE OF WORLD'S MOST ADVANCED SEISMOGRAPH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even in this, the age of technological revolution, when almost anything seems possible, the pace of scientific advance never ceases to amaze me.

Today in Billings, in my home State of Montana, the Advance Research Projects Agency is dedicating a large aperture seismic array, more handily called LASA. I am not a scientist nor am I familiar with the complex technical terminology involved, but as I understand it, this cluster of seismometers will be the most advanced yet developed. This project is an experiment in long-range detection and identification of earth tremors induced by both natural