United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

O Lord, our God, whose love will not let us go, but followest us all the way: We bow before Thee in gratitude at the remembrance of all Thy mercy and all Thy mercies.

We would bring our restless lives into the quiet sanctuary of Thy presence, that we may be still and know that Thou art God.

In spite of all the evil that stalks the earth with threats and shackles and chains, we thank Thee for human kindness, for hope that shines undimmed, for faith that is dauntless, and for all the qualities of high personality that cannot be bribed.

Let Thy beauty, O Lord, be upon us, that our spirits may be radiant as in Thy strength we face the perplexities of these troubled days. Use us, we pray, in all our human relationships as ambassadors of good will, so that at the end of the day we may be able to say, "I have kept the faith."

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 28, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 367) authorizing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 6593) for the relief of Earnest O. Scott, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of colonel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Thomas H. Rutledge, James F. Hunt, and Walter N. Warschun, members of the Coast Guard Reserve, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard;

James G. Grunwell, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Frederic G. Donner, of New York, George Meany, of Maryland, and Clark Kerr, of California, to be members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.; and

Robert A. Ganse, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Muecke, of Arizona, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed consideration of legislative business.

EARNEST O. SCOTT—CORRECTION OF ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 367), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 6593) entitled "An Act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott", the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

On page 2, line 7 of the engrossed House bill, strike out "some" and insert "any sums".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED APPROPRIATION, 1965, FOR APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 105)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed appropriation for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $800,000, for the Appalachian Regional Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of August 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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 Civil Service Commission for "Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund," for the fiscal year 1965, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions—personnel and administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOINT CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES RELATED TO THE INADEQUATE ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY BUDGET SUPPORT FUNDS PROVIDED TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT REVIEWING THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR A FAR EAST COUNTRY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report reviewing the military assistance program for a Far East country, identity classified (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPLY TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON A CERTAIN REPORT

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to his report on a review of certain problems relating to administration of the "Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam 1958–62, Part I," and review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the "Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam 1958–62, Part II," transmitted to the Senate on July 24, 1964 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Compton, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, signed by Ray N. Gesell, executive secretary, favoring action by the Congress to delay the effect of the Supreme Court reapportionment ruling, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen (Rept. No. 1603).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1605); and

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1604).

DESIGNATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE ICE AGE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1606)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 1096) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators ALLOTT, SIMPSON, and DOMINICK, and the individual views of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3225. A bill to amend the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to increase the maximum amount for which an employee may be insured under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3226. A bill for the relief of Armando Alfandari, Irene Alfandari, Alessandra Alfandari, and Elena Alfandari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954, TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR WHICH AN EMPLOYEE MAY BE INSURED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the approval of the pay act, some time ago, we felt it necessary that, in the case of the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act, the amounts be increased to conform to the Federal Pay Act.

Accordingly, I submit a bill for that purpose, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3225) to amend the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to increase the maximum amount for which an employee may be insured under such act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 1278

Mr. KUCHEL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, at the appropriate place in the chapter on public works under "Construction, general" strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$2,860,000, of which not to exceed $860,000 shall be available for emergency flood control construction of debris basins and channel clearing in the Santa Barbara, California, area affected by recent fires, and such work is hereby authorized."

Mr. KUCHEL also submitted an amendment (No. 1278) intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1276 AND 1277

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3140) to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work study, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ESTES KEFAUVER WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Lexington Leader, on August 26, 1964, which pays a deserved tribute to our late colleague, Senator Estes Kefauver.

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

WE MAY NOT REMEMBER KEFAUVER BUT WE BENEFIT FROM HIS EFFORT

Estes Kefauver, the gangling, coonskin-cap-affecting Senator from Tennessee, died a little over a year ago.

As a form of memorial to him, a book called "The Real Voice" has been published, telling of Kefauver's fight for the Senate bill that eventually became the Drug Amendment Act of 1962.

It was one of the longest, costliest and fiercest legislative battles in recent history.

The title of the book is taken from a statement by Woodrow Wilson:

"Things get very lonely in Washington sometimes. The real voice of the great people of America sometimes sounds faint and distant in that strange city."

Seldom has this been better exemplified than in the investigations of the pricing, manufacturing, testing, selling, advertising, and licensing methods of the drug industry and, in Kefauver's words, "the ins and outs, the ups and downs, and the dirty dealings" involved in getting a bill through Congress.

The significant thing, however, is not that legislators are less honest, less dedicated, more self-seeking than ordinary men; they are not. It is that they can occasionally rise above the enormous pressures that beat upon them from every side (there are 10 lobbyists in Washington for every Congressman) and actually serve the public welfare.

In the end, it was the thalidomide tragedy—which the United States escaped because of the stubbornness of Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration in refusing to OK the drug—that aroused "the real voice" and provided the impetus to push the bill into law.

History does repeat itself. It had taken another drug tragedy in 1937, in which 107 people died, to inspire the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act in 1938. Before that, the Government had no control at all over drug safety.

Although the public today is better protected against experimental drugs, Kefauver failed in his primary aim—to institute free enterprise measures that would have resulted in lowered drug prices, some of which he asserted were inflated 1,000 percent or more above cost. It was the sacrifice that had to be made to get any sort of bill passed.

The drug manufacturers' explanation—then and now—for their prices is that profits must be sufficient to finance necessary research. An executive of a small drug company testified at the Kefauver hearings, however, that the Government spends almost as much as the drug industry on such research and that private foundations, universities, charitable organizations and individuals contribute more to drug and medical research than either the drug industry or the Government.

The Salk polio vaccine, for instance, was paid for largely by public donations (though only five drug companies shared the profits of its manufacture).

Another quotation from "The Real Voice" is a statement made on the floor of the Senate by THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, after the final rollcall and after everyone—including many who had opposed the bill all along—had made their little speeches of self-congratulation. Said DODD:

"I have an idea that the Senator from Tennessee will be remembered long after all of us in this Chamber at this hour are gone."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday, a highly important piece of legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 139 passed the Senate. It is an elaborate joint resolution concerning the Presidency and the possible succession of the Vice President to the Presidency, and with a provision for an Acting President, which would repeal an existing section of the Constitution.

I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the majority leader, but as one who is eligible under the rule to make a motion to reconsider—I do not know whether it is in order during the morning hour—I wish to give notice that when I can obtain the floor for that purpose I shall make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make his motion at any time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

I wish to make clear that I am not in opposition to the joint resolution. I will support it. I support its great purposes; but, at the same time, without anyone being at fault, there was no prior notice given that this joint resolution would be up for passage—at least none that I received. I was present yesterday and in my office all afternoon and until far into the night, with reference to other official business.

The press reports that the measure passed at a time when only nine Senators were present. I do not know whether that is correct. The record does show that only nine Senators addressed themselves to the subject. The record does not show that there was any recorded quorum call prior to the vote. I received no notice of a quorum call.

I am not blaming anyone. It is a condition which existed. But the Constitution of the United States does not contemplate the approval of a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States at a time when only nine Members of the Senate are present.

Clearly the Constitution requires, and its spirit demands, that there be a showing on the face of the record that there was at least a quorum present, and that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting voted for the proposal.

Without going into the legal aspects, I refer to a case decided in 1920 on this question. One of of the conclusions of the Court, as found in 253 U.S. 350, 386, had this to say:

> The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership, present and absent.

I have not had time to go into this question in detail. I do not propose to make an exhaustive argument now—nor at any other time—except that I do wish to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I have no doubt as to what the Senate will do, and I hope that no motion will be made immediately to table the motion to reconsider, because I do believe that the matter should be more closely examined. When I can obtain the floor for that purpose, I shall make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Mississippi making his motion to reconsider now?

Mr. STENNIS. I should like first to yield to the majority leader. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this question with him. I assume there will not be an immediate motion to table until this matter has been fully discussed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that this is the first knowledge I have had of his feelings on the matter. I believe that the Senate acted entirely within the rules of this body, that there had been a quorum on this floor earlier in the day, and that every Senator present voted in favor of the constitutional amendment. There was no opposition voiced whatsoever to it.

If a motion is made to reconsider for the purpose of reopening this question and having extended debate, I shall object. I should like the Senator to know that. If he wishes to make a motion to reconsider to vote at a time certain today, but letting other business intervene, and have a yea-and-nay vote, that will be fine, but under no other circumstances today——

Mr. STENNIS. Let me assure the Senator from Montana that I have already stated that no one is to blame, and that no one was misled. It was merely a matter of lack of information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no desire to postpone the matter and will agree to a vote at any time convenient to the leadership. However, I believe there should be an opportunity for further debate; this question should be fully presented and discussed, and then a vote should be taken, which will reflect affirmatively the presence of a quorum and two-thirds of the quorum voting for the amendment. I believe that will give it a better start.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and likewise to the distinguished majority leader, that the joint resolution was the subject of long hearings in the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not remember how many witnesses were heard. But the witnesses were of a very high order.

The joint resolution was then reported to the full committee. The full committee had a substantial discussion of the matter. If I remember correctly—and I was present—there was no dissenting voice in the Committee on the Judiciary. As a consequence, it was reported to the

Senate floor in that fashion. I was in and out most of the time on various chores, but I detected no opposition to the joint resolution. That probably accounted for the fact that there were not too many Senators on the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that the resolution has great merit. I want to support it. I do not know of any Senator who is opposed to it. But I make the point that we ought, in all cases on a constitutional amendment, to let the record speak for itself. The record should show that a quorum was present and that two-thirds of the Senators present voted in the affirmative. Otherwise, I believe it would be subject to attack. And the Supreme Court has so held, if this case is correctly reported.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to propose a unanimous-consent request which I hope the Senate will grant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this is an extraordinary circumstance—that there be a yea-and-nay vote on this Senate Joint Resolution 139 at 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, the time that is proposed would permit a little over 2 hours within which to look into this matter and get ready.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Could the majority leader make that 3:30? That would give a little more time to read the cases and make a comparison. I believe there is a clear-cut case here that requires a quorum to be present. I believe that it is worth while to look into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was a quorum present yesterday. There was no quorum at the time the joint resolution was passed. That is true. But, so far as I can ascertain, we complied with the rules of the Senate. Therefore, we acted properly in proceeding as we did. But, I would be delighted to change the time to 3:30 this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. Could we make that tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A quorum is present today.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has the floor by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. While I do not see any violation of the rules with respect to the action taken yesterday, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that such an important subject as the proposed constitutional amendment ought to have the consideration of at least a quorum at the time the vote is taken on it.

Not only is the action that we take upon it important, but the House also must take action. Beyond that, we must consider the weight that will be given to the action of the Senate by the States, their legislatures and peoples in the constitutional process of confirmation. I support the Senator from Mississippi in asking that the vote be put over until tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that the Senators would not press that request. We are having a very difficult time maintaining a quorum. We have a quorum at present. I believe we ought to take advantage of that fact. We had 4 or 5 hours of debate on the joint resolution yesterday. There was no sign of any opposition whatsoever. I believe that agreeing to the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi that there be a rollcall vote at 3:30 would be about as far as we could go at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi can be ready at 3:30. But there may be other Senators who could not be ready. If the majority leader cannot agree to putting the vote over until tomorrow, does he have another day in mind?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; only today. I believe we have gone as far as we can on the matter of reconsidering the vote.

Mr. STENNIS. At 4 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 4 o'clock. But that is the end.

Mr. STENNIS. All right. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have gone from 2:30 to 3:30, to 4 o'clock. This is the end.

Mr. STENNIS. After all, this is a constitutional amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I was present for 5 hours yesterday listening to the debate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator knows that no notice was given that there would be a vote. The Senator from Mississippi understood that there would be no vote—but not from the majority leader. But that is neither here nor there; 4 o'clock is all right with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LAYMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE, INC., CITATION OF MERIT FOR 1964 TO NATHANIEL LEVERONE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on October 14, 1964, Mr. Nathaniel Leverone, founder of Automatic Canteen Co. of America, will receive a citation of merit from the Laymen's National Committee, Inc., for his many years of devoted service to the cause of Christianity. The citation will be issued in connection with the observance of National Bible Week. It is so richly deserved and I know of my own knowledge the great contributions which Mr. Leverone has made to this exalted cause. I ask unanimous consent that this citation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LAYMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE, INC., CITATION OF MERIT, 1964

To Nathaniel Leverone, on behalf of what he has done in helping to further the cause of religious education and the fundamental principles of God's words, the Laymen's National Committee, Inc., therefore presents this citation of merit, not only in gratitude for his unselfish work for this committee, but for a lifelong devotion to bringing the goodness and kindness of the Almighty to a world that he knew could only survive through God.

BEN H. WILLINGHAM,
National Chairman, National Bible Week.

SIXTY-FOUR YEARS OF FEDERAL SPENDING, DEBT GROWTH, AND SHARE BY EACH AMERICAN, 1899–1964

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my staff has compiled a record of Government spending, deficits, increased spending per capita, the increased annual debt service, and related matters. The data has been arranged in tabular form to show, among other things, the political party in power, the population, the Federal spending in millions, the per capita, the Federal debt, the debt per capita, and the change in the U.S. debt status from administration to administration since 1899. This is truly an impressive piece of work and shows what has happened to us in the fiscal field.

The Government has had surpluses over expenditures in 25 of the last 64 years—20 years in Republican administrations and 5 years in Democrat administrations. In the same 64 years "deficits" were produced by 12 Republican and 27 Democrat administrations—page 81 of Bureau of the Budget Document of 1964.

My compilation of debt growth shows how very slight has been the effort to meet the ever-growing national debt obligation. We have had 19 separate Presidential administrations in 64 years, including the short term by Coolidge and another by President Johnson. Of these 19 administrations, 10 have been under Republican Presidents for a total of 32 years, and 9 have covered 32 years under Democrat Presidents. What has each of these contributed to enlarging or lowering the national debt and per capita of that debt? Let us have a look:

Additions to the 1899 national debt of $1.437 billion have been:

By 10 Republican administrations—32 years—$22,372 billion.

By 9 Democrat administrations—32 years—$287,929 billion.

Of the 19 administrations serving during the 64-year span, only 5 reduced the national debt, and these 5 were all Republican adminstrations.

As relates to administrations affording increases in the share per person of the national debt:

Seven of nine Democrat administrations in 32 years added $1,842.

One of ten Republican administrations in 32 years added $9.24.

As relates to administrations affording decreases in the share per person of the national debt:

Two of nine Democrat administrations—in 32 years—accomplished decreases totaling $67.44.

Nine of ten Republican administrations—in 32 years—accomplished decreases totaling $142.97.

To summarize: Sixty-four years ago the per capita national debt was $18.80. In 1964, that individual share in the debt has reached $1,641.

Nineteen Presidential administrations have served through those years—9 Democrat, 10 Republican.

The 32 years under Democrat administrations saw the per capita debt increased by $1,774.66.

The 32 years under Republican administrations saw the per capital debt decreased by $133.73.

Let no one say that all of the 32 Democrat administration years were war years. After all, even the Democrat administrations have had peace years to their credit.

WARS AND DEBT

Of course, wars have played a part in occasioning borrowing by the Government. In the last 64 years we have had four wars to fight—not counting our present involvement in the Far East which the Johnson Democrat administration does not like to have called war, even though it is costing many American lives.

One of the four, the war with Spain, was fought under the Republican McKinley administration. Strangely, it was the only war of the four which did not call for any ultimate increase in the per capita debt of the Nation.

The remaining three wars, World War I, World War II, and the war in Korea—all under Democrat administrations—piled up terrifying increases in the national debt and in the per capita sharing of that debt.

One can understand why the cost of war cannot be met on a pay-as-you-go basis.

But what hurts is the evidence at hand demonstrating that we do not seem to want to pay off the war debt in the years after the wars are won.

Instead, the years of peace following the wars find us annually adding to the debt by spending more than we receive in revenues.

INVESTMENT IN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

There are those who attempt to sweeten my thinking about this growing debt by telling me first, that our $311 billion debt is investment in Government-owned property and installations, and second, that the doubling of our gross national product in the last 10 or 12 years offsets the degree of burden involved in the national debt.

Now, how much sense does that make?

Are we about to sell these Government-owned properties and installations and pay off the debt with the financial return? No. And it is still the taxpayers among the 190 million now making up our population, not these Government-owned properties, who are paying interest on the debt. Instead of selling properties, our Government more often abandons and replaces with more costly properties.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT EASES THE DEBT

This stuff about the relationship of national debt to the gross national product is nonsense. What has the steady increase in the gross national product contributed toward paying our war bills and reducing the national debt? It ought to be known by everyone that though the gross national product increases, so does the national debt increase along with the proportionate share of 190 million citizens in that debt.

INFLATION HAS EASED DEBT BURDEN

Then somebody up and springs the tale that inflation has eased the burden of national debt upon everybody. That is when I burn up.

In my early productive years, I bought with preinflation dollars enough life and retirement insurance to make certain that my wife and I, or she alone perhaps, could have comfort and security in our lives of retirement. Now, with inflation having taken its bite out of our actual return from that insurance, we are left wondering how much longer we can afford to live without falling back as dependents upon our children or holding out our hand for the kind of Government handout the welfare-state boys are urging.

Have we reached now that day when everyone should cease worrying about the future and adopt the theory that, come what may to each and all of us, the Government will take care of us?

I hope one will get from my compilation of national debt facts, what I have learned. It is my conviction that we had better be waking up to what Government borrowing and spending is doing to us of this day and to the generations which will be following in our steps. It is either wake up or let us continue charging our spending to our kids and their kids.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

64 years of Federal spending, debt growth, and share by each American, 1899–1964

	Year and party	Population	Federal spending in 1 year	Per capita Federal spending	Federal debt	Per capita Federal debt	Change in status of Federal debt
		Millions	*Millions*		*Millions*		
At close of war with Spain, McKinley administration	1899, Republican	75			$1,437	$18.80	
At close of McKinley administration in	1900, Republican	76	$521	$6.86	1,263	16.62	Debt down $174,000,000; per capita down $2.48.
At close of 1st T. R. Roosevelt 4-year administration in	1904, Republican	82	584	7.12	1,136	14.00	Debt down $127,000,000; per capita down $2.62.
At close of 2d T. R. Roosevelt 4-year administration in	1908, Republican	88	659	7.49	1,178	13.40	Debt up $42,000,000; per capita down $0.60.
At close of the Taft 4-year administration in	1912, Republican	95	690	7.26	1,194	12.57	Debt up $16,000,000; per capita down $0.83.
At close of 1st Wilson administration in	1916, Democratic	101	713	7.06	1,225	12.13	Debt up $31,000,000; per capita down $0.44.
At close of World War I and 2d Wilson administration in	1920, Democratic	106	6,357	59.99	24,299	229.15	Debt up $23,000,000,000; per capita up $217.
At close of Harding 3-year administration in	1923, Republican	111	3,137	28.26	22,350	201.35	Debt down $1,900,000,000; per capita down $27.80.
At close of 1 year of Coolidge administration in	1924, Republican	114	2,890	25.35	21,251	186.40	Debt down $1,100,000,000; per capita down $15.
At close of 4 years of Coolidge administration in	1928, Republican	120	2,933	24.44	17,604	146.66	Debt down $3,600,000,000; per capita down $39.74.
At close of the Hoover administration in	1932, Republican	125	4,659	38.00	19,487	155.90	Debt up $1,900,000,000; per capita up $9.24.
At close of 1st F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1936, Democratic	128	8,422	66.00	33,779	263.90	Debt up $14,300,000,000; per capita up $108.
At close of 2d F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1940, Democratic	131	9,055	69.00	42,968	328.00	Debt up $9,100,000,000; per capita up $64.
At close of 3d F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1944, Democratic	139	94,986	683.00	201,003	1,446.00	Debt up $158,000,000,000; per capita up $1,118.
At close of 1st Truman administration in	1948, Democratic	146	32,955	226.00	252,292	1,728.00	Debt up $51,200,000,000; per capita up $282.
At close of 2d Truman administration in	1952, Democratic	156	65,303	418.00	259,105	1,661.00	Debt up $6,800,000,000; per capita down $67.
At close of 1st Eisenhower administration, and finish of war in Korea, in	1956, Republican	168	66,224	394.00	272,751	1,623.52	Debt up $13,600,000,000; per capita down $37.48.
At close of Eisenhower 2d administration in	1960, Republican	179	76,539	428.00	286,331	1,600.00	Debt up $13,500,000,000; per capita down $23.52.
At close of 3-year Kennedy administration in	1963, Democratic	187	92,642	495.00	305,860	1,635.30	Debt up $19,500,000,000; per capita up $35.30.
At close of 1st year of Johnson administration, estimated, in	1964, Democratic	190	98,405	517.00	311,800	1,641.00	Debt up $6,000,000,000; per capita up $5.70.

Data sources: Census and Doc. 20402, "The Budget in Brief," of Jan. 24, 1964.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to make the RECORD clear, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider Senate Joint Resolution 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Joint Resolution 139 at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time for debate does the distinguished majority leader have in mind?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was understood that there would be a vote on this measure at 4 o'clock. So far as debate is concerned, I assume that Senators would have to debate the measure before the vote and during discussion of pending legislation.

There were 5 hours of debate yesterday.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi does not agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will reconsider before the matter goes too far. As the Senator knows, I would have been opposed to a tabling motion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the agreement to vote implies that the measure will be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said specifically that it would be for that purpose only that the question was raised, and not by me, in the beginning. There will be time available for debate on the measure. How much, I do not know, because I would like to take up some other business as well.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi does not desire a great amount of time. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is interested in the question. It would take me approximately 30 minutes to present my statement. I should like 30 minutes for those who are in favor of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall be most reasonable.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WATERSHED PROJECTS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order that the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter.

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

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on Sept. 28, 1964, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended

	Estimated Federal cost
Montpelier Creek, Idaho	$1,455,525
Sutherlin Creek, Oreg.	645,555
Total	2,101,080

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on Sept. 28, 1964, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 249, 86th Cong.

	Estimated Federal cost
GSA Facility, Naval Supply Center, Stockton, Calif. (alteration)	$2,500,000
Federal Motor Vehicle Facility, Houston, Tex. (construction)	891,000
Veterans Administration Regional Office, Waco, Tex. (leased office building) annual lease charge (10-year firm lease)	134,810

THE POVERTY PROGRAM GETS UNDERWAY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the speed with which the economic opportunity programs are being launched, and the speed with which Indian people generally and Indian tribes in South Dakota are taking advantage of the programs it offers, are very gratifying to me and should be to all of those Members of the Senate who supported the President's antipoverty bill.

A meeting to explain the program was held in South Dakota last week. It was well attended. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians had already started development of a community project. Members of the staff of the State university had also made a proposal for forestry work around the reservoir lakes of the Missouri river which is being developed. And plans are underway for 2 work-study camps in the Black Hills National Forest.

The response in South Dakota has thus been excellent, and the program assuredly is going to give our State—particularly young people in need of employment to continue their educational work—greatly needed assistance.

There is evidence that a similar response is being met generally. Dr. Robert Russell, of Arizona State University, told the South Dakota meeting last week that inquiries to 16 Indian tribes about their interest in community projects revealed that all 16 are starting development of proposals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the September 24 issue of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader reporting on the poverty program conference in Pierre, S. Dak., last week indicating the constructive response the program is receiving.

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

SEVERAL COMMUNITIES MAY BENEFIT: OGLALA SIOUX FIRST TO PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AID

PIERRE.—The Pine Ridge Oglala Sioux are the first Indians in South Dakota to begin a program to get Federal funds under the Government's Economic Opportunity Act.

Dr. Robert Russell of the Arizona State University told an information meeting on the act here that the Economic Opportunity Act could be a great help to the Indian people.

A list of 16 Indian tribes across the Nation initially prepared to get reactions of the tribal leaders and the Indian people toward the act has been extremely successful, he said. Russell added that there was some doubt that the tribes would be able or want to take part in the program, but all 16 of the original 16 have begun programs to get funds under the act.

OTHERS BENEFIT

The act, which is part of President Johnson's war on poverty, would also make funds available for the migrant worker, small businessman, farmer, and unemployed family head.

Programs designed to give poverty stricken people the money by which to take themselves out of the poverty classification is the single most important purpose of the act, William Finale, deputy assistant commissioner of the Community Services Bureau in Washington, D.C., said.

Finale said the migrant worker could improve his living conditions. the small businessman his management practices, the farmers their method of operations and the unemployed could begin to find jobs. The act is also aimed directly at the youth of the Nation, Finale said, through programs in the community and work camps which would be established throughout the Nation.

One provision would make Federal funds available to communities wishing to take care of the dropouts or those students in danger of dropping out of school.

STUDENT JOBS

The funds would be made available to nonprofit organizations in the community for the purpose of giving students in school jobs within the school itself, in addition to giving work and improving skills of those who already have dropped out of school.

Finale said students would be allowed to work in the school as teachers' aids and other positions up to 15 hours per week. College students, if the local school officials felt money was the factor in the student having to leave school, could receive jobs by which they could earn and continue to learn, Finale added.

He said, however, in no case could the students take jobs that would eliminate a position held by a wage earner. The students who have quit school could work in a community in a number of jobs ranging from park workers to assistants in a variety of positions within the community.

Several South Dakota communities might take part in programs under the Federal Government's antipoverty program before the end of the present fiscal year. Finale said.

The act would provide in part, for the establishment of work camps which would give young persons the opportunity to receive basic educational and vocational courses while working on public works projects.

Martin N. B. Holm, Aberdeen, area director of the Economic Opportunity Act told some 200 persons at the meeting that local

initiative is the single most important factor in getting a work camp established in a community.

Holm said a community must first express a desire for a camp and make an application to the Federal Government for funds to establish such a facility. The Federal Government could provide up to 90 percent of the money under the act.

Camps would serve at least 100 students between the ages of 16 and 21, but not more than 200 and would be manned by a staff of 14 persons. Work portion of the camp would be handled by the Interior and Agriculture Departments with the educational portion to be run in connection with local colleges and universities.

AIMED AT DROPOUTS

"The program is aimed at students who are in school but in danger of dropping out, in addition to those students who already have left school," Holm said. "Students would be enrolled in the camps for 1 year, with a limit of 2 years, but would not necessarily be forced to stay the whole year," he said.

Finale said, "the only restrictions placed on a community seeking a camp is that there must be a need, there must be no opposition to the camp and the Governor must approve the site."

He said, "the group is interested in exploring several sites in South Dakota for possible job camps." Several officials at South Dakota State University have expressed the need for such a camp along the Missouri River.

NO SCHOOL SUBSTITUTE

Finale said, "the camps are not intended to be a substitute for school. The sole purpose is to reach the dropouts or potential dropouts." He added, "That the program is a project that deals with people and helps them help themselves."

He said, "the Federal Government has no intention of taking the program over but is simply assisting local interests in the establishment of such programs."

Finale said, "the main purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act is to seek out the causes of poverty and do away with them. It would also seek to raise the level of all areas of unemployment and economic depression."

Holm said "We do not have all of the answers as yet, but we do need to start talking about the act."

ENDORSEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE FOR REELECTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the oldest and most responsible independent Republican newspapers in the State of Wisconsin, the Beloit Daily News, has endorsed the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for reelection to the Senate.

Those of us who have worked with Senator PROXMIRE know him to be one of the most energetic, courageous, and conscientious Members in the Senate. We know him to be a good ally in difficult fights. He wears no man's collar.

It is, therefore, heartening to find that these qualities by which we know Senator PROXMIRE, have been recognized by one of the most important and responsible newspapers in his State. It is a great pleasure for me to read the editorial by the Beloit Daily News endorsing him for reelection, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Beloit (Wis.) Daily News, Sept. 22, 1964]

WE ENDORSE PROXMIRE

The Daily News today announces its support and endorsement of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE in his bid for reelection to the U.S. Senate. If this comes as a shock to readers and friends of the Daily News, the simple and direct explanation is that the Daily News management believes Senator PROXMIRE has done a good job, is the best man in the field, and deserves to be returned to Washington.

This newspaper, which traces its parentage 125 years in the Beloit community, traditionally has been Independent Republican. It supported Abraham Lincoln in his bid for the Presidency during the infancy of the Republican Party. It has endorsed and assisted in the election of numerous Republicans over the span of years, but this does not obligate the Daily News to limit its support only to Republican candidates ad infinitum.

As publisher of an independent newspaper, the management of the Daily News feels it has an obligation to itself and its reading public to examine the records and qualifications of candidates, and to support the one best in its judgment regardless of party label. This it has done, and endorses Senator PROXMIRE.

Senator PROXMIRE has been budget and economy minded, opposing the Kennedy administration on numerous occasions when spending seemed excessive or unnecessary. He understands the problems of the farmer, and his grasp of the perplexities facing both labor and management are appreciated. He is working to reduce unemployment through retraining and support of vocational education, and he knows the benefits of putting Government business in the plants of his home State. Here in Beloit he has taken a personal interest in the procurement of work for community small businesses.

There are those who charge that "BILL PROXMIRE never stops campaigning." If this means that BILL PROXMIRE gets back home and around among his constituents often, we like that. If it means BILL PROXMIRE will answer a letter and try to do something about the questions in the letter, we like that. And if this means BILL PROXMIRE admits his mistakes when he hires one, tells the people what he is thinking and doing, we like that, too.

With this announcement the Daily News does not close its columns to Candidate Wilbur Renk or anyone else who seeks political office. The news columns are open to all comers, but the management's editorial policy support is behind BILL PROXMIRE. He isn't perfect, but he's done his job. And we think he deserves a chance to keep doing it.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate some vital facts about Czechoslovakia.

On October 3, this year, Americans of Czeck and Slovak descent will commemorate the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia and the 20th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising. Throughout a difficult history, the Czech and Slovak peoples have, with little armament but the strength of their convictions, defended freedom against aggressing tyrannies of the right and the left. If we learn from history, we learn from Czechoslovak history that the price of freedom is very great, and that, in the final accounting, moral fortitude may make up the balance.

Chairman Khrushchev recently falsely claimed that the Slovak national uprising against the invading German Army in 1944 was a Communist action. It is important that we let the people of Czechoslovakia know that we do not accept that assertion. In fact, the Soviet Union never came to the aid of the resisting fighters, as had been promised; and the Slovaks went to a grim and gradual defeat, much as did the heroes of the Warsaw uprising.

That the cause of the Allies was helped by the Slovak uprising is beyond doubt. Indeed, we note that the U.S. Government recognized the Slovak fighters as an Allied "combat force operating against Germany."

On this dual anniversary I recall our gratitude and our respect for the courageous people of Czechoslovakia who, over many years, have laid down their lives for the right to direct their nation according to their own cherished ideals and traditions.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Czechoslovak National Council of America be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING

Khrushchev recently visited Bánska Bystrica, Slovakia, headquarters of the Slovak insurgents in 1944, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising and to claim it as a heroic Communist act, thereby falsifying history; he also made cruel fun of Captive Nations Week in the United States and our efforts on behalf of the captive people. Therefore, it becomes necessary to speak out clearly to unmask the Communist hoax: The Slovak national uprising was a great patriotic protest of the entire nation, despite the efforts of the Soviet Union to pervert it and to seize control.

To disprove the Communist lie and to honor those who gave their life in our common cause, Slovak and Czech Americans will commemorate the anniversary on October 3, in the Morton West High School auditorium, Berwyn, Chicago, Ill.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has already sent a message for this occasion, which reads in part: "During World War II, the resistance of local populations to the Nazi armies contributed importantly to the eventual victory of the Allied forces. The 1944 uprising in Slovakia was a particularly notable example of the refusal of a brave people to yield the enemy an easy victory. Regular and irregular Czechoslovak forces held out for many months against overwhelming odds. The uprising was a heroic though sad time for the Czechoslovak people and for the Allied cause."

A FEW FACTS ABOUT THE SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING

On August 29, 1944, the German Army entered Slovakia, a vassal state of the Third Reich, in order to occupy and transform it into a bastion against the Allies. The Slovak people, traditionally pro-Western, democratic, and faithful to the Czechoslovak Republic, took up arms against the German aggressors, placing themselves unequivocally on

the side of the Allies. For 2 months of regular combat, up to 70,000 men of the Slovak army and 12,000 members of partisan units held off successfully several well-equipped German divisions which otherwise would have been used against Allied armed forces; for another 6 months irregular partisan-type fighting disrupted Nazi transportation to the front and otherwise harassed the enemy.

In the declaration of September 7, 1944, the U.S. Government recognized the insurgent army in Slovakia as an allied "combat force operating against Germany." On October 28, 1944, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his message to Dr. Eduard Benes, the exiled President of Czechoslovakia, highly praised the contribution of the Slovak insurgents toward the liberation of their homeland and the rest of Europe.

From the outset, the effort of the Slovak insurgents was hampered by a critical shortage of arms and military equipment. Promised military aid from the Soviet Union was not forthcoming; in fact, as soon as the Soviet Union realized it could not control the uprising to suit its own ends, it stopped the Western Allies from transporting into Slovakia allied equipment for 10,000 men. The fate of the Slovak fighters was very similar to that of the Polish insurgents of the Warsaw uprising: both were deliberately deprived of outside assistance by the Soviet Union and thus left to suffer the inevitable consequences in an unequal struggle against well armed superior German forces.

Our commemoration in the free world on October 3 aims to pay homage to the numerous victims of the Slovak national uprising and to stress the lasting friendship of the Czechoslovak people for the United States. We hope that our voice will be heard behind the Iron Curtain and that our message will give assurance to our silenced friends that the truth about the Slovak national uprising is known to the free world and that it will not be distorted by Khrushchev's visit to Slovakia nor buried under the Communist lie.

On October 3 we shall also celebrate the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia in 1918, to declare thereby our faith in a better future for the oppressed people. To his cause we—the free—shall rededicate our efforts.

STEVE PAPÁNEK,
Chairman, Commemorative Committee of the Slovak National Uprising.
VLASTA VRAZ,
President, Czechoslovak National Council of America.

WHICH WAY, SALMON?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there is no finer food fish in the world than Pacific salmon. The fishing and packing of salmon have been the mainstay of Alaska's economy for many years. As might be expected, there are yearly variations in the number of cases packed; but the sad truth is that the total in these latter years, whatever it may be, represents a tremendous decline from the catches of 30 and 40 years ago.

Are salmon runs to continue to decline? Will man permit sufficient escapement in the thousands of spawning streams to permit the species to survive? These and other questions are considered by Dr. William F. Royce, director of the Fisheries Research Institute of the University of Washington College of Fisheries. Happily, we discover that Dr. Royce, a noted biologist, takes an optimistic view of the future. His projections of what can be done appear in the September 1964 issue of the Pacific Fisherman, as condensed from a speech he made not long since in Alaska. Because of the general interest in this subject, I take pleasure now in asking unanimous consent that the article be printed as part of the RECORD, following by remarks.

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

PROSPECTS FOR ALASKA SALMON: LET ME BE AN OPTIMIST

(By Wm. F. Royce)

Alaska has most of North America's salmon resource, and most of the salmon problems.

Alaska now produces about 3 times as much salmon as British Columbia, and about 5 times as much salmon as the other Pacific coast States. Yet Alaska now produces only about half as much salmon as in the 1920 and 1930 decades. Almost all of the runs have declined in production and one of the major runs—southeast Alaska pink salmon—has declined to only one-fifth of its former sustained production level.

Many Alaskans are pessimistic about the future of the salmon, and about the possibilities of protecting the resource from foreign fishermen. George Rogers, in his book about the future of Alaska did not even consider the possibility of expanding salmon production.

Let me be an optimist.

I believe the United States will be successful in protecting salmon of Alaska origin from foreign fishermen; and I believe that it is technically possible and economically practical to double the production of Alaska salmon. I believe it is within our means to restore Alaska salmon production at least to the sustained level of 30 years ago. After all, there have been no significant physical changes in Alaska salmon streams and lakes.

1. What does doubling production mean? Doubling Alaska salmon production means an additional 3 million cases of salmon worth about $75 million, a major addition to the product of Alaska, a substantial source of income and a broadened base for taxes. In another sense, it means catching approximately 50 million more adult salmon, and allowing about 20 million more adult salmon to spawn.

2. How can production be doubled? This can be stated very simply, but it is enormously difficult in the practice. It is merely this: that we must regulate the runs precisely. We must protect the weak runs and harvest the surplus from the big ones. Some weak runs require total protection while the big runs can be harvested at a rate of 85 to 90 percent. A uniform catch rate such as the 50 percent rate formerly imposed by the Federal Government is now recognized as nonsense.

3. Aren't Alaska salmon runs being regulated precisely? The answer to this question is a flat "No," despite the efforts of a dedicated group of able men in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

For example, in 1963 in Bristol Bay the overall run was miserably poor because the big Kvichak run was at the bottom of its cycle. This Kvichak run is the most important in North America, and in its good years can produce $50 million worth of canned salmon.

The recent escapements have varied from 250,000 to 15 million. Our best estimate is that the peak escapement should be 6 million, with intervening escapements of about 2 million to 4 million to make full use of the rearing capacity of the lakes. Only three out of nine recent Kvichak escapements have been in this ideal range; the balance either wastefully large or too small. We are finding that too large escapements are especially wasteful. More of the adults die before spawning or dig out each others' spawn. If the eggs hatch, the overabundant young will grow more slowly and die in greater numbers in the lakes. The smaller, less vigorous young which do go to sea have less chance of surviving, and tend to return as adults a year later than they would if they had the opportunity of being well reared.

On the other hand, in the Icy Strait area of southeast Alaska in 1963 there was a near-record catch of Pink salmon, but no one knows how many Pink salmon entered Icy Strait, or the number of each race which was present. We had no forecast of this big run. We do not know why it happened. This run was a fortunate accident—not a planned production. It probably went under-harvested.

It is an unfortunate fact that no one knows the size of any significant returning Pink salmon runs to Alaska. Of course we know the catch, but it is impossible to associate this catch with specific numbers of fish spawning in specific streams. Nor does anyone know the size of the Chum salmon runs. Obviously, the regulation of these runs is largely guesswork.

4. Why is regulation so difficult?

First, there are several thousand separate spawning populations or races of salmon in Alaska. This is the crux of the difficulty. These populations are not interchangeable. The units must be regulated separately.

Second, the natural variation in survival produces runs which may vary 100 times in their size. Some runs must be given almost total protection from fishing, others may be caught at a rate of 80 to 90 percent. The pattern of uniform control which Alaska inherited from the Federal Government has resulted in the decimation of many races of salmon and Alaska's present system of regulation still permits serious overfishing of weak runs, while underfishing strong ones.

Third, the critical decisions about how much fishing to allow must be made before the catch is made and sometimes weeks before the escapement is obtained. Everyone has 20/20 hindsight about what should have been done, but the evidence on which the decisions must be based is always scanty, or worse. Resource managers frequently have no choice except to make decisions about opening or closing a fishing area or a fishing period on the basis of observations of a few jumpers seen from an airplane and on the basis of fragmentary catch reports.

Such decisions frequently involve the harvest of a million dollars worth of salmon in a few days. This is a remarkable contrast with a million dollar decision made by a banker, who completes elaborate studies before arriving at a decision. This is no criticism of present management. Able, professional, men do the best possible job with the means they have.

5. Why not hatcheries or fish farms?

Proposals have been made from time to time to put in hatcheries, to start fish farms, to fertilize lakes or to construct fishways. All of these methods together cannot possibly produce the 70 million Alaska salmon needed to restore production to its previous level. None of them can be used effectively without precise regulation of the fishing. All of the 40-odd salmon hatcheries of the Pacific Northwest, which cost about $3 million a year to operate, now produce only about 1 million adult salmon, and these are Silvers or Chinooks. There has been no successful experience in artificially raising large numbers of Pinks, Reds, or Chums. Some techniques in certain special situations will deserve serious consideration, but they should be evaluated critically. Money should never be diverted from the main task of regulating the fishery unless there is an exceptional economic justification.

6. What is needed to impove regulation? The salmon runs to any area require that we know the following things about them:

(a) What are the races, and how can we recognize them before they reach their streams? Sometimes this can be done by place at the time of their migration, some-

times it can be done by their scales or by the size of the fish, or by other means. We need to know the races to define them, and to follow them in their migration.

(b) We need accurate statistics on catch and escapement by races and by age groups. This is basic, and we now obtain little except catch data.

(c) With all big runs that fluctuate markedly, we need forecasts which will allow the resource managers to protect them, or the industry to harvest them.

(d) We need to know with assurance how many spawners are actually required to use fully the available streams and lakes, and how this may vary between years of a cycle.

(e) We need to know how to control the fishing gear and the fishing time in order to get the required spawners to spawning grounds; no more and no less.

The control of the fishing is perhaps the most difficult of all the requirements because of the free movements of the fishing fleet and free entry into the fishery. The matter of entry into the fishery must be solved in order to solve the conservation problem.

The Alaska Book of Regulations concerning commercial fishing contains some 120 pages, and almost all of them are devoted to regulations which have little to do with conservation in the sense of producing the maximum sustainable yield. These regulations force fishermen to be inefficient in order to divide the catch among all who want to fish. They control the size of boats, the size of nets, the size of mesh, the place and the time of fishing. The real conservation regulations are the field announcements which control the actual time and place of fishing, and hence the actual escapement, race by race.

7. What proof is there that precise regulations will work? The proof has been furnished annually in recent years by the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, which regulates the sockeye and pink runs to the Fraser River. Since 1958 this Commission has been obtaining record or near-record catches from many of the sockeye and pink salmon races. They have done this simply by knowing each year how many spawners were needed in each unit of the population and getting them to the spawning grounds in good condition. First they got them up the river past some obstructions, second, they have gotten them through the fishery. They have a system of statistical and biological data collection which allows precise daily control of the catch. They even divide the catch equally between the United States and Canadian fishermen. It costs about a half million dollars a year for such regulations, but it has paid off in canned salmon worth about $25 million annually.

Similar regulation can pay off in Alaska. The salmon runs in the southern half of southeastern Alaska for example, are roughly comparable in complexity to the salmon of the Fraser River, and have a similar productive potential. If we invest a half million dollars a year in the regulation of the fisheries of this area by a professional staff which will thoroughly learn how to regulate the fisheries, we can expect the restoration of the bountiful pink salmon.

Consider another example which I have mentioned earlier—the Kvichak run of red salmon. The total investment from State, Federal, and industry sources is about $100,000 per year for this area. Precise regulation of this $30 million run is probably much easier than the Fraser, but even if a half million dollars is needed for regulation it would be a good investment. Regulation of the Alaska salmon runs as a whole is much more complicated than the regulation of the Fraser River runs. Alaska has major runs occurring along thousands of miles of coastline, most of which is relatively remote, and some of the major runs are biologically more complicated. Bristol Bay sockeye, for example, return at ages of 4, 5, or 6 years; whereas Fraser sockeye return predominately at 4 years of age. I would judge very roughly that as a whole the regulation of Alaskan runs is 8 or 10 times as complicated as the regulation of the Fraser runs, which means that precise regulation would cost near $5 million annually, instead of less than $2 million which it is now costing.

Unquestionably, an increase of $3 million in the Alaska State fisheries budget is a major fiscal problem for Alaska, but that the increase should not occur suddenly, because the professional people required simply could not be obtained. Rather the principle of precise regulation should be applied to one area at a time and gradually extended as funds and personnel become available. The high probability that investment of this kind can pay off at a rate of $25 in wholesale value of the pack for each $1 invested should appeal to any businessman. (It is paying off at a rate of nearly 50 to 1 in the Fraser.)

APPALACHIA IN MARYLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the editorial page of this morning's Baltimore Sun contains an article by Ernest Baugh, a distinguished Maryland journalist.

The article, entitled "Appalachia in Maryland," puts in perspective the historical and economic background of this important section of my State. More important, it emphasizes the efforts which the people of this section of my State have made, on their own, to sustain and expand the economies of Washington, Garrett, and Allegany Counties.

My cosponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which was passed by the Senate on Friday, stemmed from my belief, apparently shared by Mr. Baugh, that the additional resources of the Federal Government could bring the regional effort to an even more successful and more rapid conclusion.

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

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

APPALACHIA IN MARYLAND

(By Ernest V. Baugh)

The Maryland section of Appalachia is not large, in Appalachia as a whole. It contains less than 1 percent of the 165,000 square miles in the mountain region stretching from lower New York to upper Alabama and Georgia. In terms of Maryland, though, it is large; its 1,567 square miles represent more than 15 percent of the State's total area.

In population the Maryland section of Appalachia has slightly less than 1.3 percent of the mountain region's 15.3 million residents. But Maryland's Appalachia accounts for about 6.3 percent of the State's population.

Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties, which make up Maryland's Appalachia, are not in the Atlantic coast corridor, with its population explosion and economic expansion. Western Maryland in a sense is far away, reaching as it does into the Mississippi watershed. In easy labels, Maryland is a coastal, not a mountain, State and its economy has a tidewater base.

Back in colonial times and well into the 19th century the people in the urban areas along the coast considered the Appalachians something to get through on the way to new, developing western lands, not a place to settle in.

George Washington's road pioneering through western Maryland was done solely to establish a trade route to the Ohio River. He took the path he did not because he liked Appalachia but because the Narrows at Cumberland provided a slash through part of the mountains.

It was to open up the new West that the Federal Government built the national road in the early part of the last century. As for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, their names indicate their goals and those goals were not in the mountains. True the canal did not get beyond Cumberland but only because the railroad could do the job of passing through the mountains quicker and better.

Later came the exploitation of Appalachia's natural resources, primarily coal. This brought people into the mountains to remain, not to pass through. But the boom was based on an extractive economy and when the natural resources were depleted hard times came.

True, there was some industry but not enough to absorb the unemployment pool. People began to drift away; the area generally became depressed, except in a few of the urban spots where manufacturing had flourished. What is the answer?

There has been much talk about turning large areas of Appalachia into recreation centers. Steps toward that end have long since been taken in the Maryland section: witness the big State forests and parks and the development around Garrett County's Deep Creek Lake. However, some of those who have become experts in Appalachia's problems hold that recreation is not the answer, that the best promise rests in an expansion in manufacturing.

Here again western Maryland has not been sitting on its hands. Manufacturing has been expanded, particularly in the Hagerstown and Cumberland areas. According to a recent report western Maryland accounts for 8 percent of the State's manufacturing employment, a figure that runs higher than its share in the State's population.

Appalachia, along with the rest of the country, has shared in Federal aid programs: unemployment relief, retraining, forest rehabilitation, attacks on stream pollution, highway construction, and so forth. Now, if the House approves the Senate-passed administration bill for a $1.6 billion relief and rehabilitation program, Appalachia will be given a special uplift.

The time is ripe for such an uplift and, parochial though it may be to say so, particularly in our section of the mountain areas. The people up there have done a lot on their own to raise the economic level in the three counties; with a proper boost from the outside they could go much further and much faster—western Maryland is not without assets for development.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of September 27 published an editorial entitled "Not a Rush Job." The editorial points out that in California, 6 million people from Los Angeles County have in the California State Legislature a single senator, while in another district in that State 1 senator represents only 14,000 people.

We have a somewhat similar situation in New Mexico, where 1 county has 1,874 people and another county has 262,199. This indicates the difficulty of a present problem, and suggests that, while there is no urgent need for haste,

the courts should make it their business to see that these serious inequities are minimized.

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

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 27, 1964]

NOT A RUSH JOB

The Senate's 6-week reapportionment struggle has ended with nothing more than a mild appeal to the courts for a measure of commonsense restraint in requiring compliance with the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" ruling. The specific suggestions proposed by the Senate, however, are entirely reasonable—and the courts should give them full consideration.

There was a good deal of conversation during the debate as to whether this subject is any of Congress business. Of course it is. The "sense of Congress" resolution is wholly proper. In fact, we think it would have been appropriate to have gone one step further, as Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN were on the verge of proposing at one point, and to place the resolution's sensible guidelines within the context of a directive to the courts.

For reapportionment is clearly a legislative function, and there is some basis for the deep concern which many constitutional lawyers feel about the courts having entered this arena at all. The basic responsibility rests, of course, with the legislatures of the States. And it was their refusal over a long period of years to correct malapportionment which provided the occasion for court intervention.

Now that the courts have stepped in, reapportionment must proceed. The grievances of misrepresentation are not imaginary. With the growth of urban concentrations, these evils have attained very serious proportions in many places. In California, for instance, the 6 million people of Los Angeles County have a single senator, while in another district of that State 1 senator speaks for only 14,000. How can anyone defend such imbalances?

Having said this, however, we think the courts have an obligation to give the States reasonable time in which to correct such conditions. Surely the 15-day period which a Colorado court gave that State legislature to come into session—and to reapportion itself—was not reasonable. Surely it is not necessary to so disrupt the orderly conduct of State affairs that three separate elections, as in New York, are required to reconstitute that legislature.

The States should not be permitted to stall in fair readjustment of their assemblies. But the courts have no magic wand by which this complex process can be easily achieved. And there is no such urgent need for haste as to justify the hardship and damage that would result from precipitate action. The courts should make it their business to see that these effects are minimized.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FREEDOM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have just had the opportunity to read an outstanding sermon delivered last July by Dr. John R. Richardson, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Atlanta.

The sermon, entitled "The Christian and His Freedom," brings a message which is both thought-provoking and extremely timely. Dr. Richardson declares that the preservation of freedom and individual liberty is the overriding issue of our time; that, and I quote from his sermon, "the erosion of freedom is America's paramount peril."

Mr. President, I commend this splendid sermon to Members of the Senate and to the American people, and I ask that we think on what Dr. Richardson has to say and to heed his words.

I ask unanimous consent that this sermon be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FREEDOM

"With a great sum obtained I this freedom."—Acts 22: 28.

"If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."—John 8: 36.

God alone is completely free. He is answerable only to Himself. To no other is God accountable. At no time is God under compulsion except to the law of His own Being. While this is necessary it is also the highest freedom.

The freedom of God is His rational self-determination. God has reasons for acting as He does. God's actions were induced from perfect motives. In each act, however, God acts from the posture of freedom.

It should be obvious to any intelligent reader of the Bible that the free God is deeply concerned about freedom. What God takes so seriously should not be lightly considered by Christians. The person who learns to think Biblically will soon become dedicated to freedom.

If ever man needed clear Biblical guidance on the subject of freedom, the time is now. We must be prepared to listen to what God has to communicate to us as we study the Scriptures.

The idea of freedom as the happy state of not being a slave prevails throughout the Bible. Freedom is looked upon as a supernatural blessing. It is unattainable apart from God. Only through God's favor can it be maintained. Disobedience to God inevitably means the loss of freedom.

Many false notions are being propagated regarding freedom. Some have the idea that to be free is to do anything we like. It is the right to have our own way at all times. The lad who is chafing under parental discipline says, "I want to be free." He means he wants to have his way and no questions should be asked. The husband or wife tired of family responsibilities says, "I want to be free." The result is that some excuse is manufactured for a divorce.

Another common mistake is to limit freedom to political liberty. No sane person would minimize the value of political freedom but history demonstrates that in itself it cannot really make men free. The French Revolution is a classic example of the fallacy of this nation. Upon the monuments of the French Revolution were inscribed the motto, "Liberty, equality, fraternity." What followed? Political liberty alone brought the imposition of a reign of terror and the abridgement of other liberties.

The paramount issue of our day is the survival of freedom. Here is where we must draw the line and fight. The Duke of Wellington was an astute military commander. He said a smart military leader must give intensive thought to the choice of the battlefield where he will take his stand. This he did when he decreed to mass his armies on the heights at Waterloo.

As informed Christians in the contemporary world we must choose the battlefield where we shall take our stand. It must be the battlefield of human freedom in a world that is rapidly losing its freedoms. Here is where we should concentrate our energies and our efforts.

Freedom has not fared well during the past three decades. The prospects for the future are not bright. Some are praying that 1964 will be a banner year for freedom. God will determine whether or not we deserve freedom.

How shall we think of freedom? I do not have a perfect definition to offer. In this study on the Christian and his freedom I submit two, either of which may be considered satisfactory. One: "Freedom is the state in which a person is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another or others." Two: "Freedom is the right to do what is good and right and fair in every area of life."

When can it be said that a person is free? When one is free from something, in something and for something. A man may be said to be free when he is free to choose without coercion. It is freedom to choose between good and evil, and choose between good things.

Freedom for all practical purposes is the power of self-determination. The Book of Proverbs describes a freeman as one who governs his own spirit. A free society is one that determines the form and function of its government and the structures of its social life.

I. THE CHRISTIAN MUST BE ALERT TO THE FACT THAT FREEDOM MAY EASILY BE LOST

Any student of the history of human beings must be aware of the ease in which men lose their freedom. Freedom can be lost suddenly, but it can also be nibbled away. This goes for every kind of freedom. It is especially noticeable in reference to men's personal, political, and economic freedoms.

God originally made man a free being. This freedom was an integral part of man's native endowment. God so made man that he could say "Yes" or "No" to his Creator. In this respect man was superior to the animal creation. Animals are regulated by instinct instead of volition. In nature there is no such thing as we call freedom. Nature operates by necessity. Nature cannot lose its freedom because it has none.

God tested man's ability to handle his freedom. The test was made on the basis of obedience. God informed man that there is a sphere that is reserved to the Creator alone. There is a fruit of which human beings may not eat. God alone knows what is good and evil. Man must recognize that he is a creature and accept his creaturely limitations.

Seduced by Satanic suggestions man failed to meet the test. The record is one of failure. The idea that man would not have to give an account to a higher power was quickly exploded. Man instantly realized that he was not his own master, and that his freedom was under God. Thus from the start sacred history reveals how swiftly man can lose his personal freedom and become a slave to sin. The first 11 chapters of the Bible graphically depict the consequences that follow the loss of freedom.

For a conspicuous instance of the case in which men lose their political and economic freedom let us learn from secular history. This time let us review a portion of the history of ancient Greece. Greece at one time had a passion for freedom but lost it. How?

Most of us who have studied Grecian history recall Pericles. He started a sort of public works administration. Desiring popularity he initiated certain giveaway programs. To promote these schemes it was necessary for Pericles to dip freely into the public treasury.

Pericles became more and more popular as he sponsored these measures. He was elected 15 times to a position similar to the Presidency of the United States. As time passed Pericles requested and was granted more and more power. So much power was concentrated in his hands that he could decide the issue of war or peace.

When the popularity of Pericles began to wane he started a war with Sparta. This Peloponesian war was wholly unnecessary. But Pericles believed that this was the best way to bolster his fading power and popularity. When things looked shaky Pericles promised the people government money. When something more dramatic was required he was ready to start a war.

Then came along a citizen by the name of Cleon. He desired the position held by Pericles. He decided that the surest way to secure it was to outpromise Pericles. This he did. He promised increased pay and shorter hours. The populace began to listen to him. He proposed more government. The people thought this was fine.

Finally Pericles lost out and Cleon took over. It was imperative that Cleon should make good on his promises. To increase government the money had to come from somewhere. To procure it Cleon was ready to extort it from every possible source. Taxation became almost equivalent to confiscation. Cleon put more and more people on the public payroll. A vast parasitic bureaucracy resulted from this device.

When in the third century Philip of Macedon destroyed Greece he found the people ground down by poverty and resigned to a dependence on the state for their crusts of bread. The rise of a huge centralized government brought about the loss of freedom. An irresponsible government had cost Athens her freedom.

A well-known observation on human behavior applies here. Those who choose to ignore the mistakes of history are condemned to repeat them.

When the Constitutional Convention had done its work, Benjamin Franklin was walking down a Philadelphia street. A woman accosted him with the inquiry: "Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?" "A republic, Madam," he replied tersely, "if we can keep it." This is the exalted task for each American.

II. THE CHRISTIAN MUST NEVER FORGET THAT OUR AMERICAN FOREBEARS WERE NOT CONTENT TO PAY LIPSERVICE TO FREEDOM, BUT SOUGHT TO GUARANTEE TO EVERY MAN HIS LEGAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE ARBITRARY WILL OF ANOTHER

Our American Government was founded by men who believed there should be a minimum of interference with human freedom. They abhorred coercion in any form. They had suffered from oppression and tyranny and were determined to establish a government that would respect the demands of freedom. They sought to make it impossible for the state to usurp man's inalienable rights.

It was the conviction of the architects of our civil government that it should be the function of government to protect its citizens against internal and external aggression, but should otherwise leave alone people to work out, unhampered, their own problems and aspirations. On this point there was no dissent.

One of the chief political beliefs of these wise men was that persons who make wise choices are entitled to enjoy the benefits of such choices. At the same time they consistently held that those who make foolish choices must suffer the consequences, and have no right to demand that the government pay for their mistakes.

It is evident from the records of the early days of our Republic that our forebears fearlessly maintained that every citizen has the right to use and enjoy his honestly acquired property. This right gave the owner the privilege of trading it, selling it, regulating it, or even to donate it if he so desired.

When we compare our present condition in reference to freedom with conditions a century ago we shall quickly see how great a change there has been and not for the better. In 1852 Carl Schurz, a wise young man who visited our country, wrote home and gave some of his observations on American life. As quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, the letter said, "Here in America you can see how slightly a people needs to be governed * * * Here are governments, but no rulers—governors, but they are clerks.

"All the great educational establishments, the churches, the great means of transportation, etc. that are being organized here—almost all of these owe their existence not to official authority but the spontaneous cooperation of private individuals. It is only here that you realize how superfluous governments are in many affairs in which, in Europe, they are considered entirely indispensable, and how the opportunity of doing something inspires a desire to do it.

"It is my firm conviction that the European revolutionists will drive the next revolution into a reaction merely through their lust for government, through their desire to improve things quickly and positively. Every glance into the political life of America strengthens my conviction that the aim of a revolution can be nothing else than to make room for the will of the people—in other words, to break every authority which has its organization in the life of the State, and as far as possible, to overturn the barriers to individual liberty."

This eloquent plea for strictly limited government and individual liberty is urgently needed in 1964. Once more we need to heed the trenchant remark of Woodrow Wilson, "The history of the development of freedom is the history of the limitation of the power of the government and not the growth thereof." This applies to all governments, for all tend to abuse their power. It is most distressing to find that many so-called molders of opinion are promoting the philosophy of an ever-expanding government.

Dr. Howard E. Kershner in his brilliant booklet called "The Hangman's Rope" exposes the movement in our Nation that is pushing hard for more and more executive and judicial usurpation. He reminds us that Executive order and court decree are prime planks in the Communist platform.

Vastly important, therefore, is the necessity to return to the original American conviction that there must be only a minimum of interference on the part of the Federal Government with the human freedom. Every department of our National Government should be overhauled and restructured to conform to the original American idea. Then the movement on the part of the institution of government to deny or suppress human freedom would be halted and Americans could again breathe the fresh air of liberty. Two pertinent questions for the consideration of this point are: Where do I fit into this picture? Shall I be a link in the chain of American freedom?

III. THE CHRISTIAN MUST BE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT IN EVERY CENTURY FREEDOM HAS CARRIED A HIGH PRICE TAG

Human freedom is a hard-bought thing. Said the chief captain to Paul, "With a great sum obtained I this freedom." (Acts 22: 28.) Human freedom is never cheap. It is costly. Somebody has had to pay for it. The cost involves struggles and sacrifices. Frequently pain is required to purchase and maintain freedom. In every century freedom has carried a high price tag.

Our forebears braved all the hardships and perils of the vast ocean and uncharted American wilderness that they might find freedom in a new world. They, too, were conscious that they could say, "With a great sum obtained we this freedom."

Half the population of the world today is living without the enjoyment of their fundamental freedoms. The other half is in danger of losing theirs. Lovers of freedom must be seriously concerned about this situation. This condition constitutes a ringing challenge to all who still enjoy some measure of freedom's holy light.

We are challenged to sacrifice our time to think through the problems of freedom. We are in the midst of a world revolution. The issues that divide us in the East and West are not to be settled on the battlefield, but in the minds of men. Just as the early Christians "outthought" the pagans of their day so we must "outthink" the pagans of our day. It is incumbent upon us to think sanely about human freedom to persuade others as to the truths of our beliefs. Church resolutions have proven to be ineffective in this area. The issue of freedom challenges our best thought.

Often the challenge of freedom is for the sacrifice of life. To overthrow the bid of the totalitarians for the complete domination of the world, many brave souls have had to sacrifice their lives. To destroy the nazism of Germany, the imperialism of Japan, the fascism of Italy, and the communism of Russia large numbers yielded their blood.

Patriots and martyrs speak to us from their graves that freedom is expensive. The voices of these men and women who have advanced the cause of human freedom in the world are still ringing down the centuries telling us that freedom is purchased by a great sum but it is worth all that it costs.

There are many names inscribed on the honor roll of human freedom. One of the most conspicuous is the French maid, Joan of Arc. Her's is a voice that still resounds down through the centuries.

In 1429, Orleans was besieged by by English armies. The French King was insane. The two major political parties among the nobles were involved in bitter disputes. Henry V took a well equipped army across the channel and captured the principal towns of Normandy, and methodically ravaged the country as he passed through it.

Joan of Arc felt divinely called to break the siege of Orleans and save her country. Despite the opposition of her family she said, "Before mid-Lent I must be with the King, if even to get there I must wear off my legs to the knees." She cut off her long hair, put on male garments and set out under an escort in February 1429. She found a terrified and broken French Army. Soon she filled the soldiers with enthusiasm and determination. Orleans was saved.

Captured by the British she paid the price that freedom required. By English hands she was burned. The execution took place May 30, 1431, in the public fish market of the old city of Rouen. The ashes of Joan were carried by the executioners to the Seine and thrown in, so that no vestige of that saint should be left.

This patriot loved France dearly. She believed that France should be free to develop her own type of life and institutions without meddling from other nations. Her motivation was not hatred. She said, "Of hate for the English I know nothing; I only know they must be driven out of France, for this is not their country." The dynamic motivation of her career was freedom. In our generation may the same passion be for freedom, and a willingness to pay the price even to the uttermost farthing.

IV. THE CHRISTIAN WHO IS SENSITIVE TO NATIONAL TRENDS MUST BE KEENLY CONSCIOUS OF THE FACT THAT THE EROSION OF FREEDOM IS AMERICA'S PARAMOUNT PERIL

The erosion of freedom is America's paramount peril. Thoughtful people recognize that something is radically wrong with our country. There is a growing uneasiness that something tragic is happening to American life. American morals are at a new low. Some colleges and universities are teaching that morality is "relative" and "one person's opinion is as good as another's." There are no moral absolutes, we are told.

Alarming is the breakdown in family life and family discipline. Parents are pampering their children and they are becoming irresponsible and soft. Children are permitted to indulge in anything that the crowd does.

But our paramount peril is the loss of our individual rights and freedoms. Too many of our decisions are reached under coercion, and coercion damages the exercise of the will. Our power of self-determination is progressively impaired with the passing of each year. The book of Proverbs describes a free man as one who governs his spirit, and a free society is a people that determines the form and function of its government and the structures of its social life.

This peril is noticed in many areas of American life. It is particularly visible in the sphere of economics. Some appear not to be concerned about the hazard in this area because they are unaware of the truth that without economic freedom all other freedoms are in serious jeopardy.

Those who lean heavily to the economic left would make it appear that a free market economy is incompatible with Christianity. The very opposite is the truth. Christian ethics require economic freedom. We cannot afford to be ignorant of this truth.

Collectivists frequently affirm that they began their acceptance of socialism for moral reasons. This fallacy should be exposed as contrary to sound reasoning. Our commonsense should teach us that a superior economic order that results in abundance is more moral than one that issues in scarcity and ultimate bankruptcy. The twin pillars of socialism are social planning and nationalization. Experience shows that such a program inevitably leads to waste, disorder, and a lower level of productivity.

Experience demonstrates that economic activity is better left to the voluntary cooperation of all individuals through a free market, unregulated prices, and open competition. The record of one European country after another reveals that socialism is the sure way to poverty, economic disorder, and economic imbalance. The remarkable recovery of West Germany under Erhart since 1948 is a brilliant example of the fact that everybody is better off as the result of a free economy.

We need to learn that socialism in its enthusiasm for bureaucratic organization, political centralization, economic regimentation, and subordination to the whims of the state is committed to a program that is not harmonious with the requirements of human freedom.

On moral grounds the Christian must ever be skeptical of the tenets of socialism. It is simply not moral to support a system that eventuates in social disorder, inefficiency, and poverty. Such a system that operates by coercion cannot be ethically defended. Free people outproduce, and it is not right to "muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn."

Here, then, is our peril. Once a government gains control of the economic area of life it can control every facet of your life. History underscores the truth that once this power is acquired sooner or later all of our activities are subjected to governmental regulation and exploitation to political ends. When a free economy is gone, it will not be long until other freedoms will disappear with it.

V. THE CHRISTIAN SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THE DEFENDERS AND PROMOTERS OF FREEDOM

Who are the defenders and promoters of freedom? People everywhere claim to believe in freedom, even the Communist. In fact, "peace and freedom" appear to be their favorite words. Yet Communist countries are bereft of freedom. This question will be answered first from the negative standpoint and then affirmatively. Let us now try to identify both the enemies and friends of freedom.

Freedom has not fared well among many of our legislators. We thank God for men in our legislative halls who are devoted to freedom. From all appearances this group is relatively small. Many of our legislatures are conducting funeral services for freedom. They are burying freedom under legislation. We have too many manmade laws. God gave through Moses 10 laws for the regulation of the human race. Christ consolidated the 10 into 2 commandments. It would serve the cause of freedom if some bold candidate would adopt a platform to repeal legislation that militates against freedom.

Freedom is not usually defended by lobbyists and pressure groups. Of course they all claim altruistic motives and goals. The fact is most of them represent special interests and work for selfish advantages. They tend to restrict and threaten freedom. It has been said that there are over 400 pressure groups in Washington.

The cause of freedom is not defended or promoted by those who say that patriotism is outdated and one's loyalty should be to the whole world. However plausible this may sound it does not work in the interest of freedom. It only serves to make it easy for gullible people to embrace alien idealogies under the guise of what is popularly called the new internationalism.

Freedom finds no defenders and promoters among the demonstrators on the streets and in public places. The place to take grievances is the court of justice. To trespass on private property is a violation of the essence of freedom. Such a practice is certainly not helping the cause of freedom.

The cause of freedom is impaired by executives in Government who phone Members of the Congress to threaten or bribe them into a course of action to enhance their political prestige. The legislative branch of Government should be left alone by the executive branch in order that legislation be enacted without coercion.

Those who plead for a policy of coexistence with systems that are the antithesis of freedom are not defenders and promoters of freedom. Such a policy is destined to undermine freedom. It is simply a trap to catch the support of unsuspecting people. Such a policy is designed to lull people to sleep. While good men sleep the enemy gets his opportunity to sow tares.

Our best defenders and promoters of freedom are those who take seriously the teachings of the Bible. The Bible is freedom's greatest bulwark. The Bible denies that the state has the right to use man as a mere tool to further its godless ends. The Bible heaps denunciation upon those who would rob man of freedom. The influence of the Bible is always on the side of freedom. The Bible inspires one to resent every repressive act of government whether it affects him directly or not.

We must also include in the list of defenders and promoters of freedom those who teach and maximize the provisions of our U.S. Constitution. The aim of the U.S. Constitution is to safeguard individual liberty. This it does when interpreted in its plain meaning as it relates to limited government powers and the division of these powers. The language is so understandable that court decisions ought to be predictable by judicially minded men.

Finally, the defenders and promoters of freedom are those who so passionately desire it that they will pray for it. Each day our prayer should be for freedom for ourselves and for others. Pray that "long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light." We should include in our prayers petitions for the restoration of the freedoms that have been lost, the preservation of what is left, and the extension of freedom to those who are fettered in bondage.

VI. THE CHRISTIAN MUST PROCLAIM CHRIST AS THE SUPERLATIVE LIBERATOR OF MEN

If the quest for freedom is to be one of the great aims of our lives it would be a major tragedy to fail to recognize that Christ is the superlative liberator of men. Freedom was His aim. Freedom is a derivative from Christ. He saw around Him many kinds of tyrannies. His own country was frightfully oppressed. There were multitudes who were slaves to their own baser passions.

One of Christ's major claims was His ability to liberate men. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." (John 8:36). Many had promised freedom but their promises were bogus. Some were simply demagogs. Others were mistaken as to the right way to secure freedom. One discerning thinker expressed the thought this way: "Christ's Gospel did not promise freedom, yet it gave it: More surely than conqueror, reformer, or patriot, the Gospel will bring about a true liberty at last."

Moral bondage is the worst form of servitude. It has been observed that the worst type of slavery is that which cramps the noblest powers. Go to the alcoholic and study him. He is a slave. He would stop this destructive habit, but he cannot. He has sold out to this sinful practice and cannot liberate himself. He needs a supernatural liberator. He needs Christ. From the thraldom of drink nothing but Christ and His truth can deliver. The testimony of Morgan Blake in his book read by many Atlantans can be duplicated by thousands of others.

Since the unregenerate man is destitute of freedom, he has to be made free. This is why Christ insisted, "if the Son," meaning the Lord Jesus Christ, "make you free, you shall be free indeed." He is fully competent to liberate those who are under the tyranny of sin and the dominion of Satan. This, He said, is the central reason for His coming into the world. To this end He was anointed to preach "deliverance to the captives and set at liberty them that are bound."

It is the glory of Christ the Liberator that He emancipates the Christian from the dominion of sin, from the wrath of God, from the power of Satan, and from the unwarranted authority of men. From the positive standpoint, Christ the Liberator frees the Christian to serve the Lord. The Scripture puts the idea this way: "that being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life."

Of interest to note is the means that Christ employs in the establishment of freedom. The means He proposed was what He called "the truth." It is Biblical truth that has brought freedom to those who have suffered under various forms of despotism. "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (John 8: 32.)

Force, at times, has helped the cause of freedom. Wherever it has been employed to this end we respect it. We enthusiastically honor the liberators of nations. But Christ knew the limitation of force in the acquisition of freedom. Thousands would have followed Him had He proposed a revolt and the use of force in removing the Romans. This, He realized, would have been abortive.

Education, if the right kind, may help the freedom movement. But secular education by itself has never been able to make or keep men free. Often it enslaves men to their own intellectual pride. Christ never said, "You shall be educated, and education shall make you free." What He had in mind was something distinct from what we call education.

It is the truth about God, the truth about man, the truth about salvation, the truth about destiny beyond death that makes men free. It is this kind of truth that fits men for freedom and makes them free. Isn't it about time that we learn this?

CONCLUSION

The study on freedom must now come to a close. I trust it will be the beginning of a fuller devotion to freedom. A few concluding remarks are in order.

We must support education for freedom. Freedom schools that are sound should be encouraged. One such school is in Colorado Springs. Robert LeFevre is president. The minds of our young people should be saturated with freedom literature. Maybe we can start a Library of Freedom. The day for the conservative thinker has arrived. There are readers ready to see what we have to say about the disease that is afflicting America, and the remedy.

Every valuable article has its counterfeit. There is an ersatz freedom. In line with such we read about freedom from the Ten Commandments, freedom from the need for thrift, freedom from work, freedom from the past, etc. Such fictitious ideas lead to human bondage. It has always done so. We should benefit from the experience of others.

Freedom must be guarded even in the church. It has been betrayed within the church and our age has not escaped it. Think of this in the matter of our giving. Ecclesiastical bureaucrats endeavor to force God's people to give to a cause whether or not they believe in it or prefer to support another cause. We need to learn afresh this principle: "That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of ideas which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." This is our justification for refusing to support the National Council of Churches.

Is freedom still an issue? Skeptically some ask the question, "Is it wise to continue to crusade for freedom when so many other good causes demand our time and energies?" The answer is freedom is not just an issue, it is the issue of our day. It is the issue to all who are alert to the signs of the times. For what shall it profit a nation if it shall seek to create an image to please foreigners and forfeit its own freedom? And before we can export freedom abroad we must make sure it is not a lost cause at home.

As I grow older it becomes clearer to me that many times in life people do not know what is best for them. They do not see the end from the beginning. They are swayed by some immediate consideration and unconscious of their own ultimate interest. Many a voter has been bribed with his own money to vote for a certain candidate only later to be disillusioned. It would be a salutary procedure if each voter would cast his ballot in favor of freedom. A vote for freedom brings no regrets.

My last word is a plea to once again reaffirm our belief in God the Author of Liberty. It is from God we claim our freedom. From Him flow our liberties. They are God given and not state given. Remove God and the structure of our system of freedom collapses. George Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair." We raise high the standard of freedom and ask you to stand with us in the unending conflict between freedom and servitude. Since God is free we must believe that He wills men to be free. "Make a firm stand then, never slip into any yoke of servitude."

THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Charlotte News for September 11, 1964, published an editorial entitled "The Chamber Off Course," which contains some sage observations concerning the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in respect to the reapportionment of membership in State legislatures.

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

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

[From the Charlotte News of Sept. 11, 1964]

THE CHAMBER OFF COURSE

The position of Charlotte Chamber of Commerce directors on reapportionment is sound as far as it goes. Unfortunately, it does not go very far.

In its letter to Senators ERVIN and JORDAN and Representative JONAS, the chamber expresses a laudable caution on the subject of a constitutional amendment that would limit the Supreme Court in the field of apportionment. It urges "the broadest possible study and debate" before such an amendment is approved for submission to the States.

So far, so good. But the letter gives no support to the Dirksen bill which is the only means of making possible the study and debate the chamber desires.

The bill that Senators DIRKSEN and MANSFIELD have worked out in their capacities as party heads in Congress simply calls for a delay of approximately 15 months in the applicability of the Supreme Court's latest apportionment decision. As matters stand now, the one-man, one-vote concept which the Court has imposed on the States could be enforced by the courts immediately. State legislatures would have to reapportion under emergency conditions or run the risk of having elections challenged. The results of inaction by Congress thus might well be impossible to undo.

Contrary to the impression left by those who oppose the measure, the Dirksen bill would not read the courts out of apportionment and leave State legislatures at the mercy of rural minorities. It would give Congress the time for "the broadest possible study and debate"—to use the chamber's phrase—on the vital question of what Congress can do to show the Court that the judiciary's powers in this field are not unlimited, as the Court seems to think.

In our opinion—and somehow we can't believe that the chamber really disagrees here—the Court went too far when it decreed as an absolute constitutional principle that every house of every State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of "one man, one vote." The one-man, one-vote concept may be a perfectly sound one in apportionment; but nothing in this Nation's constitutional history or in earlier Court decisions suggests that it is the only one.

The task of Congress, in our view, is to find a way to get this message across to a Supreme Court that isn't even paying attention to the honest apprehensions of its friends these days. The Dirksen bill would give Congress the chance to do just this. It is now or never. The "sense of Congress" resolution being backed by the administration is a sham, worse than useless.

The Dirksen bill is not some fiendish device to perpetuate malapportionment and rural advantage in State legislatures. It is a last-chance measure aimed ultimately at reserving to States some rights—as well as responsibilities—in this field.

The chamber's congressional action committee, which approved the Dirksen bill, understood that. It's regrettable that the board of directors did not choose to second the committee's support of the Dirksen measure.

SURPLUS STOCKPILE MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill which would make surplus stockpile materials available to schools and hospitals, under the donable surplus property program. When I introduced the bill, I said that I wanted to determine exactly how schools and hospitals could make use of raw materials in teaching and research programs. In working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have asked various educational centers and hospitals to evaluate my proposal and to give me an indication of the uses to which stockpiled materials might be put in their institutions.

I have also had the benefit of the advice of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. The State agencies are the approved bodies through which surplus property has been donated to schools and hospitals under Public Law 152. Mr. Robert H. Arnold, the president of the National Association, has written to me concerning my proposal to extend the surplus property program. I shall insert his letter in the RECORD; but first I quote a part of it which may command special interest this year. Mr. Arnold wrote:

> By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning, and continuation of many health and educational program could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible.

In 1964, we have passed antipoverty legislation which marks a giant step in the struggle to extend economic opportunity to all our citizens. I hope that in 1965 many other Senators will join me in sponsoring a bill which will help research programs at schools and universities that are not wealthy enough to finance adequate research programs by themselves.

Some of the schools and colleges were notified of my amendment to S. 2272 by their State agency for surplus property. Also, I have written to schools of mining, in order to determine to what extent raw materials might be used in educational programs. I am happy to say that the response to my proposal has been deeply encouraging. The University of Alaska needs cadmium, lead, and mercury for scientific research. From the Department of Education of the State of Arkansas, I have learned that the Arkansas Vocational Technical School uses large quantities of raw materials. San Jose State College, in California, has need for copper, rubber, iodine, and tungsten.

The list goes on. The Colorado School of Mines, through its president, Orlo E. Childs, has expressed a strong interest in my proposal. The school uses lead in radiation laboratories for shielding purposes; and aluminum is used as a noncorrosive material in fume hoods. Also, asbestos sheeting is valuable as a lining

for hoods and furnaces which are kept at high temperatures.

From the University of Florida, in Gainesville, I have received word that aluminum, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc are needed in a rapidly expanding graduate program. And the Dudley M. Hughes Vocational School, in Macon, Ga., has stated:

> The surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services, with the least cost to the taxpayers, that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time.

The University of Illinois can make good use of copper and copper base alloys; and the University of Kansas has expressed special interest in acquiring copper, mercury, and nickel. Also, the University of Mississippi has been strongly supporting my proposal.

The Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy has written me a letter which is an excellent outline of ways in which a mining school can use raw materials from the national stockpile. The new Materials Research Center at the University of Missouri School of Mines will investigate the physical-chemical behavior of materials, for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. For this center, stockpiled raw materials would be extremely useful. After reading this excellent letter, my opinion is that no better investment can be made with our raw materials than to donate them to vital research programs at colleges and universities. The defense capability, the educational level, and the all-around vitality of the Nation will be increased. The research programs will be spread over more of the Nation than now is the case, and the less wealthy institutions will be able to breathe life into their struggling laboratories.

I hope all Senators will read the letters which I shall have printed in the RECORD. Hastings College, in Nebraska, has a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, and tin. The South Dakota School of Mines needs copper and manganese dioxide in its laboratory programs. From Tennessee, Austin Peay State College has expressed a desire to obtain lead, graphite, and cadmium for radioisotope work. The physics department at Midwestern University, in Texas, states that aluminum and zinc would be of "inestimable value." Finally, the State of Vermont, through its department of education, has stated that my proposal, if enacted, would "prove invaluable to science programs in all levels of Vermont's educational system."

I am grateful to the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property for notifying so many educational institutions of my proposal. And I deeply appreciate the enthusiastic response of the schools, hospitals, colleges, and universities throughout America. I think the extension of the donable surplus property program to include surplus raw materials will be logical and useful. In an age in which America as a nation is committed to the development of educational excellence, such an extension is really a necessity. This bill is very important to me; and I welcome the support of all Senators who in the past have been backers of the surplus property program, and who are interested in expanding it to meet present and future needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and telegrams I have received on my proposal be printed in the RECORD.

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

August 7, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Room 140, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property is vitally interested in your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As you are aware, the donation program, as approved under Public Law 152, 81st Congress, provides a method whereby surplus property no longer required by the Federal Government is distributed to and through approved State agencies for health, educational, and civil defense purposes.

Since its inception, the donation program has been of untold benefit to the schools, hospitals, and civil defense units throughout the 50 States. The origination and furtherance of many programs have resulted from donations of Federal surplus property, especially in the field of education.

By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning and continuation of many health and educational programs could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible.

We further believe the commercial impact on producers and manufacturers of these materials would be far less if the property were donated rather than being sold.

The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property wishes to go on record as supporting your amendment in every way possible. We know of its potential benefits to health and education throughout the United States.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. ARNOLD,
President, NASASP.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have just heard of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964. I would like to point out that we, here at the University of Alaska, do have need, from time to time, for materials that are held on the present stockpile listings. Specifically for scientific research purposes are cadmium, lead and mercury. These metals are used in moderate quantities and would not affect the overall amounts greatly. However, if they would be made available on a donation basis, as certain surplus items are, it would save us purchasing them from Federal research and development moneys.

The lead is utilized as shielding for various AEC materials utilized in experimental work and the mercury has and will continue to be an important part of our vacuum systems in research laboratory procedures. The cadmium is utilized in chemical assay work in our marine science group to indicate to you some of the areas of utilization that are appropriate for such stockpile materials. I have not taken time to screen the whole campus on this matter but these are materials that I am aware of at present.

Your efforts on our behalf are most appreciated.

Sincerely,

ALFRED H. GEORGE,
Assistant Comptroller for Research.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Pine Bluff, August 4, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Room 427, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have been advised that you are prepared to offer an amendment to Senator SYMINGTON'S bill S. 2272 which would provide for donation of property in the Federal reserve stockpile prior to its disposal by sale.

I believe your amendment would greatly benefit education and would be to the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

The Arkansas Vocational Technical School of which I am director uses large quantities of raw material in our training program, and we could save the taxpayers of this State a considerable amount if we could receive some of the raw materials for our program through the Federal surplus property donation program.

Yours very truly,

ARKANSAS VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
LEON COKER, *Director.*

BRADLEY COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Warren, Ark., August 4, 1964.

Re Senate bill 2272
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that you have submitted an amendment to the Material and Stockpile Act of 1964 with the captioned bill.

Please be assured that I wish you every success in your efforts to pass this bill.

Sincerely,

JOE CARMICAL,
Administrator.

SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE,
Magnolia, Ark., August 3, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Southern State College has benefited greatly from the surplus property it has received through the Arkansas State Department of Education. We appreciate your interest in acquiring additional surplus property for public institutions and your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272.

We sincerely hope that you will be able to get favorable action on this amendment as well as the bill itself.

Yours very truly,

IMON E. BRUCE,
President.

ARROYO GRANDE UNION
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Arroyo Grande, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has come to my attention that the Federal Government is presently negotiating for the sale of certain stockpiled items to foreign countries. Some of the items under consideration for sale are the following: Asbestos, mercury, bismuth, aluminum, cadmium, copper, cartage and fibers, carborundum, feathers and down, iodine, lead, magnesium, graphite, nickel, shellac, rubber, silicone carbide, talcum, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Of this partial list, to use one example alone, is the metal mercury which has great application and use for the teaching of science. If I seek to buy this item through ordinary sources the costs are prohibitive for a junior high school educational program. However, when made available through educational surplus this item alone improves the quality of the educational program in science and the savings for the purchase of mercury can be applied toward the purchase of books in such courses as mathematics, history, geography, etc. It would be possible to use many other examples from this limited list to demonstrate how the instructional program can be improved if these items are made available through educational surplus.

I urge your continued effort to make these items available for educational consumption out of Federal stockpiles rather than have these items sold on international markets.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the schools of America.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS A. CAMPBELL.

RAVENSWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Palo Alto, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington D.C.

Hon. LEE METCALF: Please be informed that we, a small public school district in northern California, do use and do need metals and materials that are occasionally released from the stockpile of strategic materials for consumption by public agencies.

We recommend the support of your proposed legislation in this matter.

Sincerely,

CRAIG A. SNASDELL,
Assistant Superintendent,
Business Services.

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO,
San Mateo, Calif, July 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: This school district, as well as other school districts, in my opinion have use for items such as aluminum, magnesium, copper, lead, graphite, tin, zinc, tungsten, and other materials that are on the strategic list now being considered for release to school districts.

I would like to state that I would support legislation to make these items available to schools. Such legislation would put these surplus materials to beneficial use and would provide savings to the school districts throughout the Nation.

Your support of this legislation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

MATTEO V. FASANARO,
Business Manager.

CRESCENT UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Crescent City, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We have just learned that many surplus items have sometimes been made available for sale rather than to educational agencies through the donation program.

Among these items are aluminum sheet, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, copper, cordage and fiber, feathers and down material, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, nickel, rubber, shellac, silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

We recognize many of these items as being desirable for our educational programs. Inasmuch as our district has been able to acquire many things that otherwise we would have had to do without, and our program is better because of the many surplus items available to us, may we suggest that the donation program be given the opportunity of acquiring the above items, so that we can more economically meet our educational needs.

Very truly yours,

D. DEVAR FELSHAW,
District Superintendent.

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE,
San Jose, Calif., July 24, 1964.

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

We are in favor of your proposal to release stockpile materials for use in schools prior to outside sale.

For instance, we use considerable quantities of mercury, asbestos, copper, cordage, fibers, lead, rubber, shellac, silicons, and zinc. We use medium quantities of aluminum, carborundum, and tin; we use small quantities of graphite, iodine, magnesium, nickel, talc, and tungsten.

Our large engineering, science, industrial arts, and aeronautics instructional programs use most of the materials. Other instructional courses and plant operations use the materials in various quantities and in special projects.

We are a conscientious user of educational surplus property and would like to see you expand the program.

D. C. PETERSEN,
Purchasing Officer.

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Hayward, Calif., July 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We are requesting your support of an amendment to Senate bill 2272 in which you are offering to make all surplus stockpile items available to schools prior to their being offered to commercial sources. We are particularly interested in items which are manufactured with ingredients including mercury, aluminum, and copper. These aforementioned items are in great demand by our school district and we feel that we would realize a large financial saving if we could be offered these items on a priority basis.

Thank you very much for any consideration which you may give us in this very important matter and we will certainly support your amendment in whatever way you feel we are able.

Respectfully,

H. MARSHALL HANSEN,
Business Manager.

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES,
Golden, Colo., July 21, 1964.

Senator METCALF,
The Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to express our gratitude to the Senators and committeemen who have been helpful in keeping the surplus property program on the very active basis which it has been extended to the schools and colleges of our country. We have had many and varied uses for the wonderful items that have been offered for our use. We would like to let you know that we have uses constantly in different ways for the following items:

Lead is used in our radiation labs for shielding sources. It is also used in many of our experiments in metallurgy and so forth.

Mercury is used in some application or another in nearly all of our labs, and we are constantly buying this item on the open market.

Aluminum in both the sheet and rod forms is used as a noncorrosive material in our fume hoods and in building a great deal of equipment where we have a high corrosive factor.

Copper in both the sheet and rod form is used throughout the labs in a great many ways.

Asbestos sheeting is used to line a few hoods and furnaces where high heat concentration burns out most other products of this type. We also use raw asbestos as an insulator for both heat and cold.

Pearl silicones are used as greases in our petroleum labs and in many other places throughout the school.

We have appreciated your help in the past on needs pertaining to surplus property and solicit your support in continuing the program in the future.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST E. WATERS,
Purchasing Agent.

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES,
Golden, Colo., August 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I read your letter of July 8 concerning possible donation of surplus property to schools and hospitals with considerable interest. Our faculty has indicated desire to secure some of the materials you mentioned for research purposes. I am attaching a statement containing some details concerning potential uses of certain of the materials. Other possibilities will certainly develop in the future.

You will note that, in addition to research, certain of the materials would be useful to use in student laboratories and in constructing apparatus for these laboratories. In fact, small amounts of most of these materials are always in demand for routine laboratory use.

I appreciate having this matter called to my attention. I hope that this answer will be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,

ORLO E. CHILDS,
President.

Copper: A minimum of 500 pounds to be used in the foundry program and to be used in construction of equipment for teaching and research.

Corundum: 2 pounds for experimental flotation studies.

Diamond dies: 2 sets suitable for use in laboratory equipment to reduce metal rods to metal wire of small diameter.

Graphite, iodine, and manganese dioxide: 5 pounds each for use as chemicals in experimental programs.

Mercury: 100 pounds to be used chiefly in pressure measuring instruments.

Ruby: Small quantity (possibly 100 grams) to be used for experimental purposes.

Selenium: 5 pounds of high purity selenium to be used in the study of selenium alloys with other metals.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senator from Montana,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: During the past several years the University of Florida has obtained through the Federal surplus property program, many important items of equipment. In one instance we were successful in obtaining at considerable savings, all of the major items of equipment needed to establish our campus laundry.

Greater emphasis is now being placed on our graduate programs and on sponsored research. These two areas of emphasis often require our laboratory technicians and metalworking craftsmen to fabricate parts and components of various sizes and shapes. These when assembled become laboratory and field test equipment that must perform under varied and extreme conditions of operation, weather, etc.

The above described graduate and research program will require our obtaining varying amounts of the following materials: Aluminum, bismuth,[1] cadmium,[1] corundum,[1] copper, copper base alloys, graphite, lead, magnesium,[1] mercury,[1] nickel, rubber,[1] silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

If any of the above now in the strategic materials stockpile were offered to us through the Federal surplus property program, prior to sale to industry, considerable savings would be realized by the University of Florida.

Any assistance that you or your committee might be in obtaining the release of the above type of materials to the Federal surplus property program would be appreciated by all colleges and universities.

It is my hope that you and your committee will continue your outstanding work in making available to educational institutions numerous items of equipment surplus to the needs of our Federal Government.

Cordially yours,

J. WAYNE REITZ,
President.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tallahassee, July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that you are sponsoring an amendment to the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 which will permit the donable surplus property program for health and education institutions the opportunity to review and request materials declared excess to stockpile needs.

Such an amendment would be of tremendous value to educational institutions such as ours which have large basic research programs, and which also place great emphasis on teaching the physical sciences. Our research program is supported by machine shops on the campus that make the many intricate pieces of equipment required for experimental work. The need for lead, stainless steel, and aluminum is evident for such equipment. Our chemistry and biological sciences departments, both in teaching and research, have need for magnesium, antimony, mercury, iodine, and the like.

With the Government now placing great emphasis on assisting the universities in enlarging their teaching and academic facilities, the possibility of obtaining certain stock materials is most inviting.

Yours very truly,

R. K. SHAW,
Business Manager.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., July 17, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Information regarding your proposed amendment to the Strategic Stockpile Act has just reached us.

A canvas of the departments most likely to benefit from the amendment, engineering, physics, Institute of Marine Science and Chemistry, evoked a unanimous affirmative as to their needs for the materials concerned.

These materials will greatly benefit general science education. Also in many cases the above mentioned departments are constructing equipment and research apparatus under Government contracts which heretofore have supplied the funds to buy these materials, thus any materials received through your efforts will result in a direct saving to the Government.

Sincerely,

U. J. HISS,
Director of Property Control.

---

[1] Amount required is small.

MERCER UNIVERSITY,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that Senate bill, S. 2272, providing for the continuing stockpiling of certain critical materials by the Federal Government to insure their availability in case of emergency will have acted upon an amendment, designated as amendment No. 517, providing that the material cannot be disposed of under this subsection without it being offered for donation purposes prior to its sale. I am now told that some of our Senators feel that this material is of no use for educational and health purposes and therefore are not in favor of the amendment.

I thought, perhaps, it would be of value to you to know the approximate annual needs of Mercer University for materials covered under this subsection and I have requested our science departments to give me an indication, which I shall itemize for you as follows: Aluminum, 5 pounds; asbestos, 1 pound; bismuth, 2 pounds; cadmium, 1 pound; copper and copper base alloy, 5 pounds; graphite, 1 pound; iodine, 5 pounds; lead, 2 pounds; magnesium, 1 pound; mercury, 10 pounds; nickel, 1 pound; zinc, 5 pounds.

Mercer University, as you know, is a small liberal arts college of some 1,500 students and I am sure that our annual needs as indicated above for these materials would represent only a small percentage of the total needs of all institutions of higher learning in the United States. I trust that when this amendment comes before your committee, and before the Senate, that you will support it since it will be of significant value to all American higher education.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM T. HAYWOOD,
Business Manager.

PIEDMONT COLLEGE,
Demorest, Ga., July 17, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Apparently there is some question about the usefulness of certain materials in educational programs. I am writing to assure you that our building and construction program has and would find the following stockpile items to be useful: asbestos, lead, sheet cover, shellac, talc, feathers and down.

Our superintendent of construction and maintenance, Mr. Wilton Duckett, joins with me and all of our staff in expressing appreciation for the many ways in which the commodities provided by Georgia State Agency for Surplus Property have strengthened the total program of education for the young people in Appalachia.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WALTER.

DUDLEY M. HUGHES VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, BIBB COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regard to amendment No. 517 to Senate bill S. 2272. This amendment is of vital interest to our vocational-technical training program in Georgia.

The surplus property program in Georgia is the major source of metals, machine shop "stock" and material for welding training. If we did not have this source of materials for these areas of training the cost of buying these materials on the open market would cause drastic curtailment of many of our training programs in the metalworking and welding fields.

All of the new metals developed have to be introduced to the technicians who are going to use them. All that we ask is that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be allowed to send his surplus property screeners and select whatever metals that we can use at such time that they might become available as surplus to the national stockpile.

It is my thinking that the surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services with the least cost to the taxpayers that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time.

I wish that you could visit our school and see some of the fine uses that we are making of many types of property secured through this program.

We earnestly ask you to give all the support possible to the subject amendment and we assure you that this material will be utilized to the fullest extent in our school.

Sincerely,

RAYMONDE M. KELLEY,
Director, Vocational Education.

ATTACHMENT TO LETTER TO SENATOR LEE METCALF DATED JULY 20, 1964

Listed below are some materials that from time to time could be used in the 26 major training areas covered by Dudley M. Hughes Vocational-Technical School, Macon. Ga.:

Aluminum	Lead
Asbestos	Magnesium
Bismuth	Mercury
Cadmium	Nickel
Copper and copper base alloy	Rubber
	Shellac
Cardage fibers	Silicon carbide
Corundum	Talc
Feathers and down	Tungsten
Graphite	Zinc
Iodine	

MUSCOGEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Columbus, Ga., July 15, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Muscogee County School District is interested in securing additional surplus materials from the Federal Government. Therefore, we are interested in amendment No. 517 to S. 2272.

This school system, along with others, cannot maintain required standards of operation without the benefit of surplus trucks, equipment, and other materials which have been available in the last several years. Some of the materials referred to as having been stockpiled, which could be available to public schools, are used and needed both in the maintenance plant and the instructional program. Reference is made specifically to aluminum, which is used in the industrial arts, vocational, and adult training programs. Aluminum in certain forms can be used in the maintenance of plant. Other materials can be used in similar fashion, particularly copper, copper base alloy, shellac, and other materials commonly used in training situations.

Your continued interest and support of the program to make these materials available to the public schools of this country is appreciated. We request that you do everything possible to help the schools obtain additional surplus property.

NATHAN M. PATTERSON,
Assistant Superintendent
for Special Services.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., July 17, 1964.

Subject: Strategic Materials Stockpile.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The University of Illinois participates in the Federal surplus property utilization program, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the State of Illinois, at the warehouse located in Springfield.

We have been advised that certain items which are of particular need to our research programs are stockpiled, and under consideration for release. The items which we could utilize to the most advantage are mercury, aluminum, copper, and copper base alloys.

Very truly yours,

D. L. HARTMAN,
Buyer.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY,
Lawrence, Kans., August 3, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that a bill is pending which would provide for the release of certain strategic materials from stockpile. I believe that this has been referred to as the "Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964." I have also been informed concerning the proposed Metcalf amendment which would provide for making available many of these materials to schools and hospitals throughout the United States.

In speaking for the Department of Physics at the University of Kansas, I would say that this department would be extremely happy to receive material which would be available, especially aluminum, copper, mercury, and nickel. It would be my feeling that this department, as well as many similar departments over the country, would benefit greatly from the availability of these stockpiled items.

Respectfully yours,

G. M. MCGONIGLE,
Laboratory Supervisor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, DEPARTMENT OF METALLURGY AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING,
Lawrence, Kans., July 29, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have been informed that you propose to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 so that the material would become available to schools and hospitals.

Whether or not the materials would be useful depends upon the condition in which it is stored; whether ingot or finished sheet for metals, bulk or packaged for the nonmetals. If the materials were available in reasonable amounts, say in 100-pound units, our metallurgy department could use the following:

1. All of the metals for use in our metals casting laboratory and experimental alloy work.

2. Graphite, if in block form, for crucibles and electric resistant heaters.

3. Rubber, if not crude, as vibration absorber pads in the laboratory mounting of machinery.

4. Nonmetallics (corundum, asbestos, silicon carbide, and talc are usable in experimental ceramic compositional work).

We appear to have no use for feathers and down, iodine or cordage fibers.

Yours truly,

MAYNARD P. BAULEKE,
Associate Professor.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., July 30, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I support your efforts to make strategic materials from stockpile available to schools and hospitals prior to their general release. Such a provision would be most advantageous to certain of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences of Kansas State University.

Our chemistry department uses large quantities of bismuth, cadmium, copper, and copper base allows, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc for demonstration experiments in the teaching program of the department and for certain research purposes. Mercury in particular is used extensively. The department of physics also uses several hundred pounds of mercury each year in their instructional and research programs. The department of psychology uses considerable amounts of aluminum in various sizes for the construction of different pieces of equipment, particularly in some of of their animal behavior studies.

I appreciate your concern for the needs of educational institutions.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN CHALMERS,
Dean.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., July 22, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has come to my attention that the Materials Reserve and Stock Pile Act of 1964 may release strategic materials for use by educational institutions. I have conferred with the department heads in the College of Engineering and find an enthusiastic response regarding the availability of such materials for our academic program.

Specifically, the Departments of Chemical, Civil, Electrical, Industrial, and Mechanical Engineering of Kansas State University would have need for the following surplus materials: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper, corundum, graphite, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

These materials would be used extensively, both in the instructional and the research programs, with a few of the applications listed as follows:

1. Thermal conductivity experiments; thermocouples.
2. Liquid metal heat transfer.
3. Hydraulic laboratory manometers.
4. Heat transfer under vacuum.
5. Plasma studies.
6. Investigations on engineering properties of materials.

I can assure you that this surplus material would be a significant contribution to our academic program, and that efficient use of it would be made by our engineering faculty.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SHUPE,
For PAUL E. RUSSELL,
Dean.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Frankfort, Ky., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This letter is to express appreciation on behalf of a large number of colleges, technical schools, secondary schools, and hospitals in Kentucky for the effort you are making to allow strategic and critical materials now in stockpile to become available through the donation program.

One can assume that not all categories of material will be needed nor usable by such institutions; however, many can be used and would be of great value as well as withholding that portion off the market thus not disrupting our economy to that extent.

The donation program has been of unestimable value to the institutions in Kentucky as is attested to by the large number of communications and expressions we have received. To make such materials as shellac, aluminum, copper and copper alloys, mercury, graphite, etc., available will mean much in furthering our technical, science, and research programs that would otherwise be hampered if this class of material were not made available through this program.

We therefore urge you and the other members of your committee to "leave no stone unturned" in bringing about a successful conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. WILLIAMS,
Director, Division of Surplus Property.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI,
University, Miss., July 18, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We have learned that you wish to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that when such materials are found to be surplus to present need, they be released only after being offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property.

This would be an excellent thing to the institutions of higher learning and one that would aid these institutions considerably. We hope that you are successful with amending this act.

Very respectfully yours,

H. E. HANEY,
Purchasing Agent.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT ROLLA,
Rolla, Mo., July 20, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reference to your letter of July 8 regarding your proposed amendment of S. 2272. The university, like others devoted primarily or entirely to science and engineering training, has a continuing need for materials, both raw and finished, in both undergraduate instructional and graduate research programs. Our needs for any one material at any one time would, of course, be very small, but the purchase of all our materials requirements consumes a significant portion of our operating capital each fiscal year.

Our use of such materials, as listed in the second paragraph of your letter, may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. In research—the university is establishing a materials research center. Starting in September this facility will have a staff of four senior researchers in ceramics, metallurgy, physics, and chemistry and some five research assistants in various fields devoted to investigation of the physical-chemical behavior of materials for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. The primary objective of the center will be, however, the training of engineers and scientists at the graduate level for materials research and development programs.

2. The undergraduate laboratories and graduate research in both science and engineering require a wide variety of materials. In particular metallurgical engineering uses a rather full spectrum of metals, both ferrous

and nonferrous, in its laboratory course work. The mechanical engineering, mechanics, civil engineering, and chemical engineering employ a wide spectrum of both metallic and nonmetallic materials in undergraduate laboratories, as do the departments of physics and chemistry. Oxides and silicates are used in rather significant quantities in ceramic engineering.

Of the materials listed in paragraph 2 of your letter, we have need for all of those items during the academic year, with the possible exception of feathers. If some of our materials needs could be fulfilled on a donation basis from the materials in the national stockpile, these would be gratefully received, inasmuch as this would permit moneys currently expended for these needs to be used to develop further our instructional program.

On behalf of the university administration I wish to thank you for affording us an opportunity to express interest in your proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

T. J. PLANJE,
Director.

MONTANA SCHOOL OF MINES,
Butte, Mont., July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your letter of July 8 regarding a possible amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, has arrived during Dr. Koch's absence from the campus. Because he expects to be absent for several days, I have contacted the associate director of our Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology and he has furnished the following information in answer to questions asked in your letter.

In answer to your question as to what ways this institution might use strategic materials listed in your letter, we are presuming that these materials are of commercial grade rather than crude ores or materials. If this is true, I do not believe that either the school or the bureau of mines and geology could use very much of most of the materials, and some of them would be of no use to us at all. Following is some indication of the use which might be made of the materials listed:

1. Asbestos: It may be that we could use small amounts for steel pipe insulation.
2. Copper: Small amounts might be used in metallurgical research.
3. Corundum: We have no use for corundum, as such, but do use small quantities of abrasives in manufactured forms such as wheels.
4. Diamond dies: These might possibly be used in metallurgical research.
5. Feathers: We have no use for this material.
6. Graphite: We would have no use for this material as Montana has graphite deposits which would be used on any research problems.
7. Iodine: This would be of no use to us.
8. Manganese dioxide: Small quantities might be used in metallurgical processes.
9. Mercury: Small quantities could be used in research.
10. Pyrethrum: We would have no use for this material.
11. Ruby: Probably all available supply could be used.
12. Selenium: This might be used in metallurgical research.
13. Shellac: This could be used by maintenance department.

I hope the above information will be of some help to you. As you can see, our need for any of these materials for research or instructional programs would be quite small.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LOUISE HUNGERFORD,
Secretary to the President.

HASTINGS COLLEGE,
Hastings, Nebr., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We wish to advise you that we can use to good advantage critical materials as surplus for education.

We have a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, tin, zinc, and many other metals. We urge you to recommend that these surplus metals, and other materials be given to education. The surplus property program has been very vital to Hastings College. Please use your influence to support the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. KONZACK,
Associate Professor, Math and Physics, and Surplus Property Coordinator.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Avery J. Linn, director of the Nebraska State Agency for Surplus Property, has supplied the university with a list of materials and requested that we indicate those which would have the most use to the various departments.

After checking the users of such materials the following are found to be most in demand: aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, graphite, lead, mercury, nickel, rubber, silicon, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

The University of Nebraska has a very close working relationship with the surplus property program in this State and a great deal of pride is taken in the conscientious use of Government surplus.

This program has been of great value to many departments within the university, especially in agricultural and scientific research.

Very truly yours,

L. J. LEGG,
Inventory Manager.

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL
OF MINES, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Rapid City, S.D., July 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reply to yours of July 8, 1964, relative to your intended amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

We have inquired in a number of departments regarding the question which you have asked. We would request and, if made available to us, use substantial amounts of several of the items which you enumerate. Specifically and on this first inquiry, they would be mercury, manganese dioxide, asbestos, and probably copper. They would be used for general laboratory purposes, for research, and for plant operation and maintenance. The principal use would be in research. In this activity, they would provide a very substantial assistance and I assure you we would appreciate it greatly.

I trust that this is the kind of information which you desire.

Very truly yours,

F. L. PARTLO, *President.*

BETHEL COLLEGE,
McKenzie, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We understand that you have introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate in reference to the disposal of surplus stockpile materials. Such bill would offer these materials free to health and educational institutions before they were offered for public sale.

We believe that this is a good bill and that its provisions will be of no small benefit to the Nation's colleges. Although we do not know the entire list of stockpiled materials, we wish to suggest that such things as sheet aluminum, lead, zinc, and tin are used considerably in general maintenance as well as in the making of various scientific equipment. No doubt there are other materials such as iodine, other metals, and miscellaneous items that could be of value to chemistry, and physics, and engineering departments.

We hope that your bill will receive favorable action from the entire Congress and the President.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. ROUSE,
Head, Department of Physical Science.

TREVECCA NAZARENE COLLEGE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We are pleased to learn of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which provides materials to educational institutions. The Science Department of Trevecca Nazarene College could certainly use the following materials: Aluminum, copper and copper base alloys, cordage fibers, iodine, lead, magesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, talc, and zinc.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DIX,
Chairman, Science Department.

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Re strategic materials stockpile.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It would be of great benefit in the teaching program of David Lipscomb College if the college could receive some of the materials being released from the strategic materials stockpile. In conference with the departments of science of the college, it has been determined that important use could be made of the following materials: aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that the bill you have introduced in the U.S. Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stock Pile Act of 1964 will pass, so that any property being released from the stockpile may be offered for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold. This would be of great assistance to the science program of David Lipscomb College.

Sincerely yours,

ATHENS CLAY PULLIAS.

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COLLEGE,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the bill you are introducing to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide property to educational institutions by donation, I would like to encourage you. Many institutions could use the following materials for construction or direct laboratory use: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, rubber, shellac, tin, and zinc.

Sincerely yours,

BROTHER J. EDWARD, PH. D.,
Chairman, Chemistry Department.

MADISON COLLEGE,
Madison, Tenn., July 17, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I recently learned of your proposal to offer for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold, any property being released from the Nation's stockpile of strategic materials. I think this is a fine idea, provided it can be implemented with a minimum of waste and cost to the taxpayer.

Depending on the physical form and/or minimum packaged quantity, Madison College could use asbestos, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, talc, tin, zinc, and possibly others.

Very truly yours,

WILEY C. AUSTIN,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

HOUGHTON, MICH.,
July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your amendment to S. 2272 would be most helpful in providing the quantities of strategic materials such as asbestos, aluminum, magnesium, and others for our undergraduate, graduate, research, and physical plant maintenance program.

MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY,
Dr. R. L. SMITH,
Coordinator of Research.
Prof. G. A. HELLMAN,
Director of Physical Plant.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.,
July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Chemistry, engineering, physics departments use the chemicals and metals which are now stored in Federal strategic materials stockpiles. University of Chattanooga would benefit greatly if these materials were donated to educational institutions.

ROBERT W. FENIX,
Comptroller, University of Chattanooga.

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Recently you introduced a bill in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide for property being released from the governmental stockpile to be offered for donation to health and educational institutions throughout the Nation.

As chairman of the Department of Chemistry and Physics at Memphis State University, we have greatly benefited from surplus materials released to us to be used in instruction of young men and young women in chemistry and physics.

We are a fast growing metropolitan university whose enrollment has more than doubled during the past 5 years, and the anticipated enrollment for the fall of 1964 will exceed 10,000 students. The legislature of the State of Tennessee has not made adequate provision for the growth of the university and supplemental assistance is greatly needed. For this reason I am complimenting you for your interest in providing surplus materials for educational institutions and urge the passage of this act.

Gratefully,

J. W. FOX,
Chairman, Department of
Chemistry and Physics.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We at the University of Tennessee heartily endorse your efforts to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, making it possible for property in the stockpile to be given to health and educational institutions for use in research and instructional programs.

Like other similar universities, our institution has a need for many of the materials being reserved and stockpiled, and we believe it will serve in the public interest for the Government to assist us by filling such needs.

I am asking Mr. David Johnson of our Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering to send you any further details he thinks will be of value to you in promoting the passage of your bill. Mr. Johnson coordinates the university's program of acquiring surplus properties, and he is cognizant of the value of this program.

Please be assured that your interest in strengthening the Nation's institutions of higher education is certainly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. HOLT,
President.

SIENA COLLEGE,
Memphis, Tenn., July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regard to some materials which are a part of the stockpile of surplus property. Some of these things would be of great value to our biology and chemistry departments. Listed are the items which we would find most useful: Aluminum, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Thank you for your help in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

SISTER ADRIAN MARIE, O.P.,
Biology Instructor.

LAMBUTH COLLEGE,
Jackson, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have heard that you have introduced a bill to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that any property being released from stockpile be offered to health and education institutions by donation before it is sold.

On behalf of our college and other small colleges throughout the country I would like to express our sincere interest in this program and hope that you may succeed in getting the bill approved. I realize that we could not use all of the materials that might be offered, but am sure that such materials would be beneficial and give us a chance to get necessary materials that we do not have funds to purchase.

Sincerely,

J. R. BLANTON,
Business Manager.

AUSTIN PEAY STATE COLLEGE,
Clarksville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The bill which you introduced in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 has very recently come to my attention. I should like to comment. Your amendment could be beneficial to any educational institution doing scientific research, and significantly beneficial to schools like Austin Peay State College which are in the early stages of research growth. Although modest research programs have recently been initiated by all of the natural science departments of the college, each department is operating without the basic stockroom supplies necessary for effective use of the time and talent of the faculty which we possess.

The people responsible for the research in our science departments have informed me that they are in general need of brass, copper, and aluminum stock, plus mercury, shellac, and glyptol. Specifically needed are lead, graphite, and cadmium for the radioisotope work. These are all materials which are constantly required in varying forms and quantities, yet their purchase in even moderate amounts is a serious drain on our limited financial resources. Your amendment would remove this drain and thus make available more funds for use in acquiring the specialized apparatus necessary for increased efficiency and sophistication in scientific investigations at Austin Peay State College.

I thank you for your interest in the welfare of science in higher education, and I shall send copies of this letter to your colleagues from Tennessee urging them to support your amendment.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MORGAN,
President.

SAM HOUSTON STATE
TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Huntsville, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We have noticed that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile materials available to institutions. We are constantly in need of aluminum, asbestos, copper, lead, rubber, shellac, and tin. These materials could be used in our instructional program as well as maintenance and repair. We feel that passage of this bill would be of great benefit to this institution as well as other institutions of higher learning in this vicinity.

Yours very truly,

D. C. HOLLEMAN,
Comptroller.

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Wichita Falls, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have heard that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus materials from our national stockpile available for donation to educational and research programs in institutions of higher education. Because of the limited funds under which we operate and the fact that there is seldom a time when we are not in need bordering on the desperate for materials which may be available, I just want to express to you my appreciation for your thoughtfulness in getting this kind of bill before the legislators of this country. I sincerely hope that it does pass.

Some of the items which would be of inestimable value to us, if and when they may be available, are aluminum, copper, lead, tin and zinc (particularly in sheets), which could be used in our physics department. Mercury would also be very useful for this department. This department offers a major and is in the process of considerable expansion. We are in short supply on much of this type of thing. Our chemistry department, as well, could use most of these materials. The geology department, which has shown an upswing in students in the last 2 years, could

also make very valuable use of these items I have mentioned and kindred items. For example, shellac would be very useful for the finishing and protection of geological and biological specimens. Our biology department is constantly in need of asbestos, iodine and the shellac which I have just mentioned.

I sincerely hope that any surplus which develops in our national stockpile can be made available to some of us who need it.

Once again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of higher education. I just wish for you every success in the handling of this bill.

Very sincerely yours,

TRAVIS WHITE,
President.

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Beaumont, Tex., July 14, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has been brought to my attention that you have introduced in the Senate a bill amending the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As I understand, this amendment is to provide the excess material in the stockpile for institutions of higher learning. I would like to state that if these materials become available that Lamar State College of Technology can use aluminum, mercury, lead, shellac, and some of the other materials in this category.

This material has been used in our teaching field and also in connection with our research programs.

I wish to express my appreciation to you for your efforts in scheduling these excess materials for institutional needs.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. GALLOWAY,
Comptroller.

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE,
Abilene, Tex., July 27, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We understand there is a possibility of some reserve materials from the national reserve stockpile being made available to institutions of higher learning. Our science department and industrial arts department are interested in this matter and, of course, appreciate being able to acquire some of these items, especially the following: Aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, corundum, graphite, lead, nickel, shellac, silicon carbide, tin, and zinc.

We understand that you have introduced a bill making the donations of some of these items to colleges possible, and we appreciate very much your interest in our work.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE L. SMITH,
Bursar.

SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE,
San Antonio, Tex., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The information has come to me that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile material available for donation to schools and colleges.

In the teaching of our sciences, especially chemistry, we do have constant need for aluminum, copper (wire and power), corundum, iodine, lead, magnesium (ribbon), mercury, silicon carbide, tin and zinc. If your bill is passed making such materials available on a donation basis, it would be of help to educational institutions in their instructional and research programs.

On behalf of the administration and faculty of San Antonio College, may I thank you for your help in solving our problems.

Very truly yours,

WAYLAND P. MOODY,
President.

STATE OF VERMONT,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Montpelier, Vt., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I was recently informed that you have introduced an amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which would provide that any such materials that are found to be surplus to present needs, be first offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program.

As executive director of special services in the Vermont Department of Education I am in daily contact with local educators, therefore, I am in a position to know that your amendment, if passed, would prove invaluable to science progras in all levels of Vermont's educational system.

I hope your amendment receives enough support to insure its passage.

Sincerely yours,

RUPERT J. SPENCER,
Executive Director.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ROLLO OSKEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 1131, the bill (S. 724) for the relief of Rollo Oskey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill was made the unfinished business only for the purpose of filling a gap, so to speak. I ask unanimous consent that the bill no longer be the unfinished business and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

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

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1298, the bill (S. 2249).

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2249) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "dated", to strike out "September 1963" and insert "July 1964"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "LNPNE 1000 ID" and insert LNPNE 1003 ID"; in line 21, after the word "public", to strike out "access" and insert "access: (1) to the waters of the Little Calumet River and its valley flood plain, except in side drainages, up to the 630-foot elevation or, generally, to the tops of the river banks, and (2) along"; in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "to"; on page 4, line 18, after the word "before", to strike out "April 20, 1961" and insert "October 21, 1963"; on page 8, line 20, after "Sec. 7.", to insert "(a)"; on page 9, after line 2, to insert:

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided,* That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

In line 24, after the word "follows:", to strike out "(1) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by Porter County, Indiana; (2) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by La Porte County, Indiana; (3) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (4) one member to be designated by the Secretary." and insert "(1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town; (3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary."; on page 11, line 15, after the word "There", to strike out "are" and insert "is"; and in line 16, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act" and insert "not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic

interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore", dated July 1964, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1003 ID", which map is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Within the boundaries of the lakeshore the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In order to enhance the recreational benefits of this Act, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire such easements or other interests as he deems necessary to assure public access: (1) to the waters of the Little Calumet River and its valley flood plain, except in side drainages, up to the 630-foot elevation or, generally, to the tops of the river banks, and (2) along the beach and waters of Lake Michigan continuously from the western boundary of the lakeshore in section 21 township 37 north, Indiana base, range 6 west, second principal Indiana meridian, to the easternmost point of intersection of the lakeshore boundary with the shoreline. The Indiana Dunes State Park may be acquired only with the consent of the State of Indiana, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the acquisition of said park. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area described in section 1 of this Act and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area described in section 1 of this Act which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purpose of this Act, he shall establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in lands for the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore for one year following the effective date of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore during all times when an appropriate zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(b) The term "improved property", whenever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be not more than three acres in area, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters, as he may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances for the purposes of sections 4 and 6 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance and any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of such ordinance or amendment by the zoning agency. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning ordinance or zoning ordinance amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property covered by the ordinance within the boundaries of the lakeshore; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area covered by the ordinance within the lakeshore by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning ordinance consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana.

(c) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the lakeshore; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning ordinance, or is subjected to any use, which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

(e) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the lakeshore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of acquisition by the Secretary. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date: *Provided,* That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning ordinance approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary terminates a right of use and occupancy under this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

SEC. 7. (a) In the administration of the lakeshore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided,* That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of establishment of the national lakeshore pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows: (1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town;

(3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expense reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within this lakeshore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on the lands included in such lakeshore.

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for bringing up the bill. On behalf of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out the amendment applying to the Little Calumet River Valley.

On page 3, following section 2, it is proposed to add this additional subsection:

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to seek such cooperative arrangements with the State of Indiana, political subdivisions thereof, and property owners as are required to provide public access to segments of the Little Calumet River and the adjacent river banks between the lakeshore boundary and the east line of section 31 and the Secretary may acquire, other than by condemnation, such easements and other interests in lands or waters as he deems necessary to further the purposes of this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the bill's having been brought up for action. It has been before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for many years. During the course of the discussion two steel finishing mills have been built along the most beautiful section of the Indiana dunes, and there is threatened construction of two basic steel rolling mills on the lake front.

In order to get the bill through, we have, therefore, been compelled by the force of circumstances to exempt several thousand of what were the most beautiful acres, which have now been largely ruined. But we are including for development approximately 11,772 acres, including the 2,100 acres in the Indiana Dunes State Park.

I think I should add that there is no proposal to acquire the Indiana Dunes State Park, but merely to provide for joint arrangement for use between the State of Indiana, if it so chooses, and the National Park Service, for the cooperative development of the area. We propose to add approximately 1,000 acres or more west of Ogden Dunes, which will be used as a mass bathing beach and which will permit other areas of the park to be appreciated and kept in their natural wild state. This will include approximately all of what is known as Dune Acres except for the highly residential portion. This lies some 4 miles to the east of Ogden Dunes and directly west of the Indiana Dunes State Park. Then, flanking the Indiana Dunes State Park on the east, we are including all of Beverly Shores. We are doing this upon the decision of the residents of Beverly Shores.

We are providing that there shall be a permanent possession of improved property on the part of present owners and granting them complete freedom to dispose of their property, subject to local zoning regulations, which must also be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

This bill does not interfere with the proposal to erect a harbor midway between the property of National Steel and Bethlehem Steel, the two companies which have erected their finishing steel plants. Indeed, it may be the only way in which this harbor can be secured.

The bill is a compromise bill. I regret that we could not save the entire area. Life moved too fast for us, and the forces of conservation were not strong enough to save the entire area. But we are providing a relatively beautiful area of 11,700 acres located within 40 miles of the city of Chicago and some 11 miles east of the city of Gary, Ind.

Within the metropolitan area which stretches from Gary up to Kenosha and Racine in Wisconsin, there are now probably close to 7 million people, and there is great need—as there is in all the metropolitan centers of the country—for beautiful recreational sites which are close in to the population.

The national parks of this country are indeed beautiful. I have had the privilege of visting and tramping in nearly all of them, but they are located far away from the great metropolitan centers of the Nation, and it takes days to get to them, and, therefore, access to them is relatively limited.

The Outdoor Recreation Commission, which was headed by Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, reported that the great need was for beautiful recreational areas which are close to metropolitan centers and which can be reached in a short period of time. The Indiana Dunes fit this prescription like a glove.

I am delighted that we have begun to meet those needs. I supported the bill which was recently passed to provide that Fire Island should become a national park. This will provide swimming and recreational facilities for the people of the great New York metropolitan complex. I supported the bill to set aside a park north of San Francisco at Point Reyes. We need many such facilities. The Midwest is badly in need of them.

The metropolitan complex which now stretches from Gary to Racine and Kenosha, but which will shortly probably stretch from South Bend to Milwaukee and then will include at least 10 million people, needs an area such as this perhaps more than any section of the country.

I hope very much that the bill will be passed today. And that House action may be speedily taken. If House action is not taken at this session, we shall be in a better position to act early in the next Congress. The long hard discouraging fight may be on the point of successful conclusion. Let us take the next step now.

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.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President I regret that I was not present when the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke in favor of the pending bill. Minority views have been issued on the bill. For the purposes of the record, I should like to read into the RECORD, what the report of the minority views is, so we can have some exposition of the other position.

In our minority report, which, incidentally, is also signed by my senior colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], we say:

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 2249

Although we are conscious of the ever-increasing need for outdoor recreation fa-

cilities, and we recognize the wisdom of acquiring suitable lands at an early date, we feel compelled to oppose this bill because of the inclusion of certain noncontiguous tracts of marshy land. These noncontiguous tracts are not only unrelated to the main body of the proposed national lakeshore geographically, but are also unrelated insofar as proposed development and utilization are concerned. Our further concern is that the patchwork taking authorized by this bill may later be used as a precedent to take the best part of a landowner's holdings and leave him with only the scraps. It is our belief that the many problems of administration that are present without the inclusion of these noncontiguous tracts are simply compounded by their inclusion, and this is amplified by the fact that they are located many miles from the main body of the national lakeshore. The map of this proposed national lakeshore has the appearance of a crazy quilt.

If it desirable to preserve these unrelated noncontiguous tracts in their present condition, the State of Indiana should take the initiative. As in the case of Cape Cod, Point Reyes, Padre Island, and others, we recognize the desirability of setting aside these areas under equitable principles to insure their preservation for the enjoyment of future generations, but it is not necessary to join unrelated tracts and to assume functions that the State rightfully ought to assume.

Mr. President, that is the minority report. Only this morning, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we considered a bill dealing with certain property in Wisconsin in connection with the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. This land is owned two-thirds by the State of Wisconsin. We are once again authorizing funds to be advanced to the State of Wisconsin, for the purpose of acquiring noncontiguous tracts of land, and once again to have them presumably turned over to the State of Wisconsin as a part of the State park system, and then presumably once again having it charged against Wisconsin under the Land and Water Conservation Act at a later date.

Therefore, when we say we are concerned that this noncontiguous principle may provide a precedent, I would say that once again here is a specific example of what we claim today. What happened this morning may again prove to be a pattern under which money from the Treasury will be taken in the future for other situations of like incompatible and noncontiguous tracts of land.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe it is extremely important to be concerned specifically about the fact that the National Government should go in and say, "This is an appropriation of a man's land that we want to acquire for utilization for everybody in the national park system," and then leave him with nothing but the outlying areas.

This is a part of our concern with respect to establishing this type of precedent.

We have included in the RECORD the minority report. It was signed by the three Senators whom I have named, including myself. It forms a part of the pattern of opposition, so that future Congresses may consider this question when they are considering similar situations in the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have just come from an Appropriations Committee meeting, and I did not have an opportunity to hear the remarks of my colleague from Colorado. However, we have discussed this subject on many occasions, and I know I can join in his general views on this subject.

This subject has been before Congress for a long time. Many hearings have been held on the so-called Indiana Dunes project. There are many things that I personally feel are great mistakes in connection with the pending bill. First, apparently there has been very little done to consider the impact of the bill on the communities in the lakeshore itself. Secondly, there are included in the bill several noncontiguous tracts which bear no reasonable relationship to the lakeshore area itself.

From the pictures, they seem to be very nice tracts, little sylvan glades, in which people might like to sit on an afternoon, and perhaps have a picnic lunch. However, they will not accommodate very many people before their pristine character will be destroyed. They are not lakeshore areas. They are not identified with the ordinary recreation and relaxation that is associated with a lakeshore area. Some of them are 4 or 5 or 6 miles inland. They bear no reasonable relationship to the lakeshore, nor do they bear any reasonable relationship from the standpoint of administration. A separate administration will have to be provided. Separate policemen or separate watchmen or separate guards will have to be provided for each of those areas. Consequently, they are not feasible from the standpoint of efficient administration.

Also, it seems to me that with the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which Congress has passed and which the President has signed into law, it was the intent of Congress that the fund be used for this particular purpose. These particular noncontiguous areas can not logically be associated with the beach itself, but, rather they are the type of thing that Congress had in mind when it passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill, so that the States, with assistance from that fund, would be able to develop these areas under a State plan.

Most States would be glad to have the opportunity to assume responsibility for such areas as this. By the same token, there is no justifiable argument for the U.S. Government to take up such noncontiguous tracts as this, which have no development and no particular value from any standpoint, despite the loose words that have been spoken in the testimony, and having the Government bear the expense of administering them. This was a function of the State. If the State wishes to do it, it should do it under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Third, we have made an error. When I say we have made an error, I want to make it clear that in the committee I have done everything I could to correct it. I believe the areas south of the main highway, which is roughly 1½ miles from the beach, should be eliminated from the bill. The reasons for this are that to operate it practically as a lakeshore or recreation area it is necessary that it be generally in one unit. The units south of the road, of course, are relatively undeveloped. I believe there are some farms located in those areas. The point is that it does not form a reasonably compact unit. In addition to it being necessary to cross the main highway, it is also necessary to cross a railroad track. Therefore these two areas are separated by the highway and the railroad track. The part below and generally south of the road does not contribute to the practical development and enjoyment of the lakeshore area.

I believe that the other Senators who have signed the minority report, the Senator from Wyoming and my distinguished colleague from Colorado, were in general agreement on these principles.

For that reason, I wish to make my own position clear. I cannot support the bill. I do not support it in its present form. I have always supported a proposal for a lakeshore area in Indiana, just as I supported the Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island areas. Strangely enough, in the Padre Island case, while there were differences and disagreements, the main item on which the senior Senator from Colorado disagreed with some of his colleagues was that there was not enough development proposed. The Senator from Colorado wanted full development of the area. He wanted to have a highway constructed the length of Padre Island, so that it would be fully accessible to the people who would use it.

So it is on these grounds that I wish to place myself on record as being opposed to the bill in its present form. If the particular items which I have discussed were amended out of the bill, I think the bill would then be in such form that I could support it; although problems still remain that I believe the other House will have to deal with, with respect to the corporate inholdings of this area, which deserve attention. The people in that area deserve more equitable treatment than the bill provides them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I aline myself with the views of the Senators from Colorado with respect to my opposition on this measure. I speak on this subject with some trepidation because of the caliber and frankness of the Senators from Indiana and the senior Senator from Illinois.

I wish to add to what the Senators from Colorado have said that I realize there is a growing need for such recreation facilities near the more densely populated areas. I have always supported reasonable legislation which was needed by the local governments to assist them in satisfying the needs of the people. However, I do not feel that it is advisable for the Federal Government to force its plans for providing recreational facilities upon a State or local government when the needs are being met, and the proposed plan would bring hardship, dissension, and conflict to and between the people of the area and the various levels of government.

The Governor of Indiana made a bitter denunciation of the bill because it would take away a most important revenue-producing feature, the Indiana Dunes State Park. He made a more equivocal

statement later; but he has never, to date, disavowed the statement he originally made, namely, that he feels that the "general assembly and the conservation department would be most reluctant to simply give this park away." Governor Welsh said that the Indiana Dunes State Park is Indiana's "greatest revenue producer and helps to sustain other parks in the State system."

The record of the hearings is replete with the dissension that has now arisen concerning this proposal. I have seen these things happen in my own part of the country, where the dissension has been so widespread and persistent that it has extended over a period of 20 or 25 years. Because so many people and so many agencies of the State government are opposed to the proposal, Congress should be extremely chary in the approach it takes toward establishing such a facility against the will of so many people.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of S. 2249, which would establish for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the people of the United States the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which is located in Kentucky's neighboring State of Indiana.

I have noted the arguments made against its establishment; nevertheless, I support the bill because I believe such an area and other areas of unusual beauty ought to be preserved as a national benefit for the education and recreation of the people of our country, both those of our generation and the millions who will come after us. The population of our country is increasing by leaps and bounds. It is estimated that in only a few years the population will be more than 200 million. Unless such areas as the Dunes are saved, the millions who will live in the future will never know that our country was once graced with dunes, forests, streams, and waterfalls.

We know that the demands of necessary public works, such as roads and river facilities, and the increasing growth of industry, will swallow up in time the last areas of such beauty in our country, unless we act now to preserve them. This is particularly true in the eastern part of the United States, where there are not many such areas left. Only this year, the Congress made a decision to preserve in Kentucky and Tennessee an area of unusual natural characteristics and beauty between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers—called "Between the Lakes." The Dunes and other natural areas in the East may not be considered by some as striking as are other areas in the West, or even in the mountain regions of the eastern United States. Yet the Dunes have a peculiar quality of beauty which cannot be found elsewhere in the United States.

I do not know whether it is true, but many in our country say that this great Nation, beautiful as it has been and is today, may be stripped of its beauty unless its people and their representatives, by action in communities, in States, and at the Federal level, act to save and preserve its places and areas of beauty and its natural wonders. I think we can help avoid having our country lose its great beauty by creating parks and other places of natural attraction, so that they will be preserved for our people to enjoy.

I have noted the efforts and the fight made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for years, to preserve the dunes against the demands of our industrial world. Progress is inevitable and needed, but at the same time that we locate new industry and public works in many places, we can preserve other locations of beauty. Senator DOUGLAS has continued his fight throughout the years and has had the support of many in his own State and throughout the country, including my State of Kentucky. His fight has been worthwhile. So I congratulate him and his cosponsors; and as a Senator from a neighboring State, I am glad to support the bill.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement I made before the committee when it was hearing testimony on the bill.

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

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAYH ON PROPOSED CREATION OF NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN THE INDIANA DUNES AREA

I speak today as a cosponsor of S. 2249, a bill to create a national lakeshore in the Indiana dunes area, and as a representative of the State of Indiana, in which the proposed national lakeshore is located.

I support this bill because it fills the basic need for conserving the natural beauty of the Indiana dunes area and will provide in the years to come the badly needed recreational facility for the millions of citizens of Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan who are building the great industrial complex around the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

The area is of such significant value for conservation that if it were located hundreds of miles from an area of dense population concentration it would be well worth the cost of acquisition and management. Since it is located in the center of the Midwest and the middle of the rapidly growing industrial center at the southern tip of Lake Michigan, it is even more valuable and it is essential that the Senate act promptly to provide for a national lakeshore in this area.

Scientific and recreation experts have testified to the value of the land in question and the adaptability for development as a national lakeshore and recreation area. Scientific experts have and will testify to the desirability of preserving the natural botanical, geological, and pure scientific phenomena which are found in this area. I accept their testimony and concur that this area has tremendous value for conservation, scientific, and recreational development.

There is also testimony that this particular lakeshore configuration will prove to be a hindrance to the future economic development and growth of this section of my State. I disagree with this and tend to believe that the development of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will be complementary to the economic development of the Calumet area and will tend in years to come to be a great asset to the industry and the workers in that industry who are attracted by the industrial potential of our area.

I have introduced and tend to work vigorously for the passage of S. 2204, a bill to provide for authorization for Federal improvements for a harbor at Burns Waterway, Ind. This port has become a symbol of the industrial development of the area, and I think that it is possible to support in good conscience both the construction of this harbor, the economic development of the steel industry in northern Porter County, and this national lakeshore preserve.

We in Indiana are deeply concerned about the establishment of a National Lakeshore Indiana Dunes area. Senate bill 2249 is now before a Senate committee. I wish to remind Senators of the importance of this measure, and I ask them to follow it as it goes through the legislative channels, for I believe this is a great opportunity to serve not only the northern part of Indiana, but also the tri-State area of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois.

Indiana badly needs the thousands of jobs which will be provided by the industrial development of this area. The workers who will come to serve the industries will badly need Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore for recreation in their leisure time. The report of the Chief of Engineers on the Burns waterway harbor stipulates that adequate air- and water-pollution control must be provided so as to protect the adjoining areas. This should prove to be sufficient for the development of an abatement program which will allow the complementary use of beaches and park areas.

I want to make it clear that I am intensely interested in the problem of providing jobs for people in my State. I believe that the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will tend to provide a community facility which will be an additional stimulus and attraction for new industry. The relatively small acreage involved in the lakeshore, when compared to the industrial area, will not detract from future expansion by existing industry and by the future industrial citizens of this section. I support then this bill and am in agreement with its aims and purposes.

I have visited the area personally and have had meetings with the citizens of the area. Members of my staff have also been in contact with long-time residents of the area and community leaders of the section and of our State.

* * * * *

I would also like to make the record very clear that I am concerned about several other problems which I believe cannot be dealt with in this legislation but which would require the careful attention of the Secretary of the Interior when administration of this park and its acquisition begins.

The first is the problem that is caused by the taking of a large amount of land off the tax rolls in the community of Beverly Shores. It would appear that approximately 60 percent of the taxable property in the town of Beverly Shores would be lost from that corporation for tax purposes. Since the property tax is the principal source of revenue for this community, this would cause either a great reduction in municipal services or a tremendous increase in the tax rate of the community. Both seem to be undesirable. I believe that the administrator of the Park Service can work out some equitable arrangements on the division of community responsibility which will allow for continued municipal services without an increased tax rate. Certain municipal services which account for a major share of expenditures of this community are for services which will accrue benefits to the Park Service. I am hopeful that the Director of the Park Service will be able to negotiate for continuation of these services as warranted by the park and as needed by the residents of the community. Maintenance of roads and providing adequate police and fire protection seem to be matters in which the National Park Service has as great an interest as the residents of the community. If the Park Service can provide either a certain amount of these services or contract for providing these services by the town corporation, the municipal services can be main-

tained without increasing the tax burden on the community.

The town of Beverly Shores is the community which is most adversely affected by this problem of removing land from the tax base. I am confident that the industrial impact and the increased attractiveness of this area because of the building of this park and the building of an industrial complex will create significant new tax revenues for these tax units. The benefits which will accrue to the local tax units from other improvements will in a very short period of time prove to be much greater than the loss which is to be suffered by the taking of this park land.

There are several plans for school reorganization currently existing in the area. Under the present circumstances, the town of Beverly Shores, again, is the school corporation most adversely affected by this problem. It would appear, however, that impacted-area aid would be available to this corporation if it should continue in its present form. There is likelihood that local school reorganization may result in the creation of larger school-tax units. In this eventuality, the new tax units would probably not qualify for Federal assistance. There is also a likelihood that this larger taxing unit will not include the tremendously improved industrial areas to the west which would provide an adequate new tax base. This could be quite a serious problem and one which we must wait to see what develops in the local school reorganization plans before any logical action can be taken by the Congress or by the Park Service.

I want also, Mr. President, to express my concern over the possibility that the individual citizens will be adversely affected by the freeze on real estate transactions which will occur with the enactment of this particular lakeshore. While it is true that titles to these lands will remain negotiable, I think it is safe to assume that there will be very little demand for unimproved property in this area, and there is a possibility that there will be limited demand for the improved property.

I know that the Park Service has every intention of purchasing improved and unimproved property whenever a legitimate offer of sale is made. I know that their experience has shown that this is genuinely feasible in most of their acquisition problems. I want to go on record, however, Mr. President, suggesting that in their appropriation request they provide generously for the possibility that many landowners will want to sell to the Park Service immediately. There are, of course, emergency cases, and there are those who will genuinely object to living in a national park area. I believe the Park Service should try as far as possible to provide in their appropriation request adequate reserve to take care of these transactions as well as those normal buying patterns which are planned into their acquisition program.

This is a very vital issue to my State and one over which I am very deeply concerned. I ask consideration of the amendments which I have suggested. They are completely consistent with the aims of the bill and serve only to perfect and increase the benefit of the park either to the user or to the people in the area. I do not think any of these recommendations I have made detract in any way from the desirability of the lakeshore as a recreation or conservation area, but will serve to improve the acceptability and the desirability of the park area.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as one of the two Senators from the State involved, I feel compelled to make a brief statement to stress the need for this particular type of park facility. It is only right and just that in passing legislation we should try to adhere to a policy that will conform to a pattern that will be applied equally throughout the country. However, it is rather unrealistic to feel that there can be any basic pattern for park legislation which would apply with equal validity to any area in the country. For this reason, I should like to speak to the unique position in which we find ourselves in Indiana, so far as concerns the lake shore park which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pursued with such diligence and for so long, and for which he stated the case so eloquently a moment ago.

On the lake shore in northern Indiana is a rare and beautiful display of nature which is surrounded by a fast growing industrial complex. Thus, there exist two circumstances which seemingly cannot and do not exist together in this country; namely, a natural area which can be readily used for recreation, and closely associated thereto resources which are presently being used for industry and to provide jobs in a rapidly growing economy.

I urge Senators to accept this proposed legislation. It would provide adequate natural recreational facilities in a broad sense; namely, bathing, camps, folklore and nature lore, such as are found in only a few places in this country. At the same time, it is located in an area of dense population. People finding jobs in rapidly growing industries can utilize these recreational facilities much better than if they had to travel halfway across the continent to find them.

I agree that this is a patchwork effort. There is a certain basic fairness, however, to the inclusion of the so-called patchwork parts of the park.

In conclusion, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows—although I have always had the greatest respect for him and his record in the Senate, long before I had the pleasure of meeting him—that we have not always seen eye to eye on the validity and importance of this project.

We in Indiana are faced with a controversy which I feel confronts us with two great opportunities, rather than with two irreconcilable opportunities.

First, by passing the lakeshore bill today, we can provide recreational facilities unsurpassed for this area; and second, by another piece of legislation, which I do not ask that the Senator from Illinois support at this time—but I shall attempt to do so later—I hope that we can provide port facilities on the northern lakeshore which will bring Illinois markets, Indiana markets, and midwestern markets in general, closer to the terminal facilities around the world.

It seems to me that with the election so close, there are some persons aspiring to public office, or who wish to be reelected, who are trying to make a political controversy out of this question, on the ground that by passing the dunes bill we are selling out the port facilities.

I wish the RECORD to show clearly that I have felt from the beginning that it was ridiculous to say that we could not have both. We can have the great facilities of the park and at the same time we can give to the Indiana merchants, farmers, and manufacturers the benefit of foreign markets at reduced transportation rates, which can be enacted, I hope, in the next session of Congress to enable us to build this structure in Indiana.

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

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

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

The bill (S. 2249) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore", dated July 1964, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1003 ID", which map is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. (a) Within the boundaries of the lakeshore the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In order to enhance the recreational benefits of this Act, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire such easements or other interests as he deems necessary to assure public access to the beach and waters of Lake Michigan continuously from the western boundary of the lakeshore in section 21 township 37 north, Indiana base, range 6 west, second principal Indiana meridian, to the easternmost point of intersection of the lakeshore boundary with the shoreline. The Indiana Dunes State Park may be acquired only with the consent of the State of Indiana, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the acquisition of said park. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area described in section 1 of this Act and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to seek such cooperative arrangements with the State of Indiana, political subdivisions thereof, and property owners as are required to provide public access to segments of the Little Calumet River and the adjacent river banks between the lakeshore boundary and the east line of section 31 and the Secretary may acquire, other than

by condemnation, such easements and other interests in lands or waters as he deems necessary to further the purpose of this subsection.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area described in section 1 of this Act which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in lands for the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore for one year following the effective date of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore during all times when an appropriate zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(b) The term "improved property", whenever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be not more than three acres in area, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters, as he may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances for the purposes of sections 4 and 6 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance and any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of such ordinance or amendment by the zoning agency. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning ordinance or zoning ordinance amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property covered by the ordinance within the boundaries of the lakeshore; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area covered by the ordinance within the lakeshore by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning ordinance consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana.

(c) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the lakeshore; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning ordinance, or is subjected to any use, which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

(e) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the lakeshore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of acquisition by the Secretary. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date; *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning ordinance approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary terminates a right of use and occupancy under this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

SEC. 7 (a) In the administration of the lakeshore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of establishment of the national lakeshore pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows: (1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town; (3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expense reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within this lakeshore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on the lands included in such lakeshore.

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1541, H.R. 12253.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment to H.R. 12253 which was designed to close a loophole in the tariff schedule. Under the present law "button blanks" can be imported at a rate of 36 percent whereas imported finished buttons are dutiable at a rate which is equivalent to ad valorem rates ranging up to 140 percent. In the last 3 years there has been a marked increase in the importation of "button blanks." One might properly inquire why. First it will be helpful if I define what is meant by button blanks. Button blanks are the raw materials from which many types of buttons may be made. The answer is clear. Importers discovered a device whereby they could import almost finished buttons at the lower rate for button blanks. Now, Mr. President, these almost finished buttons were not button blanks or the raw material. In fact, 75 percent of the value has already been added when the almost finished buttons arrived in this country. This represented a discovery of a loophole in our tariff schedules and, as one can imagine, opened the floodgates to the importation of these almost finished buttons to the detriment of the domestic button industry. This amendment will plug this loophole and protect the domestic button industry as the tariff originally intended.

Since Maryland has a domestic button industry, I am naturally greatly interested and keenly aware of the industry's problem. I feel the closing of this loophole, which is clearly a tariff avoidance device, will be most helpful to those who are employed in this important industry.

I also would like to take this opportunity to commend the Finance Committee for their wisdom in deleting section 15 which deals with V-belts. A reduction in the tariff schedule, as approved by the House, would have resulted in severe hardship to our domestic producers. The committee's amendment wisely proposes to continue the present 16-percent duty on imported V-belts.

REMEMBERING MAYOR LA GUARDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the La Guardia Memorial Association, according to its tradition, held services at the grave of the late and beloved mayor of New York, Fiorello H. La Guardia, on September 20, the 17th anniversary of his death.

During the ceremony at Woodlawn Cemetery, Morris S. Novik, who was director of the city's radio station, WNYC, during the La Guardia administration and who is now a radio consultant in New York and a member of the Advisory Committee on International Information, spoke about the "Little Flower's" remarkable talent for communicating with the people of his city. Through this talent, the people of New York City closely identified themselves with the aspirations of their mayor, and made him the most beloved city official in modern times.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Novik's remarks on this occasion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

On this, the 17th anniversary of the death of Fiorello H. La Guardia, we assemble as we have done every year to pay tribute to a man we loved.

As the years go by, each of us attempts to assess the man. We try to explain the imprints he made, not only on our lives in general, but also on our personal lives.

The legacy of La Guardia was his identification with the people; they loved him and he loved them.

Each of us, as the years go by, see Fiorello La Guardia, naturally enough, through his own eyes. Objective though we try to be, we cannot but think in terms of our own personal relationship with him.

All of us knew La Guardia as a great man—as a great mayor—as a great leader. It was my fortune to know La Guardia as a great communicator.

There are many explanations for the La Guardia phenomenon. One seems to dominate. He was able to talk to the widest audience and not only be heard, but understood. His phrase was not elegant. It often was not eloquent, but it was always direct, earnest, and completely understandable. It was as though his heart had a tongue that spoke to other hearts. This understanding was not limited to any one group. It reached everyone.

La Guardia pioneered in the use of radio. He understood that it was not merely a medium for making speeches. It was to him, a medium for talking personally with real people about real-life problems.

He talked to people about their problems in their own terms. When he talked about the price of tomatoes on radio, he wanted to help people with limited earnings to make every penny count. He was trying to help them live better and more rewarding lives. Radio helped him ring each doorbell. Talk with each person, and help every one of them with the problems of everyday living.

This personal recollection of La Guardia is more than a sentimentalized memory. La Guardia saw radio, and in his last years, television—practically an extension of personal conversation. Many did not agree with La Guardia but they always listened.

WNYC was in existence for many years prior to Mayor La Guardia taking office. In many ways, it was regarded as an orphan or stepchild of the city government. In fact, previous administrations literally hid its antenna behind the statue on top of the municipal building and assigned the station to the housekeeping agency of the city, concerned with maintenance of buildings and bridges—the department of plants and structure.

It was Mayor La Guardia who first recognized the value of a city radio station. It was he who was responsible for the establishment of the radio station as an independent municipal department. Then began the long-range campaign to establish WNYC as a vital force in the affairs and lives of the people of the city of New York. This led into the prolonged struggle with the Federal Communications Commission to obtain recognition for the unique services rendered by WNYC and for its right to have full time on the air. A major step in winning that battle was actually achieved only recently, 25 years later. Hopefully the final victory will not be long in coming.

During the crucial years of World War II La Guardia saw radio as a personal line of communication between government—local government—and the people. From day to day the people wanted to know not only about the events of the day, but how those events were evaluated by someone they trusted. They trusted Fiorello La Guardia.

When the war broke out in 1941, the mayor was the first to realize the importance of radio and WNYC in supporting the war effort on the homefront, in civil defense, and in keeping people informed of where and how they could help.

Mayor La Guardia never missed a Sunday broadcast during the war. In the heat of summer—and city hall was not air conditioned in those days—and in the dead of winter, Fiorello La Guardia left his home to face the WNYC microphone and press every Sunday to report to the people of New York on city affairs and the contribution the city was making to the war effort.

He reported how and where they could help—when to collect tin cans, what changes were being made in rationing, how to conserve vital energies needed for the war effort.

He told them of what he thought about everything connected with the war effort. He lifted high the hope and strengthened the courage and the morale of the people of the world's greatest city.

Just as the bells of the Tower of Parliament inspired the beleaguered people of Great Britain, so WNYC broadcast the historic chimes of our city hall, followed by the identification "WNYC in a city where over 7 million people live in peace and enjoy the benefits of democracy."

La Guardia wanted the station to be a living service to the city. He wanted it to draw the people closer to each other and to their city. He wanted it to help, to teach, to entertain, to serve, to unite—and to continue.

Regularly during the war, the civil defense programs and services of WNYC were transmitted to the commercial stations in the city for rebroadcast. WNYC was the keystone in the arch that never cracked security during almost 4 years of voluntary censorship and self-regulation.

Many are commemorated by statues, monuments or public facilities named in their honor such as airports, bridges, and tunnels.

While one of the great New York airports bears his name, I prefer to think that Mayor La Guardia's principal monument is radio station WNYC. The station established a standard of excellence and a code of public service for broadcasting that even today is still unique. The station still plays a leading role in the cultural and civic affairs in the city.

That is the monument on the ether waves to Fiorello La Guardia. It is a voice that still speaks long after its innovator has passed from us. It is a voice that has meaning and responsibility. It is listened to because of its authority.

It is a living thing, a monument to his patience, his fortitude, his fighting spirit.

Perhaps I have spoken too much about La Guardia's great contributions to WNYC and the field of communications. That is natural for me.

On this the 17th anniversary of his death, I know that all of us here feel his presence. We still miss him for his concern with a hundred causes.

We miss him as a man. We miss him as a friend. He was sometimes difficult. He was sometimes violent. He could be gay. He could be sad.

Fiorello La Guardia is missed, and he will never be forgotten.

NEW YORK STATE'S ATTACK ON ILLITERACY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in solving our domestic problems—especially those involving the welfare of our underprivileged citizens—I have always advocated cooperation between local, State, and the Federal Governments. I have offered amendments to bills establishing Federal programs in many of these areas that would have allowed local and State governments to show initiative in designing programs particularly suited to local problems.

Last week, the State of New York provided an outstanding example of such initiative. Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on Thursday announced that the New York State Department of Labor, in cooperation with the State and New York City's departments of education, and the Federal Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare had developed a large-scale attack on illiteracy and unemployment in New York City.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Governor Rockefeller's office explaining the program, and an article which was published in the New York Times of September 25 on the same subject.

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

STATEMENT FROM OFFICE OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Governor Rockefeller today announced an occupational training project for 6,000 unemployed and underemployed New York City residents, the largest such program in the Nation.

The project was initiated, planned, and developed by the New York State Labor Department's Division of Employment, in cooperation with the State department of education, the New York City Board of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The division of employment will recruit and select the trainees through its local employment service offices—including centers of the youth employment service—and in cooperation with community agencies. Upon completion of training, the employment service will provide job placement services for the graduates.

The project, with an estimated cost of $12 million, is designed to train 4,000 disadvantaged youths and 2,000 jobless or underemployed adults under the Federal-State Manpower Development and Training Act. The multioccupation program encompasses vocational training in a number of selected fields where shortages exist or where there is a continuing demand for labor.

Novel in its large-scale attack on illiteracy, recognized as one of the causes of hard-core unemployment, the project will include basic remedial education geared to the individual trainee's needs in reading, writing, basic arithemtic, spelling, and language skills.

"Without such corrective training, the disadvantaged worker cannot hope to break the chain of illiteracy that links one generation to the next," Governor Rockefeller said. "We must first help the disadvantaged, regardless of age, to acquire the basic tools, the three R's of the world of work."

Vocational training for youths aged 16 through 21 and adults over 22 will be provided for entry jobs, as well as for some semiskilled and skilled occupations in the following fields of work: automotive services, such as mechanic and station attendant; building maintenance services; commercial occupations, including bookkeeping machine operator, stenographer, and typist; costume jewelry; equipment and material checking; electronics; food preparation and service; hospital and institutional care; machine shop; merchandising, including sales clerks and grocery checkers; metal fabricating; printing, bookbinding and paper goods, and silk screen printing.

For the most part, classes will be held in various public high schools as facilities become available throughout the city.

Job counseling and aptitude testing of trainees will be given by New York State Employment Service counselors to determine the broad field of work to which each trainee is assigned. Employment service counselors will also oversee the individual trainee's progress. In addition, the New York City Board of Education guidance counselors will provide appropriate educational counseling to assist those trainees who lack the proper motivation to make them ready for employment after training.

The program is designed so that the trainees can benefit from the project's flexibility and can move up the skill ladder within the chosen field of work. Accordingly, a qualified trainee can start training in an entry occupation and move on to a course for a semiskilled occupation in the same field of work or in a different field.

One of the principal objectives of the project is to discover and develop the trainee's work potential and thereby enhance his employability at his highest skill level.

Unemployment figures show higher rates among the less educated, with joblessness occurring more frequently and lasting longer. Of the approximately 145,000 young people entering the labor market during 1964 and 1965 in New York City, about 60,000 will be school dropouts. December 1963 estimates show a rate of unemployment of 9 percent among youth as against 5.2 percent for the city's entire labor force. The figure for nonwhite unemployed youth is still higher. Unemployed adults with less than a high school education have considerable difficulty in becoming reemployed. Many find their skills have become outmoded during this period of rapid technological change.

The first course is expected to get underway within the next few weeks. Weekly training allowances will be paid to those trainees who qualify under the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA).

[From the New York Times, Sept. 25, 1964]

STATE WILL TEACH JOBLESS THE THREE R'S—$12 MILLION PROGRAM HERE IS CALLED NOVEL IN SCOPE OF ATTACK ON ILLITERACY—BEGINS IN A FEW WEEKS—SCHOOL DROPOUTS AND ADULTS ARE ALSO SCHEDULED TO GET VOCATIONAL TRAINING

ALBANY, September 24.—A large-scale attack on illiteracy and unemployment in New York City was announced today by Governor Rockefeller.

Starting in a few weeks, the first of 6,000 unemployed persons, including a large proportion of school dropouts, will begin a basic remedial education program consisting of courses in reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling.

The program, which will cost $12 million, was developed by the State labor department in cooperation with the State and city education departments and Federal agencies.

Mr. Rockefeller called the program novel in the scope of its attack on illiteracy.

"Without such corrective training, the disadvantaged worker cannot hope to break the chain of illiteracy that links one generation to the next," the Governor said. "We must first help the disadvantaged, regardless of age, to acquire the basic tools, the three R's of the world of work."

SPECIAL COURSES PLANNED

Students will progress according to their ability. Once they have completed work in the basic skills, they will be tested for aptitude and permitted to take specialized courses.

Training will be provided in the following fields: automotive services, building maintenance, bookkeeping, stenography, costume jewelry, equipment and material checking, electronics, food preparation and service, and hospital and institutional care among other vocations.

Classes will be held in public high schools. Counselors of the State employment service will provide job counseling and aptitude tests.

In addition, New York City Board of Education guidance counselors will assist trainees "who lack the proper motivation to make them ready for employment after training."

Weekly allowances will be paid to the trainees to qualify under provisions of the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act.

EMPLOYMENT AID OFFERED

Trainees will be recruited through the State labor department's division of employment, which will also provide job placement services for the graduates.

A labor department spokesman said that the program involved more people, put more emphasis on reading and writing and cost more than any other of its type.

Until July 1965 it will be financed entirely by the Federal Government. After that, the State must match Federal funds.

The project is designed to train 4,000 disadvantaged youths (mostly dropouts) and 2,000 jobless or underemployed adults.

The project will be one of many operating here. The city sponsors such projects as JOIN (Job Opportunities in Neighborhoods) to train youths, a literacy training program for 800 persons, and education projects for school dropouts.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the summer 1964 issue of the Federal Bar Journal contains a most valuable symposium on the subject of conflicts of interest, covering a wide range of applications as well as the general philosophy. The legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Federal Government are treated fully in this series, as are the separate fields of securities, industry, and business, the news media, and State government. Indeed, while the entire series is well worthy of reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, certainly the two excellent comprehensive contributions on the very current subject of congressional ethics should be brought to the attention of the Congress. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the articles contributed by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who is recognized as a leader on this issue in the Senate, and jointly by Erwin G. Krasnow, a past president of the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and Congressman RICHARD E. LANKFORD, past

president and first vice president of the Federal Bar Association.

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

THE CONGRESS AND ITS DOUBLE STANDARD

(By Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE [1])

On Capitol Hill, the majestic dome of the Capitol rises newly white and strong against a background of the Mall and downtown buildings of the executive branch. Its new gleam was accomplished during the course of an extensive repair and renovation program ordered by the Congress when the east front of the building showed unmistakable signs of deterioration.

The signs of the need for a rehabilitation program of the Congress itself are at least equally plain, but so far they have gone largely unheeded. One such sign is the low esteem in which Congress is currently held by many Americans. A recent poll reported that a majority of those questioned believe Congress tends to represent "special interests working for private gains." [1a]

This conclusion may not be surprising after the many months of piecemeal and still incomplete accounts of the activities of Bobby Baker and some of his associates. But the Baker case, and especially the handling of it, are only the latest demonstration of a basic cause of public mistrust and cynicism; i.e., the double standard so long practiced by Congress—one standard for the executive branch, another lesser standard for its own members.

"We are not investigating Senators," [2] said the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee when queried about the scope of the Baker investigation. In that one sentence, he expressed a view that is all too characteristic of the Congress. It shows up in many ways.

I remember, for example, a meeting several years ago, when I was a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to consider a Presidential nomination for a vacancy on the Federal Communications Commission. The nominee, a lawyer by profession, had previously served the Government with distinction. His qualifications were not questioned. Nonetheless, the nominee was there to withdraw his nomination. The explanation helps to highlight the double standard that today prevails in Washington.

The Federal Communications Act provides, inter alia: [3]

No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or of apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any such company; nor be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any person subject to any of the provisions of this chapter, nor own stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to any of the provisions of this chapter.

As it happened, the nominee had a prudent father. Some years before, he had established a small, and irrevocable, trust fund for his two sons, to be managed by trustees outside the family. Soon after its establishment the trustees invested a portion of the funds in stock of a well-known electrical firm which manufactures, among other things, equipment in the communications field. Over the years the stock had greatly increased in value. At the time of the hearing the trustees could not justify, in the light of their fiduciary duty toward the beneficiaries, sale of the stock. Since neither beneficiary had any control over the investments made by the trust and the trust itself was irrevocable, there was no way in which the nominee could divest himself of this involuntary financial interest.

The committee agreed it came within the proscription of the act. The provisions of the act are clear, and I do not question them or the rightness of the decision to withdraw. However, I could not help thinking of the contrast between the stringent restrictions on membership on the Federal Communications Commission and the complete absence of any restriction on membership on the Senate committee which oversees it and passes on legislation in the communications field.

Another hearing on a Presidential nomination comes to mind. The nominee, from private industry, had worked for his firm through the first 6 months of the year in which he was nominated. He had relinquished all financial interest in the firm, which did some work for the Government, but was hopeful that he might be permitted to take a half year's share in the profit-sharing plan of the company in line with his employment for the first half of the year. With some reluctance I felt obliged to point out that this seemed inconsistent with the clear intent of the law inasmuch as the company's profits were calculated for the purposes of its profit-sharing plan on a yearly basis, and the value of a 6-months share would be determined partly by the profits realized in the second half of the year. The committee agreed.

Again our action highlighted the difference between standards applied to executive appointees and the Members of Congress. For Members of Congress may, and do, sit on committees which act on measures that, directly or indirectly, affect their personal financial interests. And, on occasion, Members of Congress have attempted to influence the actions or decisions of an executive agency from which they may stand to benefit personally.

In 1962, Congress revised the statute covering bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest.[4] The revision has been described as both strengthening and liberalizing the prior statute. But, whatever one's view of the specific provisions adopted, they represent an attempt to deal with the problems presented by the postwar growth in the Government's use of consultants and part-time advisers and the past employment activities of former Government employees. By contrast no effort was made to reach the problems of conflicts of interest in the legislative branch. The Congress once again concentrated its attention on the executive arm of Government. Certain provisions such as those covering bribery [5] continue to apply specifically to Members of Congress as well as to others. Others such as section 208 dealing with "acts affecting a personal financial interest" apply only to officers and employees of the executive branch.[6] It was upon the precursor [7] of section 208 that the Dixon-Yates affair turned.

The overall public policy embodied in these provisions was described by Chief Justice Warren in *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Co.*, the litigation that became known as the Dixon-Yates case.

"The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Biblical admonition that no man may serve two masters, Mathew 6: 24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms.

"The statute establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that whenever a Government agent fails to act in accordance with that standard, he is guilty of violating the statute, regardless of whether there is positive corruption. The statute is thus directed not only at dishonor, but also at conduct that tempts dishonor. This broad proscription embodies a recognition of the fact that an impairment of impartial judgment can occur in even the most well-meaning men when their personal economic interests are affected by the business they transact on behalf of the Government. To this extent, therefore, the statute is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened.

"The statute is directed at an evil which endangers the very fabric of a democratic society, for a democracy is effective only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption." [8]

If this is good public policy for Congress to proscribe for the Government generally, is it any less good for the Congress itself?

To put it another way: If a Member of Congress applies "pressure" in his capacity as a Member of Congress to an executive agency to maintain or expand a program which will benefit the company in which he holds stock, is it any less reprehensible than if he were acting as a paid representative of the company?

Does the fact that he is a Member of Congress dispel the possibility of suspicion which the statute seeks to avoid?

Such actions may be infrequent but they are not unknown. I think it is probable that when a Member of Congress does exert pressure in such circumstances, he does so with a sincere conviction that the action sought is in the national interest. But sincerity is not the test. Nor is it in point that private and public interest may, and sometimes do, coincide. Rather the question is: If "What's good for General Motors is good for the country" is considered at best naive when expressed by a member of the executive branch, it is less so when proclaimed by a member of the legislative branch?

It would be unrealistic, I believe, to suggest that Members of Congress should be required to divest themselves of all financial interests which might conceivably be affected by legislation or by action of executive agencies under the purview of a committee on which a Member serves. But should a Member of Congress, whose law firm represents a common carrier, act as a committee member, or vote on the floor, on measures affecting common carriers? Or should one with business associations in the

---

[1] U.S. Senator from New Jersey since 1955; Member House of Representatives, 1945–53; A.B., Rutgers, 1925; LL. B., Columbia, 1928.

[1a] The Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1964, sec. A, p. 2.

[2] The Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1964, sec. A, p. 7, col. 2.

[3] 48 Stat. 1066 (1936), 47 U.S.C. 154(b).

[4] 18 U.S.C. 201, 35 Stat. 1096 (1909) was amended by Public Law 87-849, 87th Cong., Oct. 23, 1962; 76 Stat. 1119.

[5] Note 4, supra. See also sec. 203 barring services before the departments and agencies but not services in court rendered for compensation solicited or received.

[6] 18 U.S.C. Sec. 205 bars services rendered with or without compensation before the court as well as the departments and agencies. Certain limited exceptions are provided.

[7] Former sec. 434 of 18 U.S.C.; 35 Stat. 1106 (1909).

[8] 364 U.S. 520, 549, 550, 562 (1960), rehearing denied, 365 U.S. 855 (1961).

mining industry pass on such measures as depletion allowances for income tax purposes?

Every lawyer is familiar with his obligation not to represent conflicting interests. Canon 6 of the American Bar Association's canons explicitly states the "* * * duty of a lawyer at the time of retainer to disclose to the client all the circumstances of his relations to the parties, and any interest in or connection with the controversy, which might influence the client in the selection of counsel." [9] We expect a Member of the judicial branch to disqualify himself from sitting in a case where his personal interests or associations might be thought to color his view. A member of the executive branch has a similar obligation. The public could reasonably look to Congress to follow this practice. And it is a matter of record that some Members of Congress have refrained from voting on particular measures because they had a direct personal interest affected by them.

It would, I think, be impossible to frame statutory prohibitions adequately safeguarding against conflicts of interest in the infinitely broad and varied situations with which Congress, and Members of Congress, have had to deal. But there is, I believe, a way in which Congress can provide better protection than now exists for the public interest, and in a manner consonant with its elective status. That is by applying the principle of public disclosure to the financial interests of members and the top staffs of the legislative branch and to their dealing with executive agencies at the behest of a particular party of interest.

Specifically, I have proposed in this and three preceding Congresses legislation that would require that all top officials in the legislative, as well as the executive branch report annually their sources of income including gifts of $100 or more in value and their financial assets and liabilities.[10] The reports would also include a statement of all dealings in securities or commodities and all purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein. They would be filed with the Comptroller General as public records available to both press and public.

A second part of my bill would also apply the disclosure principle to both oral and written communications concerning particular cases to regulatory agencies, whether from a Member of Congress or a member of the executive branch outside the agency involved. For example, all communications, routine or otherwise, from a Member of Congress in behalf of a particular application for a broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission would be made a part of the public record of the proceeding. Failure to cover ex parte contacts with regulatory agencies, as recommended by President Kennedy, is another notable omission of the 1962 revision of section 201 of title 18.

Public disclosure is not a new principle. Preventive rather than punitive in approach, it already applies, in part, to the area of campaign contributions and expenditures. It is the principle behind the requirement that lobbyists register and report expenditures to the Congress.

For another application of the principle, it is notable that in the 1963 Judicial Conference the problem of financial activities of judges was fully discussed. The Conference adopted a resolution forbidding any Federal justice or judge from serving as an officer, director, or employee of a corporation organized for profit.[11] The Conference disapproved of a Senate bill to require each judge to submit regularly complete financial reports open for inspection by any member of the judicial council of each circuit but the action was taken on the ground that "regardless of the merits of the proposal, judges should not be singled out from other officials of the U.S. Government to make such reports." [12]

Public disclosure is particularly appropriate in an area where a flat prohibition might raise questions of infringement upon the right of the people to elect the representative of their choice, be he rogue or shining knight. Certainly, it would help to give the electorate a better basis on which to judge.

For the Congress as a whole and for the individual Members of it, a requirement for disclosure of financial interests would help to dispel the cynicism and disdain with which so many citizens view the political practitioner. This attitude is, I am convinced, for the most part unfair. Yet it certainly has some historical basis. It was, after all, Daniel Webster who reminded officials of the Second Bank of the United States "* * * my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual." [13]

The venality and corruption of many State legislatures in the mid-19th and early 20th centuries were notorious. I am confident that the Congresses in modern times compare very favorably with those of an earlier day. Certainly, in my experience, the great bulk of Members of Congress, for example, are honest, conscientious men, trying to do the best job they can in the interests of the Nation and their State or district.

For officials in the executive branch and particularly in regulatory and semijudicial agencies, the obligation to file regular financial reports would be both preventive and salutary. The maintenance of public confidence in the integrity of these agencies is essential. With them rest determinations that may vitally affect the well-being of a particular enterprise or industry and the communities of which they are part. The necessity to make such a report would serve as a stop-and-think warning. In conjunction with the requirement for disclosure of communications, it would also tend to check the all too prevalent inclination of the general public to ascribe, without tangible grounds, any particular decision to "influence" or a "fix." Contrary to common supposition, they are, I believe, the exception rather than the rule.

Support for the principle of disclosure is growing. For example, at this writing, 30 Members of the Congress, including this writer, have made public financial statements.

To accomplish the objective, however, disclosure should, as the Judicial Conference report suggests, apply equally to all, and to the same extent. And it should include all sources of income.

Adoption of this disclosure requirement will not, of course, resolve all of the conflicts-of-interest problems with which Congress is confronted. By no means do all conflicts-of-interest problems fall in the category of pecuniary interest, at least in the direct sense. Every Member of Congress is confronted, at one time or another, with the problem of drawing the line between legitimate representation of constituent interest and so-called improper influence or pressure. Every Member has also, I venture, at some time wondered whether the offer of a particular campaign contribution was made in the expectation of a subsequent favor even though it was proffered solely as the fruit of a laudable desire to return a worthy official to office. Further, there are a host of other problems, large and small, that trouble many Members of Congress. More than one Member with limited personal resources has to tussle with the problem of how to meet the expenses which serving as a Member of Congress entails.

Travel, for example, is a costly item for most Members. Once upon a time, Congress met for 4 to 6 months and adjourned for the rest of the year. Since the war, sessions have been steadily lengthening. In 1963 the session ended only when Christmas impended. There is an official travel allowance, but in the Senate it covers only three round trips a year. This does not begin to meet the needs of most Members who are rightly expected to get back home far more frequently. The cases of use of official transportation for personal purposes justifiably provoke headlines. But little notice is given to the fact that most Members spend 10 to 20 percent of their salaries on travel to and from their home States or districts for necessary functions and meetings.

A pay raise would provide a partial answer to some of these problems but it would not go to the fundamental considerations involved. To consider them, my bill would establish a Commission on Legislative Standards.

But there are still other areas in which Congress itself can act immediately to eliminate the double standard that now prevails, e.g., accountability in the expenditure of public funds. Congress demands a scrupulous accounting by the executive branch, but takes a far less stringent view of its own expenditures.

One result is that congressional travel abroad has gotten a bad name in many quarters. And understandably so. Yet, with a substantial part of our military forces dispersed around the globe and with millions of U.S. tax dollars being spent in foreign assistance, Congress has a responsibility which legitimately involves, indeed requires, some on-the-spot inspection and firsthand observation. The "junkets" of a few have tended to make all such trips suspect. Fortunately, a few years ago Congress did act, after repeated exposés, to impose minimal requirements for reporting expenditures on the use of counterpart funds by committee members and staff traveling overseas. The scope of these reports should be broadened to include all committee expenditures, domestic as well as abroad, and in greater detail than is now prescribed.

Another spot vulnerable to criticism is the process of appropriating for the legislative branch. Congress tends to regard legislative expenditures as its own business while it treats those of other governmental agencies as public business. Comity between the Houses normally precludes any real questioning of appropriations for its own use approved by the other body. But even within each body too many expenditures are shrouded in secrecy and the budget is approved without most Members knowing what it may really provide by way of swimming pools or draperies, not to speak of more major matters.

This is perhaps understandable. In a body of 100 or 435 peers—some of them more equal than others—it is unrealistic to expect the kind of scrutiny that occurs between independent though coordinate branches of government.

Through the years, Congress has shown it cannot, will not, police itself. One need go back no further than the McCarthy era to

---

[9] "Canons of Professional and Judicial Ethics, Opinions of Committee on Professional Ethics and Grievances" 3, American Bar Association (1957).

[10] S. 1233, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); S. 1332, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959); S. 4223, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958).

[11] "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States," 1963, p. 62, Government Printing Office, Washington (1964).

[12] Id. at 63; S. 1613, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[13] Schlesinger, "The Age of Jackson" 84 (Little Brown, Boston, 1950).

see the futility of expecting the Congress to exercise effective self-discipline.[14]

At this writing, the Senate Rules Committee is considering the recommendations it was directed to make under Senate Resolution 212 to "make a study and investigation * * * whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable" and to "report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

Some members of the committee have proposed a code of ethics with the sanction of censure. Promulgation of such a code is all very well as an expression of sentiment, but more than another hortatory exercise[15] is needed.

Historically, as well as practically, it is the watchful eye of the press and public that exerts the strongest pressure to keep to the straight and narrow. That is why I believe continuing information, readily available to both public and press, covering the financial interests of Members of Congress is the most promising solution to the problem. It would not be a cure-all, but it would go a long way toward protecting the public interest in the integrity of the legislative process. And, after the initial shock, I suspect the vast majority of the Members of Congress would find it a positive help in carrying out their official responsibilites.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: WHO WATCHES THE WATCHERS?

(By Erwin G. Krasnow[1] and Congressman RICHARD E. LANKFORD[1a])

INTRODUCTION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress was marked by an early flurry of interest in conflict-of-interest situations and remedies for Members of Congress which resulted in a stream of legislation introduced in both the House and the Senate to prevent conflict-of-interest abuses that many Members felt existed but were understandably unwilling to lay bare in public. In addition, it led an unprecedented number of Senators and Representatives to dramatize their concern for more ethical behavior by making public disclosures of their finances in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.[2]

The recent legislative attention to this problem was originally spurred by the prosecution of Representatives Thomas F. Johnson, of Maryland, and Frank W. Boykin, of Alabama, on conspiracy and conflict-of-interest charges, the case of Phillipine's lobbyist John A. O'Donnell, and the accusations of congressional corruption by columnist Jack Anderson.[2a] This spark of interest was fanned by the revelations of certain business and financial activities of former Senate secretary to the majority, Robert G. Baker, and led to unanimous Senate adoption of Senate Resolution 212, introduced by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, authorizing and directing the Committee on Rules and Administration to investigate the financial and business interests or activities of Senate officers and employees.[3] While the report of the Rules and Administration Committee was primarily concerned with the activities of staff employees, two of its recommendations directly pertained to Members of the Senate. Both proposals, however, met with defeat on the Senate floor.[4]

Previous to the 88th Congress, the most intensive congressional study on the subject of conflicts of interest was conducted by a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 82d Congress in 1951. This study resulted in the issuance of a report[5] recommending a series of legislative proposals for the improvement of the ethical standards of the Congress, as well as those of the executive branch. This excellent report stated the core of the conflict-of-interest problem for Members of Congress in the following manner:

"The problem of economic involvement is probably more difficult for Members of the Congress than for administrators. There are fewer traditional safeguards, temptation is more subtle, there is no higher authority, and discipline is rare even for illegalities. Men tinged with sovereignty can easily feel that the king can do no wrong, and in American politics as it now is, it is easy to feel that many things are justified which one heartily wishes were not necessary."[6]

The authors propose to investigate this statement by the subcommittee with respect to congressional conflict-of-interest problems in light of its historical and statutory background, with an analysis of the various proposals for reform and a suggested approach to a solution palatable to both the Congress and the public at large.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DEFINED

In 1960, a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York completed a study of Federal conflict-of-interest laws. The committee's report, entitled "Conflicts of Interest and Federal Service,"[7] made passing reference to congressional conflict-of-interest problems, concluding that they are current, complex, controversial, and largely unresolved. In searching for a definition of a "conflict of interest," one may observe why this whole area is enmeshed with complexity, controversy, and irresolution. A definition evolved in the monumental New York City Bar Association study, which applied specifically to members of the executive branch but appears to apply equally as well to all persons enveloped with the public trust, was as follows: whenever the interest of the public official in the proper

---

[14] Of the more than 250 cases summarized in "Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960", by far the greater number involved a challenge of credentials or charges of election irregularities. Only a handful involved the conduct of the office of Senator; and in the last century the Senate acted to condemn or censure in only two of these cases. The case study was compiled for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962)).

[15] On July 11, 1958, the Congress passed a Code of Ethics for Government Service which sent out 10 tenets to which "any person in Government service should" adhere. H.R. Doc. No. 103, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1958).

[1] A.B., 1958, summa cum laude, Boston University; LL.B., 1961, Harvard Law School; member of the Massachusetts and District of Columbia bars; formerly administrative assistant to U.S. Representative TORBERT H. MACDONALD; associate, Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, and Masters, Washington, D.C.; past president of the Capitol Hill chapter, Federal Bar Association.

[1a] B.S., 1937, University of Virginia; LL.B., 1940, University of Maryland; member of the Maryland bar; Member of Congress, Fifth Congressional District, Maryland (1953 to present); president (1962–63) and first vice president (1961–62), Federal Bar Association.

[2] Those making disclosures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD include: Senator CLARK (Pa.), Mar. 15, 1963; Senator JAVITS (N.Y.), Mar. 4, 1963; Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Minn.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative DON EDWARDS (Calif.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative EDITH GREEN (Oreg.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER (Wis.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative CLARK MACGREGOR (Minn.), May 2, 1963; Representative HENRY S. REUSS (Wis.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN (N.Y.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative MORRIS K. UDALL (Ariz.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative LIONEL VAN DEERLIN (Calif.), Apr. 29, 1963; Representative FRANK BOW (Ohio), Apr. 11, 1963; Representative JOHN W. BYRNES (Wis.), Nov. 21, 1963; Representative STANLEY TUPPER (Maine), Nov. 13, 1963; Representative CHARLES W. WELTNER (Ga.), Nov. 20, 1963; Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE (Wis)., Dec. 3, 1963.

[2a] For a general discussion of the background on the above-named incidents, see, "An Ethical Guide Sought for Congressional Behavior," Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, May 8, 1963.

[3] S. Res. 212, 88th Congress, agreed to on Oct. 10, 1963, provides: *"Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether any such interests or activities have involved conflicts of interest or other impropriety, and (2) whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable for the purpose of prohibiting or restricting any such interests or activities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

[4] See Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. "Financial or Business Interests of Officers or Employees of the Senate," S. Rept. No. 1175, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964). One of the recommendations of the Committee on Rules and Administration was incorporated in S. Res. 338, which provided that the committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate any violation of the rules of the Senate by a Member or employee, make appropriate findings of facts and conclusions with respect thereto, and upon determination of a violation, recommend to the Senate disciplinary action, including "reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment." On July 24, 1964, the Senate adopted a substitute measure introduced by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in lieu of the proposal recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The other recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration was embodied in S. Res. 337, which would require Senators and Senate employees to make public disclosure of those outside business and professional interests which have a pecuniary value equal to or in excess of one-half of their annual salary and the identity of profit-making business and professional organizations with which they are affiliated as an officer, director, partner, or serve in some executive, managerial, or advisory capacity. However, on July 27, 1964, the Senate adopted a motion by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration with instructions to report back immediately in lieu thereof a joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of studying the problem of conflicts of interest in all three branches of the Government.

[5] Special Subcommittee on the Establishment of a Commission on Ethics in Government, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 82d Cong., 1st sess., "Ethical Standards in Government" (committee print 1951), hereinafter cited as "Douglas report" after its subcommittee chairman, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

[6] Id. at 24.

[7] The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, special committee on the Federal conflict of interest laws (1960), hereinafter cited as "bar association report."

administration of his office clashes, or appears to clash wtih the official's interest in his private affairs, a conflict of interest arises.[8] Thus, a conflict of interest may be merely an apparent conflict whose appearance alone tends to undermine public confidence in the official's conduct.

It should be stated at the outset that a conflict of interest does not mean that if a legislator favors his private economic interests, it will necessarily result in his acting against the public interest. The contrary is often the case. Nor is the most vital consideration in conflict-of-interest legislation whether a public official will in fact resolve the conflict to his own personal advantage and to the detriment of his public duties and responsibilities. The regulation of conflicts of interest seeks to prevent situations and appearances of temptation from arising and may be characterized as the regulation of evil before the event and against potential harm. Such regulatory legislation attempts to stop the public official at the doorstep of temptation and relieve the prosecutor of the burden of proving actual bribery or influence. However, even the most precise and illuminating regulatory legislation cannot comprehend all situations or legislative behavior.

Accordingly, there is a "gray zone" of legislative behavior, which has been defined by Ralph Eisenberg, assistant professor of political science at the University of South Carolina, as that area "lying between behavior that is 'clean as a hound's tooth' and behavior obviously improper and illegal, involving such things as bribery, embezzlement and theft."[9] Included in this behavioral gray zone are an endless variety of activities such as promises of more government contracts to elicit campaign contributions, use of official position to gain special advantages or privileges, acceptance of favors from industry lobbyists, investing on the basis of inside information, and misuse of stationery and various funds entrusted to a Member's management.

According to Professor Eisenberg, the problem of dealing with conflicts of interest becomes apparent in attempting to catalog such activities as "proper" or "improper" either generally or in individual situations.[10] One of the difficulties in drafting conflict-of-interest legislation is defining such shadowy conflict situations to achieve sufficient protection for the interests of both the public at large and the elected representative. The goal of conflicts legislation for elected officials on all levels of government is to promote both the actual practice and the public appearance of impartiality and objectivity in legislative activities without disqualifying present and potential public servants through excessively rigid restrictions.

LEGISLATIVE-EXECUTIVE SITUATIONS REFINED

The subject of conflicts of interest for Members of Congress is one which has received surprisingly little commentary in the legal journals. The scholarly writings, consonant with the laws enacted by the Congress, have centered on conflict-of-interest regulation of officials and employees in the executive branch. For example, the House Committee on Government Operations recently issued a report entitled "Avoiding Conflicts of Interest in Defense Contracting and Employment,"[11] which was a study of conflict-of-interest issues affecting employees, advisers, and consultants in the executive branch. However, such studies are of little value in formulating proposals for restraining conflicts situations in the legislative branch. The New York City Bar Association study indicates that the analysis and research required for a study of the congressional conflict-of-interest problem would differ materially from that of a study of the executive branch. In addition, any attempt to apply conclusions drawn from the executive study to one for the legislative would be dangerous and at least in part unworkable.[12] This is due to the fundamental differences between the executive and legislative branches which hopelessly complicate formulating a standard code which could apply equally to both branches.

First, the basic difference between an administrator and an elected official is the latter's role as a representative. As a representative of a particular district or State, a Senator and especially a Member of the House of Representatives, is deemed to be the spokesman of the people and the economic interests of his constituency. It is often the case that a Congressman's economic self-interest is similar, even identical, to that of a major group in his constituency. The New York City Bar Association study summarized the implications of a Congressman's representative capacity by stating:

"It is common to talk of the Farm Bloc, or the Silver Senators. We would think odd a fishing State congressman who was not mindful of the interests of the fishing industry—though his campaign funds come in part from this source. This kind of representation is considered inevitable and, indeed, generally applauded. Sterile application of an abstract rule against acting in situations involving self-interest would prevent the farmer Senator from voting on farm legislation or the Negro Congressman from speaking on civil rights bills. At some point a purist attitude toward the evils of conflict of interest in Congress runs afoul of the basic premises of American representative government."[13]

The spokesman for the view that Congressmen should have outside economic involvements was the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, a multimillionaire oil-and-gas producer and, through his corporations, the largest single supplier of uranium to the Atomic Energy Commission. Senator Kerr colorfully and forcefully expressed his views on the folly of a purist attitude restricting all economic conflicts of interest among Members of Congress:

"I represent the farmers of Oklahoma, although I have large farm interests. I represent the oil business in Oklahoma, because it is Oklahoma's second largest business, and I am in the oil business. I represent the financial institutions in Oklahoma, and I am interested in them, and they know that and that is the reason they elect me. They don't want to send a man here who has no community of interest with them, because he wouldn't be worth a nickel to them."[14]

In stark contrast to the philosophy of the late Senator Kerr is the conduct of Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio. Upon his selection as a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Committee, Senator YOUNG disposed of the shares of stock he owned in Pan American Airways, a prime contractor at Cape Kennedy.[15]

A second major difference is that Members of Congress must stand for election periodically in contrast to the career status of most Government executive officials and employees. Theoretically, congressional elections and primaries act as a smoking out process of an elected official's improprieties. However, this theory loses its force in an area where there is not a strong two party system and in those elections where the public is not well informed. Advocates of the remedy of disclosure[16] as a means of deterring economic conflicts of interest claim that the public is presently prevented from being able to vote intelligently and knowledgeably on an elected official's full record.

An important principle of democratic government should be noted in connection with the view that campaigns act as a smoking out process and elections as ultimate conflict-of-interest sanctions for legislators. This principle states that one privilege of a constituency in a democracy is to elect a man of its own choosing. It is the voter's privilege to elect a man to public office in spite of improprieties in his actions or interests. Representative Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts pleaded guilty to willful tax evasion in 1956, and served 4 months in jail, but the voice of the people returned him to three more terms in Congress. However, the indictment of Representative Thomas F. Johnson, of Maryland, on October 16, 1962, on conspiracy and conflict-of-interest charges, probably contributed heavily to his defeat in the subsequent November elections. The illict operations of Billie Sol Estes implicated Representatives J. T. Rutherford, of Texas, and H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota, and were perhaps a major factor in their defeat in November of 1962.

The continued surveillance of an elected official's behavior by the press, by his campaign opponents, and ultimately by the voters does result in some measure of deterrence as evidenced in three of the above examples. However, it is unrealistic to expect that an election contest—assuming that an incumbent does not run unopposed—will expose the dirty linen or unethical activities of a legislator. In the first place, the conflict-of-interest area touches upon many subtle ethical problems which are not susceptible to the usual black and white character in which political campaign issues are framed. Furthermore, even though an opponent may uncover unethical conduct, he may fear repercussions in opening this area as a campaign issue, both in terms of his own past conduct and the possible impact on the fair play concepts of the electorate. Reliance upon the voters to police conflicts situations provides an inconsistent and sporadic sanction devoid of any rational set of standards by which legislators may measure a projected action before the fact.[17]

Primarily it is the problem of getting elected which spurs U.S. solons to seek campaign contributions, dole out patronage, and make various and sundry promises. The periodic election faced by each Congressman highlights two problems foremost in his mind. First, he must be prepared to spend thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of dollars to pay for the increasingly high cost of electioneering. Secondly, the possibility that the voters may put an abrupt end to his political career forces him to give consideration to possible outside sources of income and future gainful employment to meet that eventuality. The executive branch does not face this reelection problem.

Since the cost of a campaign invariably exceeds the salary of a Member of Congress, a complete ban on contributions would be unrealistic. A Member cannot rely on the average party member to finance his campaign, and therefore, usually the candidate's only recourse is to accept contributions from the more actively interested persons or groups who are donating money in order to protect their interests. Consequently, conflict-of-

[8] Id., at 3.

[9] Eisenberg, "Conflicts of Interest Situations and Remedies," 13 Rutgers Law Review 666 (1959).

[10] Ibid.

[11] H. Rept. No. 917, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[12] Bar Association report, 15–16.

[13] Id. at 14.

[14] "Senator Kerr Talks About Conflict of Interest," U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 3, 1962, p. 86.

[15] Note 2, supra at 4.

[16] See sec. IV, proposed conflict-of-interest regulation for Members of Congress, disclosure of financial interests, infra.

[17] Note, "Conflicts of Interest of State Legislators," 76 Harvard Law Review 1209, 1214 (1963).

interest problems frequently arise when such individuals and groups lobbying for special interests later attempt to exert pressure and influence upon the donee. The Nation's Capital is the headquarters of well-heeled lobbying groups of virtually every economic, political, and social cause whose "raison d'etre" is to influence Representatives and Senators.

Furthermore, the ethical problem caused by financial pressure does not end with the completion of the primary and election campaigns. It is increasingly difficult—termed impossible by some—for a Congressman to subsist on his salary alone. The Senator and Representative have many unique expenses. A U.S. lawmaker has to divide his time between Washington, D.C., and his own congressional district. Almost every Congressman maintains two residences, one in Washington and the other in his home district. The Congressman receives three round-trip tickets to his district each session, but it is not unusual for Senators and Representatives to travel home virtually each weekend. Frequently Members have to pay for stationery supplies and long-distance telephone calls from their own pockets when their allowance is exceeded. Large expenditures of money are also necessary for entertaining and charitable giving each year both in Washington and at home, in order for a Member of Congress to nurture a reputation among his constituents as a gracious host and selfless philanthropist. The insufficient salaries of a Congressman, together with the high costs of campaigning, force many Members to continue their outside economic activities.

One of the difficulties, however, in gaining agreement in the Congress on the question of proper economic involvement is presented by the differing views on whether the office of Congressman is full time. When conflicts-of-interest legislation was first passed by the Congress in the 19th century, the Congress was a part-time legislative body, meeting 6 or less months a year. However, the office of the 20th-century Congressman is a year-round responsibility, and little time is left for conscientious Members to dabble in business or professional activities. The Douglas committee report noted that many lawyer-members accept fees for giving advice and counsel and for other legal services but frequently have time to give only perfunctory service. In this connection, the question is whether they are being paid "for their influence and to influence their perspective."[18] Moreover, when a Congressman accepts a large honorarium for speaking before a special interest group, a similar question is raised as to the reasonableness of the compensation in relation to services rendered. The issue is whether (and how) to regulate this area of fees and retainers so as to insure that a Congressman does not jeopardize, both in appearance and in fact, his ability to represent the public.

In addition, the special influence and power of the Congress generally, and each Senator and Representative in particular, pose difficult questions in regulating conflicts of interest. One of the most important is the power and influence of Senators and Representatives to shape the Nation's laws and policies during closed executive sessions of their committees and subcommittees. The executive agencies listen to Members of Congress with respect, especially legislators with seniority, as the extent of authority, the size of the appropriation, and the future of each administrative agency or executive department depends on the will of the Congress. In this connection, it is significant to note that a large amount of time is consumed by Members of Congress in assisting constituents in their dealings with Federal departments and agencies. The "errand boy" functions expected of each Member of Congress include getting a serviceman transferred to a base nearer to his home, helping a local company obtain a Small Business Administration loan, recommending constituents for Federal jobs, and urging a Federal installation to be located in a certain community. It is in large part a good thing for legislators to serve as an informal board of inspectors over the administrative bureaucracy. Congressional intervention often serves to counteract administrative errors, inaction, and red-tape. However, problems arise where congressional channels are used to promote the private economic interests of the individual Senator or Representative.

Finally, the legislator differs from the administrator in the area of special immunities and rewards bestowed on Members of Congress to assist them in the proper performance of the office.

Article I, section 6, of the Constitution grants Members of Congress freedom from arrest, except for treason, felony, and breach of the peace, while engaged in their legislative duties, and immunity from possible slander and libel suits for statements while involved in debate on the floor of the Congress. In addition, whereas the "red ink" side of the Congressman's budget book was depicted earlier, it should be noted that a Member does receive free office space in Washington and his home district, a liberal budget for secretarial help and supplies, facilities for making television and radio broadcasts at low rates, and, very important, the franking privilege.

A delicate balance must be maintained whenever special privileges and rewards are conferred upon the office of Congressman. The office must be secure enough for the Member of Congress to perform his functions but not so secure that there is no competition, nor so rewarding that the stakes of the office are too high. For example, the standard for remuneration of a Member of Congress should represent a balance between compensation sufficient for the Member to be independent in his legislative actions and one which is not so lucrative that a Member would wish to hold on to his position for the sake of the salary alone. In order that Congress is not made the pawn of conflicting forces which themselves are to be controlled, it is necessary that both the Congress as a body and its individual Members have some degree of independence and autonomy. In this regard, any conflict-of-interest proposal that is too sweeping in nature and overly punitive in its manner of enforcement would tend to thwart these goals.

PRESENT CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST REGULATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

This section will attempt to set forth the various conflict-of-interest statutes and regulations which are applicable to Members of Congress. Since the statutory regulations mainly take the form of criminal penalties,[19] the Justice Department is extremely reluctant to prosecute a Member of Congress unless his alleged misconduct is of a very grave nature, which appears to be evidenced by the fact that less than a dozen Members of Congress have ever been indicted under these century-old statutes. The present Code of Ethics, enacted in 1958 by the 85th Congress,[20] sets a standard of conduct for Congressmen without any means of enforcement. Although the American Bar Association's Canons of Ethics apply to lawyer Members of Congress, many such Members appear to continue to enjoy a robust law practice without the intervention of any professional ethics committee either of the national or local bar associations.[21]

Section 203. Compensation to Members of Congress, officers, and others in matters affecting the Government

Section 203 proscribes the payment of compensation to Members of Congress for services rendered before Federal agencies in matters in which the United States "is interested." The penalty for conviction is a fine of not more than $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. While section 203 contains the same basic prohibitions as its statutory predecessor, section 281, the category of proceedings to which the disqualification applied are broadened. This section, inter alia, also extends the penalty to the giving as well as the receipt of compensation to Members of Congress. The list of proceedings has been extended to include "application" and "request" for a "ruling or other determination." According to the House report on the bill, the list was augmented to make clear that the enumeration is comprehensive of all matters that come before a Federal department or agency.[22] The "interest" required by the Government is now defined as "direct and substantial," replacing a prior "directly or indirectly interested" test. Since this is a criminal statute, the change was made to set up a clearer test of the proscribed interest to replace the vaguer phrase under section 281.

Section 203 is regarded as the keystone of the legislation in this field and has been the most litigated of the laws on conflicts of interest. This is because section 203 covers the principal situation of conflicts of interest, namely the acceptance of compensation from private sources for Government-related services. The section is broadly worded in order to cover all the multifarious forms of influence, peddling whereby a Member of Congress accepts compensation for acts and decisions made in his official capacity.

The breadth of section 203 may be seen from an analysis of two cases under section 281 (the predecessor to section 203) which involved Members of Congress. The first of these cases *Burton* v. *United States*,[23] involved Senator Joseph Burton, of Kansas,

[18] Douglas report, 25.

[19] Act of Oct. 13, 1962, 18 U.S.C. 201–218. For analysis of the act, see Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, "Memorandum Regarding Conflict of Interest Provisions of Public Law 87–849," Jan. 28, 1963, 28 Fed. Reg. 985 (1963). See also "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation," hearings of June 1 and 2, 1961, before the House Antitrust Subcommittee, 87th Cong., 1st sess., ser. 3; H. Rept. No. 748, 87th Cong., 1st sess. "Conflicts of Interest," hearing of June 21, 1962, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 87th Cong., 2d sess.; S. Rept. No. 2213, 87th Cong., 2d sess.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, p. 14774; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 16, pp. 21975, 22311.

[20] H. Con. Res. 175 (85th Cong.).

[21] An attorney engaged in the practice of law is held to the same highest standard of ethical and moral uprightness and fair dealing when acting as a businessman or when acting as a lawyer and is subject to disciplinary action if he fails to maintain those standards in either capacity. "Canons of Professional Ethics," American Bar Association, canons 6 and 37. On the basis of canons 26 and 32, the committee on professional ethics of the American Bar Association has ruled that "a law firm could not accept employment to appear before a legislative committee while a member of the firm is serving in the legislature * * * [and that] a full disclosure before the committee would not alter this ruling nor would it be changed by the fact that the member of the legislature would not share in the fee received thereby." Opinion 296, Aug. 1, 1959, 45 American Bar Association Journal 1272 (1959).

[22] H. Rept. No. 748, 87th Cong., 1st sess. 20 (1961).

[23] 202 U.S. 344 (1906).

who served in the Senate from 1901 to 1906. Senator Burton was charged with agreeing to appear before the Post Office Department on behalf of the Rialto Grain & Securities Co., of St. Louis in return for $2,500. The company was about to lose its right to receive mail because it was allegedly involved in a scheme to defraud. The defendant argued, inter alia, that section 281 (then section 1782) was unconstitutional as it interfered with the legitimate functions, privileges and rights of Senators, and impinged upon the authority and powers of the Senate over its Members. The Supreme Court rejected this argument as the Senate itself voted to enact this provision. This opinion,[24] written by Justice John Marshall Harlan, contains an excellent statement on the underlying purpose of this section:

"Evidently the statute has for its main object to secure the integrity of executive action against undue influence upon the part of members of that branch of the Government whose favor may have much to do with the appointment to, or retention in, public position of those whose official action it is sought to control or direct. The evils attending such a situation are apparent and are increased when those seeking to influence executive officers are spurred by hopes of pecuniary reward." [25]

The Burton case is the leading court decision on the scope of the section 281 phrase referring to a matter or proceeding "in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested," as the Court adopted the view that a direct moneyed or pecuniary interest of the United States was not required. Although section 203, as reenacted in 1962, sets up a new statutory test, namely, "direct and substantial," it appears that the holding in the Burton case would be the same if the Supreme Court were presently construing this phrase, based on the language found in the case denominating the Government's interest in protecting its postal facilities against improper use as a "direct" interest.[25] The Burton decision, even in view of the new statutory test, virtually forecloses all administrative law practice by Members of Congress for compensation, and as revised, section 203(a)(2) extends the type of matter proscribed from receiving compensation to "any proceeding, application, and request for a ruling or other determination."

Another case worthy of mention arising under section 281 is *United States* v. *Quinn*.[26] Representative T. Vincent Quinn, now a magistrate in New York City, was charged with violating section 281 as a result of his sharing profits from cases in which his law firm represented clients before the Internal Revenue Service. The Quinn case is important as it represents the first prosecution of a Congressman for the rendition of services through partners and not personally. Quinn, who had already left Congress, was acquitted. The Quinn case held that while it is not necessary to find a specific criminal intent, in the sense of a conscious purpose of wrongdoing or evil motive, the defendant must know that partnership profits received by him are for services rendered by the partnership before an agency during the period he is a Member of Congress, and he must have knowingly received such compensation. Quinn never met the clients, was not retained by them, and did not personally appear or render any services for them before officials of the Internal Revenue Service.

Dictum in Quinn states that mere inquiries by a Congressman, without proof of a receipt of fees for services rendered, concerning the status of matters pending before a Federal bureau, without discussion of the merits of the case, did not constitute rendition of "services" within the contemplation of the statute.[27] The Court stated that as an essential element for sustaining a conviction there must be a finding "that compensation was received in return for services rendered for the purpose of interceding with, or with the intent to influence and persuade, officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau to obtain favorable decisions and actions in matters pending before the Bureau." [28]

This view seems to be contrary to the express language of section 281 and the legislative history of the statute. Congress prohibited the rendering of services within the scope of the duties of the Member of Congress for compensation. Although the object of the statute is to prevent the use or abuse of official position to influence agency action, there is no requirement that the officer actually tried to influence such action.[29] This view was expressed in *May* v. *United States* [30] where the Court commented that "the gist of the offense is the receipt of compensation, not the nature of the act done by the recipient in consequence thereof." [31] In this case, Representative Andrew Jackson May, of Kentucky, then chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, was charged with accepting $50,000 from Murray W. and Henry W. Garsson during World War II in return for his aid in getting war contracts for them. The Court commented:

"If the money was received by May as compensation for acts done by him for the Garssons, it is immaterial that those acts were patriotic, legitimate, and within the scope of his official duties as a Congressman." [32]

The Court affirmed the conviction, holding that even if the service rendered by a Member of Congress is otherwise proper, the receipt of compensation therefore renders it illegal.

Limitation of the practice of law by a Member of Congress

Lawyers traditionally have far outnumbered other professions in the U.S. Congress. Of the 535 Members of the 88th Congress, 315 are lawyers. While there is no Federal law which flatly prohibits the private practice of law by a Member of Congress, several statutes narrowly restrict the scope of such practice.

An informal survey, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of the methods by which lawyer-legislators run their private law practices evidenced "an astonishing variety of methods." [33] Great disparity was found between the standards of those Members who have an active law practice as to cases involving Federal agencies and the Federal courts. The partnership arrangements were characterized by their lack of a common pattern as to what cases would be accepted and how the common revenues were to be divided. Since there are few clear-cut guidelines in this area, what one Member considered to be a perfectly ethical practice of law the next may consider highly improper.

Section 204. Practice in Court of Claims by Members of Congress

This section forbids a Member of Congress to practice in the Court of Claims. The penalty for conviction is a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both. Moreover, conviction under this provision also bars a Member of Congress from ever holding "any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States."

Section 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses

The bribery section is not actually an integral part of a conflict-of-interest study. As stated earlier, regulation of conflicts of interest has been in the past the attempt to regulate the evil before its occurrence. Conflicts regulation is in essence derived or secondary—once removed from the ultimate misconduct feared. The bribe is forbidden because its effect is to subvert the official's judgment; a conflict of interest is regulated not only because it may have this effect but also because it looks to the public as though it does have this effect. Thus, bribery is a collateral problem of a conflict-of-interest study.

The 87th Congress combined into a single provision sections 201 through 213 of title 18 of the United States Code, which comprises nine general bribery sections and four sections prohibiting bribery in special cases. Under section 201 as revised, it is unlawful for anyone to bribe or attempt to bribe a Member of Congress either before or after he is qualified, by corruptly giving, offering, or promising him or any person selected by him something of value to influence him to commit or allow any fraud on the United States, or to induce him to do or omit to do any act in violation of his lawful duty.[34]

Section 201(c) prohibits a Member of Congress from soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to take a bribe. The theory of this section thereby runs counter to the classic advice of Lord Bacon, who said: "While never missing a chance to take a bribe, one should never let the taking of the bribe influence his conduct in the slightest." This subsection also makes clear that a Member of Congress cannot accept something of value, which while not of benefit to himself, will be of advantage to another person in whose well-being he is interested.

Other statutory provisions

There are two other statutory provisions which directly apply to Members of Congress who are lawyers: 46 U.S.C. 1223(e) makes it unlawful for any contractor or charterer who holds any contract made under the authority of the Merchant Marine Act to employ a Member of Congress as an attorney either with or without compensations; 25 U.S.C. 706 forbids a Member of Congress to practice before the Indian Claims Commission.

Canons of ethics

Conflict of interest guidelines for lawyer Members of Congress, as was mentioned earlier, are provided by the American Bar

[24] The Court stated: "That such proceeding or matter involved the pecuniary interests of the defendant's clients is not denied. That it also involved the use of the property as well as postal facilities furnished by the United States for carrying and transporting mail matter must also be admitted. What the Post Office Department aimed to do in the execution of the acts of Congress and the regulations established under those acts was to protect the mails of the United States from being used, in violation of law, to promote schemes for obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises * * *. And it is, we think, a mistake to say that the United States was not interested, directly or indirectly, in protecting its property, that is, its mails and postal facilities, against improper and illegal use, and in the enforcement, through the agency of one of its Departments, of a statute regulating such use." Id. at 370–371.

[25] Id. at 368.

[26] 141 F. Supp. 622 (S.D. N.Y. 1956).

[27] Id. at 629.

[28] Id. at 626–627.

[29] "Hearings on Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation Before the House Antitrust Subcommittee," 86th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 17, pt. 2 at 643 (1960).

[30] 175 F. 2d 994 (D.C. Cir. 1949).

[31] Id. at 1006.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Bagdikian and Oberdorfer, "Conflict of Interest, Can Congress Crack Down on Its Own Members?" Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 12, 1964, p. 34.

[34] See sec. 201(b) thereunder.

Association Canons of Professional Ethics. For example, Canon No. 36 states:

"A lawyer, having once held public office or having been in the public employ, should not after his retirement accept employment in connection with any matter which he has investigated or passed upon while in such office or employ."

This canon has been construed to bar a law firm from rendering services in any situation where any member of the firm is barred.[35]

Disqualification

An additional area of the overall conflicts-of-interest problem is based on the view that a legislator should not vote on a matter in which he has a private economic interest. The purist view, as expressed by Thomas Jefferson in his manual of parliamentary practice, provides that:

"Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary, not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to." [36]

From the rules of the House of Representatives, rule VIII, the following broadly worded limitation is placed on a Member's right to vote:

"Every Member * * * shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question." [37]

Although the annotation of this rule notes that the weight of authority favors the idea that there is no authority in the House to deprive a Member of the right to vote, in one or two instances the Speaker of the House has decided that a Member should not vote because of a personal interest. Generally, however, past Speakers have held that the Member himself should decide the question of the propriety of his voting on a particular matter. The disqualifying interest has been held to be such as affects the Member directly and not as one of a class.

The rule of "immemorial observance" runs counter to the actual state of affairs during the 19th century. A frequently cited example of the standard of public morality in the early years of Congress was the private correspondence between Senator Daniel Webster and Nicholas Biddle, president of the National Bank, in which Senator Webster suggested that Biddle might wish the Senator to bring the matter of President Jackson's proposed withdrawal of U.S. deposits from the bank before the Senate. He wrote:

"Since I have arrived here, I have had an application to be concerned, professionally, against the bank, which I have declined, of course, although I believe my retainer has not been renewed, or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it may be well to send me the usual retainers." [38]

It was such common practice for Members of Congress to represent people prosecuting claims against the Government that during the Civil War some Members of Congress even advertised in newspapers of their availability to represent claimants against the Government.

With respect to the enforcement of the rule concerning disqualification, each Speaker of the House has had a different practice. However, the rule has never been considered to encompass a Member's committee activity where, because of the importance of the work of committees in the framework of Congress, it would be most effective. Some of the difficulties inherent in a rule against voting due to personal interest may be seen from an incident which occurred in the House on April 11, 1874. The issue to be decided by the Speaker of the House was whether three Congressmen should vote on a national bank taxation measure since they were officers of national banks. Representative James G. Blaine, the Speaker, ruled that Members could vote their private interests if the measure was not for their exclusive benefit. At that time, Speaker Blaine was offering his services to the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad in return for their stock.

Code of ethics for Government service

An enumeration of conflict-of-interest provisions would not be complete without mention of House Concurrent Resolution 175, which was passed by the Senate on July 11, 1958, and approved by the House on August 28, 1957. This concurrent resolution declares it to be the sense of the Congress that a "Code of Ethics for Government Service" should be adhered to by "all Government employees, including officeholders." The report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service states that this resolution is intended to apply to Members of Congress.[39]

The code of ethics contains 10 general principles which are so broad as to shed little illumination and true guidance for the public servant. For example, the first principle states that any person in Government service should "put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department." Other principles includes upholding the Constitution and laws of the land, giving "a full day's labor for a full day's pay," never discriminating unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, and exposing corruption wherever discovered. Two members of the Senate committee wrote a concurring report to stress the fact that while the code is a "statement of principles without enforcement provisions," it was their hope that it would "be reinforced in the early future by reforms of greater stringency and efficacy." [40] The Congress might have embraced the code within its own rules and employed its principles on an ad hoc basis. However, no provision for enforcement was ever made. Since previous efforts to secure action by the Congress had been unsuccessful, the code of ethics marked a breakthrough albeit a minor one.

PROPOSED CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST REGULATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

In an impassioned speech on the House floor, Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina called for an exhaustive study of many allegedly shameful practices which are threatening to undermine this great institution we all love—the Congress of the United States.[41] He used a dramatic, perhaps melodramatic, analogy from the past:

"We have from history the example of the Roman Senate, whose power was eroded and corrupted by the Roman Emperor, and they sank into oblivion with presents, gifts, luxurious chariots, villas, and nepotism. Through such conduct, the doom of the Roman Republic was sealed forever." [42]

Although the prophecy of doom may be part of congressional histrionics, no one disputes the harmful potential of conflicts between the official duties of a Member of Congress and his personal economic advantage. Basically, the problem is not whether to have a system of legal restraints on conflict of interests, but how to design a system which achieves the maximum protection for both the Members of Congress and the public, and a minimum of undesirable collateral results.

Disclosure of financial interests

One of the most frequently recommended of the conflict-of-interest proposals advanced by Members of Congress is the publicizing of the personal financial interests of Senators and Representatives. This solution recognizes the difficulty of defining what is and what is not proper interest and leaves to the public both the information and the determination. A Member of Congress, if forced to disclose his private sources of income, has to decide what the effects of his known interests will be, and to make adjustments and bear responsibility accordingly.

Senator WAYNE MORSE has introduced a bill in each session of the Congress since 1947 to require Members of Congress to file public statements relating to amount, sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities. Senator MORSE told a Senate committee that he calls this disclosure legislation "my Caesar's wife bill because I think that a public servant ought to want to be above suspicion and I think this will help place him above suspicion." [43]

Bills calling for mandatory disclosure of income and financial interests take on varying forms. A representative example is H.R. 4747, introduced by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, during the 88th Congress. This bill provides that each Member of the Senate and House shall file yearly with the clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House, respectively, a report which shall be made public containing a full and complete statement of financial interests. Five items of disclosure are required: (1) The amount and resources of all income and gifts (including speaking fees) of more than $100 received from any one source during the preceding calendar year; (2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him, or by him and to him and any other person, including his spouse; (3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year received by him or any associate, including his spouse and minor children, or on his behalf or subject to his direction or control; (4) an annual report listing all transactions in real estate, securities, or commodities by the Member or by any person, including his spouse, acting on his behalf; (5) the name of any relative who is also an employee of the Federal Government.

One of the best arguments in favor of compulsory disclosure proposals was made by the Douglas subcommittee which recommended legislation providing for the mandatory disclosure of income, assets, and certain transactions by all Members of Congress and for higher administrative officials of the Federal Government. The report of the subcommittee noted that there was more general agreement with respect to this proposal and its general effectiveness, than upon any other; it gave the following justification for such a proposal.

---

[35] See *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co.*, 136 F. Supp. 345, 360 (S.D. N.Y. 1955), and cases cited therein.

[36] "Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives," H.R. Doc. No. 459, 86th Cong., 2d sess. 171 (1961).

[37] Id. at 318.

[38] Letters from Daniel Webster to Nicholas Biddle, Oct. 29, 1833, Dec. 21, 1833, in McGrane, "The Correspondence of Nicholas Biddle," 216–217, 218 (1919), quoted in bar association report at 30.

[39] S. Rept. No. 1812, 85th Cong., 2d sess. 1 (1958).

[40] Id. at 3.

[41] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 4, p. 4927.

[42] Ibid.

[43] "Hearings on the Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted to Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government Before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments," 82d Cong., 1st sess. 239 (1951).

"Disclosure is like an antibiotic which can deal with ethical sickness in the field of public affairs. It avoids difficult decisions as to what may be right or wrong. In that sense it is not even diagnostic, yet there is confidence that it will be helpful in dealing with many questionable or improper practices. It would sharpen men's own judgments of right and wrong, since they would be less likely to do wrong things if they knew these acts would be challenged." [44]

However, in 1958, a staff report of the House Committee on the Judiciary concluded that legislative doubt as to precise boundaries of propriety did not justify a wholesale inquisition into private affairs.[45] The staff report used the simile of disclosure as an antibiotic, which was utilized in the Douglas report, as a clue to the reason why Congress has not adopted this recommendation:

"Since the initial enthusiasm with which the medical profession prescribed wonder drugs, troublesome side effects have been encountered whose full impact on the human organism has yet to be plumbed. Today, these drugs are used more sparingly. The potential side effects of compulsory disclosure of the financial affairs of all high Federal officials seem similarly to demand utmost caution in its prescription. Much added study is recommended before any broad scale and indiscriminate adoption of this remedy." [46]

The main argument of the staff report was that added reporting requirements would be a great inconvenience to most officials. They would be required, the report noted, to forgo the privacy that ordinary citizens enjoy with respect to their holdings and transactions which, in a preponderance of instances, would have no remote bearing on their public service. Furthermore, the report seriously questioned whether such an added sacrifice should be demanded of those who are called to public office.

The approach to congressional disclosure advocated by Senators KENNETH KEATING and JACOB JAVITS, of New York, provides a middle ground between the onerous task of listing all financial holdings and the present system of disclosure on a purely voluntary basis. Their proposal, embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 (88th Cong.), provides that Members of Congress "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency," shall make the nature of such interest a matter of public record by filing a statement with the Comptroller General. The statement would set forth this interest "in such reasonable detail and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General."

Disqualification

A proposal which goes beyond disclosure is that of disqualification from voting where the Member of Congress has a personal interest in a matter which he is called upon to vote or make a decision. That this is one of the most perplexing areas of conflicts-of-interest situations is shown by the rhetorical questions raised by Representative EDITH GREEN in a speech on the House floor, on March 11, 1963:

"Now, I suppose that no one believes a Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in a housing bill because he owns a house. But what if he is president or a member of the board of directors of a local urban renewal agency or a large residential construction company?

"No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving oil or gas because his house is heated by gas or oil. But what if he is a major stockholder or officer in a gas transmission line, or the owner of a dozen oil wells?

"No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from shaping commodity legislation because he owns a farm or a ranch. But what if this Member serves as a consultant to an economic interest that seeks to knead and shape the legislation to its own ends?" [47]

Thus, the very nature of a legislator's role as a representative of the interests of his constituency makes rigid enforcement of the disqualification rule impracticable.[48]

The disqualification remedy is one that is already adopted as one of the "housekeeping" rules of the Senate and the House. However, it is rarely used and is not given serious consideration by most Members of Congress. When Senater WAYNE MORSE reminded the late Senator Robert Kerr that under rule XII of the Senate he should not vote on a natural gas bill because of his own gas investments, Kerr "exploded in anger" and proceeded to vote anyway.[49] Although both the Senate and the House clearly have the power to enforce these rules with sanctions, no machinery has ever been set up to police them.

Ex parte communications by Members of Congress

Ex parte communication is not primarily a conflict-of-interest problem; rather, it is concerned with fair hearing and adjudicatory procedures in quasi-judicial agencies. However, ex parte communications sometimes form part of a pattern of improper influence through threats, bribery, favors, or other means. A conflict-of-interest problem is created whenever an administrative official permits himself to be put in a compromising position as a result of such ex parte communication.

In recent years, Members of both Houses have introduced legislation which would require that all ex parte communications from Members of Congress relating to agency adjudications be made matters of public record. Ex parte communication legislation usually provides that all written and oral communications made by a Member, or a member of his staff, to an officer or employee of an executive branch department or agency shall become part of the public record of any case upon which a query is made. The record is then to include the name of the caller, the time, the matter queried, the proceeding, if any, involved, and the nature of the inquiry.

Proponents of ex parte communication legislation contend that this disclosure would be a strong safeguard against improper attempts to influence agency decisions. The argument is stated in its tersest form by Senator KEATING: "I can conceive of no circumstances under which it would be proper to do so without some notice to the parties in the agency proceedings." [50] Such proposals would not prohibit or limit contacts by Members of Congress with the administrative agencies but are designed to curb abuses "by exposing every such contact to the light of day." [51]

Commission of Ethics

The main recommendation of the Douglas report [52] was the establishment of a Commission on Ethics in Government. This Commission would be established by a joint resolution of Congress to focus primarily on the legislative and executive branches. It would consist of 15 members, with 5 appointed by the President, 5 by the President of the Senate (the Vice President) and 5 by the Speaker of the House. Only two persons chosen by each appointing officer would be from within the Government, the other three would be from private life. The Commission would have the power to hold hearings and secure testimony and evidence, authority to employ a staff and be given funds to carry on its work. This group would have 2 years to submit a report and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

The theory of the Douglas report proposal is that it is far more likely that reform will be accomplished if an outside nonpartisan group of eminent citizens is brought in to study the problem. There is a rule of the congressional fraternity that no Member shall expose publicly the transgressions of another. While some Members of Congress feel the need for such legislation, they are unwilling to point the finger of guilt at any of their colleagues. In this respect, an editorial in the Washington Post quipped: "Experience has shown that the prospect of getting a full disclosure of abuses from Congress is almost equivalent to that of getting complete military inspections in the Soviet Union." [53]

Favorable initial action has been taken by the Senate recently on Senate Joint Resolution 187, which establishes a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of studying conflicts of interest in all three branches of the Government. This legislation, sponsored by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, incorporates many of the recommendations of the Douglas report relating to the composition and the sphere of activity of such a "blue ribbon" commission. However, the Dirksen proposal specifically empowers the Commission on Ethics to make investigations, when necessary, of Members of Congress and legislative staff as well as of officials and employees of the executive and judicial branches. On July 27, 1964, the Senate adopted a motion to recommit to the Committee on Rules and Administration the disclosure proposal recommended by that committee with instructions to report back immediately the Dirksen measure. Subsequently, on July 28, Senate Joint Resolution 187 was placed on the Senate Calendar. The Dirksen proposal seeks to take the formulation and execution of conflicts of interest regulations out of the hands of the Congress and thus there is some doubt whether such a measure will receive the support needed in the House and Senate to be enacted into law.

Another variation of the "blue ribbon" commission idea is the Commission on Legislative Ethics suggested by Representative EDITH GREEN. The composition and goals of the Commission on Legislative Ethics would be similar to those of the Commission on Ethics in Government, except the former

---

[44] Douglas report, 37.

[45] Staff report to the House Antitrust Subcommittee, 85th Cong., 2d sess., "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation," 11 (committee print, 1958).

[46] Ibid.

[47] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 3, p. 3945.

[48] Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, raises this point in commenting on whether Members should refrain from voting on matters involving personal advantage to them: "For the most part the gain to the individual Congressman includes advantage or the advancement of an interest which is shared by many other persons, including constituents. Consequently all of these would be unrepresented and would suffer if the individual Member refrained." Speech delivered to the 16th Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Their Relations to the Democratic Way of Life, Aug. 30, 1960.

[49] Pearson, "Congress Needs a Code of Ethics," Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1963, p. B25.

[50] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 16, p. 21988.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Douglas report, 24.

[53] "Congressional Ethics," editorial, Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1963.

would concentrate exclusively on ethical problems within the Congress.

Another type of commission suggested is similar to the grievance or ethics committees of bar associations, medical societies, and other professional organizations. This group would be comprised solely of Members of Congress. Senators KEATING and JAVITS and Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, three of the most vocal spokesmen for congressional conflict-of-interest regulation, have proposed the creation of a Joint House-Senate Committee on Ethics during the past three Congresses. Under the Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal, a Joint Congressional Committee on Ethics would be established within the Congress to make a study of conflict of interest problems. The Rules Committee of the House and the Senate, respectively, would be given duties similar to those of a grievance or ethics committee of a professional organization, such as a bar association. This committee would be granted authority to give advisory opinions to the Members on conflict of interest questions and to issue public interpretative opinions for the guidance of Members either on request or on its own initiative. In addition to having a group provide general guidelines for action, machinery would be established for resolving specific congressional conflict-of-interest problems.

Same standards for executive and legislative branches

One of the remaining major proposals calls for extension of the present conflicts laws, which apply only to the executive branch, to Members of Congress. The underlying theme of this view was expressed by former Senator John A. Carroll, of Colorado, in the 1962 Senate report on House Resolution 8140, proposing legislation to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest. Senator Carroll stated: "There can be no double standard. The high standard of conduct that we in the legislative branch expect of the executive branch must be equally applied to ourselves." [54]

These proposals provide for extending the coverage of sections 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code to Members of Congress.[55] Such an equal treatment approach fails to take into account the special role and status of the legislator. As discussed earlier, the congressional problem differs from that of the executive in fundamental respects. It is submitted that the Congressman's representative status makes a conflict-of-interest approach which is tailored to govern the conduct of officials in the executive branch unworkable both in theory and in practice. For example, extension of section 205's coverage to Members of Congress would have the bizarre result of forbidding U.S. solons from rendering gratuitous services before Federal agencies on behalf of their own constituents. Furthermore, such an approach defines congressional conflicts of interest solely in terms of a criminal statute whereby conviction may lead to imprisonment, fine, or disqualification from ever holding a Federal office, or various combinations of the three. The history of congressional conflict-of-interest regulation points to the inadequacy of embracing within the concept of criminality the classic conflicts situations wherein activities may appear evil on the surface but involve no real misconduct.

A SUGGESTED APPROACH

Who watches the watchers? It has been suggested many times that Congress cannot lift itself by its bootstraps and is unwilling to take any positive steps with regard to legislative conflicts of interest. In the long run, however, Congress cannot afford to follow a double standard of ethics or assume a holier-than-thou attitude if it expects to enjoy public confidence. Unless Congress takes steps to regulate its internal affairs in a reasonable and effective manner—and convinces the public it is doing so—it cannot hope to maintain its traditional role as proctor of the other two branches of Government. If its Members cannot agree on ethical standards for themselves, Congress thereby weakens its own image as arbiter of what is proper in the society at large.

The complexity and subtlety of conflicts-of-interest problems preclude a simple answer. While criminal sanctions are appropriate for easily delineated and proscribed behavior, such as bribery, blackmail, or dishonest election practices, the gray and shadowy areas of legislative ethics militate against broad and sweeping legislation as the proper solution. In a system of government characterized by dual loyalties with a full spectrum of competing interests of the legislator and the public, codification of abstract moral principles is surely not the answer. Furthermore, pitting glib general standards of official behavior against the elements of a concrete conflicts problem rarely produces any assistance in evaluating the problem.[56] The evolution of a situational or case-by-case approach, therefore, seems to be the proper method of defining and resolving conflicts situations. In addition, any long-range solution to the problem must provide continuing machinery for defining, preventing, exposing and, where appropriate, punishing congressional conduct which falls below the designated standard.

The main impediment to regulation has been the unwillingness of the policeman to police himself. Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman of the House Administration Committee, stated that he is willing to let his committee act on congressional ethics bills "when the House desires. So far the leadership has indicated no strong interest (to do so)." [57] However, a significant step in regulating its internal conflicts problems was taken in the Senate in its adoption of a resolution sponsored by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, which creates a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, to be composed of Members, three from each of the political parties, to be appointed by the President of the Senate. This bipartisan committee is authorized to receive complaints of unethical conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the Senate, make investigations of allegations of such conduct, propose rules and regulations, and make recommendations to the Senate regarding disciplinary action.

The establishment of a bipartisan watchdog committee, without anything more, leaves much to be desired. While commending the select committee as a "useful device," a New York Times editorial went on to criticize such a measure as being clearly inadequate:

"It is unlikely to put a stop to either disquieting suspicions or actual malpractices, for it would be investigating matters brought to its attention, which is like locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen." [58]

The creation of a bipartisan investigating committee will take on real significance only when Congress is provided with the means by which it might operate effectively. In this connection, it is submitted that the legislative approach to conflicts of interest situations sponsored jointly by Senators JAVITS and KEATING and Representative LINDSAY is one that deserves full and serious consideration by the Congress. The Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal employs the following three-step approach: (1) Creation of a Joint House-Senate Committee on Ethics to investigate and recommend a specific code of ethics for the Congress; (2) adoption of an interim code of ethics and system of disclosure of financial interests which would be in force during the joint committee's study; and (3) a grant of authority to the House and Senate Committees on Rules and Administration, respectively, to receive complaints and issue advisory opinions to Members of Congress on conflict-of-interest problems. In addition, these legislators cosponsored a companion bill which would require that communications between Members of Congress or their staffs and regulatory agencies be made part of the public record of the cases to which they refer.

The main Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal, which was discussed earlier, contemplates both the formulation and execution of ethical standards by the Congress itself, with no outside intervention. The Joint Committee on Ethics would be entirely composed of Representatives and Senators, with seven members appointed by the President of the Senate and seven chosen by the Speaker of the House. The committee would study to what extent existing conflict-of-interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened and recommend a comprehensive code of ethics covering a wide range of ethical problems ranging from outside employment to use of confidential information for personal advantage. In order to prevent establishment of the committee as a mere stalling device, it is suggested that a 6-month deadline be given within which the committee must submit its report and recommendations.

The second part of the proposal, an interim code of ethics, establishes in general terms the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of Members of Congress. The main and all-embracing standard in the interim code provides:

"No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business transaction, or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the legislative branch give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of the public trust." [59]

In addition to this general rule, several standards are set forth with regard to certain specified situations, such as confidential information and outside employment. Although these broadly stated standards provide no definitive assistance to the judgment process in individual situations, they do serve the purpose of stating in advance both to the Member of Congress and the public what is acceptable behavior, as well as providing standards by which the appropriate congressional committee may be guided in the exploration of a particular case before it.

In addition to the enunciation of a code of ethics to guide congressional behavior, the interim proposal requires disclosure of Members' financial interests having a value of $5,000 or more [60] in any activity subject

---

[54] S. Rept. No. 2213, 87th Cong., 2d sess. 16 (1962).

[55] The House passed H.R. 11049 on June 11, 1964, and the Senate passed an amended version of this legislation on July 2, 1964.

[56] Eisenberg, supra, note 9 at 669.

[57] "House Tackles Problem of Congressional Ethics," Roll Call, May 1, 1963, p. 2.

[58] "Code for Congress," editorial, New York Times, July 27, 1964.

[59] S. Con. Res. 5, 88th Cong., 1st sess., sec. 6(a).

[60] Statement of Senator JAVITS, hearings before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st and 2d sessions, "Financial or Business Interests of Officers or Employees of the Senate," pt. 22, p. 1905 (May 26, 1964).

to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency. As mentioned earlier, such statements would set forth this interest in such reasonable detail and in accordance with regulations as prescribed by the Comptroller General. While such disclosures would be filed with the Comptroller General, consideration should also be given to disclosure proposals which call for filing such reports with the Secretary of the Senate and the House, respectively. However, the designation of a depository for such statements is only incidental to the requirement that all such statements shall be available for public inspection. This proposal represents a middle ground between proposals discussed earlier, ranging from the detailed reporting requirements advocated by Representative GREEN of all sources of income and gifts of more than $100, to the less onerous but more general disclosure recommended by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee.[61] Public disclosure, as long as the extent of reporting required is sufficiently extensive to cover those circumstances from which a conflict of interest might be inferred, is an important step in fostering public confidence in the integrity of Congress as an institution. This remedy avoids the extreme solution of outlawing all outside sources of income, dealings in stock, and receipt of fees for any reason. Thus, a Member of Congress would be allowed to receive any type of income or incur any financial obligation which he is willing to justify.

Another type of disclosure is contained in the companion bill which would require all communications between Members of Congress or their staffs and regulatory agencies be made part of the public record of the cases to which they refer. Such a proposal was advocated by the late President Kennedy, in his message to the Congress on April 27, 1961, in which he stated that some of the most spectacular examples of official misconduct have involved ex parte communication. By requiring that congressional intervention in any case under deliberation by an administrative agency be reduced to writing for the record, a simple answer is provided to the question of legitimate versus illegitimate influence by Members of Congress on administrative decisionmaking.

An important part of any comprehensive conflicts of interest proposal is that in addition to the promulgation of an interim code of ethics, effective machinery is provided for investigating and resolving specific congressional conflicts of problems as soon as the situation arises. The Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal authorizes the Rules and Administration Committees of the Senate and House, respectively, to perform duties similar to those of grievance or ethics committees of bar associations, medical societies, and other professional organizations. It would have authority to receive complaints and to issue public interpretative opinions for the guidance of Members either on request or on its own initiative. Consideration should also be given to the alternative of vesting such power in a bipartisan Select Committee on Ethics, similar in composition to the one recently created by the Senate. Unlike the Rules and Administration Committees of the House and Senate which are assigned a number of important housekeeping functions, a special committee would be able to devote its full and undivided time to the task of defining, preventing, exposing and punishing improper congressional conduct.

Finally, since the problems of conflict of interest cut across the entire fabric of the American political and constitutional tradition, any major reform would necessarily include a complete reevaluation and revision of present campaign contribution and spending laws. Such a study would have to come to grips with the problem of which campaign contributions are properly acceptable and which are not. Politics is not classified as philanthropy for tax purposes and as a result the main sources of campaign contributions are from well-heeled lobbying groups and individuals who frequently look upon their contribution as an investment. Proposals for reform meriting serious consideration include providing tax deductions for political contributions of up to $100 and the placing of a ceiling upon the amount that any one individual or group may contribute. Furthermore, until the time that a Member of Congress can live on his salary, he will be forced to look to outside earning possibilities and contributions from lobbying groups. An encouraging step in attacking this problem, which is one of the main sources of congressional conflicts situations, was the passage of legislation this session raising the annual salaries of Members of Congress to $30,000.

The Douglas report stated: "The standards of the public will be raised if leaders in public life practice vigorous integrity. They will be lowered if these leaders are lax in their personal or official behavior." [62] It should be added that the standards of the leaders will be raised if the public both practices vigorous integrity and demands the highest standards of ethical behavior.

[61] See note 4, supra.

[62] Douglas report, 7.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m., but I would hope that before that motion is made the attachés of the Senate would notify Senators on both sides of the aisle that there will be a yea-and-nay vote at 4 o'clock p.m. on the constitutional amendment which was passed yesterday, and that when the Senate returns, even though the tariff bill will be the pending business, there will be an opportunity for discussion prior to the time of the vote.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m., this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p.m., the same day.

At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair).

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, without amendment, the bill (S. 1082) to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5871. An act to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DORN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. BARING, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1851) for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife, and it was signed by the **President pro tempore.**

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of H.R. 12253, an act to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATOR McNAMARA'S POSITION ON PROGRAM OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the fanatic opposition of the "medicrats" of the American Medical Association to a program of hospital insurance for the elderly reached an absolute bottom last Friday.

Dr. Edward R. Annis, chief propagandist for the AMA, appeared on NBC television's "Today" show.

During the course of being interviewed, Dr. Annis suddenly launched into a vicious personal attack on the motives and integrity of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, PAT MCNAMARA. By implication, Dr. Annis extended his rusty scalpel to include those of us who have the privilege of serving with PAT MCNAMARA on the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging.

In his usual glib and phony fashion, Dr. Annis was unctuously singing the praises of the Kerr-Mills program and private health insurance, claiming that these approaches rendered a social secu-

rity plan unnecessary. The interviewer on the program upset Dr. Annis' composure through rebuttal based upon reports of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly. At that point, Dr. Annis lashed out with this statement:

I could have written Senator MCNAMARA'S report before he ever had his committee action. No one is ever surprised with what he finds. He knows ahead of time what he's going to report. He's been doing this for a number of years.

Mr. President, seven Senators signed the last two reports of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly in addition to PAT MCNAMARA. I am proud to have been one of those seven.

Anyone with a moderately "open mind" who has read those reports realizes the validity of their conclusions. Anyone who has read those reports is aware of the enormous documentation and factual material included in those studies which made the findings of the subcommittee valid and inevitable.

With regard to the Kerr-Mills program, we found it inadequate, inequitable, and inappropriate as the major Federal answer to the health care financing problems of the elderly. Dr. Annis, unable to face these hard facts, or deny them, resorts to vilification of Senator MCNAMARA.

But listen to what the Republican chairman of Iowa's State Board of Social Welfare, who is also chairman of the State senate's appropriations committee, had to say about public assistance health care financing. Senator Lawrence Putney told the Iowa State Medical Society:

We in the department of social welfare, are concerned over the fact that many persons are receiving old age assistance today almost entirely because of their medical care needs. In other words, were it not for medical care bills, these aged would be self-supporting.

I wonder how many Americans feel that it is a sound practice to force a person to go on public relief in order to receive medical care. It seems to me that this is unsound in theory and is not in accordance with American tradition.

I wonder what Dr. Annis will say about Senator Putney?

Our last report, thoroughly documented the inability of private health insurance to meet the needs of the elderly. Dr. Annis' hackles rose over our daring to challenge another section of the AMA's dogma. But, listen to what Iowa has to say about the adequacy of private health insurance:

Many of those approved for MAA (42.2 percent) stated that they have some form of health insurance. Evidently most policies did not adequately cover medical expenses as only 8.8 percent said their medical bills were paid primarily from this source.

We in the Senate know PAT MCNAMARA. He is not given to phoneying official documents of this body. I suppose it is an old tactic to ascribe your own base motives and methods to your opponents. This would appear to be the case in view of the absolute falsity of Dr. Annis' poisonous assault on a great Senator.

The Annis attack on PAT MCNAMARA and his subcommittee is nothing less than an expression of contempt for all the Members of the Senate. It is a direct attack on the integrity and motives of a distinguished chairman and the members of his committee.

The Senate has indicated, in approving a medicare bill, its readiness to face facts and to do what is necessary. We passed the medicare bill despite the distortions and malevolence of the AMA lobby. The same distortions and malevolence evidenced in the unprincipled "know nothing" vitriol unleased on PAT MCNAMARA.

The Senate recognized its obligation to act in behalf of our older people. I trust that the members of the conference will also recognize their duty. We cannot let Dr. Annis and his cohorts dictate to the U.S. Congress.

Dr. Annis and his ilk in the American Medical Association have time and time again demonstrated a lack of social conscience, and time and time again have made it perfectly clear that they wish to continue to foist upon the suffering old people of this country their profit dollars, placing the dollar sign above the great ethics of what should be a noble profession—and many of our doctors are noblemen. But, Mr. President, that does not include the propagandists within the American Medical Association who wish to capitalize upon human suffering. The medical profession should never have opened its doors to their interests in the first place. But let the profiteers in the American Medical Association who wish to make huge profits out of human suffering recognize that the day is coming when the American people will take their reckoning. The American people will make clear to the American medical profession that only those with a social conscience have any right to remain in it, and only those with a social conscience can serve the health needs of this country.

I say to the doctors of this country, "This is an issue on which you are going to lose, because the social welfare of the American people inevitably will win. You can have all the lying propagandists and all the vitriol mongers, such as your Dr. Annis and the rest of your political propagandists of the American Medical Association; but within the next few years the doctors of America will get their answer from an aroused American public opinion and we shall provide a medical care bill that will keep faith with the basic teaching of the Christian religion."

The attitude of those in the American medical profession who have demonstrated their lack of social conscience cannot be squared with Christian principles, and I care not for the hypocritical propaganda of men such as Dr. Annis. But this great Christian principle will finally prevail, and we shall proceed to be our brother's keeper. We shall proceed to carry out the teaching of the good Samaritan, and we shall stop the profiteers within the medical profession who work to put the dollar above their clear moral obligation to serve humanity through the medical profession.

Doctors who talk about socialized medicine as a great scarecrow to frighten the American people are the recipients, to a greater extent than any other profession in this country, of the largesse of the American taxpayer.

We hear doctors talk about what it has cost them to obtain their medical education. They are the recipients of one great subsidy after another supplied by the American taxpayer. Who builds the hospitals? Who provides for the great assistance that the medical profession gets so that it can even practice medicine? The American taxpayer.

We pass one bill after another for the aid of the medical profession by way of our bills providing for the construction of hospital facilities and various other bills related to health that are naught but huge grants of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers as a subsidy to the American medical profession.

Within the American medical profession are those with an avarice without any limit who wish to take out of human suffering bodies the last penny that they can exact by way of profit.

It is regrettable that we have doctors of that type. I feel sorry for them. Most of them are down to their last five Cadillacs. But they have picked this fight, and the American people will finish it. When they finish it, they will finish it by bringing the medical profession under the reasonable regulations that it needs to be brought under, and we shall start with the passage of a medicare bill within the next few years. We ought to do it before the present session adjourns; but certainly within the next few years we ought to pass a bill which would bring some hope and encouragement to the elderly. Over the rooftops of our elderly people hovers a constant fear that what little life savings they have been able to gather can be swept away by one serious illness. Yet we have a man such as Dr. Annis who calls himself a doctor, but by calling himself a doctor, in my judgment, he does not bring credit upon the title when he engages in the kind of attack that he engaged in in his attack upon PAT MCNAMARA.

I rise to defend this great Senator and personal friend of mine. I say to Dr. Annis that I can give him back everything that he wishes to pour out, because I am right and he is wrong, and that makes all the difference in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the shocking, disgraceful, and uncalled for attack by Dr. Annis on the "Today" show.

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

EXCERPT FROM THE "TODAY" SHOW, STATION WRC–TV AND NBC–TV NETWORK, SEPTEMBER 25, 1964, 7 A.M., WASHINGTON, D.C.

(NOTE.—Dr. Edward R. Annis, immediate past president of the American Medical Association was interviewed by Herb Kaplow in Washington. Various aspects of the medicare bill were discussed, and the following was heard in part.)

KAPLOW. On the other side, we have the fact, what they claim—the supporters of the King-Anderson and its refinement—that while there is an increase in the number of people making use of various health insurance plans, that the elderly people are not in this group by and large.

ANNIS. They are in error——

KAPLOW. Or they're not getting adequate health protection.

ANNIS. Well you see these have been the statements they've been making for a long period of time without bothering to check the record. But the record presented before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the testimony presented there by the health insurance industry of this Nation shows and can document the truth of what I just stated to you.

KAPLOW. Well now, did not the McNamara committee, which looked into this, come up with figures which would seem to support those favoring the——

ANNIS. I could have written Senator MCNAMARA'S report before he ever had his committee action. No one is ever surprised with what he finds. He knows ahead of time what he's going to report. He's been doing this for a number of years. I'm asking you to look at the records before the Ways and Means Committee of the House——

KAPLOW. Senator MCNAMARA might vouch for the authenticity of his own committee, and you have as head of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, who at least to this point, is opposed to the medicare.

ANNIS. The only thing I can tell you is that when MCNAMARA'S report came out a year ago that the overall chairman of the committee decried the negative character of the report. All we say is this, right today, we have programs in this Nation, to see that no one is denied medical care, because of inability to pay—old or young. And we think that a responsible administration will work with the medical profession to see to it that senior citizens who need medical care, or junior citizens, are given all of that care, already available to them, that many people don't ask for because they don't even know that these programs exist.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no man of greater integrity or honesty in this body than the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. He is an unusual man. We always know where PAT MCNAMARA stands; and when he makes a statement, it is almost always, if not always, backed by facts.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to state publicly my high esteem for the Senator from Michigan, who has represented his State so well, who has done so much for the Nation, and who has sought out of the kindness of his heart and on the basis of his most responsible position to do what he could to bring about a better era for our elderly citizens.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HART. It was not until I came to the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago that I learned of the comments that Dr. Annis had made concerning my distinguished senior colleague. In the brief moment that I have had opportunity, I have seen some of the excerpts from the "Today" show as were reported by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I am grateful to both the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and our majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that they should have so promptly, publicly, and effectively made reply. I suppose that it would be expected that the junior Senator would rise to the defense of his senior colleague, whatever his true feeling might be. I wish that were not the assumption, because in truth I would like to hope I would not do so if I felt that any colleague was in error.

I rise because of a deep conviction which developed long before I came to the Senate and was permitted to sit with my colleague [Mr. MCNAMARA] that few men in public life are more forthright in their statements of opinion and position and more sincere in their conviction behind the statement than PAT MCNAMARA. As the RECORD will clearly show, my colleague and I on occasions have differed. In a few instances we have differed on major legislative proposals.

I know PAT MCNAMARA a great deal better than Dr. Annis knows him. It has never crossed my mind on occasions when we have differed that Senator MCNAMARA had any motives other than to seek what he believed to be the right answer. Sometimes some of those questions are so complex that only time will give us the absolutely correct answer, if it is ever reached.

No Member of this body is more concerned about correctly resolving any public question than is my senior colleague; and, having reached a conclusion, no one is more willing clearly to state it and fight for it.

Parenthetically, on the matter of medical care for elderly citizens, it has sometimes been said that those who support this cause do so in search of votes. For those who do not know PAT MCNAMARA as I do, let me make clear that many years ago, when I was still in college, and when medical care for older people was only a little cloud on a horizon few thought we would ever reach, PAT MCNAMARA, in the early 1930's, was chairman of a committee seeking to achieve that objective. There were no votes involved then. It was a thankless undertaking. I am delighted that he has been given the years to see the day when we are about to attain that objective.

I regret very much that, on a national television show, the implication should have been voiced which suggested that the motivation was anything other than decent and right.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

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

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

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253), to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 12253, a bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to Senate Joint Resolution 139, which was passed yesterday. It has to do with a proposed constitutional amendment.

Earlier today I made the suggestion that I would make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed yesterday. Thereupon, in colloquy with the senior Senator from Montana, it was agreed by unanimous consent that the joint resolution would be recalled and placed on the calendar and then would be taken up today; further, that there would be a yea-and-nay vote on it at 4 p.m. today.

I address myself briefly to the matters that prompted me to make the motion to reconsider; but really the point that I had in mind has been attained by having reached an agreement on a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Joint Resolution 139.

Nevertheless, I believe some matters ought to be covered. First I wish to make it clear that the steps I am taking here today are prompted solely by the desire to have a record made of this consideration, particularly to have a yea-and-nay vote on the proposal. I in no way intend to find fault with any Senator's action, or to blame any Senator. No one is to blame for anything—especially not the majority leader, the minority leader, or the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], who so ably handled the joint resolution on the floor. I also thank the Senator from Indiana for his fine attitude toward reconsideration of the joint resolution.

Yesterday, the joint resolution, a highly important measure, passed the Senate without a yea-and-nay vote, although there was an able discussion of the measure. The newspapers this morning reported that only nine Senators were in the Chamber when the measure was passed. Frankly, as a practical matter, so small an attendance would give any proposed amendment to the Constitution a "limping start" toward final passage in the other body and approval by the States of the United States. It would be much better that a measure of such great worth—and this one has great worth—should start by having the express approval of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate. I do not question the fact that under a strict interpretation of Senate precedents, the amendment was legally passed yesterday. But I believe the whole tenor and spirit of the Constitu-

tion of the United States require that a proposal of this nature should have the RECORD show affirmatively that a quorum was actually present at that time and passed on the measure. I know the precedents do not require that, and I am not questioning that the action taken yesterday will be reconsidered, but I believe the Senate should adopt a pattern of procedure with reference to passing upon amendments to the Constitution. Article 5 of the U.S. Constitution provides:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution.

That calls for an affirmative expression. It has been held, and properly, I believe, that the two-thirds requirement does not mean two-thirds of the entire membership, but rather two-thirds of a quorum present and voting on the measure.

I have before me a case decided in 1920, in which the express point was before the Supreme Court for decision. I refer to the National Prohibition Cases, reported in 253 U.S. 350. In passing on a question of a constitutional proposal, the Supreme Court, at page 386, said:

> The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership present and absent.

The Court then cited another case, decided 2 or 3 years earlier. The Court said that the two-thirds vote required assumed the presence of a quorum. So far as the RECORD goes, I am sure that if it were shown that the Senate had a quorum early in the day, and unless that quorum were shown to have been broken, it would be presumed to have continued. But that still falls short of affirmative proof that two-thirds of a quorum—not of the membership—actually passed on this question.

Further, to carry out the spirit of the constitutional provision with reference to amending the Constitution, it would be well for the Senate to adopt a rule, or if not a rule, a practice, to provide affirmatively that there shall be a yea-and-nay vote, to show positively the number of Senators comprising the quorum who favored the proposal, and which ones they were, so that the positions they held with reference to the proposal would be known.

A few years ago, the Senate had fallen into the habit of approving treaties by a voice vote, although the Constitution requires the approval of two-thirds of a quorum. Sometimes only two or three Senators would be in the Chamber. As I recall, the Senate amended its rules so as to require a yea-and-nay vote. I have not verified that, but I know that the Senate had dropped into a habit of not having yea-and-nay votes on the approval of treaties. However, I believe the rule was changed. Certainly if a treaty, however small, is worthy of a yea-and-nay vote, a proposal by this august body to the States of the United States that a constitutional amendment be adopted should be subject to a yea-and-nay vote. I shall examine further into this question to see if a satisfactory solution can be reached.

Since I have raised this point, I shall speak for a moment on the merits of the proposed amendment itself. I commend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] for the excellent work he has done on it this year. He has been diligent and industrious. He has shown a deep understanding of the problem. I remember a conference I had with him at the first of the year in which we discussed the major problem, the selection of a Vice President in the event that office became vacant. The Senator from Indiana presented the case for the amendment yesterday.

I did not hear him then, because I did not know that it was his intention to speak on the subject and had understood that there would not be a vote, even though the joint resolution would be taken up.

But to return to the merits of the amendment, I believe that the committee selected the best way of dealing with the problem of a vacancy in the office of Vice President of the United States when, for any reason, the office of the Vice Presidency becomes vacant. Many different plans were proposed. All were weighed, considered, and discussed. In my opinion, the best and most practical plan was adopted. That lends importance, too, to the weight of this amendment and the gravity of not passing it except by a two-thirds rollcall vote of a quorum.

The amendment proposes the creation of a new way of selecting the person who may become President of the United States. That in itself is a tremendous step and carries with it all the gravity, solemnity, and seriousness that any legislation could possibly have. The subject resolution presents a satisfactory solution, as nearly as can be done. It provides that the President may select a Vice President, subject to the approval of a majority vote of the two branches of Congress. That in itself is major legislation of the gravest kind. Not only does it remedy a deficiency in the Constitution, but it relates to the most momentous single event that occurs in the Nation every 4 years. We pray, of course, that the question of presidential succession may not arise again.

In addition, the amendment provides for the creation of a body that would be called to pass upon the ability or disability of one who had already been elected to the office of President of the United States. The question of removing him from office, in the event of disability, without his consent and judgment is a tremendous responsibility. So the committee has also taken an important step forward in this respect.

I am glad to join in commending this particular joint resolution. I am also glad, indeed, that the committee has worked it out and has presented it, because it is necessary for the soundness of our Government. However, I wish to get it off to as good a start as possible with a yea-and-nay vote, perhaps with no votes against it, but certainly to get it off to a good start, and an understanding before the people, which would lend strength to it.

I hope that the vote on the joint resolution will establish a precedent with reference to passing on all future constitutional proposals—whether I may or may not favor them. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for bringing this question of the need to establish a precedent to the attention of the Senate. I join him in the hope that it will be established by this vote.

The Senator—and, indeed, other Senators—are aware of the efforts which the committee made, very early in the deliberations, to acquaint each Senator with all the facts and what went on in the deliberations. The subcommittee held extensive hearings. The committee discussed the issue at some length. The chief counsel of the subcommittee distributed to each Senator vast quantities of information, so that he could have at his disposal the complete information concerning what the subcommittee felt was a most important subject.

As the Senator pointed out, the precedent which was followed yesterday was according to that which had been established previously. The leadership and I have acted in the best of faith. There was a quorum call of an hour and a half to two hours, prior to the deliberations on this question.

Frankly, I am quick to admit that if I had my choice, I would much prefer the system which we shall follow this afternoon. However, in this colloquy, we should also include, perhaps, a bit of admonition to each of us as Senators, that we should make an effort to help the leadership carry on the burdens of leadership in its drive to close down deliberations for this session. It is faced with a gigantic task, trying to wind up the odds and ends. Some of these odds and ends, of course, are serious pieces of proposed legislation. One of the things which increases the difficulty of its task is the fact that it is almost impossible, at times, to obtain a quorum—although we did get a quorum yesterday prior to the deliberations on the proposed legislation.

For the RECORD, let me say to the Senator, in case he did not know it, that we went to some lengths, including two long-distance telephone calls to Senators who had earlier expressed opposition, and we proceeded to follow the pattern which had been followed before, to obtain the consent of those two Senators to going ahead and proceeding without them, and the promise that they would voice no objection.

I should like to raise my voice and admit that I have been one of the transgressors, from time to time, and have not been in the Chamber because I have been engaged in other deliberations.

In closing, let me point out that, perhaps, when we are closer to the vote this afternoon, I should like to make a quick

summary of the issue. Speaking to the point the Senator from Mississippi has so aptly raised, it would behoove each of us in this body to be a little more diligent about what is on the calendar, to be a little more diligent about being in the Chamber and helping the leadership to maintain a quorum so that we can go ahead and transact the business of the Senate, so that Senators can go about the business which so many of us have in our own constituencies.

Mr. STENNIS. If I may interrupt the Senator, I agree with him on the great burden the leadership carries. In ordinary times, it is heavy enough, but now, toward the close of the session, it is even heavier. I am compelled to say, in this case, in view of the Senator's remarks, however, that I inquired yesterday of the Senate aids about the vote, and they told me there would be no vote. Theoretically, I know that that is not enough, and that a Senator is supposed to be in the Chamber. This is an illustration of what we are up against. I was in my office yesterday until 11 o'clock last night, as is the Senator from Indiana frequently, I know. But, I have no complaint. I merely want to make the RECORD clear.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield once more?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAYH. I believe the leadership acted in good faith, through my office, and through one of the aids on the floor, in going to some trouble to contact Senators who had voiced objection. I believe that they will agree, and I will agree with the Senator from Mississippi, on a matter of this importance. I am glad to have the RECORD show the vote. I wish to see each Senator's vote recorded, I hope favorably; nevertheless, I wish each Senator to have his right to dissent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] suggested that it would be appropriate and, in fact, constitutional for a quorum of the Senate to vote, by recorded vote, upon this important proposed constitutional amendment. I supported him in his statement and in his request.

I did so because I believe that his suggestion is proper and carries great force. The proposed constitutional amendment before us is of such importance that even if there were no constitutional question relating to the necessity of a quorum, it should be voted upon at minimum by 51 Senators who would make up a quorum.

I suggested this morning—and repeat the suggestion again—that the record vote would carry great weight in the House, and in the legislatures of the States which, according to our constitutional process, provided for by article V of the Constitution, must ratify the proposed amendment by the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures. A recorded vote by a quorum of the Senate, and I hope by as full as attendance of all Members as is possible, will also give proof to the people of our country of our belief in the necessity of this resolution, for the people's support is of most importance.

The Senator from Mississippi has rendered a service to the Senate and to the country. His objective is achieved now that a record vote is required for a quorum will be necessary to obtain a vote upon the proposed amendment.

The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], recognized the importance of his request and joined the Senator from Mississippi this morning in securing reconsideration of yesterdays voice vote.

I do not in any way derogate the importance of the proposed constitutional amendment by making this statement. In fact my purpose is, with that of the Senator from Mississippi, to indicate its great importance, and the necessity that it carry with it the strength and the support which a vote of 51 or more Senators will accord it when it is considered by the House, and I hope favorably by the legislatures of the States.

I also congratulate the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

It was his creative idea, his initiative, and his force which brought the proposed constitutional amendment to the floor of the Senate—and I hope adoption and approval by the States.

His achievement is a tribute to his ability and statesmanship. It is a service to the country, which will be long remembered. At his request, I was happy to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

Its very importance, as the Senator from Mississippi has stated, and in whose statement I concur and I believe the Senator from Indiana will also concur, requires that it have the full support, and recorded support, of at least a quorum of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his patience and cooperation in yielding to me again. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, who knows that we discussed this subject privately. I concur with him and with the Senator from Mississippi.

As I stated a moment ago, we should put the vote on the record. A matter of this importance, any constitutional amendment, but particularly this one that deals with the ready transfer of the Presidency should be placed on the record. We hope we shall never have to use it. Nevertheless, it should be available for the safety and welfare of the country.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Mississippi for lending their voices in support of this particular piece of legislation. They are extremely able attorneys. As a freshman Member of the Senate, it is very comforting and rewarding to me to have their support. I particularly thank the Senator for cosponsoring this measure. Putting the name "COOPER" on the resolution is like putting the name "sterling" on silver. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have prepared some brief remarks. I do not wish to detain the Senate by reading them. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The statement of Mr. STENNIS is as follows:

As the RECORD for this date will reflect, I have previously moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 139 was passed by the Senate on September 28, 1964. The RECORD will likewise reflect my reasons for making this motion, but I want to briefly expand on these remarks at this time.

My desire to reconsider this vote was certainly not based on any objection to the merits of the resolution. To the contrary, I believe it absolutely necessary that the records of the Senate affirmatively show that Senate Joint Resolution 139 has the support of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate. Not in the tenure of the office of the Senator from Mississippi has a more important measure been before the Senate. It is one which should be passed by the Congress and ratified by the States without undue delay.

As all Members of the Senate know, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 139 is twofold: (1) to provide a method to fill the office of the vice presidency in the event of a vacancy in that office; and (2) to provide a positive means of determining, in any event, if the President is unable to perform the duties and responsibilities of his office. This measure is of such great importance to our Nation that, in my opinion, the records should reflect that it has the approval of at least two-thirds of the Members of this body. Yet, an examination of the Senate proceedings on September 28, 1964, when this measure was passed, does not reflect that a quorum was present, nor was there a record vote to positively establish the fact that this resolution was adopted in accordance with the requirements of article V of the Constitution.

While the RECORD reflects that a quorum was present at the time of the convening of the Senate yesterday, there was nothing to indicate whether a quorum was present at the time of the consideration and vote on this resolution. Although the absence of a quorum was suggested immediately prior to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 139, proceedings under the quorum call were dispensed with and the RECORD does not reflect that a quorum was present. I respectfully suggest that on a matter of such great importance as determining who shall exercise the powers of the Presidency, it is incumbent on the Senate to conduct its proceedings in such a manner as to affirmatively show the presence of a quorum. I do not question the fact that, under a strict interpretation of the rules of the Senate, there was no infraction, although there is judicial precedence that a quorum should be present in any proceeding under article V of the Constitution. In a series of cases in which the Supreme Court rendered a collective opinion, the Court was called upon to interpret article V as to whether an absolute two-thirds majority of each House of the Congress is required to propose a constitutional amendment, and the Court stated: "The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a

vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership, present and absent."

The Court made this statement in the *National Prohibition Cases*, 253 U.S. 350 (1920) at page 386.

I repeat for emphasis that the Court stated that a two-thirds vote of the Members present "assuming the presence of a quorum" is required to propose a constitutional amendment. The Court does recognize the importance, and, in effect, the necessity of a quorum being present in Congress during the consideration of an amendment.

It is abundantly clear that the spirit, even the letter, of the Constitution demands that a quorum be present in both the House and Senate when a constitutional amendment is approved. I believe it is the duty of each House to proceed in such a manner that the RECORD will reflect the presence of a quorum in such circumstances.

I further believe that in all matters of such importance the Senate should record its support by means of a yea-and-nay vote. Such proceedings will lend weight and significance to any amendment thus approved. It is for this reason that I, not only move for the reconsideration of Senate Joint Resolution 139, but also request the yea-and-nay vote on the question of its final passage.

Although I do not intend to comment in detail on the merits and substantive provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 139, I do want to show for the RECORD my recognition of the great importance of this measure and my support. As I previously stated, the two basic purposes of this resolution are to provide for a method of filling the office of the Vice Presidency in the event of a vacancy and to provide a method of affirmatively determining, in any given event, that the President is unable to carry out the duties of his office. I believe the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 139 effectively resolve these two questions which have arisen on numerous occasions during the history of our Nation. It is fitting and proper that the President have the authority, with the consent of Congress, to determine who shall be the Vice President in the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the Vice President. The method proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 139 effectively satisfies these requirements. At the same time, it should be a function of the executive branch of government to determine when the Chief Executive is disabled or, for any reason, is unable to perform his duties. Again, however, Senate Joint Resolution 139 provides a system of checks and balances on this power of the Cabinet.

The third purpose of this resolution clarifies the question of whether a Vice President who assumes the powers of the Presidency in the event of the disability of the President actually becomes President or merely acts as President during the disability. This also is a very needed improvement in our constitutional provisions as they now exist.

I, therefore, strongly support the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 139. I again want to assure the majority leader and all Members of the Senate that my action in moving for reconsideration of this resolution was motivated by a sincere desire to strengthen the position of the Senate in adopting this resolution. As a result of this reconsideration the permanent RECORD will positively reflect the presence of the quorum and, I believe, the overwhelming support of the Senate.

Mr. BAYH. 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.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until not later than 3:45 p.m.

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

(At 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair).

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. BAYH. 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. BAYH. Mr. President, prior to the recess we were discussing the issue which will be before the Senate for a formal vote at 4 o'clock; namely, Senate Joint Resolution 139.

Senate Joint Resolution 139 is designed to correct certain provisions in the Constitution relating to a continuity of executive power.

The problems which are dealt with by the joint resolution can be briefly stated as follows:

First, today, because of the tragedy that occurred in Dallas last November, we have no Vice President. Although there is not a soul in the Senate who will ever forget those tragic days, nevertheless, I wonder how many of us remember that this is the 16th time in the history of our country that we have had no Vice President. Indeed, over a total of more than 37 years the United States of America has not had a Vice President. We have had no Vice President 16 times. Eight Presidents died in office, seven Vice Presidents died in office, and one Vice President resigned.

Most of us are aware of the fact that over the past few years there has been a great development of the office of Vice President. Today the Vice Presidency is no longer a one-way ticket to oblivion, as it has been described by some of our Vice Presidents of the past. The Vice President has numerous tasks assigned to him.

First, the Vice President sits with the National Security Council. Second, he plays an important part in the area of space and aeronautics. Third, he is Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In addition to these official jobs, I believe it is fair to say that the Vice President today is really our No. 1 ambassador.

Vice President Nixon, in the previous administration, traveled thousands of miles outside our country, twice as much as did President Eisenhower, carrying the good will and the flag of the United States. So it was with the present President of the United States, when, as Vice President, Mr. Johnson served in this capacity.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Will not the Senator from Indiana agree with me that it is a far cry from the day when a distinguished citizen of his State, Thomas Riley Marshall, served as Vice President?

Mr. BAYH. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I feel certain that the Senator from Indiana will agree with the Senator from North Carolina that Thomas Riley Marshall, in his inimitable way, suggested the esteem in which the office of the Vice President used to be held in the old days, when he said, on one occasion, that there were two brothers, one of whom went to sea, and the other was elected Vice President, and neither of them was ever heard from again.

Mr. BAYH. Yes; that is a very famous tale. The Senator is correct. It is a far cry from those days, from the days depicted by that famous Hoosier, Thomas Marshall. Today, the Vice President is a full-time assistant to the President. He is one heartbeat away from the office of President. How important it is to have in that office one who can spend his full time in carrying out the duties of office that will best serve him in the event tragedy should strike the Nation again.

The second aspect of the problem is the one of disability. Three instances are called to mind when the executive authority of the United States has rested rather tenuously in the hands of a President who was seriously ill.

The first occasion was the assassination of President Garfield, when for 80 days President Garfield lay between life and death and signed only one extradition paper, at a time when many other problems were confronting the United States.

The second, and the one which has created a great deal of stir, because of the publication of a recent best selling book was the instance of the stroke suffered by President Wilson. President Wilson lay paralyzed and disabled for 16 months while such serious problems as the League of Nations confronted the country. He was unable, because of his affliction, to fulfill all the powers and duties of his office. More recently, we all remember the three serious illnesses suffered by President Eisenhower.

We seek to deal with a problem which today offers no legal means of transferring, even temporarily, for sickness, the power which rests on the shoulders of the President. There are no such means, other than a private agreement, such as that entered into between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, subsequently between President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and most recently between President

Johnson and Speaker McCormack. But these are private agreements which have no legal basis.

Steps have been taken previously by Congress. Efforts have been made by Members of the Senate. Perhaps the foremost advocate of this type of reform was the late Senator Kefauver, who, despite waging a strong battle, was unable to have the measure reported by the committee.

But I am happy, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the committee has been able to report a constitutional amendment because of the recognition by Members of this body, including the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], and others, that it is time action was taken. We have achieved this success by working closely with nongovernment groups, including the American Bar Association.

We are fast reaching the place where we realize that we must put aside our petty differences and adopt the best solution we possibly can. Basically, there are three criteria for the best solution. First, it must be a solution which, if it must be implemented—God forbid that it must—but history has shown us that we will not be spared—if our future can be judged by the past, we shall be faced with crises or tragedies in this area. So such an amendment must be presented in the best form or formula to be acceptable to the people.

Second, it must be workable from an administration standpoint.

Third, it must arose sufficient support in Congress and in State legislatures to obtain the necessary votes to make it a part of the U.S. Constitution. The proposal of Senate Joint Resolution 139 meets these three criteria.

First, the joint resolution provides that in the event a vacancy exists in the Office of Vice President, the President, the one who must work closely with the Vice President, shall nominate a person for the Office and submit the name to Congress. Thereupon, the nomination shall be confirmed or the person elected or chosen Vice President by a majority of both Houses of Congress.

This requirement will accomplish two purposes. First, it will guarantee that there will be a Vice President, who will be able to work with the President. Second, it guarantees to the people that their representatives in Congress, those who are most responsive to the wishes of the people at any given time, will be able to express the voice of those whom they represent.

Third, in the event the President becomes unable to perform the powers and duties of his Office, the joint resolution provides that, first, the President may declare his own disability. In the event he knows that he will have a serious operation or feels that a serious illness is coming on, he may declare his own disability in writing and submit it to Congress. Second, in the event he is unable to do so—perhaps he might have a serious heart attack, or he might be captured by the enemy—we have tried to think of every eventuality—the Vice President, acting with the consent of a majority of the members of the Cabinet, the executive officers who are closest to the President, will assume the duties and powers of the President.

We believe that this arrangement will protect the President from any possible coup or destruction of the power of his Office. The Vice President, operating with the consent of a majority of the members of the Cabinet, could assume the powers and duties of the President as Acting President. I emphasize the words "Acting President" because it was their desire not to become President that kept Thomas Marshall and Chester Arthur—and, indeed, I think seriously inhibited Richard Nixon—from assuming the powers and duties of the Office during the illnesses I described earlier.

The last contingency is that in the event—this is not likely, but is possible—there is a dispute between the President, on the one hand, saying he is able or that he has recovered, and the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet, on the other, saying that he is still unable to perform his duties, Congress shall settle the question.

As the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and I disclosed in our colloquy yesterday, we do not feel that the power of the Presidency—the Executive power—should be treated lightly. For that reason, we have said that a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress should be required to take Executive power away from the President.

Although there might have been a time when the Vice Presidency was a step to oblivion, this is no longer true. We are living in an age different from that which confronted our forefathers, when they almost forgot to mention the Vice Presidency in writing the Constitution. Rather, today we are living in an age when mankind has at its disposal the ability to wipe out civilization in a matter of minutes. Armies can be moved half way around the world in a matter of hours. In these times we must have able-bodied individuals as President and Vice President, persons who will always be capable of performing the powers and duties of President, to make that difficult decision which we pray God will never have to be made. We need able-bodied individuals at all times.

Considering the difficult problems and heavy burdens carried by the President today, we must have an assistant President, a Vice President, always standing at his side, helping to hold the torch for this great country.

In terminating my remarks, I feel it is only fair, and I feel compelled to say that had it not been for the cooperation of my colleagues, this measure would not have come to pass. Never before has Congress come this far with a proposal of this type of legislation.

In addition, had it not been for the willingness of the majority leader to cooperate and go out of his way, despite the tremendous burdens he carries in the closing days of the session, and his willingness to have this important measure considered, and his recognition of the urgency of the problem and the necessity for solving it, this measure would not have come to pass.

This is the best possible example we can have of the Senate at work. We considered 13 different suggestions and have resolved upon one, subject to the vote of the Senate, which we hope will ultimately be passed by the Senate and the House and ratified by three-fourths of the general assemblies of the individual States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the Chair, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, lays before the Senate Senate Joint Resolution 139, which the clerk will report by title.

The Chief Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on the question of its passage, and the clerk will therefore call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall],

the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 588 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Aiken	Ervin	Morse
Allott	Fong	Morton
Anderson	Fulbright	Nelson
Bartlett	Gore	Pastore
Bayh	Hart	Pearson
Bennett	Hayden	Prouty
Bible	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Boggs	Holland	Randolph
Brewster	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Carlson	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Case	Lausche	Simpson
Church	Long, La.	Smathers
Clark	Magnuson	Smith
Cooper	Mansfield	Sparkman
Cotton	McCarthy	Stennis
Dirksen	McClellan	Talmadge
Dominick	McIntyre	Walters
Douglas	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Monroney	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—35

Beall	Jackson	Muskie
Burdick	Johnston	Neuberger
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Curtis	Keating	Salinger
Dodd	Kennedy	Scott
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	Symington
Goldwater	McGee	Thurmond
Gruening	McGovern	Tower
Hartke	Mechem	Williams, N.J.
Hill	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hruska	Moss	Yarborough
Humphrey	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE TWO REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 88th Congress to file with the Secretary of the Senate two reports, entitled "The Role of Small Business in Government Procurement, 1964," and "The Role and Effect of Technology in the Nation's Economy," and that the reports be printed, along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FRANK B. ROWLETT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1494, H.R. 7348.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suspect that that is the bill that the Treasury Department objects to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it seems to be a habit for the past 3 or 4 days to reconsider bills. So, once again, though the bill has been cleared on both sides, I ask that H.R. 7348, which was just passed, be reconsidered and placed on the calendar.

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

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—88TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit for the information of the Senate, a brief summary of the activities of the committee in the 88th Congress, as of this date.

A full, detailed report on the activities of the committee and its four subcommittees in the present Congress will be submitted upon the convening of the next session of Congress, as has been the custom in the past.

The following is a condensation of the actions taken by the committee with brief explanation of some of the legislation processed, which was enacted into law, or approved by the Senate. Included are bills and subjects on which hearings were held and/or reports issued.

Of the total of 127 bills and resolutions referred to the committee during the 88th Congress, 15 were enacted into law. Twenty-eight resolutions were adopted by the Senate, and 12 bills were approved by the Senate but were not acted upon in the House of Representatives.

Those bills which became law or on which the Senate acted are listed under appropriate headings. No listing was made of property transfer proposals, or other bills on which the committee took no action.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

The Committee on Government Operations again reported favorably, and the Senate approved, as it has in five preceding Congresses, a bill (S. 537) proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation, with 77 Senators as sponsors, was developed and perfected by the committee over a period of 14 years, and has repeatedly passed the Senate. It is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in appropriation procedures and to improve the congressional surveillance over the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive expenditures.

The creation of a joint committee, as proposed, and its staff would serve in the appropriation field in a manner comparable to that in which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff in the field of taxation serve the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has, for more than a quarter of a century, proved its great worth and service in the revenue field. In the view of the committee, a like joint committee and service is needed in the appropriation and expenditure field. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Rules on May 21, 1963, but no further action was taken.

Other fiscal legislation approved by the committee and enacted into law included, first, an act to permit the use of statistical sampling procedures in the examination of vouchers—Public Law 88–521; second, an amendment to the Government Corporation Control Act changing the General Accounting Office audit to a calendar year basis in the case of the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation—Public Law 88–518; third, authorizing the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence to certain Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands—Public Law 88–538; fourth, authorizing the payment of the expenses of certain Government student trainees—Public Law 88–146; fifth, authorizing the payment of the cost of transportation of privately owned vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska—Public Law 88–266; and, sixth, extension for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by RFC to other Government agencies—Public Law 88–330.

Another proposal S. 2670, recommended by the Civil Service Commission, which would amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States, requires further study and consideration of suggested amendments, before the committee can report it to the Senate.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the rules of the Senate, a total of 570 audit reports and other communications relating to fiscal and related operations of the Government were submitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States, and referred to the committee. These reports are reviewed by the staff of the committee and, if warranted, by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The great majority of the reports relate to excessive expenditures or agency actions which are considered to be irregular or not in accord with existing law. Unless some specific action was suggested by the Comptroller General, the committee took no action on these reports. In some instances, however, other committees having direct oversight jurisdiction over the subject covered by the reports have developed additional information concerning the appropriate agencies with the objective of correcting deficiencies in the basic laws in accord with the report of the Comptroller General.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law 109, 81st Congress, as amended and extended in previous Congresses, the basic statute under which the President was authorized to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, expired on June 1, 1963. The act was further extended by the 88th Congress, which included an amendment eliminating the provision which authorized the President to submit reorganization plans proposing the creation of new Cabinet departments—Senate Report No. 1057; Public Law 88–351.

Under the provisions of the act as extended, reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President prior to June 1, 1965, become law within 60 calendar days after submission to the Congress, unless disapproved by a majority of either the House or the Senate by the adoption of a resolution of disapproval.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963, providing for the reorganization of certain functions relating to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, was submitted on May 27, 1963, under the authority of the act before it expired. The plan became effective on July 27, 1963, as neither the House nor the Senate adopted a resolution of disapproval.

The Presidential Transition Act of 1963, originally proposed in the 87th Congress as a part of the President's program based upon a recommendation of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, established by Executive Order No. 10974 of November 8, 1961, was approved in the present Congress—H.R. 4638, Senate Report No. 448—as Public Law 88–277 on March 7, 1964.

Under the provisions of this act, the Administrator of General Services is vested with the authority to provide, upon request, to each President-elect and each Vice-President-elect necessary services and facilities, including suitable office space, payment of staff salaries, travel expenses, communications services, printing and binding, and postage, subject to appropriations provided therefor during the transition period between election and inauguration, not to exceed $900,000 in any transition period. The bill also authorized the Administrator of General Services to provide, upon request, to each former President and each former Vice President, for a period not to exceed 6 months from the date of the expiration of his term of office as President or Vice President similar services and facilities for use in winding up the affairs of his office, which shall be in addition to those authorized by the terms of 3 U.S.C. 102.

As initiated in the 80th Congress, the committee continued the compilation of an annual organization chart and report reflecting, by calendar year, all reorganizations and changes effected in the basic structure and increases or decreases in personnel of all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The chart and accompanying report for calendar year 1962, reflecting date as of January 1, 1963, were submitted to the Senate on April 4, 1963—Committee Report No. 23; the chart and accompanying report for calendar year 1963 were submitted to the Senate on March 23, 1964—Committee Report No. 24. The charts contain a tabulation of personnel assignments to major operating components of each department and agency. The reports contain complete details concerning major reorganizations effected, the resulting improvements in administration as reported by the agencies, as well as the total reductions or increases in Federal personnel.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

On February 18, 1963, the chairman of the committee, joined by seven other Members of the Senate, introduced a bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology. This bill was somewhat similar to S. 1851 and S. 2771, reported favorably by the committee in the 86th and 87th Congresses, proposing the creation of a Commission on Science and Technology. S. 2771 was approved by the Senate on August 8, 1962, but no further action was taken in the House.

The bill, as revised, contained a broad declaration of congressional policy and objectives and placed more emphasis upon the need for a study of the problems relating to the improvement of Federal programs for the processing and retrieval of scientific information.

At the hearings held during the 86th and 87th Congresses testimony developed the need for further study as to whether or not a Department of Science and Technology should be created, or whether the Federal science functions may be reorganized effectively within the existing structure of the Federal Government without the necessity of creating a new Cabinet post.

The bill was directed at providing the President and the Congress with the necessary information to enable the development of an adequate legislative program to meet the needs of the Federal Government in the increasingly important field of science and technology. The chairman commented at length on the proposed legislation on January 31, 1962, and again on March 12, 1962. The bill again passed the Senate under unanimous consent on March 8, 1963, and was referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, where no further consideration was given to it.

Senate Report No. 16 on S. 816 set forth complete background information leading to the recommendations for enactment of the bill, as well as extracts from testimony of witnesses who appeared at the hearings. The witnesses consisted of officials of the Federal Government, representatives of science, engineering, and industrial organizations, and technical research administrators. The committee, in recommending enactment of the bill, pointed out that it was necessary that the Congress and the President obtain the essential information proposed to be developed in order to enable them to enact legislation required to authorize by law a properly coordinated program for the efficient and economical administration of Federal programs operating in the fields of science and technology.

Other proposed legislation—S. 1577 and H.R. 5171—with provisions having direct and important science and technological impacts, would authorize the Administrator of General Services to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

On September 21, 1964, the chairman of the committee submitted a full report on the legislative background and status of H.R. 5171 to the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 22362–22369.

GENERAL SERVICES

There were a number of bills which affected the activities of the General Services Administration in various areas, which first, were designed to broaden or clarify the authority of the Administrator, officers, or employees designated to act in his behalf, or to broaden the functions and activities of GSA; second, provide general authority with respect to certain types of surplus property disposals; third, relate to the transfer of surplus property; fourth, broaden the donable property program; and, fifth, deal with procurement procedures.

The committee, in carrying out its oversight jurisdiction over these operations of GSA, took action on a number of legislative proposals coming within one or more of the above categories. The following two bills were enacted into law, as a part of the GSA legislative program for the 88th Congress:

First. An amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorized grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States—Public Law 88–383. Under the provisions of this bill—H.R. 6237—the Administrator of General Services is authorized to expend up to $500,000 annually in appropriated funds, together with whatever donated funds may be available, to make allocations and grants to Federal,

State, and local agencies, and nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collection and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. The Administrator will be guided by the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission. This Commission is also authorized to establish special advisory committees for the purpose of consultation on its various endeavors, and the National Historical Publications Commission may reimburse members of such advisory committees for transportation costs and other expenses.

Second. Another bill amended the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (H.R. 5801), granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration.

Under existing authority of law (44 U.S.C. 396) any official of the Government who is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records in his custody is permitted to continue to certify on the basis of records which he or his predecessor has transferred to the General Services Administration. This bill amended this section of the law so that the Administrator of General Services could be authorized by the agency concerned to certify as to facts and make administrative determinations from the records in his custody.

The Administrator of General Services was also authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The bill was approved by the House on November 4, 1963, referred to this committee, reported to the Senate—Senate Report No. 828—and approved as Public Law 88-265 on February 5, 1964.

In addition, the following four measures were reported favorably, and were approved by the Senate, but no action was taken on them in the House of Representatives:

First. To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (S. 572) to provide uniformity and equality in Government contracting for public utility services and in the purchase of natural gas, coal, or oil for the production of such utilities, by providing that all such contracts may be made for periods not exceeding 10 years. The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 183—on May 23, passed the Senate on May 27, and was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on May 28, 1963, where no further action was taken.

Second. A proposal (S. 1232) to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the act directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered. At the present time, use of this modern code by such agencies is entirely on a permissive, delegated basis. This code would replace use of the limited provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, governing advertising and negotiation. A common statutory foundation of procurement authority would enable the Administrator of General Services to prescribe uniform procurement policies and procedures for agencies and so develop uniform procurement practices for the benefit both of the Government and the businessman contracting with the Government.

The bill would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination of records, and so forth—applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only title III.

The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 1059—on June 4, 1964, passed the Senate June 19 and referred to the House Committee on Government Operations, where no action was taken.

Third. Another proposal (S. 1233) approved by the Senate would permit the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts with private concerns for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

Under existing authority of law contracts for such services are executed on an annual basis. The Administrator of General Services reported that authority to enter into contracts for a longer period of time will make possible greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal Buildings and equipment at less cost to the Government than is possible under the requirement that such contracts be negotiated on an annual basis.

The Administrator of General Services reported to the committee that the fixed equipment and equipment systems intended to be serviced, inspected, or repaired under the authority of this amendment, would include air conditioning, heating systems, elevators, plumbing, pneumatic tube systems, and other similar equipment which has been installed in Federal buildings. A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment can be performed by private firms which specialize in the maintenance of this type of equipment.

The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 866—on February 3, 1964, passed the Senate February 7, and was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations where no action was taken thereon.

Fourth. A fourth bill in this category, S. 1509, introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, would authorize the heads of Federal departments and agencies for whom land or an interest therein is acquired, to reimburse the owners or tenants of such land for any expense, loss, or damage incurred by such persons in moving themselves, their families, and possessions to another residence or location.

The bill provided that reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, other payments authorized by law. The bill further provided that the total reimbursement shall not exceed 25 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the head of the agency, and that no payment may be made unless an application is submitted to the head of the agency within 1 year from first, the date the interest is to be vacated under an agreement with the Government, or, second, the date the parcel is actually vacated, whichever first occurs.

This bill was reported June 29—Senate Report No. 1126—passed the Senate on June 30, and was referred to the House Committee on Public Works, which has taken no action.

There were 23 other bills referred to the committee, involving surplus property transfers and disposals to local or State governments or for other public purposes, 5 of which were approved by the Senate, with 4 becoming law. Three of the remaining 18 proposals were implemented through administrative action, in cooperation with the committee and the sponsors of the bills, thus requiring no further consideration by the committee.

Twelve proposals were filed to extend the donable provisions of the Federal Property Act to other public and welfare groups, but in view of the opposition of the operating departments and agencies administering existing programs for the benefit of education, health, and civil defense programs now covered, the committee took no action on these measures.

A total of 170 proposals for the negotiated sale of surplus property was submitted to the committee by the General Services Administration—167—and the Department of Defense—3—pursuant to section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377). These proposals were submitted to the two Senators from the States in which the property was located, for their information and approval. Also, if the fair market value and other factors warranted, copies of the proposals were also submitted to the members of the committee. Should there be no objection to the proposed sale by any Senator, it is consummated by the GSA or other agency designated as the disposal authority, after the expiration of 30 days. All except three of these proposals were processed either within the 30-day period, or after certain questions regarding the sale which had arisen had been resolved. In two instances objections arose which required consideration by the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS HEARINGS

In addition to hearings held on legislation pending before the committee, as set forth in the respective sections of this report, the committee held hearings on two negotiated sales proposals, as follows:

First. On January 11, 1963, the proposed negotiated sale of seven surplus C-74—Globemaster—aircraft to William J. Chalk Associates, Toronto, Canada, by the Defense Supply Agency.

At the request of Senator GRUENING, who objected to the sale of these aircraft on the proposed terms and conditions,

the committee held hearings to review the merits of this particular sale as well as the broader questions involved relating to the Government's general policy with regard to disposition of surplus aircraft.

As a result of this hearing, the committee requested that the pending sale of these aircraft be withdrawn, and that no further action be taken until a thorough review and revamping of the Government's policy with regard to the disposal of surplus aircraft had been completed. This policy review and realinement was subsequently accomplished, and the surplus C–74 aircraft disposed of in such a manner as to assure that they would not be used in a way inimical to the interests of the United States.

Second. On March 25, 1963, the proposed negotiated sale of some 435 acres of surplus land and improvements, formerly Mitchel Field, to the county of Nassau, State of New York.

At the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who expressed reservations over the terms of this sale, the committee held a hearing to determine the merits of Nassau County's contention that it should not be required to pay the full market price for this property since a good portion of it would be used for park, recreational, educational, and health purposes. Following a thorough review of the terms of this proposed sale, the contention of the county authorities, as well as an analysis of the statute involved—Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended—and its applicability to this matter, the committee concluded that the General Services Administration had acted in accord with existing regulations and statutes and, therefore, withdrew its objection to the sale.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

The committee also gave consideration to a number of other bills of general application. These included two bills which would, first, authorize Government agencies to provide quarters and facilities to civilian officers and employees of the United States (S. 1833), with the objective of restating and clarifying existing statutory authority and regulations which authorize the Government to provide rental quarters and certain related services for Government personnel—Public Law 88–459; and, second (S. 1543), to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency. Its objective was to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, set forth in title 5, United States Code, section 53 (27 Stat. 591), which, in effect, prohibits the Federal Government or the District of Columbia from employing, for any purposes, employees of organizations which engage in investigative work. The bill passed the Senate on October 17, 1963—Senate Report No. 447—following the adoption of an amendment which repealed the original statutory prohibition, but continued a prohibition against the employment by the U.S. Government or the government of the District of Columbia of detective agencies or their employees for investigative work. It was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on October 21, 1963, where no further action was taken.

Proposed legislation (S. 12), identical to a bill introduced in the 87th Congress on which hearings were held, would amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act. Following the reintroduction of the legislation, continued conferences were held with the executive agencies involved, which resulted in the required administrative action being taken, thus eliminating the need for further action on the bill.

A bill (S. 1896), recommended by the Civil Service Commission, which proposed to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment, was acted upon favorably by the committee, but the report to the Senate was not filed due to subsequent developments involving proposed amendments to which the committee did not have an opportunity to give further consideration.

The committee withheld action on 18 other legislative proposals which were referred to it, because of opposition which developed, lack of agreement on suggested amendments, or because the authors of the bills did not request that the committee process the bills. Among these were several bills providing for the establishment of committees or offices to study and develop programs directed toward the solution of consumer and community problems.

There was a total of 63 Executive communications from department and agencies addressed to the President of the Senate and referred to the committee. In some instances, the agencies submitted reports required by law on certain specified activities or expenditures, or for the information of the Congress; in others the communications suggested legislation as a part of the agency's proposed legislative program.

Of the 32 resolutions introduced, which related to activities of the committee, 28 were adopted by the Senate. Of these, 10 provided authority and funds for the operations of the four subcommittees in the first and second sessions of the 88th Congress, 11 authorized the reprinting of hearings and reports of the committee and the subcommittees, and 7 authorized the appearance of the chairman or members of the staff at court proceedings resulting from testimony before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The four remaining resolutions were not reported.

REPORTS AND SPECIAL STUDIES

During the 88th Congress, the committee issued several reports and special studies on subjects which were considered to be of special interest to the Congress and the public generally. Among them were studies entitled "The Authority of the Senate To Originate Appropriation Bills," issued on April 30, 1963, as Senate Document No. 17, 88th Congress, and "Government Competition With Private Enterprise," issued on June 21, 1963, as a committee print.

The study on the right of the Senate to originate appropriation bills consisted of a review and analysis of the debates and actions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and other pertinent materials. It demonstrated clearly that it was the intention of the Founding Fathers at the 1787 Convention to vest in the Senate of the United States the authority, coequal with the House of Representatives, to originate appropriation bills.

In the 88th Congress, the committee had before it three bills and two resolutions dealing with various aspects of Government competition with private enterprise. The basic bill, S. 1093, had as its objective the statutory establishment of Federal policy directed toward the reduction or elimination of commercial-industrial activities which are competitive with private enterprise. The two resolutions, Senate Resolution 100 and Senate Resolution 299, merely authorized the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees to make a full and complete study of the entire field of Government competition with private enterprise. Two additional bills, S. 2254 and S. 2268, were indirectly related to the general subject, in that they would have required agencies and departments of the Federal Government to procure certain types of services from commercial suppliers whenever economy would result from such procurement and the national interest would not be adversely affected.

Following the introduction of S. 1093 and Senate Resolution 100, the staff of the committee was directed to make a comprehensive study of the entire subject. This study reviewed and analyzed, first, the nature, extent, and history of business-type operations carried on by the Federal Government; second, congressional studies and proposals over a period of some 30 years; third, executive branch action during the past 10 years; and, fourth, current executive branch policy and action. The report concluded that, first, considerable progress had been made in reducing or terminating those Government activities which are competitive with private enterprise; second, there are certain activities which the Government will continue to carry on, without regard to whether they compete with private enterprise, either because the public interest or national security requires such continuance, or because of cost factors involved; and, third, there are undoubtedly some activities still being carried on which should be reduced or terminated.

ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

In addition to the legislative actions set forth in the preceding sections of this report, the committee referred 10 other measures to its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations for hearings and recommendations for full committee consideration.

Two of these bills (S. 855, S. 2114) were reported to the Senate by the full committee upon recommendation of the subcommittee, passed the Senate, and were referred to the Committee on Gov-

ernment Operations in the House where no action was taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the report of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which includes actions taken on those bills reported to the Senate, as well as an outline of the other measures and special studies and reports made by the subcommittee.

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

ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, was legally constituted on July 12, 1962. During the more than 2 years it has existed, the subcommittee has taken seriously its mandate "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relations * * * including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

The subcommittee's activities have divided into two major categories, legislative and research. Under the former, three major legislative recommendations initiated or strongly approved by the Advisory Commission have been the subcommittee's basic concerns during the 88th Congress.

The first, S. 855, was introduced by Senator MUSKIE on February 19, 1963. It implements the Advisory Commission's June 1961 recommendation that certain Federal grant-in-aid applications be reviewed by metropolitan area planning bodies. Hearings on this measure, and on Senator CLIFFORD CASE'S somewhat more ambitious metropolitan planning bill, S. 915, were held May 21–23, 1963. Testimony was heard from 22 witnesses, and the official reports of 10 governmental departments, as well as statements on behalf of 17 private organizations, were received and made part of the hearing record. The bill as amended and the accompanying report (S. Rept. No. 821) were approved by the subcommittee and subsequently by the parent committee. S. 855 passed the Senate unanimously on January 23 of this year and is now pending before the House Committee on Government Operations.

A bill (S. 815) to permit Federal agencies to restore to States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States which could be better administered by State authorities, was introduced on February 18, 1963, as an administration bill at the request of the Attorney General. It is identical to legislation originally drafted by the committee staff with the cooperation of the Justice Department, in order to implement recommendations outlined in the "Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States."

The Advisory Commission, in its June 1961 "Report on State and Local Taxation of Privately Owned Property Located in Federal Areas: Proposed Amendment to the Buck Act," supported the retrocession of legislative jurisdiction in such areas to the States and indicated its approval of a similar bill then pending before the 86th Congress. Hearings on S. 815 were held by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on August 20–22, 1963. Some 20-odd witnesses testified, and official reports from 19 governmental departments were received and made part of the record. Three executive sessions were held on the bill, and it is still pending in the subcommittee.

The third major legislative measure of concern to the subcommittee is S. 2114, introduced by Senator MUSKIE on September 4, 1963, which implements the Advisory Commission's June 1961 report, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments." Thirty-nine other Senators joined in sponsoring this measure. Hearings were held in January of this year, and the bill as amended and the accompanying report (S. Rept. No. 1056) were approved by the subcommittee and subsequently by the parent committee. On June 19 the measure unanimously passed the Senate, was favorably reported by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, and is now before the House Committee on Government Operations.

The question of the future disposition of Ellis Island has been a continuing responsibility of the subcommittee. The parent committee referred the following five bills dealing with the subject to the subcommittee soon after its establishment: S. 2596, Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc.; S. 2582, the Training School at Vineland, N.J.; and S. 867, S. 1118, and S. 1198, which included slightly different programs for health, education, and housing for the elderly. As a follow-up, S. 1090, the Training School at Vineland, N.J., and S. 1300, Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., were also assigned to the subcommittee.

In September 1962 the subcommittee held hearings to "gain a broader and more detailed understanding of the fundamental issues and questions involved,"[1] following which the chairman of the subcommittee requested the General Services Administration to withhold action on final transfer of title to the island until the subcommittee and the full committee had concluded their review of the disposal problem. Additional subcommittee hearings were held in New York City in December, during which numerous proposals were advanced. Additional recommendations have been received since the conclusion of these hearings.

Since no one proposal has had sufficient widespread support or stood out as being more meritorious than the others, the subcommittee attempted to promote cooperation among the various sponsors. Extensive communications and conferences failed to produce a multipurpose plan. In April 1963, 11 major foundations were requested by Chairman MUSKIE to assess and comment upon "the feasibility of the financing, public benefit, practicality, and probability of ultimate realization" of the various noncommercial proposals. Some replies favored one or another of the plans, but none indicated a willingness to support any one or a combination of the proposals.

In July 1963, the chairman contacted congressional representatives and State officials of New York and New Jersey, as well as the mayors of New York City and Jersey City, requesting their assistance in the subcommittee's deliberations on the disposal question. At the suggestion of Senator JACOB JAVITS, a meeting of such officials was held in September "to arrive at a consensus as to what should be the disposition of Ellis Island." While it was not possible at that time to decide on a specific course of action, none of the officials favored commercial development of the island. The chairman raised the question of whether the proposed redevelopment of the New Jersey shoreline "might enhance the possibilities of using the island for a national park, monument, or recreational purposes."[2] He asked the Interior Department's National Park Service to review the proposal in light of New Jersey's redevelopment plan, which ultimately led to a recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior in June 1964 for the conversion of Ellis Island to a national historic site dedicated to public park and recreation uses.[3] The subcommittee is presently exploring the merits of this proposal.

In the realm of research and investigation, the subcommittee has engaged in various undertakings. Advisory commission studies and reports have been examined and analyzed so they will get the careful consideration they deserve. In June 1963, the subcommittee joined with the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee to sponsor 3 days of joint hearings on the manifold problems confronting governments in the New York metropolitan area. These proceedings clearly demonstrated that one of the most important single problems in the field of intergovernmental relations is the emergence of a metropolitan America.

During the spring and summer of 1963, the subcommittee staff continued to process its questionnaire that had been distributed earlier, resulting in the publication in December 1963 of a committee print entitled "The Federal System As Seen by State and Local Officials." As a followup on this attempt to determine the views of interested public officials on crucial intergovernmental relations issues, a second questionnaire was sent out in March 1964 to Federal departments and agencies.[4]

As part of its continuing survey of the impact of urban area problems on our Federal system, in December 1963 the subcommittee published a report entitled "National Survey of Metropolitan Planning," prepared by the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In a probe of the nature and extent of urban research currently being conducted under Federal auspices, on April 15, 1964, the subcommittee issued another study, prepared at its request by the Bureau of the Budget.[5] This survey prompted the recent establishment, at the chairman's suggestion, of a centralized system for reporting and listing all urban research projects financed by Federal funds, to be done by the Science Information Exchange of the National Science Foundation. Such clearinghouse activities should eliminate much of the duplication and overlapping among such projects and provide needed information relating to urban research to interested Federal agencies.

Indicative of the subcommittee's perennial concern with the need for more effective coordination of joint local-Federal projects was the issuance in May of this year of a survey conducted by the Advisory Commission entitled "Impact of Federal Urban Development

---

[1] "Disposal of Ellis Island (New York harbor)," hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to S. Res. 359; p. 2.

[2] "Discussion on the Disposal of Ellis Island," before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 45 (committee print), pp. 1 and 2.

[3] "A Study Report on Ellis Island," by the National Park Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior, June 1964.

[4] "Problems of Federal-State-Local Relations, Questionnaire No. 2," prepared by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to S. Res. 280 (committee print).

[5] "Urban Research Under Federal Auspices," a survey prepared for the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, by the Bureau of the Budget (committee print).

Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning." A few weeks later, pursuant to a July 1963 contract with the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, the subcommittee published an expert analysis of the present condition of metropolitan planning in America. This study discusses many aspects of S. 855 in addition to more general problems relating to orderly metropolitan development.[6]

In response to numerous requests, the subcommittee prepared and distributed in August of this year a select bibliography entitled "Metropolitan America."

The publications cited highlight in various ways the challenge that massive urbanization presents to our traditional system of Federal-State-local relations. They have greatly assisted the subcommittee in its legislative deliberations and there is considerable indirect evidence that legislative and executive officials at all levels of government have found these research efforts of value.

Finally, in an attempt to merely define the scope of its second major focal point of re-research interest, the subcommittee this summer distributed a "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments," prepared by Mr. I. M. Labovitz, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. It covers all forms of Federal aids effective as of April 1, 1964, and more than 40,000 copies have been requested by Members of Congress and interested State and local officials.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS PUBLICATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS

HEARINGS

"Role of the Federal Government in Metropolitan Areas," December 13 and 14, 1963.

"Metropolitan Planning (S. 855 and S. 915)," May 21–23, 1963.

"Government in Metropolitan Areas (New York Metropolitan Region)," (joint hearings with House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, held June 7, 8, and 10, 1963, in New York City).

"Adjustment of Legislative Jurisdiction on Federal Enclaves (S. 815)," August 20–22, 1963.

"Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants-in-Aid (S. 2114)," January 14–16, 1964.

REPORTS

"Activities Report of Subcommittee (S. Rept. No. 84, Apr. 1, 1963)," (includes as appendix D the GSA assessment of legal status of Ellis Island).

"Planning in Metropolitan Areas (S. Rept. No. 821)," to accompany S. 855, January 22, 1964.

"Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants in Aid (S. Rept. No. 1056)," to accompany S. 2114, June 1964.

COMMITTEE PRINTS

"Discussion on the Disposal of Ellis Island (Sept. 4, 1963)."

"The Federal System as Seen by State and Local Officials (December 1963)."

"National Survey of Metropolitan Planning (HHFA) (December 1963)."

"Questionnaire No. 2 (March 1964)."

"Urban Research Under Federal Auspices (BuBud) (Apr. 15, 1964)."

"Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments (Apr. 15, 1964)."

"Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning (ACIR) (May 30, 1964)."

"The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning (MIT-Harvard Joint Center) (June 1964)."

"Metropolitan America (Bibliography) (August 1964)."

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Senate authorized the Committee on Government Operations to conduct investigations during the 88th Congress into 3 fields of jurisdiction, and the committee delegated this duty to its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The three areas are:

1. Waste, inefficiency, and kindred matters in Federal executive agencies.

2. Crimes and improper activities in the labor and management fields.

3. Activities of organized crime which utilizes facilities of interstate or international commerce to violate Federal laws.

Major investigations under these broad powers in 1963 and 1964 resulted in public and executive hearings, as follows:

1. The Procurement of the TFX aircraft by the Department of Defense.

2. Organized crime hearings concerning the first major breakthrough in the traditional barrier of silence that has always surrounded the criminal organization known as the Mafia (Cosa Nostra). Mafia gangster Joseph Valachi's testimony was described as a criminal intelligence weapon of great importance by police officials of major metropolitan areas.

3. International and interstate traffic in illicit narcotics. The hearings examined the network of organized crime which operates the traffic, and studied the problems of treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

Numerous other inquiries were carried out by the subcommittee without public hearings. Many of these investigations resulted in corrective action by agencies or organizations involved; others produced no evidence to substantiate information or allegations received, and several are being continued. Examples of such inquiries are:

1. An investigation of reports of falsification of records by personnel of the U.S. Employment Service.

2. A study of gambling and bribery of players in professional and college sports.

3. An investigation of the infiltration of hoodlums into legitimate business and industry.

Disclosures made to the subcommittee resulted in the introduction of the following bills, among others, pending before the Senate:

S. 287, introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN, would amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade.

S. 288, introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN, would prohibit strikes by employees in certain strategic defense facilities.

S. 1308, introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN, would prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses.

S. 3009, introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN, would grant immunity to certain witnesses in order to compel testimony in racketeering cases.

It is likely that the subcommittee's recent hearings will result in other legislative proposals in the fields of organized crime and illicit narcotic traffic. The subcommittee has worked closely with the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Narcotics in these areas, and is presently studying proposals made during its hearings. Among these are proposals that would make it a crime to belong to a criminal organization like the Mafia, and that would make it a crime to obstruct justice by threatening witnesses prior to the formal initiation of judicial proceedings. Other legislative proposals are likely in the field of treatment and rehabilitation for narcotic addicts.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee's efforts will be directed toward investigations in the following major areas, among others:

1. To complete the inquiry into the procurement of the TFX aircraft by the Department of Defense.

2. An inquiry into criminal activities of certain officials of a building construction union in New York.

3. An inquiry into the national urban renewal program to determine whether there have been improper practices, frauds, and waste in certain of its 350 individual programs.

4. An inquiry into contract and procurement irregularities and possible conflicts of interest in a branch of one of the armed services.

5. An inquiry into allocations of certain foreign aid funds to pay for wasteful and ineffective airline operations in one of the new nations of Africa.

6. A continuing inquiry into operations of the Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture, in connection with the operations of Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. (Anthony DeAngelis).

7. A continuing inquiry into certain aspects of foreign aid to Iran.

SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS

In the 88th Congress, the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations has conducted a major study on the administration of national security in Washington and in the field and has issued findings and proposals for improvement.

These findings are set forth in three short and highly readable staff reports: "Basic Issues," an analysis of the fundamental dilemmas and problems of national security administration; "The Secretary of State," analysis of the Secretary of State's dilemma and his relations with the Congress, and the problems of the Department of State, with specific recommendations for improvement; "The American Ambassador," analysis of the modern ambassador's functions with particular emphasis on the nature of support given him from Washington, with recommendations for changes in staffing procedures and operations.

Many of the recommendations contained in these reports have been or are now being acted upon by the Government; others are being weighed.

During the 2 years, the subcommittee has held a comprehensive set of hearings on basic issues of national security operations, on the role of the State Department in the policy process, and on the role of U.S. Ambassadors and the missions they head in the conduct of our relations with other nations. Issued in nine parts, this testimony includes contributions from present and former government officials, military leaders, and expert students of national security operations:

Gen. Lauris Norstad, former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The Honorable W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

Dr. Robert W. Tufts, professor of economics, Oberlin College.

The Honorable Ellis O. Briggs, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable H. Freeman Matthews, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer, U.S. Ambassador to Japan.

The Honorable David K. E. Bruce, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain.

[6] "The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning," prepared in cooperation with the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, June 30, 1964 (committee print).

The Honorable Samuel D. Berger, former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

The Honorable William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

The Honorable George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia.

The Honorable Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil.

The Honorable Donald M. Wilson, Deputy Director, U.S. Information Agency.

The Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

The Honorable William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

The Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable Edmund A. Gullion, former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo.

The Honorable Foy D. Kohler, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Col. George A. Lincoln, professor of social sciences, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

In addition, background studies have been prepared by the subcommittee staff in cooperation with the executive branch and the Library of Congress. The following studies have been published: "Administration of National Security: A Bibliography," an up-to-date, annotated bibliography; "Staffing Procedures and Problems in Communist China," a study of the recruitment and management of personnel in the making of national policy in Red China; "Staffing Procedures and Problems in the Soviet Union," a study of the recruitment and management of personnel in the making of national policy in the Soviet Union; "The Ambassador and the Problem of Coordination," a historical study of the coordination of U.S. policies and operations in individual countries abroad.

The subcommittee's hearings and publications have found a wide audience not only in official circles in Washington and abroad, but also in universities, colleges, research centers, and among private citizens.

The subcommittee has received the full cooperation of the executive branch and has approached its task in a nonpartisan and professional manner.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Two principal studies and a number of miscellaneous reviews comprised the work of this subcommittee during 1963 and 1964.

The two major studies related to (1) interagency coordination on drug research and regulation, and (2) interagency coordination on environmental hazards—pesticides.

Each of these studies has involved the examination of governmentwide cooperation, efficiency, and economy in scientific and regulatory programs.

1. COORDINATION ON DRUGS

In August 1962, the subcommittee began a study of Federal drug problems. The immediate basis for the study was the problem of drug safety. This problem was illustrated by the international tragedy of the birth abroad of thousands of babies, deformed by a "harmless sedative," known as thalidomide.

Problems of drug safety and drug efficacy, drug information, research, purchases and regulation occupied the subcommittee's attention throughout 1963. The hearings ended on May 28, 1964. The final report is now in process.

Publications: In addition to its first volume in 1962, the subcommittee issued, during 1963–64, five hearing-exhibit volumes and a committee print on "Drug Literature."

Achievements: The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, has presented to the Senate a series of statements, describing significant achievements by the subcommittee in fulfillment of its mission. These achievements relate both to cooperation between agencies and strengthening of intra-agency programs, notably those within the Food and Drug Administration.

Fiscal significance of study: The study of Federal drug problems has involved the scrutiny of over $\$1\frac{1}{4}$ billion annually in direct Federal expenditures. This includes around $90 million in purchases of drugs used in the three Federal hospital systems (those of the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Public Health Service). Indirectly, much larger sums of money are involved. The reason is that drug therapy plays a crucial role in Federal inpatient and outpatient clinical programs (over and above those in our basic system of private medicine throughout the Nation).

2. COORDINATION ON DEVICES

Medical devices and materiel: In connection with the interagency drug study, evidence emerged of the need for increased coordination in the separate agencies' procurement of medical supplies and equipment. As a result of the subcommittee's efforts, steps are underway in an Interagency Procurement Advisory Council toward increased cooperation in this respect, as well.

Fiscal significance: Purchases of medical devices by Federal agencies involve over $100 million annually. The safety and effectiveness of this equipment also involves, however, the health and well-being of vast numbers of patients.

3. COORDINATION ON PESTICIDES

In May 1963, the subcommittee held the first of a series of hearings on Federal pesticide policies and programs. The review has been conducted under the acting chairmanship of the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Significance: Pesticide programs are vital to the Nation's production of food and fiber. The programs may likewise involve health in many instances.

Hearings and publications: Close to 100 witnesses, representing every shade of opinion on this very complex and controversial subject have been heard to date. Cabinet officers, Federal and State scientific experts, conservationists, university agricultural scientists, pesticide industry representatives, and the late Rachel Carson have presented their views.

Printed transcripts of the record, covering over 1,000 pages, in 4 volumes, have been made public. The background material used by the President's Science Advisory Committee in developing its 1963 "Report on the Use of Pesticides" will be released by the subcommittee at a very early date in a 4-volume set covering an additional 1,000 pages. The transcript of the more recent hearings, which may comprise 10 additional volumes of printed hearings, is being prepared for early publication.

Achievements: Considerable progress in interagency coordination has occurred during the past year and a half. This progress is due in considerable measure to contributions by the subcommittee.

Subcommittee's own economy: The subcommittee has endeavored to serve as a model of economy in its own right. For example, the pesticide study has been conducted with the services of only a single clerical-stenographic employee on the payroll of the subcommittee. Editing work has been performed by existing subcommittee staff and all other professional duties by staff loaned from the office of the Acting Chairman.

4. OTHER AREAS OF COORDINATION

During the 88th Congress, the subcommittee and its staff maintained close contact with Federal agencies on a number of other areas of interagency coordination on which the subcommittee had been active in previous years.

(a) The most important of these areas was interagency coordination on scientific information, documentation, and communication. The subcommittee's interest in this topic dates from August 1957. It involved in earlier years an extensive series of hearings, reports, committee prints, Senate documents, and studies by the staff of the full committee and the subcommittee.

It should be noted that the efficiency of numerous agencies' science information programs vitally affects the success of the over $15 billion in federally supported research, development, testing, and evaluation. During 1963 and 1964, much additional progress on the information front resulted from the subcommittee's efforts.

The subcommittee also endeavored to stimulate governmentwide teamwork in a number of other areas.

The subcommittee chairman has summarized a few of the miscellaneous results obtained in 1963–64, as follows:

(b) Study of interagency coordination in international technical assistance programs resulting in increased partnership between the Agency for International Development and domestic departments and agencies (e.g., U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) in the furnishing of technical aid overseas.

(c) Interagency coordination in international athletic programs, resulting in the issuance by President John F. Kennedy of an Executive order, establishing an Interagency Committee on International Athletics (a mechanism useful in encouraging both fitness of American youths and an adequate American effort in the world of Olympics).

(d) Interagency coordination in behavioral studies relating to war or peace, resulting in the establishment in March 1964 of a Social Science Advisory Board by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Manual: As part of other diverse activities, the subcommittee published in August 1963 a revised edition of the "Federal Disaster Relief Manual." First published 4 years earlier, the manual, prepared by cooperating Federal agencies, has served as a useful handbook. It outlines, on a governmentwide basis, programs available to States and communities stricken by floods, hurricanes, and other disasters.

GAO studies: In addition, during the 88th Congress, two studies were made by the General Accounting Office, at the subcommittee's request: A study of waste, resulting from inadequate planning and tardy termination of a radio telescope in Sugar Grove, W. Va., by the Department of the Navy; and a study of mismanagement of National Science Foundation grant funds by the American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Study of foreign aid: In October 1962, the subcommittee issued as a committee print a study of American foreign aid programs by Senator ERNEST GRUENING. The study was based on his on-the-scene analysis of U.S. aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries.

THE DRAFT IS NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the past year, the late President Kennedy, President Johnson, Secretary McNamara, and many distinguished Members of the Senate gave increasing attention to the problem of our outmoded military draft.

Three months ago, on June 29, 1964, I discussed the draft in a detailed Senate

speech, proposing specific legislation directing the Secretary of Defense to submit a step by step plan for the full, responsible elimination of the draft by 1967, when present draft laws expire.

In this connection, of course, Senator GOLDWATER'S recent, somewhat vague, proposal that the draft be ended "as soon as possible" is a welcome one. There is a danger, however, that the tone and context of the Senator's remarks may cast the issue in partisan terms, which would be a disservice to the Nation.

I would like, therefore, to review the record of the last year to show that there is a growing and nonpartisan consensus that the Selective Service System must be revised, and that Senator GOLDWATER is a latecomer to this consensus.

On September 6, 1963, John F. Kennedy noted in a letter to James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, that "the growing pool of eligible manpower is far in excess of the needs of the armed services, short of national emergency." The President told Mr. Patton that he was "starting to study carefully all the steps that we can take to free young men from doubt about their status, and from inequities under the present law."

Accordingly, President Kennedy issued an Executive order on September 10 providing for the deferment of all married men from the draft.

Far from resisting change in the present Selective Service System, the Department of Defense has begun to try to find possible alternatives to it. As the New York Times reported on January 6, 1964, the Pentagon was already studying the draft laws early this year "with an eye to possible major revision."

On January 16, Senator KEATING introduced a bill to establish a commission of 14 which would provide a "comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act." Senator KEATING was joined in sponsoring this bill by a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, including myself.

On April 19, President Johnson announced plans for a full review of the draft system, indicating the hope that it would be replaced within 10 years, and on June 22, Secretary McNamara approved a $1 million manpower study program which was expected to lead to the elimination of the program or drastic revision of it.

So the administration had already taken all of these definite steps indicating its desire to revise the present Selective Service System, when I introduced, on June 29, legislation aimed at eliminating the draft by 1967. My bill, S. 2960, would direct the Secretary of Defense to formulate and submit to Congress for its consideration at least 2 years prior to the expiration of the present program, an alternative designed to meet our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis.

I introduced this bill because I believe the Congress has a responsibility to express itself on this major issue. And I believe we should take action to establish a definite schedule for ending the draft by 1967.

Mr. President, the primary fear of those who feel that we must maintain an involuntary system is that the armed services might not be able to attract enough volunteers if the threat of the draft were not hanging over the heads of potential enlistees. On July 8 I presented to the Senate evidence based on Army and Air Force surveys of enlistees showing that the draft is not needed as a threat to get men to volunteer. If the main elements of my plan are implemented—increased military pay and other incentives for enlistment, the elimination of arbitrary standards which bar many capable men from enlisting, and the use of more civilians in noncombat jobs—I believe conscription will be unnecessary.

On August 14, the Pentagon announced plans to enlist 60,000 draft rejectees over the next 3 years for a 6-month rehabilitation and training period in the Army. The major aim of this program will be to test one of the assumptions embodied in my bill: that certain arbitrary standards for enlistment could be lowered without harm to the quality of our Armed Forces.

The Department's program follows a smaller experiment undertaken early this year. After a 6-week intensive training course 11 men who had failed the enlistment screening test scored high enough to meet draft standards. Administered by the National Committee for Children and Youth, and joined by the Departments of Labor and Defense, the program showed that revisions in present standards are possible.

The record shows, I think, that the draft is under serious and responsible attack. Indeed, by this summer, the winds of change had become so strong that the membership of our major parties reached a consensus on the desirability of ending the draft as soon as possible.

On July 14 the Republican Party signified its agreement with the goal of the administration's announced actions. The Republican platform pledged a "reevaluation of the Armed Forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives."

On August 25, the Democratic Convention promised in its platform to "pursue our examination of the selective service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our manpower needs without social or economic injustice."

Thus, it was almost a year after President Kennedy had begun to take another look at the draft that the Republican candidate on September 2 joined those who oppose the present system. To my knowledge, his proposal to end the draft was the first time that the Senator from Arizona had publicly commented on the issue, and his statement came when all the necessary steps for ending the draft had been proposed.

We are happy to welcome Senator GOLDWATER to the cause, but frankly, there is some doubt about his complete dedication to it. In the same September 2 speech, he charged that the Johnson administration is using the draft for "political and social schemes."

Without further clarification, we are once again left in uncertainty about what the Senator really means, but if he includes in his condemnation the program which was announced by the Pentagon on August 14, his determination to end the draft must certainly be questioned. The expressed purpose of the first program, as I pointed out earlier, is simply to see if young men who would like to volunteer for the services but are rejected, can meet the qualification standards after a brief training program. More importantly, this test program will, if successful, answer part of the problem of a voluntary system, for if we can use men who are presently excluded from the draft, it would mean a great addition of enlisted men to our present forces.

I do not see how Senator GOLDWATER can proclaim his intention to end the draft and at the same time dismiss this kind of program, which is a preliminary to creating a new system, as a "political" or "social" scheme. It would seem that either the Senator does not understand the draft, or he is not very serious about doing something about it.

Those of us who have taken an active interest in changing our manpower procurement system know that this is not a partisan effort. There is now a broad consensus that the draft should be eliminated as soon as possible. The remaining differences are matters of method and of timing, and I am hopeful that agreement can be reached on these during the next session of Congress among all who are genuinely concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles relating to the draft be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1964]

DRAFT OVERHAUL BEING CONSIDERED—REPEAL OF LAW HELD DOUBTFUL, BUT PENTAGON REVIEW MAY LEAD TO MAJOR CHANGES

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—The Pentagon is studying the draft laws and how they are carried out with an eye to possible major revision.

Officials point out, however, that total abandonment of some form of conscription is not likely without a far more drastic reduction of military forces than is now foreseen.

There are now 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces and no major reductions are pending, despite certain cutbacks for economy reasons.

According to Defense Department experts, the size of the Armed Forces would have to be reduced at least one-third and probably more to permit recruitment of an entirely voluntary force.

Nevertheless, studies have been undertaken on all aspects of conscription, including its possible abandonment. They are directed by William Gorham, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Mr. Gorham was in charge of the studies that were prepared for President Kennedy last September, when the President halted the draft of married men by giving them deferred status.

The United States never had a peacetime draft law before 1940. It was extended by one vote in the House of Representatives in 1941, on the eve of World War II, after a fierce debate in which then Representative Lyndon B. Johnson played a major role.

Mr. Johnson, favoring the draft among other forms of military preparedness, arranged for Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a former Member of the House, to send an appeal to the House requesting extension of the Draft Act. The message was applauded and presumably won over some Members.

EXTENDED WITHOUT DEBATE

After the war conscription and proposals for universal military training were hotly debated. The Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, however, has been extended by Congress regularly virtually without debate.

The Senate last year took 10 minutes to extend the act. The House did not take much longer, although a handful of its Members argued for a reassessment of military manpower needs in view of the growing population and complaints of inequalities.

One of the proposals, by Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called for a Presidential commission on the utilization of military manpower that would make recommendations on personnel requirements of the future.

President Kennedy, although supporting the draft, concerned himself with the complaints about it. His exchange of letters with James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, was an example.

Mr. Patton wrote the President last August, reporting that in traveling around the country he had found "that an increasing number of Americans are becoming deeply concerned over the ineffectiveness, inequality, and consequent injustice of our national policy on the procurement of military manpower."

Pointing out that the policy and program had been established a long time ago, but that times had changed, Mr. Patton went on:

"Experts appear to agree that the draft no longer meets the needs of our armed services for skilled manpower and that, in addition, it unequally and undemocratically distributes the burden of defending our society.

"Isn't it time for a thorough-going reappraisal of our military manpower problem?"

Mr. Kennedy, in a "Dear Jim" reply said:

"I am sure that all of us agree that the Selective Service Act is administered as fairly as it can be but falls far short of being perfect. Certainly there are inequalities in its results."

NEW STUDY URGED

The President added that it was "especially important" to survey the problem again because "the growing pool of eligible manpower is far in excess of the needs of the armed services, short of a national emergency."

Mr. Kennedy added, however, that he was "in complete agreement" that some sort of Selective Service System must be kept in operation for an emergency.

The President then called attention to his plan to permit deferment of married men.

"But that is only an initial step, and we are now starting to study carefully all the steps that we can take to free young men from doubt about their status, and from inequities under the present law," Mr. Kennedy said.

With his letter to Mr. Patton, Mr. Kennedy forwarded an extract from a Pentagon memorandum outlining certain reasons for maintaining the Selective Service System.

The extract suggested that some of the inequities in the draft were due to increased voluntary recruitment. Conceivably, it observed, efforts to increase the attractiveness of military service could lead to elimination of the need for military conscription.

"Nevertheless," the Pentagon warned, "until we actually have attained this objective it would be a grave gamble with national security to terminate the authority."

Because the Armed Forces do not need all the men that the draft makes available, deferment possibilities have been broadened over the years and physical and mental standards raised.

TESTS ORDERED AT 18

In raising the standards, the Government has been dismayed at the number of youths exempted for psychological disorders. The Army Surgeon General's Office found that nearly one-eighth of those who failed to meet minimum standards between 1953 and 1958 were psychologically unfit.

This concern led to an order, issued yesterday by President Johnson, moving up to 18 years old the age for physical and mental testing for the draft. At present the examinations are generally given at 22 or 23. The idea of the earlier examinations is to try to spot those youths who need help as soon as possible.

The broadening of deferment possibilities has brought charges that the young men with enough money to get married or enter college have an advantage over those who must go to work immediately out of high school.

While selective service decisions are subject to appeal in Washington, it is said that regulations are often applied differently in various communities. A youth who would be drafted in one locality is spared in another, and some young men are reported to have moved their residences for that reason.

At the Pentagon, the manpower experts assert that about 500,000 new recruits are needed annually to keep the active duty force at 2.7 million and that 100,000 more new men a year are required to maintain an Active Reserve force of 1 million.

Although the Army is the only military service that uses the draft, it is agreed that without it the Navy and Air Force would be hard put to maintain their strengths through recruitment. Many young men, facing the draft, volunteer for the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps or Coast Guard in preference to Army service.

As alternatives to the draft, suggestions have been made for increasing pay and making military service so attractive that its appeal would permit recruitment; a nationwide lottery, in which the various deferment and exemption practices would be eliminated and the luck of the draw substituted; and the Hershey plan.

The latter plan, named for Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, would introduce a form of universal military service. Existing mental and physical requirements would be lowered considerably, although not abandoned, in order to bring virtually every young man of draft age into a training program for a period of as little as 3 months.

The plan has other features but it is based essentially on the premise that virtually all young men should serve, that many who do would choose to stay in uniform, and that those who don't stay would be wasteful of the training effort anyway.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 9, 1964]

DRAFT INVESTIGATION NEEDED

Inequities of the Draft Act become increasingly apparent as the pool of draft-age young men increases without an increase in the number needed by the Armed Forces.

Universal military training is not universal. Many young men avoid service. Deferments are liberally granted to college students and men in "critical" occupations. Under the latest draft rules married men are not taken.

Defense authorities concede that the Draft Act is not so much a program for conscription as a "hot breath" that spurs young men to enlist. They say that without the draft enlistments would fall off drastically.

Some critics urge abandonment of selective service. They think volunteer service could be made sufficiently attractive with better pay and fringe benefits so that all the men needed would volunteer. Dr. Eli Ginzberg, the Columbia University manpower specialist, does not go that far but he thinks the draft should be reformed. Recently he suggested a lottery. Each boy upon reaching 18 would pull a number from an urn. On the basis of the number drawn he would be classified as immediately available, available if needed, available in a serious emergency. Nobody would be permanently exempt but all would have a clear idea, early in adulthood, about the chances of being called.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, and six other Senators have now introduced a bill calling for an investigation of the Draft Act. The legislation proposes that a study commission of 14 members be created. It could have no more than five military men.

The Pentagon already has a committee at work making a similar study, but the draft is essentially a civilian operation. A commission authorized by Congress is the appropriate body to make the study. By the time the present act expires July 1, 1967, detailed information and recommendations should be available.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1964]

REVISING THE DRAFT

The new studies by the Defense Department of means and methods of procuring military manpower are welcome—though tardy. They should be supplemented by investigations by appropriate congressional committees and by private groups.

For it is none too soon to begin to consider alternatives to or major revisions of the draft law, which expires in June 1967. It has been clear for some time that the inequities in the present law and the great increase in the draft-age population, plus technological changes in the armed services, require a major reexamination of how to select, recruit, and retain the numbers of men required annually.

There is much that is wrong with the present draft law. It is in no sense universal: only about 58 percent of the men reaching age 26 (the upper induction level) ever serve. There are all sorts of exemptions. Aside from the inequities, the draft per se (except when applied en masse in wartime) is a wasteful system. Shocking, too, are the high percentages of those rejected for mental or physical defects or illnesses.

The studies ought to be directed primarily at two objectives:

Can the services be maintained at required levels without the compulsion of the draft? Without additional inducements toward professionalism—higher pay, quicker promotion, more psychic rewards, or what not—this seems doubtful. We cannot afford to gamble with security. Britain has discarded the draft and as a result she has not been able to maintain her army at a size commensurate to her needs or plans. The United States may be able to do so, but only if we provide more inducements to volunteers.

What can be done about the intolerably high rate of rejections? President Johnson has made the first partial move by directing that all 18-year-olds be examined immediately upon reaching draft age to permit correction of, or treatment for, remedial defects. But this is a palliative. The large number of men rejected as psychiatrically unfit is a challenge to the Nation's program

of mental health. How is it to be met? Where are such men to be treated? Who is to treat them?

Answers to these and scores of other questions dealing with the procurement of military manpower—and indirectly with the social health of the Nation—are long overdue.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1964]

OVERHAULING THE DRAFT

The comprehensive review of the Selective Service System launched by President Johnson carries no implication of a softer approach to our world problems. Although it coincides with a relaxation of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, the President's chief motive appears to be adjustment of the draft to current domestic realities. The fact that the present law has been in effect for 15 years and that the fairness of its operation is being increasingly questioned is sufficient reason for a thoroughgoing review.

In wartime the draft was imperative because of the heavy demands of the military services for manpower. Through the cold-war period the Selective Service Act has been repeatedly renewed because the country has looked upon it as the best means of sharing the obligations of military service equally, as the President has said, through a "fair and just system." But the country is certainly not committed to compulsory military service any longer than it is necessary to the national defense.

The study which the President has ordered may lead to the conclusion that the draft is no longer the best means of recruiting the type of men that the services need. It may indicate that the registration of 9 million men between the ages of 18 and 26 is a wasteful way of recruiting the 500,000 who are actually inducted each year. Or the President's study group may find that the draft is still essential and that it can be made to operate more satisfactorily.

Whatever the outcome, further emphasis should be focused on the plight of the young men, nearly one-half of the total, who are deemed to be physically or educationally unfit for military service. The Nation cannot afford this continued waste of manpower. Here is one of the most vital segments of the administration's campaign to rehabilitate the disadvantaged.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1964]

HOW UNITED STATES FINDS MILITARY MANPOWER

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Practically every American male, 18 through 26 (who is not deferred and is physically and mentally fit), can expect to do military service.

It will come some time during those 8 years—sooner or later—depending on whether he waits for the draft.

What so drastically cuts down the size of the 9-million-man draft pool in this country is the size and number of those exempt and deferred—plus those who enlist.

MINIMUM STANDARDS

Roughly a third of the country's male population ages 18–26, is judged unfit for peacetime service.

These men cannot meet the physical and mental tests given all entering the military services.

This suggests that, as Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, said not long ago:

"If the needs of the armed services were simply for aggregate numbers of men under arms, irrespective of trainability or skill, it is possible that we could procure the number of individuals needed in all services today without recourse to the draft. As a practical matter, certain minimum mental, physical, and moral standards of acceptability for military service have been essential at all times * * *."

Since 1951 all enlistees and all draftees are examined under the same physical standards and under a common mental test. Each service also uses its own specialized supplemental aptitude screening tests.

The physical standards are essentially the same as in World War II.

ABILITY TO ABSORB

The mental test (Armed Forces Qualification Test) is aimed at measuring a person's general ability to absorb military training within a reasonable period of time.

The minimum passing score for inductees, set by Congress in 1951, corresponded to about a fifth-grade level of education.

The Korean war, however, showed this level too low for the "higher qualitative requirements" of the services in modern warfare.

In 1958 Congress allowed a supplemental aptitude test. This disqualified the lowest 15 percent of the draft-liable population.

ONE-THIRD ELIMINATED

Still, about a third of inductees are drawn from group 4, or the lowest acceptable mental category.

Physical and mental standards, then, eliminate about one-third of all young men examined for service—volunteers as well as draftees.

Next came the deferrables—married men, students, those engaged in an exempt occupation—generally something to do with defense, security.

Draft boards are sympathetic to the educational efforts of those eligible for selective service.

They invariably permit high school students to finish their schooling. They generally permit those that want to go to college to do so. They even allow most of those wanting to work for a master's degree to work for it.

HESITANT ON PH. D.'S

But they are hesitant to allow work for a Ph. D. It is argued that a young man, by stretching out his education that far and getting regular deferments could reach 26 before finishing his schooling—and avoid (or evade) the draft.

High school students, however, are deferred not just because selective service is sympathetic to education in general, but because in practice 18- and 19-year-olds, even 20-year-olds are not called up, as older men are taken.

Fathers have been deferred all along.

Last September, the late President Kennedy deferred married men without children.

This was done primarily to cut back the size of the draft pool that was growing much faster at the bottom than it was being siphoned off at the top.

NO RUSH INTO MARRIAGE

His ruling did not though, as some thought it would, create a rush to the marriage bureaus.

Before Mr. Kennedy's ruling, 3 out of 10 in the draft pool were married.

Now it is only about 33 out of 100.

However, the elimination of married men has lowered the average age of draftees by 1 full year—from about 23 to 22.

The explanation is the way the draft boards pick men to be inducted.

The first group called are the so-called draft delinquents.

They are not juvenile delinquents—but those who in some way or other have tried to skip the draft, avoid the call—gone a.w.o.l., and so on.

They catch these boys first. It is a small group.

NEXT THE 26-YEAR-OLDS

Then they take those not exempt or deferred by age order, starting with the 26-year-olds who have not yet done their military service.

They want to be sure that except for those exempt or deferred, everyone does his time in the service.

When all 26-year-olds are taken, then the 25-year-olds, and so on down the age list.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 15, 1964]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS FACE PUZZLE

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Eighteen-year-olds face a problem: Should they enlist or wait to be drafted?

If they enlist, they are in for 4 years if they choose Air Force or Navy, or 3 years if they choose Army.

If they wait for the draft the stretch is only 2 years. But if they enlist, they can get their tour of duty over by the time they are 22.

If they wait for the draft (as things are now) they won't be tagged until they are 22.

If they enlist they can choose their service. If they wait to be drafted, they automatically go into the Army.

At some point, if single and physically and mentally fit, they are going to be called before they reach 26.

However, somewhere between 18 and 22 or 23 (when the draft might get them) they may get married. That would defer them.

Therefore, unless they are really looking forward to military service (which is not the rule) they can well miss it.

Congressmen have made it quite clear they don't particularly approve of deferring all married men. Fathers, yes. But childless married men, no.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Armed Services, said early this year: "That was a serious mistake. It should never have been done."

EXEMPTION CRITICIZED

His argument was that local boards knew better the circumstances in each case and could use judgment and discretion in making deferments of married men.

"This blanket exemption," he charged, "naturally is going to drive some of these young men into marriage before they are ready for it. It just is not fair. It brings a new element of unfairness into a situation that was already crowded with unfairness."

Eighteen-year-olds face the fact that under the draft system they are not going to be taken until they are 22 or 23.

They could, if through high school, start learning a trade, or go to a junior college, or get married at 21 or 22 and never be inducted.

But if they don't get married they will eventually get called (unless the rules change), and it will not be at their pleasure but at the Government's.

EDUCATION PLANNED

That is another reason why many enlist—they want to decide when to do their military service and how to plan their future education, if any, not leave it to chance and the Government.

As things now stand they cannot be drafted at 18 and get out at 20. This is because only the older age draft groups are called, due to the size of the draft pool and the desire not to let the older men escape.

True, at 18 they can enlist and get their military duty over within 3 or 4 years, depending on the service they join. Then they can go on with their education or a career.

One thing 18-year-olds find hard today is to get a job with the draft hanging over them, even though 3 or 4 years off.

Employers don't want to hire someone who is going into the Army a year or two or three later.

Four out of every ten enlistees admit that they volunteered rather than await the certainty of the draft but the uncertainty of the time they would be drafted.

It is quite apparent that the draft has given impetus to voluntary enlistments.

CHANGE LOOMS

Without a draft the other services (which don't use it to get their manpower quotas) would have a hard time filling their ranks. Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army, put it this way recently: "The other services would suffer without a draft because to a certain degree the fact that the Army has a draft makes some people volunteer for the Air Force and Navy."

There is one draft uncertainty facing the 18-year-old that is being eliminated this coming fiscal year. It is surprising it wasn't done earlier.

The practice is, and has been, to defer the physical and mental examinations of draft registrants until they were called up.

That has meant that 18-year-olds had to wait until they were 22 or 23 to find out if they met the physical and educational standards of the military services.

BENEFITS SEEN

With one out of every three men not meeting current standards, it became obvious that this particular draft uncertainty—disrupting the work, schooling, plans of so many young men—needed to be eliminated.

Eighteen-year-olds ought to, and before long will, know if they are physically and educationally unfit for the services, instead of waiting 3 or 4 years to find out.

The benefits are obvious.

It will permit those with deficiencies to go ahead with their plans and possibly start remedial action.

It will let the others know they are going to be drafted eventually, unless they enlist or marry, and let them plan accordingly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 16, 1964]

LEGISLATORS RESTUDY DRAFT

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—What's wrong with the draft—or UMT as the Universal Military Training Act is known?

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, has called it "unfair."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, says it is "neither universal, military, nor training."

More and more Congressmen are asking for changes in the law, or for doing away with it altogether.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, has asked for a Presidential commission to study defects in the law and recommend changes.

Mr. CURTIS has a bill before Congress to set up a joint congressional committee to study possible substitutes.

CONSIDERATION ORDERED

President Johnson has ordered Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to consider "alternatives" to the present selective service system.

There seems to be a widespread feeling that there's something wrong with the draft.

What is it?

Here are the major criticisms floating around the Capital:

1. The draft should be, as it was before Pearl Harbor, only used in wartime—there is something un-American about it in peacetime;

2. The only thing universal about it is that everybody has to register; exemptions and deferments make a mockery of universality;

3. It is really a program to spur men to enlist for 4 years, rather than wait to be drafted for 2;

4. It makes a "hardship" case out of marriage, by linking it in deferment with parenthood, which can really be a "hardship";

5. It doesn't provide the increased demands under modern warfare for qualified technicians;

6. It keeps the 18- or 19-year-old in suspense as to his military prospects, making it difficult for him to get a job or go on with his schooling;

7. It discriminates in favor of the rich boy, encouraging him to continue his education and possibly evade military service;

8. Its system of screening and placements is haphazard and inadequate, wasting a lot of manpower.

9. Its physical and mental standards are obviously inadequate when a man like Cassius Clay is turned down;

10. It is providing such an ever-increasing draft pool that escaping the draft will become easier and easier.

While the peacetime draft is something new in American life, most Americans seem to have accepted it as a necessity. The contention of the military, that they need it to get the men required, has so far persuaded, if not pleased, the Congress.

It is true that UMT is far from universal. A third of the men in the draft pool are ruled out for physical or mental defects. Possibly 40 percent avoid it by enlisting. Another 10 percent or so are deferred because married or having dependents.

VOLUNTEERS SOUGHT

Another 10 percent stay out to continue their education or because of specialized talents. It is universal then for less than 10 percent—after exemptions, deferments, and enlistments.

It does spur enlistments, which is what the services want. They want volunteers as opposed to forced-duty inductees. They prefer young men, around 18 and 19—who make up most of the volunteers—to older 25- and 26-year-olds more set in their ways—who make up most of the draftees. And they want men for 4 years (3 for the Army) rather than just 2.

TECHNICIANS REQUIRED

The decision to defer married men, as well as fathers, has caused some young men to rush into marriage to avoid the draft, but not as many as expected. Still the possibility of using marriage to avoid the draft disturbs a lot of Congressmen.

The draft does not consider the dramatic shift in military manpower needs since Korea—particularly for electronics specialists. Actually today the enlisted force requires more electronics technicians than infantrymen, more aircraft mechanics than cooks and drivers. This change in the required force structure of the services, plus the revolutionary changes in military technology have occurred, but with no change in the basic draft system.

While the deferment for education is approved by Congress, Congressmen are disturbed lest college and particularly master of arts and doctor of philosophy work be used to avoid the draft. Deferment has been left to the judgment of local draft boards, but there is considerable variation in the way the rule is applied. Obviously deferment for schooling favors those who can afford it.

COMMENTS DRAWN

The case of Cassius Clay (the heavyweight boxer who lifted the boxing crown from Sonny Liston but who could not pass the Army's mental tests) has caused a lot of talk and some resentment. But surprisingly enough less than a dozen poeple have written to either President Johnson or Mr. McNamara criticizing his exemption from the draft.

He is said to have an intelligence quotient of about 78, below a fifth grade educational level.

It is practically certain that Mr. Clay did not fake his low mental rating. The best psychologists the Army had saw to that. Actually Mr. Clay, "the greatest," would have made a marginal soldier at best. Most of the cries against his deferment came from the press, not the public.

A real danger to the draft system comes from the startling expansion of the draft pool. The military need stays constant, but the size of the pool increases each year.

Deferment of married men was a quick way of reducing the pool.

When it gets too big the possibility of escaping it obviously increases.

THE DRAFT IS OUTDATED

(A column by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmer's Union, distributed July 7, 1964)

In August 1963, I wrote President Kennedy that I was deeply concerned over the ineffectiveness, inequality, and injustices of our national policy on the procurement of military manpower. I pointed out that the draft no longer meets the needs of our Armed Forces for skilled manpower and that, in addition, it unequally and undemocratically distributes the burden of defending our society. I suggested to President Kennedy that it was time for a thoroughgoing reappraisal of our military manpower policies.

In September, President Kennedy responded that he agreed with the necessity for a careful study of the inequities under the present law and that such a study would be undertaken. He also said that he was planning to issue an Executive order deferring married men. This he did the following week.

In October I wrote President Kennedy expressing my appreciation for his proposed action and raised with him two additional questions:

1. Are our present Reserve, ROTC, and National Guard policies and programs realistic in the nuclear age? My impression is that they are badly outdated and highly wasteful.

2. Shouldn't the Secretary of Defense be give meaningful authority over military assignments, transfers, and promotions? It is difficult for an administrator to function effectively without genuine control over the personnel in his agency.

Finally, I suggested that he appoint a Presidential Commission to look into the whole problem of military manpower purposes and programs and I sent him a detailed memorandum dealing with the proposed responsibilities of such a Commission.

Before further action could be taken, the tragedy at Dallas was upon us and we had a new President in the White House.

In February of this year, I wrote President Johnson telling him of my earlier correspondence with President Kennedy and sent him a copy of my memorandum urging the establishment of a National Military Manpower Commission.

Naturally, I am extremely gratified with the President's announcement of last month that a broad study of the draft is being undertaken and that $1 million is being devoted to these studies designed to explore the feasibility of discontinuing military conscription. I was only disappointed in one aspect of the President's plans. It seems to me that the problem of involuntary military service in peacetime is so fundamental in American life that the study should be undertaken by a Presidential Commission composed of distinguished citizens and reporting directly to the President. I think it would be a mistake to have primary control over the project rest in the Pentagon.

I am confident that a well formulated program can be achieved which will eliminate the draft, modernize reserve programs and achieve huge savings in man-years and budget dollars. Such a program would justifiably generate widespread public support and enthusiasm. Most important, it would bring strengthened civilian control and simple human justice into our huge military manpower structure.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1964]

ELIMINATION OF THE DRAFT SEEN BY 1967

(By John G. Norris)

An exhaustive Government review of military conscription now underway is likely to result in the Nation's shifting to all-volunteer recruitment in the Armed Forces, on a trial basis, by 1967.

At the least, the broad study ordered by President Johnson will bring major changes in the selective service law that has been a key factor in American life for most of the last quarter century.

Should present indications prove wrong and continuation of some type of draft be ruled necessary, an annual lottery for 19-year-olds to determine who serves and who is exempt is probable.

These forecasts can be safely made, even though Pentagon officials in charge of the review are withholding predictions of what they will recommend until their study is completed late next winter. The facts all point toward far-reaching changes in military manpower policies.

The chief factor is the postwar bumper baby crop. By next year or the year after, it is expected that some 1.9 million young men will be reaching military age annually—nearly double the total up until last year.

This key fact is important in two respects: it will multiply existing doubts about the equity of the present draft system; and, with some increase in incentives for voluntary enlistment and other steps, probably make it possible for the armed services to get the numbers of men they need without conscription.

But major questions remain. Can the Armed Forces, without the spur of the draft to encourage voluntary enlistments, get the quality of young men they need? Will enough youths enter the officer procurement programs to provide the required number of young leaders if they have no legal military obligation to fulfill?

HALF MILLION NEEDED

Can today's services, which require more electronics technicians than infantrymen, obtain sufficient recruits with high IQ's if career incentives replace the draft incentive?

The services need nearly a half million men from each class coming of military age to supply their needs. At present, close to 100,000 are drafted into the Army each year, and the remainder enlist in the service of their choice for longer periods than the 24-month required draft service.

It has always been assumed that without the draft law the other services would not get enough volunteers to maintain their required strengths and the Army its specialist needs, with the Armed Forces at their present 2,700,000-man total.

Part of the governmentwide review of the conscription system now in progress under the direction of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense William Gorham is to determine what is the prime motivation for enlistment in the Armed Forces today: a military career, specialist training that will qualify for a civilian job, or simply fulfillment of the present legal military service obligation.

Intensive surveys among servicemen and high school students are planned to help answer this question, which, in turn, will help in answering the broader question whether the draft is indeed necessary.

Among the imponderables involved is whether the draft now and in the future will generally be accepted as meeting reasonable standards of equity. Arithmetic will make this question more acute during the next several years.

Until last year, about 1 million young men reached military age annually. Of this total, about one-third were found mentally or physically unfit. Of the remainder, almost all served unless deferred under constantly liberalized criteria, culminating in the virtual exemption of all married men last year. This has kept the manpower pool of 18-to-26-year-old registrants roughly in balance with needs.

But with the big increase in men coming of military age, only about half of those eligible under present standards will be needed to meet Armed Forces needs.

In looking into a substitute volunteer system for the draft, the Pentagon is considering both how to raise the supply of volunteers and how to reduce some military manpower commitments. One method would be to raise military pay and fringe benefits. The entrance pay for both officers and enlisted men now is well below civilian standards.

Another possibility under study is to cut requirements for some skills and leadership posts and rely on longer training for slower learners. This raises the basic question of the advisability of lowering military manpower requirements to achieve an all-volunteer service.

A final answer to what the United States will do about the future of the draft will depend on the results of current studies, including the added cost of a volunteer system. The odds now favor reenacting the selective service law when it expires in 1967, with a number of changes, and a trial period of keeping draft calls on a standby basis.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 1964]

ARMY TO ENLIST 60,000 REJECTEES ON 6-MONTH REHABILITATION TRIAL

(By John G. Norris)

The Pentagon announced plans yesterday to enlist 60,000 young draft rejectees over the next 3 years for a 6-month trial rehabilitation and training period in the Army.

The major aim, Pentagon officials said, is to determine whether an expanded program along these lines could provide many more volunteers who could be made acceptable for service and thus help end the draft.

The program, starting in November, also would provide an additional program for rehabilitating high school dropouts and other poor youths who are unable to find work, as a further step under President Johnson's war on poverty.

President Johnson is reported interested in the plan. He has expressed concern about the high rate of draft rejection for mental and physical reasons. A major study of the draft is already in progress.

The Journal of the Armed Forces reported that some in the Army did not like getting the military into "health, education, and welfare functions," and dub the plan the "Military Youth Corps" and "Moron Corps."

But Army officers said the pilot program should provide experience in emergency preparations of men who do not now meet mental and physical standards but who would be called in a mobilization.

Understandably, however, military chiefs would rather take the better qualified recruits and draftees that they have been getting under higher standards set in 1958.

Under the new program, the Army will accept an average training level of 11,000 previously rejected men for 3-year conditional enlistments. They will receive basic training and special educational instruction. Men with minor, correctable, physical defects such as bad teeth or hernias will be accepted and the defects will be remedied.

After 6 to 12 months, those found to be acceptable—either by passing the Armed Force qualification test after educational help or proving they were good soldiers—will be offered regular enlistments. Others will be released to civilian life. Volunteers only will be taken under the plan. The trainees will not count as part of Regular Army strength.

It is expected that training will be conducted at a single, as yet undetermined, camp.

Last year, of 532,000 men who took preinduction examinations, 265,000 qualified and 266,000 were rejected. Of those, 115,000 failed mentally and nearly half were classified 1–Y and 4–F.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1964]

HOPEFUL EXPERIMENT

The Pentagon's plan to enlist 60,000 young men rejected for the draft in a program of training and rehabilitation is conservationist in the best sense of the word. In many instances young men are turned down for military service because of decayed teeth or easily correctable physical defects. In other instances they are turned away because of inadequate education. It is inexcusably wasteful merely to reject these men and do nothing about their disabilities.

Some objection has been raised to getting the Armed Forces into the business of health, education, and rehabilitation. But these are vital elements in the building of any military force. The only difference in the special rehabilitation and training program is that men of somewhat lower qualifications will be taken and the conditioning process will have to be somewhat more extensive. But this would seem to be a wholly proper burden to place upon services that are making large demands upon the country's manpower.

Volunteers for the rehabilitation program will be offered regular enlistments if they qualify at the end of 6 to 12 months. Others will be released with the advantage of improved education and health as a reward for their willingness to seek military service. In either event, there should be a net advantage to the country as a whole. It would be a mistake to belittle this advantage even from the military point of view, for the men who will be helped by this training would inevitably be swept into the military under a general mobilization.

The new experiment will be especially useful if it helps to remove the necessity for the draft. Extra training and health aids for unprepared young men who wish to join the services would be a small price to pay for elimination of compulsory service. We hope that this promising experiment will be carried out with full appreciation of its potential value for the entire country.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1964]

THE PENTAGON SAYS IT WELCOMES GOLDWATER IDEA THAT DRAFT END

WASHINGTON, September 3.—The Defense Department said today that the military draft should be ended "as soon as possible," and that it was glad Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, the Republican presidential nominee, agreed.

A Pentagon statement said, however, that it was irresponsible to suggest ending the draft before there were other adequate means

for recruiting manpower for the Armed Forces.

Replying to the speech in which Mr. GOLDWATER formally opened his campaign, the Pentagon cited a quotation from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower about making a political issue of the Selective Service.

The Pentagon said:

"Any suggestion that the draft be ended without providing adequate substitute means to recruit soldiers for our Armed Forces is the kind of irresponsibility that was described by President Eisenhower in 1956 when he said, 'The issue of our military draft is no matter of a technical point to be scored in a political debate.'"

PLEDGED TO END DRAFT

Senator GOLDWATER said in a speech prepared for delivery today at Prescott, Ariz., that a Republican adminstration would "end the draft altogether, and as soon as possible." He also said the Democrats were using the draft, for "social schemes," as well as military needs.

Nils A. Lennartson, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Public Affairs, issued the Pentagon's reply.

"We are glad to know that the Republican candidate agrees with the administration that the draft should be ended as soon as possible," the statement said.

"The fact is that more than 4 months ago President Johnson directed a study to reach this result," Mr. Lennartson said. He said the study would be completed next April.

When he announced the study last April, Mr. Johnson said the Pentagon would search for alternatives to the draft system, including the possibility of going to an all-voluntary basis.

Mr. Johnson said then that the draft was clearly needed at present but that a comprehensive study of the system was required.

SYSTEM WAS HELD INDISPENSABLE

Up to that time, the Defense Department had contended that the draft, although it took few men each month, was an indispensable means not only of meeting Army manpower requirements but also of influencing men to enlist or volunteer for officer programs in all services.

The Pentagon said the draft would be "ended today" if voluntary enlistment could meet all military manpower needs.

Mr. Lennartson's statement said the Defense Department could not understand Senator GOLDWATER'S charge that the draft was used for anything but military purposes.

The statement mentioned two programs of the type that Mr. GOLDWATER'S press secretary, Paul F. Wagner, said the Senator meant when he spoke of the draft being used for social schemes.

One program is the newly announced plan to take in volunteers who fail to meet physical and mental standards of the Army. They would be rehabilitated while taking basic military training. Plans call for taking in 60,000 over a 3-year period.

That program is for volunteers. Another plan, developed by the Pentagon and several other Government agencies, calls for helping draft rejectees to qualify themselves for either voluntary military service or useful civilian employment "so that they can become taxpayers and not taxeaters."

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 27, 1964]

SHOULD WE END THE DRAFT? OUR WAY OF PROCURING MILITARY MANPOWER, NOW A CAMPAIGN ISSUE, IS REEXAMINED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

(Hanson W. Baldwin is military editor of the New York Times. His most recent book is "World War I: An Outline History.")

"Peacetime conscription is repugnant to the spirit of democracy and the soul of republican institutions."

"By handing boys over to the arbitrary and complete domination of the Government, we put it in the power of the Government to indoctrinate them with the political doctrines then popular with the Government. * * * In wartime it is bad enough; in peacetime it would be intolerable."

These comments were made respectively by Senators Arthur Vanderberg and Robert A. Taft, Sr., less than 25 years ago. And the opinion they expressed—that peacetime conscription was intolerable in the United States—reflected at the time the basic attitudes of millions of citizens, many of whose parents had migrated to America to escape what they considered the tyranny of European conscription.

Despite such ingrained feelings, the United States has had a military draft system—except for a brief 17-month interlude—ever since the emergency brought on by World War II in 1940. It was renamed, during the Korean war, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and has been extended repeatedly for 4-year periods. Last year Congress gave the draft some cursory hearings and debate before voting overwhelmingly to extend it until 1967, but until recently, it appeared that the draft had little opposition today and was here to stay.

Now Senator GOLDWATER—as Adlai Stevenson tried to do in 1956—has made the draft a political issue in the presidential campaign, branding it "outmoded and unfair" and promising, if elected, to end it "as soon as possible." To which the administration has retorted that the Pentagon is already embarked on a study, to be completed next April, which will explore the feasibility of ending the draft, but that it is irresponsible to suggest ending the draft without providing adequate substitutes for recruiting necessary military manpower.

The total strength of the Armed Forces today is approximately 2,700,000 men, and it is expected to remain at about this level in the immediate future. There is a major turnover in personnel, particularly in the lower ranks and grades, which amounts to about 20 percent annually. New replacements come through voluntary enlistment, officer candidate schools, ROTC programs, pilot training programs, the Reserves and, of course, the draft.

About 100,000 men a year are currently being drafted for 2-year terms—a figure which represents some 20 percent of the roughly 500,000 men the services require yearly for replacements. All the rest are volunteers, in name at least. The services—the Army particularly—believe that the "hot breath" of the draft is what persuades many young men to volunteer. Actually, the Army is the only service utilizing draftees at the present time. The other services, because they are smaller or more technical, or have more of a reputation for glamor, sustain their strength solely by volunteers. But many of these volunteers, it is suspected, enlist in the service of their choice in order to make sure they are not drafted into the Army.

There are many other factors which influence men to volunteer for terms varying from 2 years to a lifetime. Among them are the opportunities provided by the services for education and technical training; the security of a Government paycheck; pension rights and other so-called "fringe benefits"; travel and adventure; "escape"; the inability to find a satisfactory civilian job, and so on.

It is this system of procuring military manpower—combining compulsion with inducements, the carrot and the stick—that is now under heavy fire, particularly the compulsory part of it.

Objections to the draft fall into four major categories—military, political, social and economic.

In the military view, Armed Forces composed of long-term professionals are likely to have better morale, to be better trained, more ready and generally more effective than short-term, semitrained conscripts. If one thinks in terms of the kind of combat waged in World War I and II, then mass-drafted armies would still have considerable importance. But today's technological revolution and the nuclear age have reduced the demand for "bodies" and the "Big Battalions" and have accentuated, instead, the need for "brains" and for the "Ready Battalions." The soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines of today must be highly intelligent, highly trained men. For many key specialists the schooling and training required may take longer than the 2-year term of the draftee. And the large turnover annually in personnel—whether of drafted men or volunteers—reduces the readiness of the services and makes them more training schools than combat forces.

The political arguments against the draft center on two basic objections; first, that conscription is inherently incompatible with democracy and freedom, and second, that the so-called universal training and selective service act is in no way universal or even selective, but rather discriminatory, inequitable and unfair.

It is true that the concentration and centralization of military power tends to restrict individual freedom; career planning, for instance, is complicated—sometimes completely distorted—by the draft. The Federal Government has utilized draft deferments, as Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, has testified, as "the carrot * * * to try to get individuals into occupations and professions" considered by Government to be necessary ones. In a free society the draft does, then, serve to promote regimentation.

The personal inequities and hardships caused by the draft as it now operates are legion. Today, only about 48 percent of the approximately 1.1 million men reaching the age of 26 (the de facto cutoff age for the peacetime draft) have ever donned a uniform; by 1965, this may drop to 40 percent. Instead of being inducted at the age of 18 or 19, after high school graduation, men are taken now at about the age of 22 or 23, just when they are trying to finish college or start their careers. The reason they are not drafted earlier is that there is such a large pool of potential draftees—one that is still increasing.

Moreover, young men can now be deferred for so many reasons that the majority can—and do—escape all service. Farming, special occupations, physical deficiencies, educational deferments, marriage, and fatherhood—all these and many others are reasons for draft postponement. Some critics believe that the educational deferments are particularly unfair and dangerous, and are creating a kind of "oligarchy of brains." Educational deferment, it is charged, tends to favor the rich or the well-endowed at the expense of the poor or the less well-endowed. These discriminations, and the fact that one selective service board drafts one man while another man with virtually the same history is deferred or rejected, document in an increasing number of cases the charges of unfairness. And unfairness to constituents is political dynamite on Capitol Hill.

Those who object to the draft on social grounds say that it is disruptive because the uncertainty about deferments and age of induction make planning for a career or family life difficult. And since the late President

Kennedy added marriage (fathers had already been deferred) to the list of deferments, which meant virtual exemption from the draft, there have been reports of youthful marriages contracted or materially hastened in order to make the man draft exempt. Needless to say, many of these hasty marriages end in the divorce courts.

The economic consequences of the draft parallel some of the social liabilities. Employers do not like to hire young men who are uncertain when, if ever, they will be called into uniform. As Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio, has stated: "The draft most certainly contributes to the high unemployment rate found among young men in their late teens and early twenties."

These are some of the criticisms of the draft stressed by those who believe it should be ended. But the debate is by no means all black or white; there are many valid arguments that support continuation of compulsory military service.

First and most important are the requirements of security. Despite the comforts with which most Americans live and the Nation's booming economy, few in Government regard the present era as peacetime. We are still involved with recurrent paramilitary crises, such as Vietnam, Cyprus, and Cuba, and anticipate being so for an indefinite future.

We live, too, in the atomic age—the age of speed and power unlimited—and the Nation cannot possibly afford to drop its guard, or even appear to drop its guard. Elimination of the draft would have international political and psychological effects—some of them adverse to the image we have tried to project of a strong and determined America. In other words, democracy, as usual, must be prepared to give up some of its internal freedoms if necessary to protect itself against external enemies.

The draft is the only way, according to a study by the House Armed Services Committee last year, by which the required size of the Armed Forces can be maintained. Without the compulsion of the draft, voluntary recruitment might slough off, and the size of the services might diminish to a point of danger. The United Kingdom eliminated draft, and the British Army, despite increased emoluments, has never since been of sufficient size to meet adequately all of its commitments.

In addition to its influence upon the size of the Active Forces, the draft is important to the size and quality of the Reserves, particularly the Army's ground units of National Guard and Reserves. Because of the draft, with its requirements for a minimum of 6 months of active training (plus 6 years of Reserve training), some of the ground units of the Reserves are in a higher state of readiness than they have ever been. Elimination of the draft might reduce the readiness and effectiveness of Reserve units and increase their difficulty in recruiting the necessary personnel.

Compulsory military service has also brought many byproducts which have strengthened the political, social, and economic fabric of the Nation.

The services operate the largest and in some ways most advanced technical training and educational institutions in the Nation. Annually scores of thousands of technicians doff their uniforms to form the backbone of trained labor staffs in electronic, aerodynamic, automotive, and other industries. Most of the country's airline pilots were trained by the military. Many of the Nation's best management specialists are ex-military officers. More linguists, though perhaps not the best linguists, have been trained by the services than by our universities. In training aids, in methods of language instruction, and in other areas the services have been preeminent. Assuredly, though the large annual turnover of military personnel hurts the efficiency of the Armed Forces, many of those who graduate from uniform represent a major contribution to the Nation's skills and knowledge.

But behind the immediate debate about the draft is a larger problem, one that goes beyond compulsory military training alone. It is the problem of how best to mesh the requirements of the services with the best interests of a free society.

There is not much doubt that long-term professional services—Active and Reserve—are better suited to the military requirements of the atomic age than large, semitrained rapid-turnover forces drafted or induced to serve by the prospect of the draft.

Whether the young men of America would volunteer in sufficient numbers to maintain forces of the requisite size once Uncle Sam was no longer breathing down their necks depends primarily upon three factors:

1. The size of the military manpower pool. The "baby boom" of the postwar years is now steadily increasing that pool; in 1962, 1,476,000 youths reached the draft age of 18; in 1966, this figure will approximate 1,880,000. Today there are 10.6 million American men between 18½ and 26½; by 1967, this pool will grow to 12.4 million. Some experts believe—and the Pentagon study is plumbing these beliefs—that it will be possible to recruit voluntarily all our military needs from the swollen population of tomorrow.

2. The inducements provided to voluntary recruits and would-be officers. Pay and other incentives are important material considerations which influence men to undertake a service career. So, too, are the psychic inducements—the sense of a job worth doing, of loyalty and tradition, a pride of uniform and a feeling that the Nation is proud of the men who serve it. Certainly the inducements offered today will not be adequate to meet the military manpower needs of tomorrow without compulsion. A sharp improvement in service pay scales, pensions, housing and other benefits, and a revision in the methods of procuring service manpower, in service career patterns, in stability of assignments and in other areas will be essential before sufficient volunteers of high motivation and intelligence eliminate the need for compulsion.

3. The reduction of present service standards. It has been suggested that one way of obtaining volunteers would be to lower the present strict physical and mental standards to a more realistic level. About one-third of all men examined by the services—volunteers and draftees—are now rejected, some for physical defects, some because they are in the lowest mental and intelligence classification, some because of emotional or psychiatric problems. President Johnson, in attempts to help these men, recently ordered the Government to provide those who wished it with educational, physical, or other aid.

The President also ordered the start of a pilot program. The Army, in each of the next 3 years, plans to induct 20,000 below-standard volunteers for experimental training. Some of these may be taught to read and write or will receive other basic education; others, with remediable physical defects, will receive medical care; all of them will be given 6 to 12 months' training to determine their usefulness to the Army. Those who make the grade may be retained in service for a full 3-year enlistment.

Actually, this program is not startlingly new. The Army taught men to read and write, and accepted far lower category recruits in World War II and in the Korean conflict than it does now. A mass Army and a mobilization numbered in millions required the use of all manpower categories.

From the strictly military point of view, the utilization of lower-category personnel no longer appears to be necessary, while past experience with such personnel has been disappointing. As recently as 1957–58, the Army, convinced that its low-category personnel was causing an undue amount of trouble, weeded out, with the approval of Congress, the low performers. Since then, the guardhouse and prison population has materially declined, and overall performance has increased. Any reduction of standards—particularly if it should admit large numbers of low-category personnel—would undoubtedly reduce quality, and hence combat effectiveness, to a dangerous degree. While it may well be desirable, for the sake of society, to educate and train the backward, sickly and depressed, is the Army the place to do it?

Thus the problem of the draft is broad and complex; whether it is retained or eliminated or modified, the effects will be widely felt—in the services, throughout society, around the world.

From this weighing of the pros and cons several clear-cut conclusions emerge.

First, there is absolutely no doubt, in my opinion, that the present system of procuring military manpower, including the draft, must be revised. The annual turnover in the military services is too large and the inducements to professionalism too small. The Navy, for instance, is able to retain as regular, long-term officers only about 15 percent of the graduates from its officer candidate school—a major source of officer procurement. Electronic specialists are no sooner trained than their term of enlistment expires and they doff the uniform. Largely although not entirely because of the turnover there is far too little stability of assignment; men become expert sonar operators aboard a ship one year only to be transferred to new duty the next; a battalion or a company may have a new commanding officer every year or two. To correct this, not only must the annual manpower input be reduced and more officers and enlisted men induced to make military careers their life work, but service career patterns and assignment policies must be modified.

Second, there is no doubt that it would be desirable to end the draft entirely. Military effectiveness—in terms of highly trained professionals instantly ready—would be greatly improved if professional motivation could be substituted for compulsion. Certainly a voluntary system of recruitment is more compatible with past American traditions and with our concept of political freedom than conscription. The younger generation would be able to plan its important beginning years with far greater certainty than is now possible, and the somewhat corrosive effects upon morale of the present system of deferments and exemptions would be ended. Militarily, politically, and socially then, it seems desirable to end the draft.

Third, the first priority of the foreseeable future is still national security. While it may be desirable to end the draft, the price would be too high if it meant enforced reduction in the size of the armed services, or a watering down of quality. If there is no other way to maintain the quantitative and qualitative strength of the Armed Forces at approximately the present plateau, the principle of compulsion for military service must be continued, although its application should be modified.

Fourth, far more intense and detailed studies are needed before any final decision can be made. The study now underway in the Pentagon is an essential beginning. But it is not enough. It should be followed by a

much broader and more comprehensive examination of the entire problem of the effects of the draft upon our society and of the procurement of military manpower. A joint bipartisan congressional committee or a specially appointed Presidential Commission should undertake such a study, calling upon experts from all fields.

Finally, if the facts then clearly indicate that voluntary recruitment and long-term professionalism, encouraged by improved incentives, might supply service needs, the draft should be ended. But if there is doubt, the principle of compulsion might then be suspended, rather than eliminated, for a stated period, in order to test and try a new system, one more compatible with "the soul of republican institutions."

THE ECONOMY OF THE MIDWEST

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, for more than 1 year now I have been conducting a study of the economic problems of the Middle West as related to federally sponsored research and development.

On June 23, 1964, I urged the development of a new national policy on the distribution of Federal funds for research and development.

In 1940, we were spending $74 million for research and development. In the current fiscal year, we will spend $15 billion. During the period when this form of Federal spending has increased so dramatically there has been surprisingly little attention paid to the overall manner in which this money is spent or to the place where it is spent.

Some time ago, I learned that the presidents of our outstanding Midwestern universities were becoming increasingly concerned about the effects of Federal spending for research and development on the future of higher education and on industrial development.

I have been corresponding with some of these educators and with others interested in this subject and I want to report some of their comments to the Senate which I am sure shares my concern about this vast investment which our taxpayers are making in research and development.

Our progress in science and technology is without equal and we must expand and build on our past accomplishments. More than this, however, we need to evaluate the effects of our scientific activities from points of view other than just the scientific. Expenditures for research and development should be viewed as one category of governmental purchase. We need to ask if we are purchasing what we want and if our purchases are having the most constructive effects.

For various reasons Federal support of scientific research has been concentrated on the coasts of our country. This concentration of funds, scholars, equipment, and experience in working with the Government creates great competence which, in turn, begets more governmental support.

Thus cycles are established and it becomes very difficult for regions or industries outside the established cycle to compete. The States of the Middle West have excellent universities and train many of the scientists and engineers who conduct the various scientific activities of the Government. F. E. Mills, associate director of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, has written in a letter to me:

We find, however, that we not only educate our own young and send them to these large federally supported research areas, but that we also pay for the education of the young people from these (out-of-State) areas and then send them back. Viewed this way, one sees that these universities are a major national asset in a region being neglected by the Federal Government. We already have strong evidence that this situation cannot persist but is leading to the deterioration of these very institutions. Any one of a dozen university presidents can testify to the difficulty of maintaining topflight staff in this situation.

The fact is we don't have any definite national policy today on the pattern to be followed in allocating Federal funds for research and development. The pattern which we have followed almost unintentionally is having an unfavorable effect on the Midwest, home of many of our greatest industries and our greatest universities, which are the real strength of America. Federal funds come from all the taxpayers, including 50 million or more people in the Midwest. We cannot pursue a policy, even unintentionally, which has the effect of wasting the industrial and intellectual potential of the American heartland.

This point is expressed well in a letter to me from W. Clarke Wescoe, chancellor of the University of Kansas. He states:

The Nation cannot afford to allow the deterioration of the economic position of any significant sector of the country, but particularly of the Midwest which has shown itself the backbone and sinews of agriculture, military materiel production, vital transportation and communications networks, and broad education at all levels, particularly the training of graduate students in critical manpower areas of science and engineering. The demonstrated potential of our region in these crucial fields must not be ignored and allowed to wither while vast investments of Federal funds are made to build from much more meager foundations new industrial and technical complexes in regions which must import their capabilities, nurse and develop their educational and research institutions, and look to far markets for their products.

The vitality of any region is greatly dependent upon its intellectual resources. When federally suported activities are located preponderantly in one region or another, bright young scientists tend to flock to the attractive and challenging new fields. Mr. Wescoe continues:

The scientific aspect of the problem is simlar and similarly disturbing. The Midwest is far from lacking intellectual capacity and scientific capability, but the current patterns of placement of Federal funds for research and development certainly do little to foster the growth of this capacity; in fact, they operate to drain away much of our newly trained young scientific and technical manpower. Yet the solution is not a simple geographical or population-based allocation of funds. There must be a rigorously applied philosophy and policy of recognizing the Nation's long-term interest in the broad developments of its scientific and technological resources and needs.

Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan, writes to me:

Your statement pointing out that there must be some consideration given to a reasonable distribution of defense contract work and other Government support in areas besides the two coasts is one to which the University of Michigan heartily subscribes. We believe that this point must be made strongly and repeatedly until a recognition of the seriousness of the situation is aroused in the administration and in Congress, and through them in the Government agencies.

Not all the blame for lack of Federal research and development activity can be attributed to the Government. The industries and universities of the Middle West have not in all cases been as aggressive as they should have been in seeking Federal contracts. In this regard, Marshall W. Keith, associate director of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, has written to me:

To illustrate, in the middle 1950's when I was with the Office of Naval Research, I spent a day at a well-known Racine manufacturing plant begging them to take a research contract that they were well equipped, both personnel- and equipmentwise, to carry out. On another occasion the same year, the Chief of Naval Research and I spent 2 days with a Minneapolis firm begging them to take a contract in a field in which they were specialists. In both instances we were turned down. Can you, by any stretch of imagination, see one of the California companies acting thus?

I am afraid that the pioneering spirit that built the Midwest immigrated to the coasts sometime in the last 50 or 100 years.

The universities of the Middle West and the other neglected regions need assistance in building their competence for training and teaching as well as for conducting research. A National Science Foundation program to begin in 1965 will aim at increasing the number and quality of university science departments. This is but a small first step, although it may prove to be the method best suited to vastly increasing our competence in training scientists in future years. However, the most immediate need is for increasing support for the present excellent universities. J. B. Page, vice president for research and dean, the Graduate College of Iowa State University, writes to me:

We would not oppose the establishment of new centers; what we do propose is that it is clearly in the national interest to support through research and facilities grants existing strong universities to the absolute limit of their ability to take additional students or to train additional numbers without diluting quality. This support should be immediate and adequate so that our present strengths are not eroded away and dissipated for the sake of gaining greater geographical distribution. It takes from 3 to 8 years to train the best qualified student after their bachelor's degree to the Ph. D. level. The training and bringing together of well-qualified, able graduate faculties in the numbers envisaged may well take two to three times that long.

Our first effort must be to maintain and to strengthen our existing graduate faculties to the ultimate of their capabilities. Only when this can be assured should additional efforts be directed toward building up additional centers of excellence.

Long range planning for scientific activities is needed and manpower needs must be evaluated. The very challenging recommendations made by the Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower is reason alone for us here in the Congress to reconsider the scientific activities which are supported by the Government. The committee states:

Government must assess in advance the effects of its decisions on the deployment of large numbers of scientists and engineers, both in undertaking new projects and in discontinuing old ones.

Further the committee recommends:

Before the Government reaches a decision to undertake a great technological program it should make a careful assessment of the impact of the decision on the deployment and utilization of scientists and engineers.

I cannot urge forcefully enough that we consider our scientific stature carefully. As a Senator from the Middle West, I sincerely hope that, through increased industrial and scientific enterprise, the economy of the Middle West can be improved. Cooperative effort by industries and universities in the Middle West is needed and machinery for cooperation and communication is being set up already in several of the States. This united front in the States is the most important ingredient for increasing the competitive position of the Middle West. Also needed is guidance and leadership from Washington. Here we must see that all the regions of our country are given a chance to develop and contribute on a fair and equal basis.

I ask unanimous consent that some correspondence with officials of universities of the Middle West be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION,
Stoughton, Wis., July 16, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washinton, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I have had an opportunity to read your "Statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics." I find it to be a most thoughtful and challenging document. I am interested in this problem myself and have come face to face with it several times in the 8 years I have spent at MURA. I hope you will continue your efforts in this subject and can make the problem widely known.

I should like to add several comments about my own thoughts and experiences. You have correctly pointed out that the enormous growth of science-oriented industry in diverse parts of the country is not due to investment in scientific training by citizens of these areas. Rather, this trained cadre of engineers and scientists is largely due to the efforts of Midwestern universities in coping with the problem of maintaining high standards of education while providing education for the great masses of people. Contrast this to the attitude, for example in the East, where little attempt is made to provide this education. This is the source of a problem which is common to all of the Midwestern universities: the enormous influx of out-of-State students. Now we certainly want to make this education available to all who can profitably use it. We find, however, that we not only educate our own young and send them to these large federally supported research areas, but that we also pay for the education of the young people from these areas and then send them back. Viewed this way, one sees that these universities are a major national asset in a region being neglected by the Federal Government. We already have strong evidence that this situation cannot persist but is leading to the deterioration of these very institutions. Any one of a dozen university presidents can testify to the difficulty of maintaining topflight staff in this situation.

Another observation I should like to offer concerns the local attitudes of people essential to the growth of science-oriented industry. In the Madison area, I have seen the attitude of people in general shift to a point where they understand very well the implications of science-oriented industry. Indeed, these implications are apparent in their daily life. These people want to take part in this technological revolution and want their communities to grow with the rest of the country. For example, farming is an industry which has benefited perhaps the most from research. I have discovered in talking to people in small farming communities that they are very aware of the function of research and education in society, and in discussing MURA and its role; they really only need to learn the details, not the overall situation. On the other hand, I find a reticence in some of the larger manufacturers to strike out in these new fields and commit themselves to the future. I have no suggestion about how to overcome this attitude, but it must be done to make progress in the future.

I appreciate the chance to read and comment upon this statement and strongly urge you to continue your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

F. E. MILLS,
Associate Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, July 21, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Thank you for your letter of July 9 and the opportunity to comment on the matter of federally sponsored research and development.

The distribution of Federal research and development funds has become a matter of major economic as well as scientific importance to the Nation. Your statement describes well, and documents, the economic aspects of the problem. The Nation cannot afford to allow the deterioration of the economic position of any significant sector of the country, but particularly of the Midwest which has shown itself the backbone and sinews of agriculture, military material production, vital transportation and communications networks, and broad education at all levels, particularly the training of graduate students in critical manpower areas of science and engineering. The demonstrated potential of our region in these crucial fields must not be ignored and allowed to wither while vast investments of Federal funds are made to build from much more meager foundations new industrial and technical complexes in regions which must import their capabilities, nurse and develop their educational and research institutions, and look to far markets for their products.

The scientific aspect of the problem is similar and similarly disturbing. The Midwest is far from lacking in intellectual capacity and scientific capability, but the current patterns of placement of Federal funds for research and development certainly do little to foster the growth of this capacity; in fact, they operate to drain away much of our newly trained young scientific and technical manpower. Yet the solution is not a simple geographical or population-based allocation of funds. There must be a rigorously applied philosophy and policy of recognizing the Nation's long-term interest in the broad development of its scientific and technological resources and needs. There must be a practice of placing Federal funds where past performance, present capability, and future potential guarantee research and development of high quality and when several different regions seem to offer equal promise, then habit, inattention, default, parochialism, or political expedience must not be allowed to sacrifice the Midwest and imperil the Nation's future.

Sincerely yours,

W. CLARKE WESCOE,
Chancellor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, July 28, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: The University of Michigan is much concerned about the problem discussed in your letter of July 9 and in your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The university appreciates the research and effort that you have devoted to this problem and wants to be of help.

When the location of the new NASA Electronics Research Center was being considered, the University of Michigan in cooperation with the other universities in southeastern Michigan and with the government of the State made a determined effort to try to bring this Center to the Midwest and if possible to Michigan. A location proposal was prepared and a presentation was made to the NASA Committee in Washington. I enclose a copy of this proposal. You will see that it brings out a number of the same points that you make with regard to the strong position of the Midwest as a manufacturing center, the recent decline in Defense and Government contracts in this area, and the very strong position of the area in the preparation of Ph. D.'s in science and engineering, most of whom have to leave the area to find employment.

The committee's report justifying its location of this facility in the Boston area took the position that the Center should go to Boston because of the strength of that area in electronics research. The fact that the Midwest had completely adequate and unutilized resources in electronics did not carry sufficient weight. If it continues to be the position both of Government agencies and of industries that it is desirable to congregate in areas where these research-based industries are already strongly represented, the situation can only get worse.

Your statement pointing out that there must be some consideration given to a reasonable distribution of defense contract work and other Government support in areas besides the two coasts is one to which the University of Michigan heartily subscribes. We believe that this point must be made

strongly and repeatedly until a recognition of the seriousness of the situation is aroused in the administration and in Congress, and through them in the Government agencies.

The University of Michigan wishes to help in this problem of industrial strengthening of the Midwest. It has established, with support of the Michigan Legislature in its Institute of Science and Technology, a division of industrial cooperation. This division, with about $1 million in State funds annually, is undertaking to strengthen the cooperation between industry and the university and to make known the advantages of this area for research-based industry. The University of Michigan believes that not only the universities of the State of Michigan but also the universities, governments, and industries throughout the whole Midwest must cooperate in this undertaking and desires to be of any assistance possible. We are assured of support from our Michigan Senators and congressional delegation and will be ready to cooperate in any regional efforts to improve the situation.

Sincerely,

HARLAN HATCHER.

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION,
Stoughton, Wis., July 15, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Thank you for your letter of July 9, 1964, which enclosed a copy of your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I have read and reread both your letter and statement and am very much impressed with the thought, research, and analysis that went into the preparation of both. There is, in my mind, absolutely no question as to the veracity and accuracy of your statements, and I am only sorry that every Member of Congress and all citizens and taxpayers cannot be forced to read your statement and made to understand it and its implications, as they involve not only the welfare of the Midwest but of the Nation. I am particularly concerned at what I consider to be the rather stupid attitude of some of our larger State industries who would still be making horsedrawn plows and harnesses if their more progressive competitors in other States had not forced them into the tractor business. I am rather certain that all of the blame for concentration of Federal funds cannot be placed on the Federal Government. To illustrate, in the middle 1950's when I was with the Office of Naval Research, I spent a day at a well-known Racine manufacturing plant begging them to take a research contract that they were well equipped, both personnel and equipment wise, to carry out; on another occasion the same year, the Chief of Naval Research and I spent 2 days with a Minneapolis firm begging them to take a contract in a field in which they were specialists; in both instances we were turned down. Can you, by any stretch of imagination, see one of the California companies acting thus?

I am afraid that the pioneering spirit that built the Midwest immigrated to the coasts sometime in the last 50 or 100 years.

Your presentation covered all of the vital points as to the need for support of research and development work in the Midwest except one that most people don't even like to think about; that is the strategic danger of concentrating all of our top research and development and important defense work in a few areas. I believe that a half dozen well placed nuclear weapons could wipe out our entire defense potential and leave us at the mercy of any potential aggressor.

I have shown your letter to a number of our senior staff and asked that they write to you, giving any comments they have that might be of use to you.

Thank you again for an opportunity to review this material and for your continued interest in MURA.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL W. KEITH,
Associate Director.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Ames, Iowa, August 11, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Your recent very welcome letter to President Hilton was received at a time when he was out of the State. It has been handed to me for a reply and comment which I am most happy to give.

We are very pleased with the excellent summary you have prepared for the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Your summary is excellent and it presents an unusually lucid analysis of what is an alarming situation and a potentially serious problem both for the region and for the Nation as a whole.

It is clear that there are two ways in which this alarming trend could be halted or reversed: (1) by modifying existing procurement policies to the end that existing industrial and human resources of the Midwest are more adequately recognized and utilized and that a more equitable distribution of procurement is achieved, or (2) recognition that the major educational resource with respect to production of Ph. D. scientists and engineers is in the Midwest region and taking steps to strengthen and protect this vital national resource.

The first of these is receiving attention in many quarters and it is clear that much can and must be done if this region is not to find itself at an even greater disadvantage with respect to the rest of the country. Political considerations will certainly be of great consequence. It is encouraging that the congressional Representatives, the Governors, the educational and business leaders of the Midwest region are joining together to point out the magnitude of the problem and to urge that corrective steps be taken.

The second area in which changes need to be made may be equally, if not more, significant, but I fear that less attention has been directed, and less public concern has been expressed, over what is clearly beginning to happen to our great educational institutions in the Midwest region. You have pointed out in your excellent summary that of the 10 top States in the production of Ph. D.'s, 6 are in the Midwest. The great publicly supported universities, with the addition of a smaller number of privately supported universities in this region, do constitute an educational resource of inestimable value to the Nation as a whole. There has been significant Federal support, but in general the individual States and the region have supported and maintained a unique concentration of great universities presently producing more Ph. D.'s than are being absorbed in the region which supports and provides for their education and training.

Strong pressures are being exerted for the creation of new centers of excellence and for the wider distribution of educational facilities across the country. These are worthy goals with considerable emotional appeal, yet the hard facts are that such centers cannot be created overnight and that if a crash program is undertaken, the needed faculties can only be assembled by raiding the faculties in our universities which have already achieved excellence. Even the President's Science Advisory Committee has pointed out the fallacy and the danger of assuming: that existing first-rate universities are at saturation, that our national capabilities to produce highly qualified scientists and engineers can be doubled or tripled by the simple expedient of large Federal grants to universities newly involved in graduate work, or by failing to recognize that there is a critical mass of high quality professors in related subject areas with associated expensive and extensive facilities which must be brought together in one place if graduate education of quality is to result.

The great universities in the Midwest are faced with a brain drain which could far surpass the exodus which has so alarmed the Government and press in Britain. The announced manpower goals are to more than double our outturn of Ph. D scientists and engineers by 1970. This clearly means that existing faculties and existing facilities will carry the brunt of this effort if the goal is to be reached. It is fallacious to assume that new centers can be staffed at the expense of existing well-qualified and capable universities and get the job done.

We would not oppose the establishment of new centers; what we do propose is that it is clearly in the national interest to support through research and facilities grants, through expanded fellowship programs, and through direct institutional grants existing strong universities to the absolute limit of their ability to take additional students or to train additional numbers without diluting quality. This support should be immediate and adequate so that our present strengths are not eroded away and dissipated for the sake of gaining greater geographical distribution. It takes from 3 to 8 years to train the best qualified students after their bachelor's degree to the Ph. D level. The training and bringing together of well-qualified, able graduate faculties in the numbers envisaged may well take two to three times that long.

Our first effort must be to maintain and to strengthen our existing graduate faculties to the ultimate of their capabilities. Only when this can be assured should additional efforts be directed toward building up additional centers of excellence. If our Midwest universities are kept strong, we will have the strongest possible argument for attracting new science-oriented industries into our region. If we allow our existing strong universities to be weakened or our existing strong faculties to emigrate, there will really be little point to efforts to attract science-oriented industries regardless of what political pressures may be brought to bear.

The rather strong position I have taken above results not just from self-interest, but from a very deep conviction that we have not only an imbalance of industry and Government contracts, but an immediate emergency situation which would clearly be in both the national and the regional interest not to allow it to deteriorate further. Corrective steps would be fairly easy to undertake; the emergency is upon us now and the States do not have it within their own resources to support adequately what we must now recognize as a prime national resource, namely, the combined capabilities of the great universities of the Midwest to train the large numbers of scientists and engineers needed by our Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

J.B. PAGE,
Vice President for Research and Dean,
The Graduate College.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., July 23, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: All of us who have been so closely associated with MURA are heartened

by your continuing interest in the regional problems created by the Federal research and development programs. Your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics documents these problems forcefully.

Through membership on the National Science Board, I am a party to the policy established for National Science Foundation under which geographical distribution of funds has been an important, if not the controlling factor, in awards for basic research and science education programs. I am glad to say NSF has effected a distribution of these funds that varies from the general population pattern only to the extent it favors somewhat the less populous and affluent States and regions. Of course, NSF is only a small part of the national $15 billion research and development effort but its experimentation with institutional grants and the science development program just approved by the House for fiscal year 1965 may chart new paths to the effective accomplishment of the objectives you have so well stated.

On the local scene, the demise of automobile production by Studebaker has sharpened the sensitivity of our business community to the increasingly dominant role of science and technology in economic growth. To strengthen our position to compete effectively in the Federal research and development programs, the university is continuing to expand the capability of its faculty in science and engineering, is establishing a program of continuing education to serve both the university and the local community and is studying the feasibility of an industrial research program including, possibly, joint sponsorship with the local community of an industrial research park.

In the long run, however, I concur in your judgment that more rational and coordinated planning is needed at the Federal level to insure that the great economic benefits flowing from the national research and development effort are realized in every region of the Nation.

If there is any particular constructive action you think I can now take in furthering the development of our Midwest region through increasingly effective participation in the national research and development effort, please do not hesitate to advise me of it. Meanwhile, you have my very best wishes for your personal happiness in serving our country so devotedly.

Cordially yours,

Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.,
President.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., July 24, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It is heartening to know that you are continuing to press for more attention to the research and development problems of the Midwest. I was most interested in reading your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Mathematics.

Attaining a fairer geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds is surely a good cause. I have, for some time, wondered at the Midwest's meeting its educational obligations to the Nation in producing scientists and engineers and the lower rate of scientists produced elsewhere in the country. Yet, most research funds, which are certainly needed to keep this educational process alive, seem to go elsewhere than the Midwest. It seems that the production of scientists and engineers on the coasts does not keep pace with the volume of research funds and the educational obligations that implies.

The equally important problem of the distribution of development funds is of concern to the Midwest. A much closer cooperation and support by midwestern industries for its universities may be a solution to this geographical inequity.

I hope you will continue to devote your energies in calling the attention of the Nation to these problems and the far-reaching consequences of this trend.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN B. WELLS,
Chancellor.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 12253, the Tariff Technical Amendments Act of 1964, contains 74 sections making technical, clarifying and other changes in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which became effective on August 31, 1963. Largely, these changes correct errors and omissions, reaverage certain rates and conform the schedules to recent court decisions and customs rulings.

The amendments provided for in H.R. 12253 in some instances increase the rates of duty on imported articles and, in other instances, decrease the rates of duty. A number of the amendments are merely clarifying in nature and involve no changes in rates of duty on imported products. Generally speaking, the rate changes provided for are for the purpose of restoring to the particular imported articles involved the actual or approximate tariff rate levels that had previously applied under the old tariff provisions in effect prior to August 31, 1963. In some cases this involved arriving at a weighted average of several different rates. I ask unanimous consent that a table illustrating the purpose of the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee be printed at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill as it came from the House was not regarded as controversial. Its passage by the House on August 17, under suspension of the rules testifies to this. However, after the Senate received the bill, considerable objection was received with respect to three or four provisions. For instance, the treatment of V-belts by the House bill has caused considerable concern among domestic manufacturers of this product. And the classification of zipper tapes as provided by the House bill was seriously questioned.

These objections and others were carefully reviewed by the Committee on Finance. As the result of this study, five provisions of the House bill were deleted and three were amended. The provisions deleted are those relating to V-belts, wood particleboard, certain ball bearings, sausage casings, and round wire. The provisions amended by the committee relate to commutators, fabrics of manmade fiber, and zipper parts. The amendment to the zipper parts provision assures that the American zipper industry will continue to receive the full benefit of a recent customs ruling classifying zipper tape without teeth as "zipper parts" rather than as "narrow fabrics."

In addition to these provisions of the House bill which were deleted or amended, the Committee on Finance added several provisions to the House bill. Two of these, the first relating to certain wool fabrics and the other relating to button blanks, eliminate tariff avoidance devices. In the case of the wool fabrics, it developed that under the new tariff structure a small quantity of high value vegetable fiber, such as flax or ramie, could be combined with a large quantity of low-value reclaimed wool with the result that the completed fabric, although a woolen product for all practical purposes, would be treated for duty purposes as a vegetable fabric thereby avoiding the higher woolen duties. This was not possible under the old tariff structure. The committee amendment deals with this situation by largely restoring the rates which would have applied to this product prior to August 31, 1963.

The button blank problem is similar. The duty on blanks is 36 percent while the duty on finished polester buttons ranges up to about 140 percent. Because of this disparity, the practice has developed of importing buttons which are finished in every material respect, except that no holes have been drilled in them. The only commercial value of this is to avoid the button rate. Under the committee bill, these almost-finished buttons will be subject to the appropriate button rates.

Other amendments added to the bill by the committee eliminate the duty on limestone chips and spalls, certain agricultural machinery and implements, polyethylene imine, and mass spectrometers imported for the use of Pomona College in California and the University of New Hampshire.

The committee bill also includes an amendment dealing with the treatment of continuous cast aluminum. Under the present tariff structure this continuous cast product is treated as unwrought aluminum, dutiable at 1.25 cents per pound, although it may be competitive in many respects with aluminum which has been processed into rods, plates, and shapes which are dutiable at a higher 2.5 cents per pound rate. The committee has adopted a use-test approach as a solution to the problem. Under this amendment continuous cast aluminum imported to be used for unwrought purposes—that is, for melting, ruling, forging, drawing, or extruding—would continue to be dutiable at the unwrought rate of 1.25 cents per pound, while continuous cast aluminum imported for other uses competitive with wrought aluminum would be dutiable at the higher rate of 2.5 cents per pound.

The committee also added the text of H.R. 5986 to this bill. This amendment, which passed the House unanimously, imposes a specific duty of 24 cents on brooms made of broomcorn valued at not over 96 cents, and a duty of 8 cents on each whiskbroom not valued over 32 cents. This amendment largely carries out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission in its 1962 report on the differences in cost of production of brooms in this country and in the principal supplying foreign country, Mexico. I might add that a somewhat similar amendment was adopted by the Senate in 1962 as an amendment to a House-passed bill. However, Congress adjourned then before the House could act on the Senate amendment.

Mr. President, the administration is quite anxious that the Congress act on this bill before adjournment, since the correction of the errors and omissions in the tariff schedules, which this bill accomplishes, will improve our bargaining stature in the forthcoming trade talks at Geneva by making our law more certain.

I urge that the bill as reported by the committee be approved.

EXHIBIT 1

H.R. 12253—Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964—Outline of provisions

Section	Article	Purpose
7	Agricultural bins and sprayers	Rate decrease to free.
37	Agricultural and horticultural machinery and implements	Clarify.
25	Aluminum, unwrought	Clarify (rate increase).
46	Anesthetic apparatus	Court ruling (rate decrease).
69	Articles assembled abroad	Clarify.
68	Articles of hair	Clarify (increase or decrease).
28	Automobile, etc., parts	Generally clarifying.
	Automatic voltage-current regulators	New provision (rate decrease).
	Electrical articles, parts of	Clarify (rate increase or decrease).
	Furniture designed for motor vehicle use	New provision (rate decrease).
	Hairsprings	Do.
	Hinges and fittings, etc	Do.
	Ignition wiring sets, etc	Do.
	Lighting equipment	Do.
	Permanent magnets	Re-averaging (rate decrease).
	Pumps for liquids	New provision; re-averaging (rate decrease).
	Repair kits	New provision; ease administration (rate decrease).
	Speedometers and tachometers	New provision (rate decrease).
8	Boxes and cases, certain covered or lined with textile fabrics	Simplification (rate increase and decrease).
43	Brake regulators	Rate decrease.
63	Brooms of broomcorn	Tariff Commission investigation (rate increase).
58	Buckles and buckle slides	Court ruling (rate decrease).
57	Button blanks	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
32	Camping and picnic sets, certain	Clarify (rate decrease).
18	Cellulose compounds; lignin	Clarify (rate increase).
34	Chain and chains	Clarify.
71	Coconut, palm oils	Rate decrease.
66	Colostomy bags	Do.
39	Commutators	Do.
48	Comparators	Clarify.
20	Concrete	Do.
42	Conductors, copper insulated	New provision (rate increase).
4	Containers not imported empty	Clarify.
40	Dictation machines	Rate decrease.
32	Dissecting tools fitted into cases containing microscopes	Clarify (rate decrease).
50	Editors and combination editor splicers for motion-picture films	Customs ruling (rate increase).
17	Esters of monohydric alcohols	Clarify.
13	Fabrics, ornamented or with tucks	Correct potential avoidance (rate increase).
30	Files and rasps	Clarify (rate decrease).
64	Fireworks	Rate decrease.
6	Florist articles	Clarify.
67	Fly ribbons	New provision (rate decrease).
9	Gasketing materials of ground or pulverized cork	Do.
23	Glass, colored or special	Conforming (rate decrease).
5	Grape juice	Rate increase.
51	Halftone screens made photographically on plastics material	New provision (rate decrease).
73	Handbags and luggage, certain	Temporary retroactive rate decrease.
33	Handtool, parts of	Clarify.
45	Headwear of fur not on the skin	Do.
44	Headwear of pandan	New provision (rate decrease).
35	Horseshoes	New provision (rate increase).
72	Import restrictions (sec. 22, Agricultural Adjustment Act)	Eliminates administrative burden.
38	Jacquard cards; parts of taps, valves, etc	Clarify (rate increase).
59	Jewelry clasps	New provision (rate decrease).
56	Jewelry, costume	Rate increase.
21	Limestone spalls, etc	Rate decrease to free.
15	Labels of manmade fibers	Court decision (rate decrease).
16	Lactic acid	Re-averaging of rates (increase).
53	Magnetic tape, recordings on, etc	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
12	Manmade fabrics, certain	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
74	Mass spectrometer for certain universities	Rate decrease to free.
36	Metal products, enameled, miscellaneous	Clarify.
54	Musical instruments, electronic	New provision (rate increase).
52	Papers, heat-sensitive	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
31	Pencil sharpeners and lead and crayon pointers	Clarify.
29	Picks and mattocks	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
24	Platinum, certain semimanufactured	Rate decrease to free.
55	Playing cards	Rate decrease.
70	Polyethylene imine	Rate decrease to free.
65	Rubber and plastic film, strips, sheets, and plates	Redefinition of sizes (increase and decrease).
10	Shoeboard	Rate increase.
60	Slide-fastener parts	Clarify (rate decrease).
46	Stethoscopes	Court ruling (rate decrease).
22	Subporcelain refractory articles	Clarify (rate increase).
47	Surveying compasses	Rate increase.
39	Synchronous motors	Rate decrease.
19	Synthetic resins and plastic materials	Clarify (rate decrease).
14	Swiss-type curtains and drapes	Do.
26	Tableware and household utensils	Court ruling (rate increase or decrease).
11	Textile fabrics, coated, filled, or laminated with rubber or plastics; articles made from such fabrics	Clarify (rate decrease).
41	Television picture tubes	New provision (rate increase).
62	Toothbrushes, electric	Rate increase.
49	Watch or clock movements, combination articles containing	Correct potential avoidance (rate increase).
27	Wire fencing, certain galvanized	Court ruling (rate decrease).
12	Wool fabrics, certain	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
61	Wreaths, etc., dried	Rate decrease.
12	Yarns, measure of certain	Clerical.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for purposes of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we had better have the RECORD show what the amendments are.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have done so already. All I am asking is that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for purposes of amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follow:

On page 2, line 12, after "(a)", to strike out "The" and insert "Except as provided in sections 21(c), 63(b), and 70(b), the"; in line 25, after the word "amendments", to insert "(other than the amendments made by sections 21(a) and 70(a))"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "69" and insert "72"; on page 6, after the chart following line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 10. WOOD PARTICLE BOARD.

"Item 245.50 (p. 98) is amended by striking out '12% ad val,' and inserting in lieu thereof '20% ad val.'."

At the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "13" to "12"; in the heading at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "Fibers" and insert "Fibers or Wool"; on page 10, in the heading in line 4, after the word "Made", to strike out "Fibers" and insert "Fibers or Wool"; after line 6, to strike out:

335.60	Over 50 percent by weight of yarns which yarns are composed of fibers not exceeding 5 inches in length and contain not less than 50 percent by weight of manmade fibers	25¢ per lb. + 22.5% ad val.	45¢ per lb. + 70% ad val.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

335.55	Containing over 17 percent of wool by weight	30¢ per lb. +45% ad val.	40¢ per lb. +55% ad val.
335.60	Fabrics, other than the foregoing, containing over 50 percent by weight of yarns which yarns are composed wholly of fibers not exceeding 5 inches in length and contain not less than 50 percent by weight of manmade fibers	25¢ per lb. +22.5% ad val.	45¢ per lb. +70% ad val.

At the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "14" to "13"; on page 11, after line 11, to strike out:

"SEC. 15 BELTING AND BELTS FOR MACHINERY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Items 358.05 and 358.10 (p. 147) and the article descriptions preceding such items are repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Belting and belts, for machinery, of textile fibers or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
358.02	V-belts	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other:		
	Of vegetable fibers, or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
358.05	Not in part of rubber or plastics	12% ad val.	30% ad val.
358.06	In part of rubber or plastics	16% ad val.	30% ad val.
	Of wool:		
358.08	Woven	37.5¢ per lb. + 15% ad val.	50¢ per lb. + 60% ad val.
358.09	Other	32% ad val.	50% ad val.
358.11	Of silk	27.5% ad val.	65% ad val.
358.14	Of man-made fibers	25¢ per lb. + 30% ad val.	45¢ per lb. + 65% ad val.
358.16	Other	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

"(b) MACHINERY BELTS NOT CONTAINING TEXTILE FIBERS.—Item 773.35 (p. 395) is amended by striking out 'vegetable fibers' and inserting in lieu thereof 'textile fibers'."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "16" to "14"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "17" to "15"; at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "18" to "16"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "19" to "17"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "20" to "18"; on page 14, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "21" to "19"; at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "22" to "20"; at the top of page 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 21. LIMESTONE CHIPS AND SPALLS, ETC.

"(a) FREE ENTRY.—Item 513.34 (p. 226) and item 514.11 (p. 227) are each amended—

"(1) by striking out '20¢ per short ton' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Free', and

"(2) by striking out '$1 per short ton' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Free'.

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Item 480.05 (p. 215) is repealed.

"(2) Schedule 5, part 1, subpart C, headnote 1 (p. 226) is amended by striking out subparagraph (i), and by redesignating subparagraphs (ii) through (vi) as subparagraphs (i) through (v), respectively.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act."

At the beginning of line 18, to change the section number from "23" to "22"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "24" to "23"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "25" to "24"; after line 10, to strike out:

"SEC. 26. ROUND WIRE.

"Schedule 6, part 2 is amended by striking out items 609.40 and 609.42 and the article descriptions preceding item 609.40 (p. 271) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Round wire:		
	Other than alloy iron or steel:		
609.40	Under 0.060 inch in diameter	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
	0.060 inch or more in diameter:		
609.41	Containing not over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	0.3¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
609.43	Containing over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 25. UNWROUGHT ALUMINUM.

"Schedule 6, part 2 is amended by striking out item 618.01 and the article description preceding such item, item 618.02 and the article description preceding such item, item 618.04 and the article description preceding such item, and item 618.06 (p. 279) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Unwrought aluminum:		
618.03	Aluminum silicon	2.125¢ per lb.	5¢ per lb.
618.05	Other: Products of uniform cross-section throughout their length (except any such product the least cross-sectional dimension of which is not greater than 0.375 inch, in coils) imported to be melted, rolled, forged, drawn, or extruded; and products other than those of uniform cross-section throughout their length	1.25¢ per lb.	4¢ per lb.
618.07	Other	2.5¢ per lb.	7¢ per lb.

On page 17, at the beginning of line 1, where it appears the second time, to change the section number from "27" to "26"; on page 18, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "28" to "27"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "29" to "28"; on page 19, after the table following line 5, to strike out:

"(e) BALL BEARINGS WITH INTEGRAL SHAFTS.—Item 680.35 (p. 319) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Ball or roller bearings, including such bearings with integral shafts, and parts thereof:		
680.34	Ball bearings with integral shafts	12% ad val.	35% ad val.
680.35	Other	3.4¢ per lb. +15% ad val.	10¢ per lb. +45% ad val.

At the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; on page 20, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)"; at the

beginning of line 15, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)"; on page 21, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)"; on page 22, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)"; at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "30" to "29"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "31" to "30"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "32" to "31"; on page 23, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "33" to "32"; on page 24, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "34" to "33"; at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "35" to "34"; at the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "36" to "35"; on page 25, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "37" to "36"; after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 37. AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL MACHINERY AND IMPLEMENTS, AND PARTS THEREOF.

"The article description for item 666.00 (p. 313) is amended by inserting after 'farm wagons and carts,' the following: 'milking machines, on-farm equipment for the handling or drying of agricultural or horticultural products,'."

On page 26, to strike out the table after line 8, as follows:

"682.52	Commutators	12.5% ad val.	35% ad val. '

And insert in lieu thereof:

"682.52	Commutators: With diameter of brush surface not over 1½ inches	8½% ad val.	35% ad val.
682.53	With diameter of brush surface over 1½ inches	12½% ad val.	35% ad val. "

After the amendment just above stated, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 40. DICTATION RECORDING AND TRANSCRIBING MACHINES.

"Schedule 6, part 5, is amended by striking out items 685.40 and 685.42 and the article description preceding item 685.40 (p. 323) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"' 685.40	Tape recorders and dictation recording and transcribing machines, and parts thereof	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val. ' "

At the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "40" to "41"; on page 27, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "41" to "42"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "42" to "43"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "43" to "44"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "44" to "45"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "45" to "46"; on page 28, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "46" to "47"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "47" to "48"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "48" to "49"; on page 29, at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "49" to "50"; on page 30, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "50" to "51"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "51" to "52"; at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "51" to "52"; at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "52" to "53"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "53" to "54"; on page 31, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "54" to "55"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "55" to "56"; after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 57. BUTTON BLANKS.

"The article description for item 745.40 (p. 380) is amended by striking out 'Button blanks and molds,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Button molds,'."

At the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "56" to "58"; on page 32, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "57" to "59"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "58" to "60"; in line 8, after the word "lengths", to strike out "but not including tapes wholly of textile fibers"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "59" to "61"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "60" to "62"; on page 33, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 63. BROOMS MADE OF BROOM CORN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 (p. 383) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
750.28	Valued not over 32¢ each	8¢ each	8¢ each
750.29	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
750.30	Valued not over 96¢ each	24¢ each	24¢ each
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	20% ad val.(s)	'

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

At the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "61" to "64"; on page 34, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "62" to "65"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "63" to "66"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "64" to "67"; after the table following line 15, to strike out:

"SEC. 65. SAUSAGE CASINGS.

"Item 790.45 (p. 397) is amended by striking out '16% ad val.' and inserting in lieu thereof '12.5% ad val.'."

At the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "66" to "68"; on page 35, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "67" to "69"; after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 70. POLYETHYLENE IMINE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 1, subpart B of the appendix is amended by inserting immediately below item 907.30 (p. 432) the following new item:

" '	907.40	Polyethylene imine (provided for in item 445.50, item 493.50, or item 425.52)	Free	Free	On or before 6/30/67 '

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act."

On page 36, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "68" to "71"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "68" to "72"; after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 73. CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND HANDBAGS.

"In the case of an article (other than flat goods) provided for in item 706.24 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, if—

"(1) the textile materials of chief value in such article are fabrics coated or filled, or laminated, with rubber or plastics,

"(2) such article was imported before September 1, 1964, and

"(3) such article was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after August 30, 1963, and before December 31, 1964,

such article shall be treated as if it were provided for in item 706.60 of such schedules. This section shall apply in the case of any such article entered or withdrawn before the date of the enactment of this Act only upon request filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of enactment of this Act, and upon such request the entry or withdrawal of such article shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of this section."

And, on page 37, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 74. MASS SPECTROMETERS IMPORTED FOR USE OF CERTAIN COLLEGES.

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College, Claremont, California.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of New Hampshire.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to the articles described therein whether such articles were entered before the date of the enactment of this Act or are entered on or after such date. If any such article was entered before such date, the entry involved shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of this section."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, which would make two clerical changes in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the proposed changes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are clerical changes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that is all the amendment embraces, but my attention was distracted for a moment.

All I wish to know is—and I am sure that my able friend will confirm that that is the situation—that any of us who desire to direct ourselves by way of an amendment to any provision of the bill as it has come from the committee will have the right to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 37, line 7, after "and" insert "on or".

On page 37, line 14, after "date of" insert "the".

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield first to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with respect to section 25 of the bill, which deals with aluminum, I have received a number of telegrams from people who are in the business of making window sills and using molding aluminum. That industry provides many jobs for many people in my State and elsewhere throughout the United States. It is their contention that the particular section to which I have referred, which the Senate Finance Committee adopted, as I understand, would raise the tariff considerably on imported aluminum, the basic quality of aluminum which those people use, and the increase would be very detrimental to their particular business. I did not hear the Senator's full remarks, but I did hear him make some reference to aluminum. I wonder if he has any view on this particular section.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What we have in the bill involves a problem that arises from changing over from a "product" concept to a "process" concept of classification, and that is a subject with which we shall have to deal in conference. It will be in conference between the Senate and the House. The domestic aluminum industry feels that it has been victimized by the practice that is being used, which I discussed in my speech, of bringing in large amounts of aluminum which should be taxed at the higher rate and instead is taxed at the lower rate. If the Senator would care to have me do so, I should be happy to repeat that portion of my speech.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if I may first make a brief statement and then have the Senator's comment on it, because he may be able to answer the question.

As I understand, section 25 should be deleted because, first, it proposes to increase the duty on continuous cast aluminum, which proposal was fully reviewed and rejected by the Tariff Commission and by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Second, a Bureau of Customs ruling of September 28, 1962, relating to continuous cast aluminum does not reflect any existing or past customs practice, and was reviewed and found by the Tariff Commission to provide no basis for modifying its findings.

I am informed that actual importations of continuous cast aluminum have for many years been uniformly assessed for duty as crude, that is, unwrought aluminum.

I am further informed that continuous cast aluminum is not commercially interchangeable in use with "comparable" shapes that are "wrought".

I am further informed that the proposed "use" tests would double the existing duty on some crude products and create difficult administrative problems and long delays in final settlement of the duty liability.

Finally, I am informed that existing tariff schedules are clear and provide adequate tests for classification of aluminum.

Therefore, if this amendment which was added in the Finance Committee should now be dropped——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason why the Ways and Means Committee did nothing about this was that its members studied the problem and did not have time to find an answer to it. What we are recommending is not what the domestic industry really wanted. What we are recommending is a solution which represents what the Finance Committee felt was what the appropriate answer should be.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is my understanding that the Tariff Commission rejected the proposal to increase the duty on continuous cast aluminum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Commission did not reject what is in the bill. This provision is in the bill with the technical advice of the Tariff Commission staff. What the industry was asking for, and what was declined in the House, was far more favorable to the domestic industry than what we are proposing. As I understand, this amendment is necessary in order to clarify the law. Its necessity arises because we are changing from one method of classification to another. It used to be classified on a product basis. Now we are to classify it on a process basis, depending on the particular use of the imported aluminum.

As I understand, the reason for the amendment and the reason why it is necessary is that continuous cast aluminum is not distinguishable from rolled aluminum, and rolled aluminum is clearly dutiable at the higher rate. Since the two are not distinguishable the rate of duty on them should be the same and that is what the committee amendment proposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Many businesses have as their basic product continuous cast aluminum. If they have to pay an 8.5 percent duty on this aluminum, which they now import, and which goes into all kinds of kitchen utensils, windows, louvers, and products of that kind, they will be forced out of business. When this problem was brought up with the Tariff Commission, the Tariff Commission rejected the recommendation for a higher tariff on continuous cast aluminum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The problem is that if companies are using the product as a raw material, they pay the raw material rate, which is the lower rate. If they are using it as a manufactured or semimanufactured product, they will have to pay the rate that is applicable to a manufactured or semimanufactured product. That is what they should pay. The Tariff Commission declined to do what the domestic industry was asking for initially. It still does. That is the kind of proposal that was declined by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The Ways and Means Committee did not have the advice possessed by the Senate Finance Committee. We had an opportunity to study the problem. A former majority leader used to say to me, "Don't bring me any more problems. Bring me the answers; I have all the problems I want now." We have the problem. This is the solution we offer.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator when he says, "Do not bring me any more problems." The reason I am bringing him this problem is that the problem was brought to me by small manufacturers of windows, louvers, and products of that character, not only in my State but in other States. The difficulty is in distinguishing between continuous cast aluminum and rolled aluminum. Therefore the Finance Committee has decided against the little businessman, it seems to me, and decided in favor of the big corporations—unintentionally, I believe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The manufacturers of whom the Senator from Florida is speaking should be protected. The Senator is going to be a conferee, if the bill ever goes to conference, and he will be in a position to look after their interests. The little manufacturer should be able to get the raw material at the raw material rate, if he wants to get it to manufacture into a finished product. If what the manufacturer is getting is in effect the manufactured or semimanufactured product rather than the raw material, he should pay on the manufactured product basis.

The Senator will be one of the conferees. He will be able to devise some protection for those who are affected and who should not be adversely affected by the provision. But if the manufacturers who use the material are obtaining that material as a manufactured or semimanufactured product, they should pay the rate in effect for manufactured or semimanufactured products. The existing problem arises because of the change made from a product basis to a process basis.

That change advantages our Canadian friends to the detriment of American producers. We want to clarify the law to the extent that those entitled to the

lower rate will get it, and those who should be paying the rate for a finished commodity will pay that rate for it.

This question will be in conference. The House considered a similar problem. It did not have the answer. The House may reject this amendment, but the Senator will be able to try to help adjust the matter. We do not want to hurt anyone who has a proper, reasonable basis to be given favorable consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I know from his past record that he is always endeavoring to help the small manufacturer and the small businessman. If we can obtain a clarification in the interest of the small manufacturer—and, therefore, the employees of that manufacturer will likewise be served—we shall be performing the task which we are trying to do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is my honor to occupy a seat beside the Senator on the Small Business Committee. The Senator from Florida is sitting next to the chairman of that committee, who has been on that committee since its institution. I have been on the committee since that time. I am interested in seeing that small business is not in any way injured, and in giving it the consideration to which it is entitled.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the committee for putting in the bill section 21, which relates to limestone. I hope it will be sustained in conference. Once before, near the end of a session, we lost it in conference. I hope this section will be sustained in conference. I do not want the provision to be lost, because it involves a peculiar problem in my State, where the crude stone is alongside the border and the plant is on the other side of the border. A negligible amount moves, but the difference of 20 cents a short ton means the difference between whether or not two or three companies on the border can remain in business.

I thank the Senator for including this provision. I hope the conference will sustain it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. This provision was agreed to by the Senate 2 years ago. Unfortunately the House adjourned before we could obtain action on it. I hope that does not happen again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope not.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to return to the discussion of aluminum which was carried on by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida.

Some concern has been expressed to me about this section of the bill. The Senator from Louisiana has expressed the thought very well, indeed. The subject will be in conference. As a matter of usual procedure I shall probably be a conferee. I shall try to be helpful in meeting this problem if some changes must be made. There are some who are concerned about the situation which might develop.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I note the presence in the Chamber of a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who is observing the proceedings. In view of the fact that the House has declined to do anything on this subject, we can be pretty sure that no violence will be done, because the House is not easy to persuade on some matters.

Mr. CARLSON. Having served as a conferee on matters in conference with the House I can readily appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, my able friend from Louisiana, that there are in the bill some items which are not noncontroversial, but concerning which there is vigorous dispute as to whether they should be included in the bill.

In a moment I shall call up an amendment, on behalf of my able friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, to strike from the bill certain language on page 33 of the bill, dealing with brooms.

I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33 it is proposed to strike out lines 4 through 11—section 63—of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 63. BROOMS MADE OF BROOM CORN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 (p. 383) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"

	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
750.28	Valued not over 32¢ each	8¢ each	8¢ each
750.29	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
750.30	Valued not over 96¢ each	24¢ each	24¢ each
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	25% ad val.(s)	

"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

And to renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is my understanding that this language, which the Senator from New York and I seek to have stricken from the bill, was not the subject of any testimony in either the House committee or in the Senate committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A discussion was held in executive session in the Ways and Means Committee, at which representatives of the executive branch of the Government appeared and explained the views of the executive branch with regard to this problem. No public hearing was held, however.

Mr. KUCHEL. No testimony was taken and printed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe any public testimony was taken.

Mr. KUCHEL. Neither was any testimony taken in the Senate Finance Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not in the Finance Committee; no.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is most regrettable that a problem that is controversial does not come to the Senate in a form in which Members of the Senate have an opportunity to read for themselves the testimony, pro and con, on that subject.

What we talk about in this part of the bill is a situation that deals with the importation into the American economy of brooms. The American market today is controlled by the American producers of brooms to the extent of 98 percent of the market. About 2 percent of the market is occupied by foreign importation of brooms.

Our neighbor to the south of us, Mexico, is responsible for about half of the amount of the importation.

With respect to what is sought to be done in the bill, a few years ago the Tariff Commission held a hearing. It did not find that the American producer of brooms was damaged. It did say that, with respect to the problem of equalizing the costs, the tariff on brooms ought to be increased if we measure the difference in terms of the American selling price.

The late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, overruled the determination of the Tariff Commission.

This year, the Senate has received from the House of Representatives a bill to do that which was overruled by the late President, and it is sought to be done without benefit of any testimony pro or con.

Statements were filed with the Committee on Finance by the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of State. All of them objected to the enactment of the bill.

Representatives of the State Department asked for an opportunity to testify, but were not called. American producers occupy 98 percent of the American market. Some are located in the State which I represent. Some of them have asked me to oppose the proposal which would increase the duty on the importation of 2 percent of the brooms sold in this country on a sliding scale basis, which would vary from 120 to 125 percent.

With respect to the pending amendment, the Senate should strike from the provisions of this "noncontroversial and technical bill" provisions which are neither noncontroversial nor technical, and give an opportunity to the people who are interested to come forward and testify before the Senate and Congress makes its decision up or down on a controversial issue.

In all that I have said I have made no statement with respect to our neighbor. I devotedly believe in strengthening the

ties which exist between the Government and the people of the United States and the Government and people of Mexico and Canada. I believe in hemispheric solidarity. I wish to see the Alliance for Progress work. I voted for the Trade Expansion Act, which is now the law of the land. I did so having clearly in mind the policy set forth in the legislation, to expand trade.

With respect to trade between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, the United States, in 1963, the last year for which figures are available, sold to Mexico $830 million worth of U.S. goods, and Mexico sold to the United States $595 million worth of goods. The favorable balance on our side is almost a quarter of a billion dollars; $235 million, to be precise.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which are the nations that are mainly interested in selling brooms to our country?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mexico occupies about one-half of the 2-percent market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What other countries?

Mr. KUCHEL. Italy is one of them. There are a number of others which occupy the 2-percent market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is proposed to increase the tariff on this 2 percent of broom imports, and this is objected to by our broom manufacturers?

Mr. KUCHEL. By some of our broom manufacturers; but, for the purpose of the record, by the Senator from California. Also, it was objected to by the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and is now objected to by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, and the State Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from California that the increase on this 2 percent of imports ought not to stand in the way of maintaining our good relations around the world?

Mr. KUCHEL. The position of the Senator from California is that if Congress deals with tariff schedules, there ought to be a public hearing at which the pros and cons can be heard, and the committee—the Senator from Ohio and I not being members of the Committee on Finance—can determine whether they believe a case has been made for a change in the schedule.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from California for or against the change?

Mr. KUCHEL. I favor taking this controversial item out of this generally noncontroversial bill, so that a hearing might be held and witnesses may come forward to testify.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we settle the broom question and settle the button question, will that button up the tariff argument?

Mr. KUCHEL. Only God knows; I do not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can I feel that this bill will be buttoned up if we settle the button question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I cannot answer the question: I do not know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the Senator have any belief that further complications might be involved in the consideration of the bill? Is there any talk about throwing the medicare bill into the tariff bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Into this bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I had never heard of that until the Senator asked me the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we button up the button aspect of the bill, will that mean that the tariff bill has been buttoned up? That is a peculiar question, but it sounds all right to me.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may reply?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from California has the floor; I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to inform my friend from Ohio that I have an amendment to try to solve the sugar problem, and I shall offer it to this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The solution of the button controversy will not button up the tariff bill. How long will we stay here with these various problems, trying to get them through the Senate, not letting Senators return home to duly and fully consider issues, without pressure of time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until Christmas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator prefer that I button up my mouth and not raise in the Senate what I believe to be an issue that the Senate ought to pass on?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been intrigued by the button and broom aspects of the bill. Are we going to use the broom to sweep everything into the bill, and the button to button everything up?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend for his contribution.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann, an able career officer in the Foreign Service of the country. He formerly was U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. I have high respect for him. I shall read what he has written to me; then I shall conclude:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: May I call your attention to the facts surrounding H.R. 5986, a bill to increase by 500 percent the duty applying to import of brooms made of broomcorn which has now been added to the provisions of H.R. 12253.

As you know, the Department has opposed the increased tariff on brooms since it would adversely affect U.S. efforts to maintain and enlarge foreign markets for U.S. products under the Trade Expansion Act and would have particularly adverse effects on our neighbor, Mexico. Almost all the brooms which Mexico (the principal supplying country) ships to us are made in Cadereyta, a small town of 10,000 people in northeastern Mexico. Since the majority of the population of Cadereyta is employed either in growing broomcorn or in making brooms, the passage of the broom tariff would therefore have a serious effect on this small community. I should also like to point out that the value of broom imports from Mexico is negligible, equivalent to only 1 percent of U.S. broom production.

On the other hand, trade is vital to the success of the Alliance for Progress. I therefore do not believe the passage of this tariff on brooms to be in our own national interest.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. MANN.

Mr. President, I can only add that the importation from Mexico amounts to less than half a million dollars a year. The American production of brooms has increased each year to the point where it occupies 98 percent of the American market, running now into some $33 million or more.

If the bill were passed as it is before us, it would destroy a community in Mexico. It would not destroy the Mexican economy; that is true. Nevertheless, it would smack the good-neighbor policy in the face. I do not believe we ought to do that kind of legislating in the U.S. Senate.

Therefore, I hope that the amendment that the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have offered together may be approved by the Senate, so that this controversy can be scrutinized and a decision made as the result of a complete hearing, when the pros and the cons may come forward, through representatives, and there will be a confrontation with cross-examination. Then let Congress work its will, rather than in this fashion summarily overruling the executive branch and many other people in this country, and register an affront to a good neighbor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. The amendment does not involve a large sum of money. It does not involve a monumental product. However, the Senate Finance Committee's action on brooms seems to typify within itself everything that is happening to erode the foreign policy of the United States and to destroy the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. That act, which was considered a landmark of heroic action by Congress in the national interest, apparently is an illustration of our thinking upon the great foreign policy problem of trade. We seem to be well able to take some great initiative across the board by enacting an extensive law to rationalize the trade relationships of the United States with the whole world in order to expand trade, which is absolutely indispensable to America's strength in the world, as I shall illustrate in a moment.

Having done that, having taken that broad point of view illustrating the majesty and power of our country, we promptly proceed to nibble away at it, to backtrack, to get down to cases, and destroy it.

We are well in the process of doing that now. All of a sudden, the Kennedy round will fail, our trade policy will blow up in our faces, the European Common Market will go protectionist, and we shall have great difficulty in Latin America of a kind we have not yet experienced—notwithstanding that we have had some trouble there already. Then we shall say to ourselves, "Why did not someone tell us that all these little acts would cause all this trouble?"

We are telling ourselves now, so that there can be no mistake about it. The cumulative effects of the restriction

on beef imports, notwithstanding they are standbys, or the buy American amendment to the mass transit bill, or a nettling little thing like the tariff increase on brooms and other matters of the same general character, will torpedo American foreign policy unless we put a stop to it.

The Senator from California is rendering a signal service in giving us an opportunity to put a stop to the Finance Committee's broom amendment on a basis which is certainly not harmful, in terms of money and quantity, and in terms of its effects on our own interests.

There is always someone—including me—or there is always some State which is adversely affected by a protective device of this character, or by the denial of it. We cannot depend upon the vote of a Senator from that State because of what needs to be done. The way the Senate is organized, we cannot expect him to do anything but try to protect the interests of his State. We have to depend upon the good sense of the rest of the Senators who kindly, graciously, understandingly, but nonetheless firmly, will do what must be done in the national interest. If the rest of us abdicate our duty, the country is in great trouble. That is exactly what is happening in the minor amendments, such as those we are discussing at the present moment. They are meaningful to the policy of our Nation. Let me point out why.

A new President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, will be sworn in as President on December 1. He ran on a platform of great friendship for the United States.

The present President of Mexico, Lopez Mateos, is a great friend of the United States. Diaz Ordaz is supposed to be an even greater friend of the United States.

Mr. President, what are we going to greet him with when he comes into office? Are we going to greet him with an act against which he must—because he is a politician, too—retaliate? Retaliation can be expensive in matters of this kind. It will be far more expensive to us than to Mexico, because the whole foreign policy of this Nation is pinioned upon the fact that it has an export surplus—approximately $6.5 billion a year, notwithstanding our difficulties in the international balance of payments, which at maximum runs to an adverse balance of $3 billion a year.

If we did not have this big export surplus, we would be literally unable to maintain our Armed Forces, the diplomatic establishments, the aid programs, and the exchange programs which represent the essence of American foreign policy. This policy is built upon a practical and realistic base. That base is a $6.5 billion minimum trade surplus. It should be $9 billion in terms of the viability of the American financial system and American standing in the world. These little mouthfuls, this chipping away, will destroy that system and our standing, and will destroy the whole economic base upon which our country stands.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to reinforce the arguments of the Senator from New York by reading a letter which I have received from the vice president of New York Merchandise Co., Inc. Let me inquire of the Chair whether the Senate is under any time limitation. It will take me only a minute to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limitation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. J. M. Constantine, of the New York Merchandise Co., Inc., of Portland, Oreg., expressed his concern over the amendment relative to the rate of duty applicable to imports of certain brooms made of broom corn. Mr. Constantine's wire of the 24th reads as follows:

Urgently request your assistance in eliminating corn broom amendment from Tariff classification bill, H.R. 12253. Bill itself is desirable, as essential and noncontroversial corrective measure, but corn broom rider which triples existing duties and will force stopping importations of corn brooms is highly controversial and does not pertain to the classification bill. Corn broom rider was originally a separate bill and was attached to the classification bill as a rider without hearings of importers. It would hurt the essential U.S. trade goals and since no urgency exists, it should be considered in public hearings next session. Respectfully yours.

Mr. Constantine's wire was supplemented by a letter dated September 25, addressed to me by Mr. Posner, vice president of New York Merchandise Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Posner's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW YORK MERCHANDISE CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our branch office in Portland, Oreg., 1900 NW 22d Avenue, has taken the liberty of sending you a wire, addressed to your Washington office regarding H.R. 12253, and in particular, regarding the attached rider, H.R. 5986, concerning duties on corn house brooms and corn whiskbrooms.

We are importers, with our head office in New York City, and branch offices also in Los Angeles, Calif., and Dallas, Tex. Among the important commodities which we handle are corn brooms and whiskbrooms made of corn, from Poland, Mexico, and Hungary.

We are concerned about the H.R. 5986, which increases duties on our type of brooms and whiskbrooms by three times or more. For all practical purposes, such duty increase will result in discontinuing importations of our type of brooms.

Technically, my greatest worry is that this particular H.R. 5986 has now been attached as a rider to the very desirable, corrective H.R. 12253.

It is our feeling, and the feeling of all importers of this commodity, that H.R. 5986, increasing the duty on brooms has been passed by the House, and approved by the Committee on Finance, in the Senate, without giving a hearing to the importers. We believe that if we receive such a hearing we will be able to convince the Senate that the suggested duty increase should not be passed, for various reasons. For example; we believe that we can prove that the import of this type of price range of broom actually did not injure the domestic industry.

Also, we believe that statements made by the domestic manufacturers regarding the comparable cost of production are not in accordance with the facts. For example; the domestic producers have stated that the cost of production of a corn broom in the United States is somewhere around an average of $11. This statement was made without comparing this particular domestic corn broom with the imported broom. At the same time, they stated that the cost of the production of the imported broom is somewhere between $5 and $6.

We claim that different types of brooms have been compared. Furthermore, we will prove that the domestic brooms are being sold to U.S. retailers at a price of $7.20 per dozen, which is far below the stated cost of production.

We also would like to have the opportunity to state our opinion that such an increase of duties, resulting in the stopping of importation, is contrary to the goal of our foreign trade policy, and also contrary to the principles of Alliance for Progress.

Since H.R. 5986 most certainly does not represent an urgent measure, we think that importers should be given a proper committee hearing.

Your kind assistance in this matter will be immensely appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE POSNER,
Vice President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York whether he is planning to seek to remove the corn broom provision from the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. The pending amendment is one proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and me.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join in that amendment, if I may.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. The argument which my constituent makes is in support of the position of the Senator from California and the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his comments.

Mr. President, the present situation is a classic illustration of almost every facet of this whole trap. These small but meaningful moves toward protectionism and away from international trade are of the greatest importance to us. The U.S. export surplus indicated for the first several months of 1964 is $6 billion—$24 billion in exports and over $18 billion in imports.

If we wish to sell, we must buy. If we buy from abroad and thereby create competition for domestic industry—which is of critical importance, incidentally, to the consumer who should have that, too, in terms of a better price and quality—someone, somewhere, somehow, will be hurt.

Although it has been stated time and time again, it is still a fact that the automobile forced those manufacturers of horse carriages out of business who were not smart enough to turn to manufacturing automobile bodies.

It is also a fact that the advent of radio had an effect upon the phonograph industry. I remember, when I was a boy, that the long-horned phonograph was

a big seller. Yet there were many manufacturers of long-horns for phonographs who went broke, because they did not realize what was happening to their business, so that they could then turn to the manufacture of radio loudspeakers, or go into some other line of business.

If the United States is in fact a private enterprise society, should it give a guarantee to everyone in business in this country, regardless of the effects of competition, that it will keep him in business and protect him against foreign competition?

The committee's amendment illustrates a classic defect in policy. The amendment will not work because, as the Senator from California has pointed out, imports of the commodity in question—brooms of broom corn—are—let us say, 3 percent—of domestic production. If, in fact, our broom manufacturers are being hurt, they are not hurt by imports. What is hurting them perhaps is synthetic brooms.

There is also the compassionate element to consider. I do not know whether it has been mentioned as yet in debate, because I was not in the Chamber to listen to all of the speech by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. However, there are workshops for the blind in this country where brooms are made, with approximately 1,000 persons engaged in that activity.

Certainly, it is extremely vital and important in terms of our hearts and our spirits that these people should be encouraged to put their hands to some use. A heavy proportion of their output is sold to institutions, housewives, to State and Federal agencies and are protected by various preferences in respect to such sales. It is doubtful that imports play an important part in the level of their sales.

We shall hear those arguments, nevertheless without any question. It illustrates the classic technique in respect to protectionism: "Because it is a special circumstance and affects people to whom our hearts go out, let us not be cruel Senators. Let us let this one ride."

We are missing completely that what is at stake is the interest of the country, without which nothing in the Nation can stand up—workshops for the blind, or anything else.

In every case involved in this protectionist problem, we can muster evidence of this character. If that is going to be the determination we sweep the whole reciprocal trade problem out of the window.

What about the workers in the export industry? What about the millions of workers who create the $24 billion in exports that the United States has? Are they to be discriminated against? Are we to forget about those workers in our concern for the infinitely smaller number?

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the point that the Senator from New York has just made is very telling. I do not know what the figures are specifically. But, I believe we ought to know more than we do about the number of American workers who are working in industries which are dependent upon exports. And with the balance in trade in our favor, I believe it would be interesting to have a counting of noses to see whether those who sometimes seem to talk about going back to Smoot Hawley are really advocating something that is to the long-time best interest of the wage workers of this country. I believe that the point that the Senator from New York has made is very powerful.

Mr. JAVITS. There was a general debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Contrary to the ideas of so many, it was overwhelmingly approved in the House and Senate. The facts of economic life impress themselves upon us in terms of the basic products involved. There is grave danger that the policies which would best serve our national interest will be laid aside. When we make such exceptions, as we have begun to make them in Congress since the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was enacted, we run into the grave danger of experiencing serious trouble.

Mr. President, I conclude upon this note. Lest we think that we can hide our heads in the sand and that no one will pay any real attention to what we do about these matters, let me point out our experience with respect to raising the tariffs on velour carpets and rolled glass in June 1962, as they affected the major exporters to us of those commodities—notably Belgium. What happened is that they immediately retaliated. Indeed, they retaliated in an amount that was about equal the amount of the imports that we inhibited by our increase in tariff, except that they retaliated in another area. They retaliated in the chemical field.

As I pointed out, we do not save domestic producers by these measures. But whatever we may have gained for the workers in the velour carpet and the glass industry—and it is highly dubious as to whether we gained anything—we know that we lost work for the workers in the chemical business. In that industry, they were disadvantaged. I think the relative figure was $55 million which we inhibited or curtailed in imports, as compared with the $44 million in U.S. exports in the chemical field which they promptly retaliated against us for.

If the relations between us and the Mexicans are materially disturbed by a thing like this, we would regret the day that we ever thought of it.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Can the Senator indicate how many brooms are manufactured from broom corn and what section of the country or what States are affected? From what source does the amendment come?

Years ago, as people know who live in the rural areas, every farmer raised a little broom corn to make brooms for his own use. There was broom corn production for the manufacture of brooms. I did not realize that it was so important now.

Mr. JAVITS. I call attention to the U.S. Tariff Commission's 1962 report on broom corn, which indicates a production in this country of approximately 2.5 million dozens in 1960, valued at $26¼ million. The greatest concentration of broom factories, according to the Tariff Commission, is in Illinois, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, California, and Texas.

These are, generally speaking, the orders of magnitude which are involved. That is about the ambit of the situation. It is the basis for the figure of around 2 to 3 percent in imports, which figure has been referred to by the Senator from California.

I deeply feel that we are now dealing with a process which has a serious effect on the economic policy of the United States. I appreciate the very heart appealing program of the workshops for the blind. I deeply feel that the same ingenuity and the same generosity—I myself, and many others are great supporters of these workshops—that have brought about the particular type of work for the workshops will see to it that the workshops continue their effectiveness in terms of work for the individuals concerned.

As I said before, a substantial proportion of broom making by the blind and those made by prisoners can in any case continue because it would involve State and Federal institution purchases. I make that statement again because I yield to no one in my deep-hearted concern for that particular situation. I feel that in our general appreciation of what is at stake, we must understand that the proposal is a step in a process, and we must not accept the argument that only a small sum of money is involved, a small order of magnitude, and one country, substantially, is involved, namely, Mexico; therefore, why cavil or argue; let it ride and go on to the next order of business.

I believe that the Senate ought to decide to let the question go to a considered hearing so at least we may have the benefit of all the aspects of the problem which can be presented in a hearing, including, incidentally, the problem of workshops for the blind. We should not proceed to erode away the trade expansion structure, which we erected with such painstaking care, by small but very meaningful exceptions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is one amendment that does not need any further study it is the amendment before the Senate. We can decide, if we wish to do so, to let the small businesses in America continue to manufacture brooms, or to run them out of business. If Senators wish to run them out of business, go ahead and accept the amendment. If Senators wish to permit 345 small businesses manufacturing brooms to remain in business, then vote against the proposal offered by the Senator from California to strike out the committee amendment.

The facts show that between 1953 and 1958 there were 450 broom manufacturers in America who went out of business because down in Mexico, and in other foreign countries, brooms can be

manufactured much cheaper than they can be manufactured in this country. Mexico can do so because of its low labor cost. We cannot compete with brooms manufactured in Mexico. We have remaining, 345 small businesses engaged in that production. What could those small businesses do?

They went to the Tariff Commission and asked for help. They explained their plight. The Tariff Commission recommended that we give them a tariff based upon the American selling price, which would have permitted them to continue in business.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall yield in a few moments. Other Senators have been discussing the subject for an hour or so, and I should like to say a few words at this time.

The Tariff Commission recommended that the domestic manufacturers obtain appropriate relief. Unfortunately, the State Department felt that the proposal might conflict with trade negotiations. What we have here would not in anywise conflict with GATT. The State Department has taken the Mexican side; the Tariff Commission has taken the side of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, we can leave the domestic industries in business or we can put them out of business. It is that simple.

These people are being run out in large numbers. A few are left. There are about 19 factories left in Illinois, which is so ably represented by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader. Sixteen broom factories are left in North Carolina; about 12 factories are left in Pennsylvania; California and Texas have about 9 factories each. So a few are left.

But the disparity is so great between the Mexican cost of manufacture and the American cost that the American producers cannot survive if we do not give them the proposed protection.

We have heard a great deal of crying on the floor of the Senate about how we must not discriminate against Mexico. We have heard that we must not raise the tariff against an industry in Mexico if Mexico wishes to ship us some commodity.

What has Mexico done to our broom manufacturers? Mexico has a tariff of $4.50 a dozen on brooms and her price is half of ours. What do we charge Mexico? $1.01 a dozen.

Mr. President, no country on earth, except ours, is ashamed to say, "We have a legitimate and respected industry which is being driven out by foreign competition and we have a duty to protect and look after our own. Charity begins at home."

How long did it take the Common Market in Europe to decide to do what it did to us in respect to chickens? They took the chicken market away from us, which was a direct violation of their pledged word given to our country.

The proposal would not be in violation of an agreement.

Mexico made an agreement with us in relation to oil on a most-favored-nation basis. She made a trade compact with us, and she agreed that she would live up to certain obligations in respect to oil. One of them was not to confiscate or to nationalize American investments down there. She proceeded to break her word with us and nationalized our investments and discriminated against our imports. Notwithstanding that action, we made a trade agreement with Venezuela to reduce the tariff on oil and gave Mexico the benefit of it, although Mexico is in violation of her pledged word in other respects on trade agreements.

What we have proposed is something which any other nation under the sun would do if it had a similar problem.

Representatives of the industry went to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission studied the problem and recommended relief. Two years ago we passed a bill which would have given the people in the industry the kind of relief that the Tariff Commission recommended, but it was in a form that was more objectionable to the State Department than the language we now propose, because then the action was based upon the American selling price.

The State Department very much objected to that. But when we impose a tariff of a specific amount on an item in order to more nearly equalize the costs of manufacturing brooms in the two countries than the present duty, we are told that it is wrong, even though it is not as much as we did 2 years ago.

More people are involved than the manufacturers of brooms. There are thousands of blind people in this country. One of the few things that blind people can do to make a few dollars is to make brooms. Blind people make brooms and make a few dollars out of the work. Do Senators wish to let them make a few dollars or do they wish to put those blind people out of business?

One of the few things that a prisoner can be taught to do so that he can learn an occupation and find work on the outside is to put brooms together, sitting in a prison cell. Here is a letter from a prisoner who desires parole. He must say that he can make a living, and he must demonstrate that he is not likely to return to theft or committing some kind of robbery in order to make a living when he gets out of the penitentiary. He is looking for an opportunity to make a few brooms. That is one skill that a person can learn while he is still a prisoner in a prison cell. He is urging us to let the broom industry stay in business because he had an opportunity to learn how to manufacture brooms in prison and wants to follow that work when he gets out.

We can put all those people out of business if we wish to do so. We can turn down our blind people. We can say that Mexico is more important, even though it has broken its word, and we can give it every advantage. We are afraid to give our people the same protection that Mexico gives hers. We can do that. We can turn our backs on the domestic industry. We can turn our backs on our blind people. We can turn our backs on the prisoners who are trying to rehabilitate themselves, and we can say, "Mexico must come first. It can do anything it wishes. It can break its word, but we would not think of breaking ours." If Senators wish to take that view, they are entitled to do so.

Furthermore, I point out that the Mexicans are not the only people in the broom business. Communist countries are in the business. Hungary is in the broom business; Poland is in the broom business. While we would be attempting to protect Mexico, we would be looking after those communistic countries. Why are Senators turning their backs on their own?

The amendment has been considered by the Senate previously. It has been agreed to by the Senate before. It has been recommended by the Tariff Commission. It is the kind of consideration that American people who elect us are entitled to receive. They are entitled to some kind of representation.

Mr. President, I could be a statesman on the question. So far as I know, every broom manufacturer in Louisiana has been driven out of business. I am speaking only about the other industries that might follow. We have a chart which indicates that there might be two left in Louisiana, but I do not think that there are any left, for I have not heard from any in my State. They have all been run out.

There are a few broom industries left in Illinois. The Senator from Illinois has a good case. The Tariff Commission has a good case. The Senate has a good case. I would say that if we cannot provide this little protection to 345 small businesses in America, if we cannot provide for this minimal amount of help, to give the people in that industry a tariff so as to more nearly equalize the cost between American-made and Mexican-made brooms—if we cannot give them that kind of protection when Mexico has had more than a $4 tariff on our brooms, and their cost is half of ours—why are we so ashamed to vote some kind of protection for our own industry?

We can go to conference, if this is voted, and see if the House will not agree, after the conferees consider it, to some reasonable sort of protection.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on one occasion or another I have bled as I have heard the great concepts of national interest expounded on this floor. It is always done so eloquently that I fairly weep and my heart murmurs in a deep concordance of sympathy. Then I see a little fellow in the water, and he is foundering. He is about to go down. He has been operating a little broom shop in a pineboard factory, and he shouts "Help!"

We are asked to stand there and say, "Save yourself. Think of the national interest. Think of all the great relationships we have across the world. Hold your peace. Do you not know that this is in the national interest? Do you not know that we are trying to do something for a town in Mexico? Do you not know that we are trying to do something for an importer in California? Yes, I know you have $50,000 in capital investment. You have 25 people employed in your plant. You are just reaching out

to touch bottom. You are afraid you are going to sink in a minute. But you ought to remember, as you go down for the third time, it is in the national interest."

Mr. President, do Senators think that is overdoing? Some 450 small broom plants have gone out of business since 1953.

Like my distinguished friend from Louisiana, I shall bleed for them a little, and I shall forget all the great, overriding concepts. There is a broom plant in Virginia, the State of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, where Seventh Day Adventist students manage to get enough together to go to school. There are 2,000 such students working in broom plants throughout the country. They make enough to get a college education.

My friend from Louisiana has pointed out the number of blind people who work in broom factories. That is one thing they can do. They can, by feel, run a stitching machine and form the brooms. Something was said about synthetic material. I point out that these brooms are all made from broom corn.

It is rather interesting that only a few days ago the Senate passed the Appalachia bill. One billion dollars was involved. I fairly fell to the floor of the Senate Chamber when I heard my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] round out that amount. I thought, "Is there that much money in the world?" There must be, because we are going to spend $850 million for highways in Appalachia and $150 million for sewage disposal plants, hospitals, schools, and nurseries. I wondered somewhat where we are going to find a market for the coal, for the durable jobs, after the highways are built. It is perfectly good to have a fine highway, so that a 10-ton truck can operate over it, but the question is, Is there a buyer for the coal?

I was about to say that there are 30 broom companies in Appalachia. That word has a wonderful sound. I suppose I shall be using it a good deal in many sections of the country. Perhaps I shall give it a "Latin twist" and say "Ahppalahchia."

Why did we pass the Appalachia bill? To make jobs, so it was said. This I have to see. But while we are making jobs with $1 billion for Appalachia, we may be putting 30 plants out of the broom business in Appalachia—and they will not like it.

I remember one time when I went to Wyoming to campaign against our old friend Joe O'Mahoney. When I got to the airport I called him up. I said, "Joe, I am in town." He said, "Yes, Everett. I read the papers. I knew you were coming." I said, "I am going to talk at the rodeo." He said, "I wish you well on any mission you have in life except the one that brings you here." I said, "Joe, you know I had an awful time finding a text for this speech, and it was not until I left Omaha that, with my disagreeably evil mind I suddenly remembered the first line of an article Senator O'Mahoney wrote for the Reader's Digest. That line was, 'They are remaking America, and you won't like it.' "

Perhaps it is all right, but I wonder if it is all right to find some jobs for carpet workers and let the broom workers go down the drain. There they are. I do not know how many have been put out of business, but they are told, "Hush your mouth. It is in the national interest. So go down for the third time. Let us have it over with. We cannot be concerned about you."

Mr. President, I am concerned about them. Congress has provided a small business investment organization through which small business loans can be obtained. We want to help small business enterprise. Then we come along and, by this strange device, undertake to put them out of business because they cannot make the grade.

Mr. President, I have been in several lines of business. It is not always the quantity that comes into this country that counts. There can be a small amount of merchandise from abroad, but if it is put in the finest department store window, with signs around it saying it is from Hungary or Czechoslovakia or Mexico, or some other place, it has a great lure, and the price is always lower. The price of the domestic merchandise must be reduced in price to compete. It may be only 1 percent of the volume of business in that town, but that is the effect of it. I have seen it and experienced it.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to equalize a little. It has been said there have been no hearings on this proposal. Let me show my colleagues the tome of the U.S. Tariff Commission, entitled "Report to the President on the Differences in the Cost of the Manufacture of Brooms Made of Broom Corn in the United States and the Principal Competing Countries."

Mr. President, what do Senators think the difference is? The Mexican brooms, for which there has been lamentation this afternoon, are delivered in this country for $5.73 a dozen. What does it cost to deliver the equivalent American brooms? Does it cost $5.73? No. It costs $11.15. That is almost twice as much. When the manufacturers went before the Tariff Commission, the Commission unanimously reported that the price ought to be equalized and that the American selling cost should be used to do that.

The President rejected the unanimous report of the Tariff Commission, after all the pages of testimony that had been taken.

It is said that no hearing has been held. Is it necessary to have a hearing before a Senate committee? A hearing was held before an executive agency. It went into the subject very thoroughly. How are we to equalize, and how are we to carry out what the Tariff Commission thinks ought to be done in order to give the little fellows a chance to survive? That is the reason why this provision is in the bill. We are told that it is a tariff revision and that it does not belong here. Mr. President, there are quite a number of tariff revisions in the bill. There is a list of them in the Tariff Classification Act. The list is as long as your arm, Mr. President.

We had quite a time wrestling with this problem. Very properly it is entitled to be here. It involves relief for a small American industry.

They have no great superlobby. They cannot come down here and fairly overwhelm committees of Congress and executive agencies. They have a fellow out in the cornfields of Douglas County in Illinois. He is a county chairman on occasion. But he also helps to operate the Broom Corn Association. He knows what is going on. He comes down here and says, "Please, sirs; 450 of my boys have been put out of business since 1953. Can't you stop it? Can't you give us a break? Isn't it possible that you can equalize this in line with what the Tariff Commission said to the President of the United States, or are you going to say to them, as they begin to flounder, and cannot pick up their loans at the bank, 'Hush your mouth; it is in the national interest; just go down for the third time and then we won't have to bother about you.' "

It is about time that we bleed a little for some of our own little people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This has not been pointed out by me or by my friend from Illinois, but it should be said that many farmers in Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma look upon the broom corn as a very material crop. They would lose that crop. Naturally, if more broom industries go out of business, there will be no purchasers for the broom corn. Furthermore, in the manufacture of the brooms, handles are used. The people who manufacture handles will go out of business. Wire is also used. That means that wire manufacturers will lose business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The operation involves packing boxes, and many other things.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is more involved than merely broom corn. I appeal to the Senate to give thought for a moment to a little industry. This is not General Motors. This is not Henry Ford III. This is not Chrysler. This is not International Harvester. This is a little industry, where youngsters who obtain an education and who are affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist faith can put themselves through school. It is an industry in which people whose sight has been destroyed and who can do only limited things, with subtle fingers, can find work and make a livelihood.

When, on top of all that, the Tariff Commission itself says these people have a case, and the Commission makes a unanimous report, I do not know what else can be said to the Senate, unless we want them to sink. They will sink under competition when brooms are brought in from abroad and delivered at one-half the price that it costs to deliver domestic brooms.

That is all we ask. I cannot be beguiled by the distinguished arguments of

my friend from New York and my beloved and affable friend from California. I know he bleeds for that little town in Mexico. So do I. Some day, if I have a great deal of time, I shall go down there. I shall take the Senator along. Let us hope it will not be too hot a day, so we will not have to wear coats and ties. We shall walk in on Mr. Lopez Mateos and tell him the whole story.

We will tell him, "Your country bleeds for you because you have a tariff much higher than ours. Do you think we did anything wrong when we bled a little for our little guys who are just like you, except that they do not speak Spanish?"

Mr. President, that is the story. I hope the amendment will be rejected. I have nothing more to add. If I do I shall think of the 450 little proprietors who are swimming around in the deep sea, ready to go down. I am afraid I shall weaken. I am afraid that all these things I have heard will suddenly salve my conscience and my consciousness, and I shall say, "It is in the national interest."

Mr. President, this is for the interest of the people, including blind people. May it never be said that the Senate is insensible to their problem, because of some broad concept with which we might be at variance.

Therefore, may the amendment of my friend from California be rejected by a resounding vote. I would not like to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us ask for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not ask for them. If we can have enough lusty voices to boom out a resounding "No," I shall be satisfied.

Mr. KUCHEL. "Leader, you are great." I would like to associate myself with my leader with respect to my desire to take care of my fellow Americans. "Leader, you are wiser than I am."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not even the equivalent of 20 or 10 percent of the able legislator that the Senator from Illinois is. "Leader, you are acquainted with the facts, but I want to give you these facts, too." The facts are that in 1954 the American industry sold $25 million worth of brooms made in the United States. Last year, $33 million worth of brooms manufactured in the United States were sold in the United States.

I do not know how my friend from Louisiana can talk about the damage that is being caused, when less than 2 percent out of 100 percent of the brooms are coming into the country.

Do we want to build a wall around the United States and say, "Get out of here. We don't want to have anything to do with you"? Of course not. I say most sincerely that if the American industry were damaged, it would be our joint responsibility to do something about it. But I ask my beloved leader and senior colleague: In this instance, who in the Senate can say, when the United States has 98 percent of the market, that the American industry will be damaged by 2 percent?

I add one more fact that is important to me. Last year $830 million worth of American goods were sold to Mexico. Mexico sold $595 million worth of her goods to the United States. So we have a balance of trade with Mexico of almost $250 million. Now it is proposed to spank Mexico and say that the $400,000 worth of brooms that Mexico is selling in this country must be kept out of the United States; that we are not going to let Mexico send brooms into this country.

I have a recommendation to make, because I know when the giants in this Chamber are on the march. I should like to propose an alternative amendment as an appeal to Senators, especially to the leader of my party and to the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance. I should like to modify my amendment. I should like to offer to the Senate an amendment which would provide that the present duties or levies shall continue on the amount of brooms which came into this country in 1963; but that if anyone abroad wanted to send in another broom, the new schedule, which has been written into the big bill before us, shall be applied.

I should like to add a second section to the modified amendment, and give the President discretion to allocate the quantity of brooms, but never above the amount imported in 1963, which I shall spell out.

Finally, the modified amendment would provide that the revised schedule would become effective on January 1, 1965. On behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I should like to offer that as a good-faith attempt to reach an agreement, and my Republican leader knows I am trying to make a good-faith amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the amendment provides for 340,000 dozen brooms to be imported duty free.

Mr. KUCHEL. Not duty free.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At the present duty—340,000 dozen brooms.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct; 140,000 dozen whiskbrooms and 210,000 dozen brooms above that size.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Our best information is that in 1963, the last year for which we have information, 310,340 dozen brooms came into the country. If the Senator wishes to propose an amendment, I suggest that he use the 1963 figure, which is a total of 310,340 dozen.

Mr. KUCHEL. I was giving figures representing the importation in 1963, but I would not quibble on a question of arithmetic. If the Senator from Louisiana and the Senate were to adopt our proposal, the precise figures could be supplied to coincide with the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid my distinguished friend from California offers me a horse-and-rabbit deal. By that I refer to the barbecue man who was called upon by the health commissioner to explain how he made rabbit sandwiches. He said, "50–50, one horse to one rabbit." I do not think that is quite the kind of deal I would like to see; but I will make the Senator a counterdeal. Before I do so, I shall have to straighten him out as to his figures.

In 1952, 7,300 dozen brooms were imported from Mexico. In 1953, the number had risen to 14,000 dozen brooms. That was 11 years ago. In 1963, the importation had risen to 140,000 dozen. The Senator says we cannot build a wall around those people.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is not the American share of the market 98 percent today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I do not want to build a wall around those people. I am reaching down by the hand to get them out of the water, so that they will not founder. I have to have something to offer them, so I will tell the Senator what I will do. Suppose we take an average of the importations of 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1963, omitting 1962, because the importations for 1962 jumped away up. But if we will take the average, that will be 277,000 dozen on which the present tariff will apply. On everything above that, the new duty, suggested in the pending bill, would apply.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that the absence of a quorum may be suggested and I might commune with him a moment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator propose to discuss brooms?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator know something about brooms?

Mr. CLARK. I think I know enough about them, although perhaps not too much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So long as we are sweeping up the place, we might as well talk about brooms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senators in charge of the bill, who I take it to be my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the learned minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], will accept the substance of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

It so happens that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania brooms are both made by local manufacturers and imported from Mexico and elsewhere in substantial amounts. This means that so far as the economy of Pennsylvania is concerned, it is a difficult task for a U.S. Senator to make up his mind where the economic interests of the manufacturers and the businessmen of his State lie.

It occurs to me that the compromise suggested by the Senator from California and the Senator from New York is a happy one. It would place a ceiling on the importation of brooms from abroad, except under a penalty of paying a substantially higher tariff. Thus, to that extent, supporting the position of the domestic broom manufacturers. On the other hand, it would permit the importations to continue at the rate that has prevailed for the last several years.

It is my understanding that the imported brooms, which would be subject

to the increased tariff if the committee proposal were adopted, constitute no more than 5 percent of the total number of brooms sold in the country.

(At this point Mr. HART took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as some Senators no doubt know, these are cheap brooms, many of them selling for less than a dollar. I believe that if we were to place a ceiling on the importation of brooms equal to the amount of imports in the last year, and permit them to come in under the present tariff, and then impose the additional tariff on all importations over and above the so-established quota, we would arrive at a compromise which should be satisfactory both to the domestic producers and to the importers.

Therefore, I hope that the compromise suggestion will be acceptable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

If, however, the Senator is insistent that the tariff go across the board, as presently proposed, I shall vote against the proposal and in favor of any amendment which may be offered to strike it. In my opinion, what we are beginning to do in the bill—which I very much deplore—is to get back to the old, discredited days of Smoot-Hawley, and all the other tariffs which went before it when Congress, by the theory of log-rolling deals between the economic interests in the various States, undertook to fix tariff rates.

I believe that the reciprocal trade agreements provisions, initiated under Cordell Hull, moved us away from that rather discreditable chapter in the history of Congress. I should dislike to see Congress returning to that, through the mechanism called a technical adjustment of the tariff schedule. The bill is entitled "An act to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States." I believe, in fact, that this is, rather, a junior tariff bill.

I see that I have the rapt attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I urge upon him, once more, acceptance of the compromise presented by the two Republican Senators across the aisle. I should like the Senator from Louisiana to know that a compromise also has Democratic support. It will also have some effect on the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, so far as the manufacturing and importation of brooms are concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is there anything to be swept under the rug here?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and me, a proposal in lieu of the amendment now pending.

I ask that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

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

On page 33, strike out lines 4 through 11, and insert the following:

"SEC. 63. BROOMS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
	Valued not over 32¢ each:		
750.26	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 112,000 dozen whiskbrooms classifiable under items 750.26 to 750.28	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.27	Other	8¢ each.	8¢ each.
750.28	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
	Valued not over 96¢ each:		
750.29	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 168,000 dozen brooms classifiable under items 750.29 to 750.31	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.30	Other	24¢ each.	24¢ each.
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	20% ad val. (s)	'

"(b) ALLOCATION.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 8, subpart A are amended by adding at the end thereof the following headnote:

"'3. The President may, if he determines such action to be in the national interest, allocate the quantity provided for in item 750.26 and 750.29 among supplying countries on the basis of exports during a previous representative period.'

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the amendment would provide that the present rates shall apply in the future on the first 112,000 dozen whiskbrooms, and the first 168,000 dozens of other brooms. Thereafter, it would provide that the rates proposed in the bill as it came from the committee shall apply.

It is a matter of regret to me that quite apparently the Senate was not disposed to look with favor on the original proposal which the senior Senator from New York and I offered. But the action just taken is prior to a conference—and I have spoken to the distinguished leader of my party—is indicative of the fact that the Senate desires to operate on the theory of a quota with respect to this item, by reason of the national interest.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that two things have been accomplished.

First. The principles of imports have been sustained. The legislative history should show a rounded-off figure roughly between the imports for 1960 and 1961, in the same proportions as the two types of products are at present generally approved by the Tariff Commission, based upon generally existing experience.

Second. Notwithstanding my strong feelings on the question of trade, I have been somewhat moved myself by the problem of the blind who work upon these things, although, I do not believe that has made any difference.

The record should show that the domestic industry has increased roughly by $1.5 million a year in the last few years in its own production, notwithstanding the fact that these tariffs have been allegedly too low.

Finally, the Senate has expressed itself as not excluding exports from a friendly neighboring country. That, I believe, is very important in terms of the principal workers involved here.

So like my colleague, the Senator from California, and without trying to go into a detailed reply to the Senator from Illinois—and we may have other occasions to do so—his statement was so delicious and charming that I do not think hardly anyone would wish to debate the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we agreed?

Mr. JAVITS. I stand with my colleague, the Senator from California.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, if we are agreed, let me throw a rope around the flounderers on the floor.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the Senator is interested in his whiskbrooms. I know that the amendment is important to the people who are employed in making whiskbrooms. But the clothespin industry is equally important to the people who make clothespins, particularly the people in the States of Maine and Vermont, where most of them are made.

I wonder if the Senator would object to having the same conditions apply to the importation of clothespins that he is requesting for the whiskbroom industry and other broom industries?

Mr. KUCHEL. My friend from Vermont makes a powerful speech. I am moved by it. I would want to treat the industries located in his State with the greatest compassion and sympathy. But I suggest to my able friend that perhaps we could do that tomorrow morning.

Mr. AIKEN. Clothespins are still very important.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed, they are.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the population explosion, we still must have clothespins.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator's point is a very pregnant one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So long as the crop of three-cornered-pants wearers grows, there will be need for clothespins.

Mr. AIKEN. But we wish the American producers of clothespins to maintain at least their present position in the marketing field, and it is only with difficulty that they have been holding that position during the last few years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The bill will be before the Senate all day tomorrow, I am sure.

Mr. AIKEN. We still use clothespins. We are not like the fellow who went into the store and bought some diapers. The salesgirl said, "That will be $2 for the diapers and 10 cents for the tax."

The fellow replied, "I don't want the 'tacks.' We use safety pins." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly tomorrow we shall consider that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two. I opposed the amendment in the committee. I am not in favor of it now. I am not in favor of even the substitute, although I recognize that it is better than the language of the bill as reported. I favor the original proposal of the Senator from California. It is regrettable that we should pick up a small item like this and do serious harm to our relations with a friendly country and no particular good to our own citizens.

The argument about the blind, I believe, is wholly irrelevant, because the total output of the blind, I am informed, is taken up by charitable organizations, which make special arrangements for the brooms made by the blind and by Government agencies.

Furthermore, there was no really serious testimony taken in the committee. This is another example of improvident and imprudent action in the last days of a Congress. I regret that the subject has come up in this fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I submit a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on September 30, 1964, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is there any expectation that there will be offered to the tariff bill an amendment which would attach to the bill the medicare bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Where did the Senator get that information?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana might have more information than I have, but I had heard earlier today that there might be some prospects of that, but I have heard subsequently—in fact, only a few moments ago—that it would not be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there are prospects of such amendments being offered, because of the very great importance of that subject, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to amend the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is time that we close the present session of Congress. It is folly to try to hurry through important proposed legislation without adequate consideration. Many items of great importance will come before this body which have been inadequately considered, and they will be passed upon. I have heard the argument in relation to the folly of attaching the reapportionment amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill. Now we would attach a medicare bill to a tariff bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I speak to the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator wishes the Congress to wind up its work. So does the junior Senator from Louisiana. I am not sure that we shall be able to adjourn this Congress unless we do something about national health insurance. This Senator did not vote for it. But I am on notice that other Senators will not let us vote on a social security bill to help the aged, or public welfare amendments to help the needy and to help the old folks, the orphaned children and everyone else unless we obtain from the House its answer on health insurance. We might be confronted with a situation in which we shall have raised our own pay by $7,500 and raised everyone else's pay in varying amounts with a big tax cut for everyone who is doing well. We would have taken good care of ourselves and everyone else except the needy.

That would be a very unfortunate vote for the Congress to adjourn upon.

We are in conference on medicare. The Senate voted on medicare. There are Senators who are thinking about not permitting that conference report to come to a vote unless the House tells us what it is willing to do on that subject.

This is where we stand in conference. The House has been willing to talk about an approach to medicare completely at variance with the Senate amendment. It will be easy enough to explain to the Senator the difference between what we voted and what the House might consider. I think I could explain it to him simply enough if we could sit down and discuss it. What we are talking about in conference, which perhaps could be considered, and which the House conferees might be willing to consider, would be subject to a point of order if it went back to the House, so that a single House Member could then kill the proposed compromise on the medicare problem. The problem could be bypassed by a Senate amendment to the tariff bill proposing the kind of compromise which the House might be willing to consider. We could then go to conference with an amendment on the tariff bill, which would not then be subject to a point of order, in the event the House agreed to go to conference.

As one Senator who did not vote for medicare—I fought against it to the best of my ability—if my vote on this floor is required in order to get the medicare proposition on this bill, or anything in the field of national health insurance, I do not expect to vote for it; but, on the other hand, so far as this Congress is concerned, I doubt very much that those who are for health insurance are going to let us go home until we give them a good faith answer on the health insurance feature.

If the amendment were to be offered and considered, it would be one of the few possible ways in which we might be able to arrive at some kind of compromise between the House and Senate in this difficult field. I am frank to say I do not think we are going to be able to go home unless we work out something on that score.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have the floor——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I should like to finish my statement.

The Senator from Louisiana bases his argument on the fact that we raised our salaries from $22,500 to $30,000 and therefore we cannot deny petitions of others for similar treatment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is one good reason.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not vote for the increase to $30,000, and when I voted against the increase to $30,000 I stated that we would never be able to reject inordinate demands as a result of our giving ourselves a 33-percent increase in salary.

I am on sound ground on this item. If the Senator from Illinois had not objected, I would have objected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If Senators wish to keep the Senate from voting on an amendment, Senators should be prepared to speak at length on the matter. So far as I am concerned, if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment, he has a right to offer it, and if he thinks he has the votes to have it adopted, I hope he has a chance to have it voted on.

So far as the salary matter is concerned, Senators who voted for it will have considerable difficulty going home and explaining to their people why they insisted on adjourning when the Congress had taken care of everybody but the needy, everybody but the blind, everybody but the aged. This Congress has a magnificent record of taking care of everybody except those who need help the most.

I do not believe Congress will go home on that note. My guess is that Members of Congress who are advocating health insurance—and I am not for it—are going to keep us here until we do something about health care insurance.

Senators can do as they wish, but I am desirous of achieving the same result the Senator from Ohio is. I wish to achieve results and go home. That was the object in asking unanimous consent. The Senator's objection is all right with me. We can debate the question from now until kingdom come, so far as this Senator is concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, by trying, in an election year, to give everybody everything he demands, we exhibited a lack of character which in my opinion was astounding. I refused to do it. I will not listen to this type of argument based upon the proposition that we have given to everybody everything they have asked, though they may not have been entitled to it, and now we must pick up the others who have been left out and give them what they ask. Members of Congress may as well stew and boil and roast in the fire which they created.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 29, 1964:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of colonel.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, September 29, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles A. Muecke, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 118: 24: *This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day, affording us many opportunities for growth in nobility of character and service.

Help us to believe that the crowning glory and joy of life is one that is characterized by inward goodness and outgoing service.

Show us how we may undergird the moral and spiritual well-being of our beloved country.

Give us the courage to drive out those vicious influences which corrupt the youth of our cities and communities.

Grant that we may encourage all those cooperative organizations of State and church which are striving to unify their efforts to build a social order which has in it the spirit of brotherhood and good will.

Inspire us to break through and break down the barriers of prejudice and selfishness.

May we have a clear understanding and appreciation of the worth and dignity of mankind.

Enable us to awaken within our own hearts the contagion and capacity for a joyous and victorious spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1851. An act for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-exempt status for nonprofit nurses' professional registries operated by nurses' professional associations.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 88–606, had appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO MAKE IT FEDERAL OFFENSE TO ASSAULT OR ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCHWEIKER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the tragic events of last November 22 I called to the attention of my colleagues the fact that assassination of the President of the United States is not a Federal crime. A number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle joined me in introducing legislation making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President or Vice President.

Today, 10 months later, we have made no progress toward enacting this legislation. The Warren Commission has included in its recommendations announced yesterday a plea for passage of legislation such as that for which my colleagues and I have been pressing.

Assaults on many lesser officials are now specifically covered by Federal

statutes. These include U.S. attorneys, judges of the United States, U.S. marshals, FBI and Secret Service agents, and some employees of agencies such as the Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture.

It is inconceivable to me that the protection of Federal jurisdiction offered to a number of our Federal officials has not been available to our President and Vice President. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I think we ought not to delay any longer.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION TO CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GOODELL. 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. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to a point of indignation. On August 11, 1964, I introduced H.R. 12337, a bill to extend Secret Service protection to candidates for President and Vice President. It appeared at the time that bipartisan support for this proposal was so overwhelming that we could pass the bill by unanimous consent. I discussed the matter with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He indicated that he would bring the matter up himself, requesting unanimous consent. I discussed the matter with both the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House. I discussed the matter with the leadership of the Senate. There was and can be nothing partisan in such a proposal to give our leaders minimum protection during a time of great emotional ferment.

With all the bipartisan support for my proposal, suddenly a hitch developed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] abruptly indicated he could not bring the matter up under unanimous consent. The Speaker voiced misgivings. In order to avoid a controversy where controversy was unnecessary, I discussed the matter at great length with the leadership. No specific technical objections to the language of the bill were raised. There was some inference that anyone desiring Secret Service protection was exhibiting cowardice; that this kind of protection had never been extended before to candidates; and that maybe two or three Secret Service people could be assigned "if BARRY GOLDWATER and BILL MILLER appeared before a committee and requested it."

After repeated oral requests, on September 3, 1964, I telegraphed Mr. CELLER requesting immediate and expeditious hearings on my bill. I did not even receive the courtesy of a reply to my request. I have repeated the request for action on a bipartisan basis on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, with the release of the Warren report we are all once again profoundly bestirred by the memory of that awful event on November 22, 1963. The Warren report recommends that we take action to improve the Secret Service protection of our President. Let us do so to the maximum extent that we can, consistent with our free and open way of life. But there is something we can do right now to minimize the chance of another monumental disaster shaking the very foundations of our Nation. HUBERT HUMPHREY, BARRY GOLDWATER, and BILL MILLER do not even have the inadequate Secret Service protection criticized by the Warren report.

What kind of a national and constitutional crisis would occur tomorrow if one of these fine and dedicated Americans was assassinated? And how would you and I feel if we had neglected to give them the minimum protection that is so readily available?

I have consulted with the Secret Service officials. They take no policy position either for or against H.R. 12337, but they have indicated unqualifiedly to me that if Congress passes this bill they can implement it immediately and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to take this action now—by unanimous consent, or whatever other device the leadership chooses. There is no partisanship when the basic interests of our beloved country are at stake and certainly the safety of our national leaders in both parties is basic to our national interests.

IMPORTATION AND SALE OF PIRANHA FISH

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently I had informed the House of the increasing importation and sale in the United States of the South American piranha fish. This marked increase posed a definite threat to the residents of south Florida where all authorities agreed that there was a possibility that the tiny flesh-eating fish could establish themselves if given the chance.

I have been in touch with the Department of the Interior in regard to this matter and have been informed by that Department that new regulations are to be issued shortly which will curb the uncontrolled sale of the piranha. I assure you that the residents of Florida will greet this news with a sigh of relief. Our hundreds of miles of recreational waterways are a source of great pleasure as well as a vital part of the tourist attraction which brings thousands of people into our area each year. It, therefore, is of great satisfaction to all the people of Florida that the Department of the Interior is in the process of drawing up new regulations which will insure that these waterways will not be the future home of the tiny flesh-eating piranhas.

Mr. Speaker, I along with the other residents of Florida look forward to the issuance of these new regulations which will secure the permanent safety of our recreational waterways from the piranha fish.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S HEALTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the most important presidential election campaign in many decades. If we probe to the core of this contest, we can see that the issues are clear and the alternatives are distinct. And it is most vitally important that the American people see and understand those issues and alternatives so that their choice, at the polls on November 3, will be based on fact rather than fantasy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the clear issues on this campaign are being deliberately blurred. I submit that the "big lie" is being used to an extent never before seen in American politics. I submit that the hate-peddlers and the fright-peddlers and the muckrakers are deliberately vilifying Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. The truth is not in them, Mr. Speaker, and they are without honor. Apparently there is no limit to their desperate and depraved attempts to portray a U.S. Senator and a presidential candidate as mentally incompetent.

As this campaign started, it was inconceivable to think that Senator GOLDWATER'S health could possibly be a campaign issue. He enjoys unusually robust health, both physically and mentally—and that fact has been apparent all his active life. He rides, he hunts, he hikes, he swims, he explores. He is a pilot, a jet pilot, checked out by the U.S. Air Force this year to fly faster-than-sound airplanes. It requires, as I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, excellent physical coordination, mental judgment and nervous control to fly a jet airplane. Senator GOLDWATER has been a member of the military or its reserves for nearly 25 years and has passed every examination during that time.

Let me be specific about one big lie being aimed at this honorable, honest and healthy man.

This lie is receiving circulation in the form of a full-page ad placed in such newspapers as the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Journal American and the New York World Telegram & Sun. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that these papers charge about $4,000 and $5,000 for a full-page ad. I personally know of 5 ads that have been placed, costing about $25,000 total. It would be interesting to know where the money came from.

The ads were placed by one Ralph Ginzberg, publisher of a magazine which is curiously named Fact. The ads question Senator GOLDWATER'S mental stability and promote an article, soon to be published in Mr. Ginzberg's magazine, about the Senator's supposed state of mental health. The ad is vicious and it

is cruelly distorted. It alleges that the article is based on responses made to a poll by psychiatrists across the country.

Psychiatrists are scientists, doctors of medicine, and any one of them worth the name will recognize the dishonest and disreputable nature of what Fact magazine is doing. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have on the record what medical societies say about Mr. Ginzberg's project—and I quote, in part, from their statements:

From the American Medical Association:

AMA did not cooperate in any way in the taking of the poll. The AMA condemns this obviously scurrilous unscientific questionnaire * * * The AMA intends to register the strongest protest with Fact for using the name and reputation of AMA for obvious propaganda and financial purposes.

That is from Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of AMA.

From the American Psychiatric Association:

Let me assure you that we share your sense of outrage and indignation that Fact magazine proposes to publish what purports to be an analysis of psychiatric opinion regarding the psychological fitness of Mr. GOLDWATER to be President of the United States. We alerted the officers of our district branches to the mischief afoot and asked them to urge members not to write to Fact magazine, but, there was not time to reach all 14,000 members individually and, of course, many of them sent some form of a "response." It is our estimate, judging from the letters we have on file from our members, that ever so many of these responses were in essence expressions of indignation at having been sent the questionnaire.

I want to assure you that we will proceed with our plan to disavow the validity of any so-called psychiatric opinion of Mr. GOLDWATER's relative psychological fitness to be President that the magazine may publish.

From Dr. Walter E. Barton, medical director, American Psychiatric Association.

From the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons:

We do object to the inane method of attempting to judge the psychological fitness of an individual through long-range diagnosis. We do deplore the slanted presentation which encourages only one kind of vote, and which, apparently, is for the purpose of vilifying and destroying the character of an individual citizen.

These are excerpts from the AAPS News Letter of September 1964, by Dr. Thomas Parker, president.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real and indisputable fact is that Fact magazine is the most misnamed publication in America. And its publisher, Ralph Ginzberg, is now appealing a jail sentence and heavy fine for sending pornographic material through the mails.

I understand that Mr. Ginzberg is going to report the results of his so-called poll this Wednesday, September 30, in a speech at the University of Southern California. No doubt he will claim his poll is scientific and impartial. But will he say that the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons have already repudiated his poll? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, I doubt it.

And I believe the American people will join these distinguished organizations in repudiating Mr. Ginzberg's vile effort to assassinate the character and reputation of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

It behooves all of us, Mr. Speaker, to expose this evil effort and to present the facts openly, and to help give the electorate a true picture of the issues and the candidates.

The American people have an important choice to make November 3. Let them make that choice on the basis of truth, not in a poisonous climate of fear engendered by fiction and fantasy.

LABOR SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, farmers in California, as well as other employing States, are still awaiting an answer to the supplemental labor problem which they will face next January 1.

We have heard many comments in recent days acknowledging that a labor shortage does exist. But, we have not heard many solutions proposed.

Recently, I received copies of correspondence from Mr. Jesse Frye, the general manager of the Ventura County Farm Labor Association. Mr. Frye had written to each of the State departments of employment concerning the possibility of recruiting able, qualified, domestic farmworkers in the various States. The replies point up emphatically the shortage of such workers almost everywhere.

In view of this situation, it is essential that a program for supplemental labor be devised and made known immediately. Statements by public officials that crops will not perish in the fields for lack of labor are not enough. Farmers need to know now what they can expect.

Every Californian is affected in some way by the condition of California agriculture. The absence of an adequate and qualified supplemental labor force would mean disaster for many California farmers. The entire State would suffer.

This problem is not going to vanish. On the contrary, it is becoming more aggravated daily. This administration owes it to farmers to develop and announce at once a program for supplemental labor that will enable them to meet their needs under fair and reasonable conditions.

The methods for accomplishing this exist. It is time that they were used and farmers relieved of the uncertainty which they now face.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLIER. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances entirely beyond my control I was unable to be on the floor on Tuesday, April 14, 1964, when the vote was taken on H.R. 10809, and on Tuesday, September 1, 1964, when the vote was taken on S. 2701.

Had I been present on these days, I would have voted yea on both bills.

THREE MILLION DOLLARS SAVED, BUT NOT UNTIL FIVE MILLION DOLLARS WAS WASTED—PRC–47 PROCUREMENT

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

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, time and again in the past, I have proven where the military can save money by allowing competitive bidding for electronics equipment after the equipment is properly developed. Here is another case which proves:

First. When the Marine Corps wasted over $5 million of the taxpayers' dollars in buying the AN/PRC–47 walkie-talkie radio.

Second. It also paid $250,000 for development of the radio, then allowed one producer to, for all intents and purposes, keep the results of the Government-sponsored development.

Third. When competitive bidding was forced upon it, the price for the radio dropped to less than half the sole-source price.

Fourth. Under competitive conditions, the former sole-source producer trimmed its price by 43 percent; and

Fifth. The Marines showed favoritism for a preferred company.

Mr. Speaker, you would think this object lesson would be enough to start a flood of competitive purchasing. This is just another example of what I have been bringing to the floor now for years. Each one helps change the direction of the procurement current from sole source to competitive bidding.

The mainstream of this current, however, is still much—far too much—in favor of sole-source buying. I say this in the knowledge that my study has succeeded in prodding Secretary of Defense McNamara and his procurement officers into exceeding their competitive procurement schedules by 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, the AN/PRC–47 radio was developed under a Government contract. Under terms of the contract the Government was to pay $250,000 for five of the radios. In return the Government got five radios and the plans and specifications.

This, you would think, would allow competitive bidding. It could—and it should. But, it did not.

The Marine Corps entered into a contract—NOm–72362—in December 1961 for over $8 million worth of these radios at average unit price of $4,523.77 each. This was a sole-source contract. Only one company was allowed to bid—the

company paid by the Government to develop the equipment.

Studying another radio in 1962, I came across the PRC–47 case and started asking questions about it, to buttress my file about the other radio. Imagine my surprise when, in October 1963, I received a call from a civil servant alerting me that another big sole-source purchase was coming up for the PRC–47 radio.

In October 1963, the Marine Corps was asked to fill me in, to answer questions and supply documentation on the equipment. All this work takes months, Mr. Speaker. In the interim the Marines shoved this second sole-source purchase through—for almost $1 million worth of radios at an average price of $5,734.60 each.

Such disregard for the taxpayer literally makes my blood boil. I contacted the Marine Corps, both formally and informally, and strongly urged that all future procurements of this radio be competitive. I even suggested the $1 million contract be abolished. My suggestion went unheeded at the time.

Some weeks ago, however, I was informed that a competitive procurement had finally been forced for the AN/PRC–47 radio.

Mr. Speaker, on September 4, 1964 the bids for this radio were opened and here is a tabulation of bids a member of my staff recorded at that time:

AN/PRC–47( ): Prior development by Collins Radio at Marine Corps expense, followon production by Collins $7.5 million at $4,500; also urgent delivery NOm–72986 June 25, 1964, to Collins Radio for $806,806—at unit price of $5,734.60.

NOTE: For ease of comparison, the unit prices for 12 quantity ranges plus the option were multiplied, so that the following sequence gives you from low bidder to high bidder with total bid, and average system price for the 1,133 maximum (including optional) units:

Name of firm bidding, IFB 25-65, and terms	System	Average total bid price
1. Bendix Corp., Baltimore, Md., D. L. Gunter, market manager, terms net	$2,794.21	$3,165,844.00
2. Admiral Corp., 3800 West Cortland St., Chicago, Ill., R. M. Jones, vice president, net	2,846.48	3,225,070.00
3. ITT Federal Labs, 500 Washington Ave., Nutley, N.J., G. Banino, president, terms net	2,977.99	3,374,063.71
4. Dalmo Victor Co., Belmont, Calif., P. H. Friedman, vice president, marketing, net	3,199.00	3,624,517.00
5. Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, W. G. Kane, contract administration, terms net	3,257.75	3,691,026.00
6. Avco Corp., Electronics Division, 2630 Glendale Melford, Cincinnati, Ohio, C. A. Lenn, assistant comptroller	3,728.72	4,224,649.00
7. Radio Corp. of America, defense electronic products, Cambridge, Ohio, net	4,093.12	4,637,514.00

(NOTE.—Contract NOm–72986 awarded Collins Radio, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, under date of May 18, 1964, on a sole-source noncompetitive basis due to urgency of delivery for Army requirements, covering 124 units of the AN/PRC–47 Radio Set per CSY–3–FY62–3 and amendment No. 1, where the radio carried a unit price of $5,734.60; plus 124 blower 199Q–1 Collins part No. 522–3856–00 at a unit price of $199.40; plus 124 sets of repair parts consisting of 20 amp fuse, 5 amp fuse, 1 each of each, plus 2 lamps 262–0179–00 and 262–0556–00 (2 each of each) at $1.54 per set * * * where 100 units had to be delivered before October 15, 1964, with 24 units to be delivered by November 16, 1964 * * * with several exceptions in the specifications: water splash for water spray; frequency stability of equipment after warmup for 2 minute shall be sufficient to maintain operating frequencies over a period of 60 days, within ±15 cps; 3.310.2 substitute 150 for 120; 160 for 130, and 15 for 14, etc. The development of this radio was in September 1959 covered by NOm–71453 for five units of a team pack single sideband radio set per CSY–3–FY–59–11 at a unit price of $50,000 each. December 1961: NOm–72362 awarded Collins for 1,375 units of the AN/PRC–47( ) Radio at a total liability starting at $7,558,022.92—subsequently increased to $8,047,520.46 with unit price at $4,502.56, and others.

You will notice that the Bendix Corp., Baltimore, Md., was the low bidder—quoting an average price of $2,794.21—less than half the sole-source price.

You will also note that the former sole-source producer—Collins Radio Co.—quoted an average price of $3,257.75—43 percent less than they quoted for the same radio just a few months ago when they had no competition.

This proves that the Marines literally squandered over $5 million of the money spent thus far for this radio. And it proves that forcing the Marines to go competitive on this purchase has saved the taxpayers over $3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I was speechless when I learned that on one hand a contract can be handed sole source to a firm so capriciously and without regard for cost, and the minute competition comes into the window this same sole-source producer trims its price so dramatically.

The PRC–47 is not an isolated instance. The same circumstances surround one after another of the cases I have developed. The AN/TRC–75 radio is another example. The Navy wasted about $25 million on this radio. One of my colleagues is working on this case right now, so I will leave the details for him to present at a future time.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to be perfectly fair about this case, I requested the Comptroller General to make a technical evaluation of the different radio procurements to ascertain whether or not the radios purchased noncompetitively were identical to the others. September 11, 1964, Mr. Campbell informed me:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, September 11, 1964.

The Honorable EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILSON: Reference is made to your letter of August 24, 1964, requesting information pertaining to various procurements of the AN/PRC–47 radio, an evaluation of Collins Radio Co.'s patent claims with respect to the AN/PRC–47 radio, a comparison of the technical requirements of various specifications involving the radio, and a tabulation of bids recorded in connection with the Marine Corps invitation for bid No. 25–65.

We have initiated a review for the purpose of obtaining and evaluating the data necessary to prepare a report on the matters referred to in your request. In view of the complexity of the matters involved, we estimate that the review and report will require approximately 90 days to complete.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Realizing how busy Mr. Campbell is, I personally conducted a technical review of the negotiated contracts with Collins and the competitive procurement for the AN/PRC–47. I found the equipments to be basically identical, but that the sole-source producer did not have to make a preproduction unit, was released from a guarantee clause and had other concessions. This saved Collins at least $150,000 and should have made its manufacture much less expensive than the competitive price. But, as we have seen, the facts are just the other way around.

For the RECORD, here is my survey of specifications for the two procurements involved here:

Radio set AN/PRC–47 specification comparison

Subject	Paragraph	Contract NOm–72986	Paragraph	IFB No. 25–65
Specifications	2.1	Calls out MIL–T–1374A, truck, utility, ¼-ton, 4x4, M38A1.	2.1	Not called out.
		Calls out MIL–STD–752, equipment spectrum signatures.		Do.
		Not called out		Calls out "Drawing 5116–522–2433–011 and associated drawings, lists, etc."
Preproduction samples	3.1	Preproduction sample included in quantity to be shipped. (NOTE.—Contract eliminates need for preproduction.)	3.1	Preproduction samples not included in quantity to be delivered.
Type and function	3.1.1	A watertight transit case shall be provided which is capable of enclosing all components and accessories except the rucksack frames.	3.1.1	A watertight transit case shall be provided which is capable of enclosing all components and accessories.
Type of construction	3.1.2	All of the basic components shall be splashproof when assembled in operating condition or constructed of materials, which, when exposed to the elements, shall not affect the operating capability of the equipment.	3.1.2	All of the basic components shall be splashproof when assembled in operating condition or constructed of materials, which, when exposed to the elements, shall not adversely affect the operating capability of the equipment.
		Convection cooling of the equipment shall be used throughout except as noted herein.		Convection cooling of the equipment shall be used throughout.

Radio set AN/PRC–47 specification comparison—Continued

Subject	Paragraph	Contract NOm–72986	Paragraph	IFB No. 25–65
Case CY–3762		Not called out by specific type number. May be subsequent assignment of nomenclature.	3.1.2.1.8	The receiver-transmitter case shall be of aluminum and balsa sandwich construction. When the front panel cover, CW–647/PRC–47, is in place, the receiver-transmitter shall be waterproof.
Cases	3.3.1	The transit case and cases for the basic units shall be watertight.	3.3.1	The transit case and transceiver case shall be watertight.
Service conditions	3.3.3.1	Not listed	3.3.3.1	1—Temperature shock; par. 4.7 applies.
Frequency stability	3.3.4.3	±40 cycles −40° to −30° C. ±25 cycles −29° to +20° C. ±15 cycles +21° to +30° C. ±25 cycles +31° to +60° C.	3.3.4.3	±40 cycles −40° to −30° C. ±25 cycles −30° to +20° C. ±15 cycles +20° to +40° C. ±25 cycles +40° to +60° C.
MTBF—Mean time between failure		Not called out as such. Par. 3.3.4.1 requires 200 hours' operation without failure.	3.3.5.1	230 hours under AGREE–3 test procedures.
Interchangeability	3.3.6	The components, modules, and accessories of this equipment shall conform to the interchangeability requirements of specification MIL–E–16400. Every effort shall be made to utilize standard parts and components currently available in the Marine Corps supply system.	3.3.6	All components and parts of the equipment shall be physically, functionally, mechanically, and electrically interchangeable with the corresponding components and parts of the Government-furnished AN/PRC–47.
Interference	3.3.18	Does not contain table I	3.3.17	Contains table I, delineating specification deviations for interference and front end rejection.
Performance requirements	3.4	Specifies minimum warmup period of 20 minutes. (Since this warmup period was changed in other sections to 2 minutes, this may be a typographical error.)	3.4	Specifies minimum warmup period of 2 minutes.
Sensitivity	3.4.2.1	Does not include this relief	3.4.2.1	Includes statement that the requirement does not apply at certain frequencies.
Duty cycle	3.4.3.2	Not called out	3.4.3.2	In FSK–Hi power operation the duty cycle will be 9 minutes receive, 2 minutes transmit for 1 hour.
FSK	3.3.11.3	Details the use and nonuse of external blowers in the 2 modes of frequency shift keyed operation.	3.3.11.3	Does not mention blowers, merely states source of audio tones.
Whip antenna	3.5.3.1	Specifies fiberglas	3.5.3.1	Does not specify fiberglas.
Antenna accessories	3.5.4.3b	Requires furnishing an antenna lead wire for use when transceiver is mounted on ¼-ton truck.		Not required.
Audio accessories	3.5.4.2	Calls out headset H–233/PRC–47	3.5.4.2 3.7	Calls out headset H–223/PRC–47. Calls out headset H–233/PRC–47 (probable typographical error).
	3.5.4.2g	Requires a blower to be furnished. This is listed in the contract as a separate item, at additional cost.		Not required.
Government-furnished material		Not included	3.6	Specifies 2 PRC–47 sets to be GFE'd, to be tested by the contractor.
Equipment listing		Does not appear as such in the specifications; however, there is a comparable listing in the contract, and there is general conformance to the listing in Bid/Spec IFB 25–65. Some differences seem to be due to the use of different words to describe an item; some are indicative of configuration differences.	3.7	Detailed listing of items to be furnished.
Tests	4.2.1.1	Requires −25° C. temperature test as part of sampling test.	4.2.1	Not required.
	4.2.1.1	Requires watertightness test as part of sampling test.	4.2.1	Not required. Watertightness test only required for preproduction tests.
		Not required	4.2.1	Primary power variation test required during preproduction and sampling tests.
Test procedures		Not required (understandable, because of prior contract).	4.2.1.1	Submission and approval of test procedures required 1 month prior to tests.
Tests		Not specified	4.2.1.2	Specifies quantities of radio sets to be subjected to various tests: Preproduction, production, sample.
Intended use	6.1	Includes requirement: Provisions are to be made for vehicular mounting.	6.1	Not included.
Government-furnished equipment		These 2 items are to be furnished by the contractor.		LS–166/U loudspeaker and J–45 telegraph key are to be furnished by the Government.
Guarantee		Clause deleted		Guarantee applicable.

Mr. Speaker, I requested of the commanding officer of the Marine Corps a detailed bill of materials—priced—from Collins together with the DD–633 form supplied by Collins under its sole-source contract, but he has indicated an obscure regulation which prohibits this, and has forwarded the hot potato to the Secretary of the Navy, thus:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1964.

HON. EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: The information requested in the second paragraph of your letter of September 8, 1964, relative to contract No. 72986 with the Collins Radio Co., would necessitate the disclosure of business confidential information. Pursuant to Armed Services Procurement Regulation 1–1006, this matter is being referred to the Secretary of the Navy.

The following information is furnished with regard to Mr. J. F. Maguire: His rating is GS–14; his annual salary is $16,130, and he has never been disciplined, suspended, or officially reprimanded.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. BATTELL,
Major General, U.S. Marine Corps, Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, by direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, since this is a very serious matter, and goes to the very heart of the problem of waste in military purchasing, I have today requested the General Accounting Office to audit contract No. 72986 line for line, item for item. I want to know where the money went.

It is obvious that no firm can or should show a profit factor of 45 percent on any single contract and go unquestioned.

When the report comes back, I shall make it public.

There are several individuals connected with this case, Mr. Speaker, who must explain their actions. One is J. F. Maguire, who is employed by the Marine Corps as a contract negotiator. The people of this country pay him $16,300 a year or thereabouts to have their best interests at heart when he obligates their money—in tax dollars.

Mr. Maguire is the contract negotiator who has sat on the top of this procurement. How wisely has he spent the taxpayers' money? Has he been worth the money we are paying him? I hardly think so, and that is as charitable as I can be toward Mr. Maguire.

I am going to have more to say about Mr. Maguire in the future. My study of the way in which he performs his job is still going on. I can say now, however, that his file jacket would make interesting reading even if it were published in incomplete form today.

The commanding general of the Marine Corps should relieve Mr. Maguire of any sole-source purchasing duties, at least until the audit of the PRC–47 contracts are concluded. In that way, the Treasury and the taxpayers will be protected.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. FALLON. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland is one of the largest in the United States both in population and geographic area. Because of its unusual size, its close proximity to the Nation's Capital and its wide variety of interests, the Fifth District is also one of the most difficult to represent in the Congress.

The people of the Fifth District have been very fortunate to have been represented in the Congress during the past 10 years by a dedicated public servant who has rendered them effective, responsible service and has given assiduous attention to their concerns and problems. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD.

Congressman LANKFORD has decided not to seek reelection and will leave the Halls of Congress at the end of this session. The achievements and solid accomplishments of Congressman LANKFORD in the years since he took his seat in this body in January 1955, are too numerous to list here.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him during these years have come to know him as one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House. He has worked diligently in the interests not only of those whom he served but the State and Nation as well with an honesty and devotion to principle that has been inspiring and has earned him the respect and confidence of his colleagues of both parties.

Congressman LANKFORD has written a great record of service in the Halls of the Congress. His voice and his vote always have been in support of those policies and those programs designed to make the United States a better place in which to live. He is deserving of high commendation for the substantial and continuing contributions that he has made to national defense as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Members of Congress usually fall into one or two categories—they are either workhorses or showhorses. A workhorse Congressman spends his time attending long and grueling committee meetings where the real work of Congress is done and in looking after the needs of his constituents and his district. From the standpoint of hard work and solid accomplishment Congressman LANKFORD can claim membership in the workhorse fraternity. He has been a competent and useful Member of Congress. He has been a credit not only to the House but to the entire U.S. Congress.

When Congressman LANKFORD vacates his congressional seat at the end of this session the loss will be felt not only in this body where he will leave a void that will be hard to fill, but also in the Fifth Congressional District and the State of Maryland where he has consistently championed the just causes of all people.

I know I do not speak for myself alone when I extend to Congressman LANKFORD best wishes for continued good health and success in whatever pursuits he may follow in the years to come.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. GARMATZ. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I view with regret the pending retirement of my colleague and close friend, RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, upon completion of this 88th session of Congress. He has chosen not to seek reelection and therefore, will terminate a career of 10 years distinguished and dedicated service to the constituents of his district, and to his country.

Though he has forsaken the hallowed Hall of Congress to return to the private practice of law, we shall long remember the devoted and effective service he has rendered as a Member of this body and as a ranking member of the 37-man House Armed Services Committee. Through his seniority on this committee, he was chosen this year to serve on the Special Investigations Subcommittee which was created by a House resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation of all matters pertaining to our national defense and security.

In 1962 Congressman LANKFORD was selected to fill the vacancy on the House Government Operations Committee of Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, upon the occasion of his appointment to the Speaker of the House and was subsequently assigned to its two most important subcommittees, the Military Operations Subcommittee, where I had the privilege of serving with him, and the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.

His committee assignments gave Maryland representation on two of the most important committees of the House and was particularly effective in view of the heavy concentration of defense and other Government activities in our State.

When Congressman LANKFORD leaves office at the close of this 88th session of Congress, his loss will be felt not only among his colleagues but also his constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland.

Although we all will miss him, I am sure you will join me in wishing him good health and happiness in the years ahead and utmost success in all his future endeavors.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. FRIEDEL. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join our dean of the Maryland delegation in paying tribute to our good friend and distinguished colleague, DICK LANKFORD.

I am very sorry that DICK has decided not to seek reelection from the Fifth District of Maryland but I respect his wishes in this matter. He has a long and honorable record of service to the people of his district and to the Nation, and has merited our gratitude and esteem.

Before coming to the House of Representatives, DICK LANKFORD served in the U.S. Navy in Europe during World War II. From 1948 until 1953 he was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates and served on its legislative council. In addition, he engaged in many civic and charitable activities and was elected vice president, then president of the Federal Bar Association.

When DICK LANKFORD took his seat in the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress he immediately distinguished himself as a hard-working Congressman, a man you can rely on to consider all points of view and vote according to his conscience.

As a member of the very important Armed Services Committee, DICK has been in the forefront in our constant fight to maintain a strong national defense and has always considered the best interests of our men in uniform in the service of their country. Through his activities on the Government Operations Committee he has been instrumental in the enactment of legislation which has saved our Government millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and privilege for me to serve with DICK LANKFORD in this body for the past 10 years. I think he has been an outstanding Congressman and I have benefited by his cooperation and counsel in matters affecting our State. Maryland is truly proud of this man who has an enviable record as Navy veteran, farmer, distinguished lawyer, civic leader, and legislator.

The House of Representatives will not seem the same without DICK LANKFORD but we wish him good health, happiness, success, and prosperity in the future.

Mr. MATHIAS. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress I was the only Republican in the Maryland delegation. But the center aisle was not too wide for DICK LANKFORD to extend the hand of welcome and the hand of friendship. I shall always remember and appreciate

his many acts of kindness to me in my first days here.

DICK LANKFORD helped to initiate me in some of the parliamentary procedures of the House of Representatives. He helped to explain some of the rules of the House. Without this type of personal guidance, a new Member here has a difficult time.

We may have differed on many issues during the period that we have served here together. But I believe that DICK LANKFORD and I have shared together a profound concern and interest for the welfare of the United States and of the State of Maryland.

There have been many occasions when I have had problems in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland which have concerned matters involving the armed services. Because of DICK LANKFORD's membership on the Committee on Armed Services I have appealed to him for guidance and help, and without exception, he always lent himself generously to any job which involved the welfare of our people in the State of Maryland.

DICK LANKFORD's interest in industry in the State of Maryland has been outstanding. He has made a contribution to the improvement of the conditions of employment and the business climate which will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, all of us thank DICK LANKFORD for his days in the House of Representatives. We thank his family for sharing him with us. Our best wishes go with him. God bless him.

Mr. SICKLES. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] be given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we shall regret the absence of RICHARD E. LANKFORD upon his retirement from Congress at the close of this session. As a fellow member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been privileged to observe his keen analysis of our Nation's defense programs. As a fellow Marylander, and Democrat, I have admired his tireless campaigning for our party. As a Congressman, I have been impressed by the testimony of his own constituents, who elected him to the House of Representatives by overwhelming majorities. We shall miss the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] in this Chamber, and we wish him well in his future pursuits.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to Congressman LANKFORD for the cooperation he has given me and the rest of the Maryland delegation on projects and programs in which we have had a common interest and a common purpose.

He has always been willing to do his share of any assignment and it has been a pleasure for me to work with him.

I wish him the best of success in whatever undertaking he plans for the future. I am sure he will continue to work for the benefit of our State of Maryland and the Nation.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to add my voice to the other voices that we have heard from the delegation of the State of Maryland in recognition of the great service which DICK LANKFORD has rendered to the State of Maryland and to this Nation. I refer particularly to the services which have been rendered to the Fifth Congressional District by the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD, our Congressman.

RICHARD E. LANKFORD was first elected to represent the Fifth District in Congress in 1954 after serving a 6-year apprenticeship in the Maryland Legislature. He was reelected in 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1962.

The Fifth Congressional District is the largest in Maryland and the fifth largest in the country with a total population of 711,045. The national average is 410,481 persons per district; the average for the State of Maryland is 442,956 persons per congressional district.

The Fifth District includes the counties of Prince Georges, Anne Arundel, St. Marys, Charles, Howard, and Calvert, and precincts 12 to 19 in the 25th ward in Baltimore city.

Congressman LANKFORD has lived in the district all of his adult life, and was actively engaged in many of its numerous business and civic activities before going to Congress. He has been a lawyer, a small businessman, a tobacco farmer, and for a brief period prior to his active duty with the Navy in World War II, he was a Federal employee.

Congressman LANKFORD is now serving his fifth term—10 years—as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. He ranks 10th in seniority on this 37-man committee. As a result of his seniority he was selected this year to serve on the special investigations subcommittee which was created by a House resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation of all matters pertaining to the national defense and security. He ranks second on this subcommittee behind Chairman PORTER HARDY, of Virginia.

In 1962 Congressman LANKFORD was selected to fill the vacancy on the House Government Operations Committee created by the resignation of Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, upon the occasion of Congressman MCCORMACK's election to Speaker of the House. At the beginning of the 88th Congress he was elected to a full 2-year term on the committee and assigned to two of its most important subcommittees, Military Operations and Legal and Monetary Affairs.

Because of its jurisdiction over Government activities at all levels, the Government Operations Committee is commonly referred to as the House's "watchdog" committee. It maintains a continuing study of the operations of the Federal Government, both at home and abroad, with a view to maintaining maximum economy and efficiency.

Congressman LANKFORD's committee assignments give Maryland's Fifth District representation on two of the most important committees of the House, particularly in view of the heavy concentration of defense and other Government activities in the area.

Congressman LANKFORD has introduced and worked for passage of legislation raising the pay and improving the working conditions of Government employees.

He has sponsored passage of legislation helping the farmers, the watermen, the veterans, the small businessmen, and has worked steadily to improve the living conditions of the working men and women. He has also consistently and vigorously supported measures strengthening our public schools. He led the fight which defeated efforts to reduce and eliminate Federal aid to schools crowded beyond normal with children of Government employees and military personnel. Maryland schools receive over $10 million a year under this program. Should it be eliminated it would be necessary to raise taxes to meet school needs.

From his strategic position on the Armed Services Committee, Congressman LANKFORD triggered an investigation into Navy's failure to utilize fully Indian Head Naval Propellant Plant; and continued the fight until layoffs were halted and rehiring begun, saving important payroll for southern Maryland. He also conducted a successful fight to get 1,100-acre Greenbelt tract developed into recreational park to be enjoyed by district residents and millions of annual visitors to the Nation's Capital.

Congressman LANKFORD was born July 22, 1914. He attended Maryland grade school and in 1937 took a B.S. in political science from the University of Virginia. In 1940 he took his law degree from the University of Maryland. He practiced law and engaged in active management of tobacco and cattle farms from 1940 until 1942 when he was commissioned an ensign in the U.S. Navy and went on active duty, serving 2½ years overseas. Released from duty in 1948 with the rank of lieutenant, Congressman LANKFORD resumed his law practice and tobacco farm management.

A former vestryman of St. Anne's Protestant Episcopal Church of Annapolis, Congressman LANKFORD has been active in civic affairs. He is a former member of the advisory board, Anne Arundel General Hospital; advisory board, Salvation Army, chairman of the 1950 and 1953 Anne Arundel County Community Chest campaigns, chairman of the 1947 Annapolis Red Cross drive and member of the executive council of the Anne Arundel County area Boy Scouts of America

Mr. Speaker, I speak with a personal note in my voice with respect to DICK because I first met the gentleman from Maryland [Mr LANKFORD] back in 1954 when he and Mary Elizabeth became our very close friends at a time when we were both campaigning for public office. At that time I was campaigning for the State legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, DICK LANKFORD has been my Congressman for 10 years. As a matter of fact, he is still my Congressman, because I live in his district.

Mr. Speaker, oftentimes remarks such as these sound more like sort of a requiem, but let me say that nothing could be further from the truth. I saw Congressman LANKFORD just a few minutes ago and he is just as bright-eyed and bushy-tailed now as he has ever been. I hope we may continue to have the service of DICK LANKFORD to our community that we have had for the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know that DICK has been active, even before he came to Congress, in many of the civic, church, and other activities of our area. He has made a great impact on southern Maryland. He has been one of those who has helped to improve the image of the "politician" in our community.

Time limits me in saying all the nice things I would like to say about DICK LANKFORD. The nicest thing I can say about him is that he has personified a model legislator: hardworking, and conscientious. He has been right on the issues. I have watched him very closely.

I say Godspeed to DICK LANKFORD, his wife, Mary Elizabeth; his son, Richard; and daughter, Sallie; and also say thank God for the DICK LANKFORDS of yesterday, today, and those who are to come tomorrow for their great contribution to the American dream.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the members of the Maryland delegation in this tribute to our distinguished colleague, DICK LANKFORD of Maryland, and to express my own feeling of personal loss at his leaving us. He has been an able and dedicated Member of this body and we are understandably reluctant to be deprived of his skills and his presence. I wish him and Mrs. Lankford Godspeed in their new undertakings. It has been a privilege, indeed, to have served with DICK LANKFORD and to have been able to number him among my friends.

THE 144TH LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not enthused for 1 minute about being here today for I think Congress should have adjourned long ago. But I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that, according to the House Calendar, this is the 144th legislative day of this session.

A dozen multiplied by 12 is 144, and 144 equals 1 gross.

If there is not a quorum call, I want to designate my presence on the House floor on this occasion.

TO AMEND TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REVISE THE PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

The chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TEAGUE of Texas, DORN, HALEY, BARING, EVERETT, AYRES, ADAIR, and SAYLOR.

TO AMEND TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REVISE THE PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Senate, in passing H.R. 1927, liberalizing the pension benefits of veterans and the families of deceased veterans, are to be complimented for their action. The changes advocated in H.R. 1927 were the result of an exhausting study of pension legislation by the Veterans' Administration under Administrator Jack Gleason, and the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE. As a result of this study, several changes were proposed in order to prevent certain injustices noted and also others to perfect a realistic standard of solution of the problems confronting the recipients. To the credit of the national commanders of the servicemen's organizations, certain compromises were accepted—resulting in the unanimous House vote of 388 to 0.

The Finance Committee of the Senate—Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, after hearings, reported the measure with technical modifications and an amendment reopening the national service life insurance for 1 year.

Although I was in favor of this amendment, and having participated in the debate on the floor of the House during its consideration for passage in the 87th Congress—I feared that being a highly controversial subject, and because time is of the essence, that H.R. 1927 would be placed in jeopardy for passage in the House as amended; that in case of disagreement, and the appointment of a conference committee—the Senate conferees refusing to recede, or the House conferees to concur, that the 2½ years of work represented by the provisions incorporated in the House bill would be lost.

H.R. 1927 is a meritorious bill that provides beneficial changes in favor of the veteran and his family—widows and orphans. It is our responsibility to grant such benefits where the need is the greatest. This facet of the legislation is the prime consideration met by the provisions of H.R. 1927—and I am doubly proud to vote for its enactment because of the action of our distinguished Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE and the members of the committee who greatly honored my feeble efforts in behalf of the veteran over the years selecting my bill, H.R. 1927, for passage—calling it the Libonati bill.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE PASCUA YAQUI ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6233) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc., with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall make such Yaqui Indians eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be applicable to the Yaqui Indians."

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

Mr. HALEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona tell us exactly what this Senate amendment does? We recognize that this language does not cost the Government anything and does not give this group of Indians any right they do not have.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has stated the language correctly. The House bill had a similar amendment in it. This merely clarifies the language.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the consideration of District of Columbia bills. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF CERTAIN JUDGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5871) to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 11–776), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. (a)(1) Any judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, any judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (as established by this Act), or any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia who is subject to this subsection shall hereafter be eligible to retire after having served as a judge of such court or courts for a period or periods aggregating ten years or more, whether continuously or not. Any judge who so retires shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge: *Provided*, That if any such judge shall retire after twenty or more years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement salary shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of fifty: *Provided further, however*, That if any such judge shall retire after less than twenty years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement salary shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of sixty-two, except that such judge may elect to receive a reduced retirement salary beginning at the age of fifty-five or at the date of his retirement if subsequent to that age, the reduction in retirement salary in such case to be one-half of 1 per centum for each month or fraction of a month the judge is under the age of sixty-two at the time of commencement of his reduced retirement salary. In no event shall the sum received by any judge as retirement salary under this subsection be in excess of 80 per centum of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in either the Police Court of the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous. The terms 'retire' and 'retirement' as used in this section shall mean retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent.

"(2) Any judge subject to this subsection may hereafter retire after having served five years or more and having become permanently disabled from performing his duties. Such judge may retire for disability by furnishing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. A judge who retires for disability under this subsection shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge, except that in no event shall the sum received by any judge as retirement salary hereunder be in excess of 80 per centum of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement for disability.

"(3) Any judge receiving retirement salary under the provisions of this subsection or under the provisions of this section as it existed immediately prior to its amendment by the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 may be called upon by the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, or the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the chief judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in any of such courts, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for a total of more than ninety days in any calendar year after such retirement. Any judge called upon pursuant to this subsection to perform judicial duties who, for any reason except illness or disability, fails to perform such duties so requested shall forfeit all right to retired pay under this section for the one-year period which begins on the first day on which he so fails to perform such duties. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

"(4) From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary of each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection an amount equal to 3½ per centum of such judge's basic salary. The amounts so deducted and withheld shall, in accordance with such procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be deposited in the District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund established pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of this section. Each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular service during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this subsection, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.

"(5) Each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, in the fund, a sum equal to 3½ per centum of his salary received for judicial service performed by him as a judge of any court referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) prior to the date he became subject to the provisions of this subsection. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the failure of any such judge to make such deposits, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered but the retirement pay of such judge shall be reduced by 10 per centum of such deposit remaining unpaid, unless such judge shall elect to eliminate the service involved for purposes of retirement salary computation.

"(6) If any judge who is subject to the provisions of this subsection resigns from his judicial office otherwise than under the provisions of this subsection, all amounts deducted from his salary under paragraph (4) and deposited by him under paragraph (5), together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him. In any case in which any such judge, who has not elected to bring himself within the purview of subsection (b) of this section, dies while in regular active service, all amounts so deducted from his salary and deposited by him under this subsection remaining in the fund at the time of his death, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his death, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving him in the order of precedence provided for in paragraph (7) of subsection (b). Such payments shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(7) All judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection, except that any such judge who is serving as such on the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 shall be subject to this subsection (except paragraph (3) of this subsection) only if, within one year following such date, such judge files with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a written election to come within the purview of this subsection. Such election once made shall be irrevocable. If no election is made within such one-year period, such judge shall have his right to retirement salary and the amount thereof determined as though the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 had not been enacted.

"(b)(1) Any judge of any of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), whether or not subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, or any judge retired under the provisions of this section as it existed prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, may, by written election filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within six months after the date on which he takes office, or is reappointed to office (or within six months after the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964), bring himself within the purview of this subsection.

"(2) There shall be deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this subsection a sum equal to 3 per centum of such judge's salary, including salary paid after retirement under the provisions of this section. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the salary of each such judge shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be deposited in the fund. Every judge who elects to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be deemed thereby to consent and agree to the deductions from his salary as provided in this subsection, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and

demands whatsoever for all judicial services rendered by such judge during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he or his survivors shall be entitled under the provisions of this subsection.

"(3) Each judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to 3 per centum of his salary received for service as a judge of any of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), including salary received after retirement, and of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for services as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress and for any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253). Such interest shall not be required for any period during which the judge was separated from all such service and was not receiving retirement salary under this section. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioners. Notwithstanding the failure of a judge to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of the widow of such judge shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount of such deposit, computed as of the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under paragraph (13) of this subsection: *Provided,* That no deposit shall be required from a judge for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for any honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(4) If any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection resigns from office otherwise than under the provisions of this section, the amount credited to his individual account under this subsection, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him.

"(5) In case any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die while in regular active service or after having retired from such service under the provisions of this section, after having rendered at least five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (13) of this subsection for the last five years of which the salary deductions provided for by paragraph (2) of this subsection or the deposits required by paragraph (3) of this subsection have actually been made—

"(A) If such judge is survived by a widow but not by a dependent child, there shall be paid to such widow an annuity beginning with the day of the death of the judge or following the widow's attainment of the age of fifty years, whichever is later, in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (12) of this subsection; or

"(B) if such judge is survived by a widow and a dependent child or children, there shall be paid to such widow an immediate annuity in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (12) of this subsection and there shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of the annuity of such widow, but not to exceed $900 per year divided by the number of such children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser; or

"(C) if such judge leaves no surviving widow or widower but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to the amount of the annuity to which such widow would have been entitled under paragraph (A) of this subsection had she survived, but not to exceed $480 per year.

The annuity payable to a widow under this subsection shall be terminable upon her death or remarriage. The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (i) his attaining the age of eighteen years, (ii) his marriage, or (iii) his death, whichever first occurs except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability after attaining the age of eighteen years. In case of the death of a widow of a judge leaving a dependent child or children of the judge surviving her the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph. In any case in which the annuity of a dependent child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any remaining dependent child or children, based upon the service of the same judge, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such judge.

"(6) As used in this subsection—

"(A) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual who either (i) shall have been married to such individual for at least two years immediately preceding his death or (ii) is the mother of issue by such marriage, and who has not remarried.

"(B) The term 'dependent child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, who is under the age of eighteen years or who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

Questions of dependency and disability arising under this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as they shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any dependent child who is an annuitant or applicant for annuity under this subsection, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any examination.

"(7) In any case in which (A) a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die (i) while in regular active service after having rendered five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (13) of this subsection, or while receiving retirement salary under this section, but without a survivor or survivors entitled or who, upon attaining the age of fifty, will become entitled, to annuity benefits provided by paragraph (5) of this subsection, or (ii) while in regular active service but before having rendered five years of such civilian service or (B) the right of all persons entitled to an annuity under paragraph (5) of this subsection based on the service of such judge shall terminate before a valid claim therefor shall have been established, the total amount credited to an individual account of such judge under this section, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date title to the payment arises, in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries whom the judge may have designated by a writing received by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia prior to his death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow of such judge;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such judge and the descendants of any deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such judge or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such judge;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to such other next of kin of such judge as may be determined by the Commissioners to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such judge at the time of his death.

Determination as to the widow or child of a judge for the purposes of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioners without regard to the definition of these terms stated in paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(8) In any case in which the annuities of all persons entitled to annuity based upon the service of a judge shall terminate before the aggregate amount of annuity paid (together with any amounts received by the judge as retirement salary) equals the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge under this section, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, the difference shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in paragraph (7) of this subsection.

"(9) Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the termination (other than by reason of death) of the annuity of any person based upon the service of a judge shall be paid to such person. Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the death of any person receiving an annuity upon the service of a judge shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such person;

"Second, if there is no such executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of the death of such person, to such individual or individuals as may appear in the judgment of the Commissioners to be legally entitled thereto, and such payments shall be a bar to recovery by any other individual.

"(10) Where any payment under this subsection is to be made to a minor or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides, the Commissioners shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(11) Annuities granted under the terms of this subsection shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued.

"(12) The annuity of the widow of a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be an amount equal to the sum of (A) 1¼ per centum of the average annual salary received by such judge for judicial service and any other prior allowable service during the last five years of such service prior to his death, or retirement from office under this section,

multiplied by the sum of his years of judicial service, his years of prior allowable service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of prior allowable service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his years, not exceeding fifteen, of prior allowable service performed as an employee described in section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act and (B) three-fourths of 1 per centum of such average annual salary multiplied by his years of any other prior allowable service, but such annuity shall not exceed 37½ per centum of such average annual salary and shall be further reduced in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection, if applicable.

"(13) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3) of this subsection, the years of service of a judge which are allowable as the basis for calculating the amount of the annuity of his widow shall include his years of service as a judge of one of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under this section), his years of service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States not exceeding five years in the aggregate and not including any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, and his years of any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

"(14) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a widow eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity under this subsection and any annuity to which she would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this subsection, but in computing such other annuity, service used in the computation of her annuity under this subsection shall not be credited.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving his retirement salary under this section and any annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section, but in computing such annuity, service used in the computation of retirement salary under this section shall not be credited: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge of any court referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) who is serving on the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, and who does not elect under paragraph (7) of subsection (a) to come within the purview of such subsection, from electing to waive the provisions of this section regarding retirement salary and crediting service hereunder in computing an annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section; nor shall anything contained in this section (except paragraph (7) of subsection (a) of this section) or in any other law be construed to require any such judge eligible therefor to elect to waive either the provisions of this section regarding retirement salary and annuities or the provisions of any other law relating to retirement salary or annuities prior to the date of his retirement.

"(d)(1) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the 'District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund', and such fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of retirement salaries, annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this section. If, at any time, the balance in such fund is not sufficient to pay current obligations arising pursuant to the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to such fund, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to pay such current obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare the estimates of the annual appropriations required to be made to such fund, and shall make actuarial valuations of such fund at intervals of five years, or more after if deemed necessary by the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest, from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States or Federal farm loan bonds, any portions of such fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for payments from the fund, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of the fund.

"(3) All amounts deposited by, or deducted and withheld from the salary of, any judge as provided under this section for credit to the fund shall, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be credited to an individual account of such judge.

"(4) None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or in equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(5) Whenever used in this section, the term 'fund' shall mean the District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund established under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 2. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective on and after the first day of the first month following the date of its enactment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend existing law—56 Stat. 197—to provide a more equitable and realistic retirement law for the judges of the several courts for the District of Columbia.

The bill, as amended by the other body, is an improved bill, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendment.

In brief, the changes made by the Senate are as follows:

First. The bill as passed by the House provided that if judges elect to come within the survivor benefits provisions they will be required to pay into a retirement fund 3 percent of their salaries, including salaries paid after retirement from regular active service.

The Senate amended the House bill to provide for a deduction of an additional 3½ percent for judges electing to come under the retirement provision of this bill. Hence, under the House bill as amended by the Senate, the total of 6½ percent—rather than 3 percent—would be deducted from the salary of judges electing to come under the provisions of the bill.

Second. The bill as passed by the House provided, under the method included for computing retirement salary, the payment of not more than 100 percent of salary.

The Senate amended this section to permit payment of not more than 80 percent of their salary.

Third. The bill as amended by the Senate further provides that judges now serving on the bench may elect, within a period of 1 year from the enactment, to come under the provisions of the bill. If no election is made by a judge, he remains under the existing retirement system.

Judges appointed to the bench subsequent to the enactment of this legislation will not have such an election but will receive only the retirement benefits set forth in this bill.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as well as the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

EXISTING LAW

Under existing law there are two retirement programs available to judges of the several courts of the District of Columbia. A judge is automatically subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act upon appointment unless and until such time as he may exclude himself from coverage under such act by electing to be covered under the noncontributory judicial retirement provisions established by the act of April 1, 1942.—District of Columbia Code, 11–776. This special noncontributory program provides retirement benefits regardless of age only after at least 20 years' service as a judge in the courts of the District of Columbia. Under the retirement program, provided for by the act of April 1, 1942, there are no provisions to enable a judge to retire for disability, or to provide survivorship benefits for his widow and children.

H.R. 5871 corrects the inadequacy of existing law as follows:

The bill requires judges to be age 50 before becoming eligible to retire after 20 years of service with salary and reduces the minimum service required on the bench for retirement with salary from 20 to 10 years. The bill retains the present method of computing retirement salary; i.e., one-thirtieth of a judge's salary at the time of retirement for each year served on the bench, but not to exceed 80 percent of salary. In the case of 10-year retirement, a judge must be 62 years of age to receive full accrued retirement benefits. However, a 10-year retiree may elect to receive a retirement annuity commencing at age 55 but such annuity would be subject to being reduced by an amount computed at the rate of one-half of 1 percent for each month or fraction of a month the judge is under age 62.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT BASIC RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL JUDGES WITH THOSE PROPOSED UNDER H.R. 5871, AS AMENDED

PRESENT LAW	H.R. 5871
Permissive retirement after 20 or more years service. No minimum age.	Ten or more years service but less than 20, must be 62 years of age, or elect reduced annuity at age 55. Twenty or more years of service, must be age 50.
Pension: Proportioned on basis of aggregate years of service to 30 years computed on salary at time of retirement, or 3⅓ percent of salary per year.	Same, except no judge can receive sum in excess of 80 percent of the salary of such judge at time of retirement.
Contribution to pension: None.	Three and one-half percent of salary.
Disability retirement: None.	After 5 years of service if a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician is furnished the Attorney General and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.
Survivor benefits: None.	For widows, not to exceed 37½ percent of average salary as determined by service formula. For dependent child, one-half of widow's annuity not exceeding $900 per year divided by the number of children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser.
Contributions for survivor benefits: None.	Three percent of salary in fund subject to control of Secretary of Treasury. Should fund be inadequate, District of Columbia required to provide necessary funds to meet obligations.

(NOTE.—Incumbent judges may elect to remain under existing law or convert to H.R. 5871, as amended, if enacted. Such election is irrevocable.)

REQUIRING PREMARITAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all applications for marriage licenses shall be open to inspection as public records. All such applications upon which licenses have not yet been issued shall be kept together in a separate file readily accessible to public examination.

SEC. 2. No application for marriage license shall be accepted unless there shall be filed therewith a statement or statements, signed by a person in the District of Columbia certified by the Department of Public Health as duly qualified to administer and interpret such test, or by a physician licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia or in a State or territory of the United States, or by a commissioned medical officer in the Army, Navy, or Public Health Service of the United States, that the applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within thirty days prior to the filing of such application, and that, in the opinion of such physician, or medical officer, or certified person based upon the result of that test, the applicant is not infected with syphilis in a stage of that disease in which it can be transmitted to another person, but such statement shall not disclose the technical data upon which it is based. Any such statement shall include the name of the person or laboratory administering the test, the name of the test administered, the exact name of the applicant, and the date of the test.

SEC. 3. No marriage license shall be issued until the fifth day following the filing of the application.

SEC. 4. For good cause a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power to waive the provisions of either or both of the foregoing two sections and, upon his certificate that public policy or the physical condition of either of the parties requires the intended marriage to be celebrated without delay, a license may be issued without compliance with the provisions of the section so waived.

SEC. 5. Any applicant for marriage license, physician, or representative of a laboratory who shall misrepresent his identity or any of the facts called for by the certificate form prescribed by this article; or any licensing officer who shall issue a marriage license without having received the certificate form or an order from the court, or who shall have reason to believe that any of the facts on the certificate form have been misrepresented, and shall nevertheless issue a marriage license; or any person who shall otherwise fail to comply with the provisions of this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and punishable accordingly.

SEC. 6. This Act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those States which enact it.

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the Uniform Marriage License Application Act.

SEC. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts which are inconsistent with provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Army, Navy" and insert in lieu thereof "military service".

Page 2, line 18, strike out "the fifth day" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four hours".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to require laboratory tests of persons who are contemplating marriage, with a view to ascertaining whether they are affected with syphilis in a communicable stage. The bill provides that no license would be issued without certification by a physician or authorized designated person that the parties contemplating marriage are not infected with such disease, or if infected, that such disease is not in such stage to be transmitted to another person.

The bill is based upon the Uniform Marriage Application Act proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law in 1950. Forty-five States now require by statute some form of premarital examination or routine serological testing for syphilis as a condition precedent to the issuance of a marriage license. Nearby Virginia has such a requirement although Maryland does not.

Your committee has been disturbed by reports made of the high percentage of infectious syphilis cases reported in the District of Columbia.

From 1956 to 1963, the number of reported cases of infectious syphilis in the District of Columbia increased from 36 to 711. This was an increase from 4.3 cases per hundred thousand population to 92.3 cases. In 1963, among cities of 200,000 population or over, Washington, D.C., was second only to Newark, N.J., and there were only four other cities with a rate of over 50 cases per 100,000 population. During the period from 1956 to 1963, the national rate also increased, but not nearly so dramatically from 4.1 cases per hundred thousand population to 11.9 cases.

While some of the indicated increase in the District of Columbia may be the result of better case findings and better reporting, the indications are that the major part of the increase is an actual increase. This is confirmed by reports from 63 cities throughout the country, 28 of which have attributed the major part of their own increase to an actual increase in cases.

How many cases exist which are not reported is not estimated, but the above figures are so impressive as to confirm the necessity of the enactment of legislation such as proposed in this bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners in the past have favored such legislation and it is certainly the hope of those concerned therewith that these tests will materially contribute to education of the public and to the avoidance and treatment of this disease, thereby curtailing its spread as well as materially contributing to the prevention of congenital syphilis in the District of Columbia.

The Department of Public Health in the District of Columbia estimates that

the enactment of the bill would require between 19,000 and 20,000 serologic tests each year, approximately 75 percent of which would be performed by this Department, the other 25 percent estimated to be handled by private or hospital laboratories.

The extra services and supplies required by the Department of Public Health is estimated to cost less than $10,000 per year, a very small price to pay for attempting to remove this disgrace from the Nation's Capital.

CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES FUND FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1082) to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the Treasury a revolving fund for the government of the District of Columbia to be known as the correctional industries fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") to replace the working capital fund created by Public Law 493, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514), as amended.

SEC. 2. The fund shall be available without fiscal-year limitation and shall be used for the performance of such services and the production of such commodities as, in the judgment of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as "Commissioners"), will contribute to the rehabilitation, knowledge, and skill in trades and occupations of inmates of the institutions in the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia, thereby equipping them with a means of livelihood upon release. The accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual basis, including provision for employees' accrued annual leave and depreciation of fixed assets, and financial reports shall be prepared on the basis of such accounting.

SEC. 3. Products and services produced by utilization of the fund may be purchased, at fair market prices as determined by the Commissioners, by any department or agency of the District of Columbia government, the Federal Government, any State or subdivision of a State or any Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States. Receipts from the sales of products and services shall be deposited to the credit of the fund. The fund shall be used for all necessary expenses directly related to the fund, including personal services; payments to inmates, or payments to their dependents, of such pecuniary earnings as the Commissioners deem proper; purchase, repair, and maintenance of equipment; purchase of raw materials and supplies; payment of dues and expenses of attendance at meetings and conventions, as approved by the Commissioners; maintenance and repair of buildings used for fund purposes; alteration of existing facilities used for fund purposes where the total project cost does not exceed $10,000; and, within the limits of amounts provided in annual appropriation Acts, acquisition and improvement of real property.

SEC. 4. Not later than six months after the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Commissioners a report of the financial condition of the fund and the results of operations for such fiscal year. The Commissioners shall review such report and determine the disposition to be made of realized profits. The Commissioners are empowered to authorize retention of accumulated profits for the purpose of acquiring or improving personal property, or to increase working capital to planned operating levels. In no case, however, shall such profits retained for these purposes increase the net worth of the fund beyond $2,500,000. The Commissioners are also empowered to authorize retention of accumulated profits for payments to inmates, other than those employed in industrial operations, or for payments to their dependents, of such amounts as the Commissioners deem proper. Accumulated profits not retained or used for the aforementioned purposes, or which exceed the limitation imposed, shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. All assets except buildings and all liabilities or other obligations which at the time of enactment of this Act are components of the working capital fund, Workhouse and Reformatory, as created by Public Law 493, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514, ch. 544, sec. 1), shall be transferred to the fund created by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 6. The paragraph beginning with the caption "WORKING CAPITAL FUND" under the heading "ADULT CORRECTIONAL SERVICE" in the first section of the Act approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514, ch. 544), creating the working capital fund for the industrial enterprises at the Workhouse and Reformatory, and the proviso in the paragraph following the caption "OPERATING EXPENSES" under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS" in the first section of the Act approved July 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 380), authorizing the retention of not to exceed $50,000 of accumulated profits in the working capital fund as additional working capital, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be performed by the Commissioners or may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 8. This Act shall take effect July 1, 1963.

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.

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to establish a revolving fund for the District of Columbia government, to be known as the correctional industries fund, with a maximum net worth limitation of $2,500,000. This correctional industries fund is to replace the present working capital fund of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, and is to be used for the performance and production of such services as will contribute to the rehabilitation, skill in trades, and occupations of inmates of the institutions in the District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

In addition to establishing a correctional industries fund, the bill also provides—

First. Transfer of all assets (except buildings) and all liabilities or other obligations from the working capital fund to the correctional industries fund;

Second. Authorization for the sale to the States and possessions of the United States at fair market values of all services and products financed by the correctional industries fund;

Third. Authorization for the use of receipts from the sale of products and services for all necessary expenses directly related to the fund, including personal services, payments to inmates, purchase and repair of equipment, purchase of raw materials and supplies, maintenance and repairs of buildings, and alteration of facilities where cost does not exceed $10,000; and

Fourth. Accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual basis, and financial reports shall be prepared and submitted to the Commissioners.

HISTORY OF THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Commencing in 1915, the Congress included provisions in appropriation legislation relating to the sale of products of the correctional institutions of the District of Columbia. Similar legislation enacted in 1928 provided for working capital for industrial enterprise at the District of Columbia Workhouse and the Reformatory, and designated the Commissioners to transfer to a fund, to be known as the working capital fund, such amounts that may be appropriated but not to exceed $25,000. In 1929, similar legislation increased that amount to $50,000. Pursuant to this authorizing authority, varying amounts ranging from $25,000 to $50,000 were appropriated for each of the fiscal years from 1929 through 1946. Since the 1928 legislation did not include a provision for any profits from the operation of the working capital fund to be returned to the District of Columbia general fund, the appropriations and profits were used to build up the amount of the working capital fund that was reflected in raw materials, supplies, equipment, and finished goods inventories. Thus, over the years, the appropriations and profits were capitalized until the net worth of the fund now amounts to approximately $900,000.

In 1946, the Congress enacted appropriation legislation (60 Stat. 514) establishing a $50,000 working capital fund to be used as a permanent revolving fund. Provision was also made in the 1946 legislation for the Commissioners to transfer all accumulated profits arising from the year's operations under the fund to the general revenue of the District of Columbia for each fiscal year. The Congress followed with similar legislation in 1952 that authorized the reten-

tion of $50,000 of accumulated profits from operations under the working capital fund as additional working capital, thereby increasing the authorized working cash to $100,000.

The following statement of annual profits returned to the District of Columbia general fund by the operation of the working capital fund was submitted to your committee by the District of Columbia Department of Corrections:

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIES DIVISION

Schedule of returnable profits

Fiscal year:	*Returnable profits (adjusted)*
1956	$64,265.96
1957	67,966.37
1958	(7,038.96)
1959	91,799.00
1960	64,705.25
1961	123,303.11
1962	118,223.20
1963	128,534.51
1964	116,323.89

Your committee is informed further that in the District of Columbia Workhouse and Reformatory at Lorton, Va., there are presently some 1,400 inmates and they are offered instruction, by reason of the working capital fund, in machine shop practices, funiture refinishing, tailoring, laundry services, patternmaking, foundry work, broom making, and mattress manufacture and renovation. Also, their shops make automobile license plates for the District of Columbia

REASONS FOR THE BILL

The basis for the legislation proposed in S. 1082 stems from certain weaknesses that the General Accounting Office found to exist in the financial and management controls of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia. An examination and review of the Department of Corrections management controls by the General Accounting Office was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67). After the General Accounting Office completed its management review, a report was made to the Congress by the Comptroller General which was entitled "Review of Management Controls of the Department of Corrections, District of Columbia Government, October 1958."

The report of the Comptroller General, in addition to presenting a careful analysis of the corrections institutions' management controls, also pointed out certain management deficiencies on the part of the Department of Corrections that included, first, an improper retention of working capital funds and, second, utilization of an inadequate accounting system to control costs and work programs.

The enactment of the pending bill will serve as remedial legislation for these deficiencies. The first of the two deficiencies will be corrected by a provision of the bill providing authority for the establishment, within the Department of Corrections, of a correctional industries fund with a net worth limitation of $2,500,000.

Actually, your committee is informed that the accounting practice which was criticized by the General Accounting Office as resulting in improper retention of working capital funds, as mentioned in item (1) above, has been corrected. The District of Columbia Accounting Manual was changed in this respect, and the practice was discontinued several years ago.

The principal advantage of this bill is to provide a true permanent revolving fund, with a specific limitation upon its total accumulated assets of $2,500,000, for the operation of the industries of the District of Columbia's correctional institutions. This will provide the Department of Corrections' Superintendent of Industries with a knowledge of the limitation within which he may plan future operations, to a degree which is not possible at present because these limitations are not definitely established under present law.

Another new advantage which will result from the enactment of this bill is that it will authorize the sale of the Department's products and services to all the States and possessions of the United States. At present, they may be sold only to agencies of the Federal or District of Columbia Governments.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 2 on September 15, 1964, approval of this proposed legislation was expressed on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, the District of Columbia Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. No opposition to the bill was expressed.

FURTHER NECESSITY FOR THE LEGISLATION

The working capital fund for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections was originally established by legislative provisions in an appropriation act many years ago. Subsequent amendments relating to this fund were likewise included in appropriation acts. The result has been the creation of a fund which has the character of a revolving fund and which has been operated on a continuing basis without the benefit of the usual procedures for legislative authorization.

Since this capital fund permitted the reuse of moneys appropriated and the use of income derived from the use of appropriated funds, income was received and public moneys were spent without being subject to regular review by any committee of the Congress.

This fund has grown from the original appropriation of $25,000, and from a later increase of $50,000, to a gross value of approximately $1 million in cash and other assets. The operation of the fund was not routinely reported to the Committee on Appropriations, nor was there any presentation of information regarding the use of these public funds to the Appropriations Committee for review.

While the Committee on the District of Columbia recognizes the possible desirability of a continuing fund of this nature, the committee believes that without provisions for periodic reports or review, the establishment of such continuing revolving funds is a questionable procedure.

The pending bill gives to the working capital fund for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections the usual legislative authorization for the existence and continued operation of the fund but requires that reports be filed on an annual basis concerning the use of public funds involved.

This particular fund and use of public moneys may be distinguished from the more than 100 other separate legislative items, in appropriation acts for the District of Columbia. Once this fund was established there was no necessity for annual provision of funds by the Appropriations Committee, which is not the case with the more than 100 other items.

It is the purpose of the Committee on the District of Columbia to require that the Commissioners for the District of Columbia have legislative authority for all annual appropriations. Toward this objective, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, more than 6 months ago, was asked to submit drafts of appropriate legislation covering each of the items for which public funds are required but for which no specific legislative authority has been provided as of this date.

In a sense, the pending bill is a forerunner to this effort of the House District Committee to relieve the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia from the necessity of including legislative provisions in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, annually, for such activities.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, House Subcommittee No. 4 after several months of open hearings added 10 amendments to the bill S. 628. We had discussed with the other body this proposed legislation and we were advised that they would not agree to all the amendments proposed by the House District of Columbia Committee. However, the members of the House subcommittee met in my office and we ironed out what amendments we thought would be agreeable to the other body. However, our agreement of course did not bind all the other 14 members of the committee and the House. I have read several proposed amendments that would be offered on the floor this afternoon and some of them I must agree would strengthen S. 628. In fact, 11 Members of the House that I had talked with all had pending amendments and 2 Members had as high as five amendments each to offer and some of them certainly would have been adopted. Knowing what the other body would accept, I had no alternative other than to propose the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request is

not necessary if the gentleman decides not to call the bill up. Has the gentleman decided not to call the bill up?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. Under present circumstances, I believe since the city already has several urban renewal projects under construction this project can easily wait until January.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman, my chairman, I have no desire to embarrass anybody with reference to this situation. However, this bill, may I say to my colleagues in the House, has been pending in committee for many months now. My distinguished chariman has tried to work in every way that I know to get a bill out here without some kind of fight over it.

Apparently, that cannot be done. From what he has said here this morning, there will be amendments offered and the chairman thinks possibly some of them might be passed. However, since this bill has been pending, and we have had an agreement with the Senate that they would take the bill with certain amendments, and the subcommittee agreed on this we ought to proceed today with the bill and have this matter out, one way or the other.

We have done everything we possibly can to get something that would be agreeable to everybody. Here we are this morning apparently in a situation where there is going to be a fight on it. If this has to be let us get on with it.

I want to say to my distinguished chairman, I think he has done everything he could to get this bill through by some kind of an agreement so that we can get it through the Senate also. It is apparent that cannot be done—so why not let us go ahead—let the chips fall where they may. The District of Columbia is entitled to know where it stands on urban renewal. It cannot proceed without this legislation.

May I say to my colleagues of the House that this bill as it came over from the Senate was not satisfactory to many Members of the House. Personally, I was more in favor of the Senate bill than I was with the House bill. There were many of us on that side of the aisle and on this side of the asile who felt that the Senate bill represented the better position. We modified our position and agreed to accept certain amendments, in order to get the present bill to the floor for a vote.

The other side who were opposed to the Senate bill also made some concessions. I think this bill has been conceed to by those of us who felt the Senate bill represented the best position. I think there have been some concessions made by those people who believed the Senate bill did not represent the best position insofar as urban redevelopment in the District of Columbia is concerned. But it just seems to me today that we ought to proceed with the bill, S. 628, and vote it up or down.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. If I have the floor, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the House District Committee. I think there were provisions in the committee amendments to this bill that were unacceptable to many members of the committee and many Members of the House as well. We have gone a long way in compromising these positions in the interest of avoiding further unconscionable delay. I think we accepted some things that we would not under other circumstances have accepted. But in spite of this we are at a point where apparently there has got to be a fight, and if there needs to be a fight, I think we ought to have it now, even if it takes all night. Progress waits in the wings in Washington pending action of the House on this legislation. If there needs to be a fight, let us have it today and get it over with.

Mr. SISK. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am of course somewhat concerned, after what I believed was a very firm agreement that the bill would be scheduled and would be brought before the House today. As has already been indicated, some of us have worked on this legislation and have worked on the problem for a great many months. In fact, for the past 2 years this matter has been constantly before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I realize that there are differences of opinion as to exactly what the bill should contain, but there has been long and rather arduous work and effort and concessions on both sides. Certainly I am swallowing very hard to accept some of the amendments which were to be offered in the compromise proposal here today, as I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] had reservations about some that were to be stricken out. But this was a firm agreement on the part of our committee.

I believe it will be most unfortunate if the House is denied an opportunity to work its will on this subject, which has now been pending for the past 2 years.

It seems fantastic to me that this method could be used to kill legislation which is so important to the District and upon which I firmly believe this House should have the right to pass. Further, it is hard to believe this in view of the fact that legislation identical to S. 628, as passed by the Senate, passed this House in the 87th Congress by unanimous consent and here we have a situation where we are not even going to be given the opportunity to vote on amendments or even to pass on the basic issues contained in the legislation. The objective sought to be achieved by the initial legislation introduced in both the House and Senate was to place Washington, D.C., on an even par with cities throughout the 50 States. Now, as a result of this action today, we are continuing the discrimination which has so long existed in the area of urban renewal. It seems to me that the reasonable approach for the enemies of urban renewal, and there are some, would be to attack the national legislation when it is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over the department of urban renewal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and of the gentleman from California in urging that this matter be brought before the House.

What we are asking is that the House be given an opportunity to act on a bill which has already been very carefully and very thoroughly considered. It is a bill which essentially would allow the District of Columbia to do no more and no less than any other American city—to use the urban renewal program to redevelop and revitalize its commercial and residential areas.

A good bill to this effect was passed by this House in 1962, and passed without a dissenting vote.

The Senate passed this identical bill in July of 1963.

Earlier this year the House Committee on the District of Columbia reported an emasculated version of this same bill, so badly distorted that it would have had the practical effect of virtually destroying all urban renewal efforts in the District of Columbia.

Fortunately, this bill was reconsidered by the committee.

It has now been reported, although with some remaining defects, in a version which would allow the urban renewal job which needs to be done in our Nation's Capital, to be done.

I am personally very disappointed that the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia has declined to call this bill to the floor today.

It has been approved by the committee with broad support.

It was actually placed on the House Calendar for consideration. Most of all it is urgently needed.

I hope and urge that the chairman of the committee will reconsider his position and that the House will be given an opportunity to act on this bill before adjournment.

Mr. MULTER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the bill, S. 628, will not be called up, and because it will not be called up I suggest that there are many things which the Redevelopment Land Agency and the other agencies in control of housing and slum clearance in the District can do between now and the time the bill will be called up.

I have reread this morning the criticism by the Agency of the report of the District Committee.

At this point I should like to say to the House that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], in referring to an agreement by the committee, meant an agreement by the subcommittee and not the full committee.

As to the criticism of the report by the Agency, I say that instead of arguing with the committee, it should actually develop some plans for low-income housing and middle-income housing in the District, and also some plans for protecting small business in the District of Columbia. If the District agencies devote themselves to that, I believe that when the bill is called up it will have a much easier road, and probably can be enacted. The agencies by their actions can eliminate the necessity for some of the proposed amendments.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, may I supplement my chairman's remarks concerning our colleagues who have expressed an intent and desire to offer amendments to this bill? Seven Members of this House have informed me they have amendments, and those amendments as related to me are material proposals, which would demand considerable discussion and debates and certainly these gentlemen are entitled to be heard and have their proposals considered. They cannot and should not be cut off merely because of an agreement between a handful of other Members. I understand the wish that no controversy should be brought up at this late date about this matter. In addition to being inadvisable, it would serve no purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] referred to the criticism of our committee by the Chairman of the Redevelopment Land Agency, Neville Miller. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, I replied to Mr. Miller's epistle, and ask that my reply with the cover letter be here incorporated in my remarks:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1964.

NEVILLE MILLER, ESQ.,
Chairman, Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This is in response to the letter of August 10, 1964, signed by you as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia, in reference to House Report 1481, which accompanied S. 628, entitled "District of Columbia Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1964," as reported to the House with committee amendments.

It may be observed that the above bill had been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia and had been pending on the House Calendar for nearly 2 months prior to the date of your letter. I am sure that members of the committee and of the House welcome valid criticism and constructive suggestions in connection with pending legislation. The more than 7 weeks period from the date of the committee report to the date of your letter afforded generous time to present any comments concerning the bill.

Your letter was addressed to the chairman of the full committee. The dating of the letter and its transmission to other Members of Congress on the date the bill was scheduled for consideration by the House on August 10, appears to have been purely coincidental. The legislation would have been considered and disposed of on that date except for the fact that the House adjourned out of respect to a distinguished Member from Michigan who died over that weekend.

Agency lobbying, using public facilities and funds, aside from the question of propriety, may take curious forms. Such activity, designed to inform rather than confuse and distort, might be excused. No response to your letter was felt necessary insofar as Members of Congress were concerned since they have access to the information and reports and have the capacity to judge the merit of the statements in your letter. However, it now appears that your letter is being circulated outside the usual legislative circles for the purpose of leading others to believe that it is an accurate and responsive comment on the 28 committee disclosures stated in House Report 1481.

Accordingly, so that others may examine for themselves the statements in your letter, along with the committee report text, the enclosed analysis is directed in reply to you in correspondingly numbered paragraphs.

Briefly, I find that the separate numbered statements in your letter fall into the following classifications: (1) the language of the law and the intent expressed by Congress is conveniently ignored; (2) technicalities are raised and the substance of the committee report statement is avoided; (3) issues unrelated to the committee report statement are disguised as explanations or answers; (4) statements which neither deny or refute or cite inaccuracies in the committee statements, which apply to the majority of your separate comments.

The two unnumbered paragraphs on page 2 of your letter require separate comment. The first paragraph covers low-rent housing and public housing together and states that the report attempts "to prove that the Redevelopment Land Agency would be wrong * * * irrespective of what course of action it had taken." Any casual attention to the law and the clearly expressed intent of Congress regarding low-rent housing sustains the committee report. As to scattered-site public housing, the corporation counsel rendered an opinion finding it contrary to the Redevelopment Act. Had there been a gesture at observing the provisions of the Redevelopment Act, neither of these questions would have arisen.

The second of these two paragraphs relates to the statement in the committee report that no public, low-rent, or middle-income housing has been built in any urban renewal area. Your letter states that the "committee certainly knows" that the pending plans call for such housing. I would observe that the committee "certainly knows" that such is the case and that plans are not officially adopted urban renewal project plans. The committee likewise knows that low-rent housing was included in the first project plans in 1952 for Southwest area B. Finally, the committee knows that despite the appearances, expressions of concern and justification of projects to rehouse low-income families as intended by Congress, nothing has been accomplished after 12 years.

After you have reviewed the enclosed analysis, any further comments will be welcomed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DOWDY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4.

ANALYSIS OF LETTER OF NEVILLE MILLER, CHAIRMAN, REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 10, 1964, RELATING TO HOUSE REPORT NO. 1481, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS, ACCOMPANYING S. 628

Introductory note: The following analysis involves a brief treatment of each of the numbered paragraphs in Mr. Miller's letter. The answers assume a substantial familiarity with the committee report and public hearings before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

PARAGRAPH 1

RLA statement: "There is not any requirement in the definitions of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, that the land be used for housing at a particular price for a particular income group."

Answer: District of Columbia Code section 5–702(f) states as follows: "Low-rent housing means safe and sanitary housing within the financial reach of families of comparatively low income and, as a guide for the standard of rental to be used as a maximum at the time of enactment of this law but not necessarily thereafter, it is specified that such housing shall be rented at not more than $13 per room per month, excluding utilities."

"This Agency (the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency) is especially intended to assemble some property, substandard housing, and vacant land in such manner as to make it available for development of low-rent housing by private enterprise." (S. Rept. 591, p. 2; 79th Cong.)

"These development plans shall not only cover the uses to be made of the land but also the maximum rentals which may be charged to tenants of the housing on the properties." (S. Rept. 591, H. Rept. 2465; 79th Cong.; S. Rept., p. 2; H. Rept., p. 3.)

"In substance it is the purpose of this bill to provide private enterprise in the District of Columbia with an opportunity to meet the need here for low-rent housing. * * *" (H. Rept. 2465, 79th Cong., p. 4.)

"The act provides the necessary Government machinery to assemble and to sell or lease it (land) to private owners for low-rent housing purposes." House Report No. 2465, 79th Congress, page 4.

PARAGRAPH 2

RLA statement: "Paragraph 2 merely states that the Agency, over a 14-year period, has expended $100 million of public funds. I presume the intention is to suggest that the program has been operated imprudently and improperly, although no such charge is made."

Answer: This paragraph of the committee report specifically cites the annual report of the Agency and the amounts shown as having been spent as of the end of June 1963. No inference or statement concerning the successes or shortcomings of the program is included in this paragraph.

PARAGRAPH 3

RLA statement: "I have already commented on the provision of low-rent publicly financed housing adjacent to the southwest urban renewal projects."

Answer: The statement of the committee report is "not one unit of low-rent or public housing has been built in Washington under any urban renewal project plan, nor has the program provided any middle-income housing."

The statement in the committee report remains a fact unrefuted by the RLA statement.

RLA statement: "Moreover, the urban renewal plans adopted by the National Capital Planning Commission for project Adams-Morgan and project Northwest No. 1 specify land to be used for both low- and middle-income housing."

Answer: The plans mentioned in the RLA statement are not official urban renewal project plans approved by the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

Further, low-rent housing has been a part of approved project plans in the past but such housing has been removed by project plan changes. The statement in the report that no such housing has been built in an urban renewal project area will stand until low-rent housing, public housing, or middle-income housing is constructed under an urban renewal project plan.

PARAGRAPH 4

RLA statement: "As pointed out under paragraph 1, there is an apparent misunderstanding by the authors of the committee report that there is a legal requirement that land in an urban renewal project in Washington, D.C., must be used only for housing to be rented to families of low to middle incomes."

Answer: The statement in the report is that the powers provided in the law, to meet urgent needs for eliminating existing substandard housing and providing low-rent housing, have been used to produce high-rent, luxury-type residential units. (H. Rept. 1481, 88th Cong., pp. 9–15.) There is no misunderstanding since the Redevelopment Act text and the committee reports, expressing the intent and purposes of the Congress, at no point mention the need to exercise powers of the act for the construction of high-rent housing which was being produced in abundance by private enterprise. The facts, showing the production of abundance of the latter type housing not mentioned by the Congress, to the exclusion of the needed low-rent housing specifically mentioned by the Congress leaves the committee report statement unchallenged.

PARAGRAPH 5

RLA statement: "In all cases, the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency has attempted to pursue a course of action it thought best suited to the public interest at the time the action was taken."

Answer: The committee report states that "chosen instrument" redevelopers for urban renewal projects have been selected many months before any official approval of a project plan."

The statement of the committee report is neither denied nor refuted. If the action of the Board has accomplished the purposes and intent of the Congress, no defense is needed.

PARAGRAPH 6

RLA statement: "The Agency has conducted four architectural competitions. However, except for complaint of one contestant, the Redevelopment Land Agency has not been found wanting in its efforts to afford each competitor equal opportunity."

Answer: The committee report stated that contestants in such competitions "were not equally notified and informed as to specifications." The statement is neither denied nor refuted. Further, the fact that only one complaint was filed with the Agency does not deny the fact that other complaints were filed with or heard by other government bodies. It is not a question of whether a complaint was made but whether the complaint was justified.

PARAGRAPH 7

RLA statement: "It need only be noted that any Agency accepting signed statements does so on the basis that the persons signing them did so in full knowledge of the documents he signed."

Answer: The RLA answer does not deny or refute the committee report statement that a financially responsible person denied under oath that he authorized the use of his name or was responsible financially on a project where his name had been used to lend color of financial responsibility to a project. The RLA statement otherwise avoids the real issue and the legal implications and evades the question of government agency responsibility to act after notice of such defect.

PARAGRAPH 8

RLA statement: "The waterfront land is not reserved for the redeveloper with whom the memorandum of understanding was executed."

Answer: The committee report stated that the Agency had agreed years before approval of any project plans to sell to a redeveloper, without knowledge or consent of Congress, lands belonging to the U.S. Government. The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report. It merely states that the "waterfront land is not reserved for the redeveloper." The memorandum in volume 1 of the committee hearings, page 192, reveals the substance of the agreement and the exchange of the waterfront lands committed to Webb & Knapp Co., for other urban renewal lands following action by Congress to preserve relocation rights for businesses displaced from the waterfront area.

PARAGRAPH 9

RLA statement: "The '50-percent rule' referred to in paragraph 9 was not adopted by the Agency's Board of Directors."

Answer: The committee report stated as follows: "The Agency has used an unauthorized and secret formula for the disposition of project area land." The RLA statement neither denies now refutes the statement in the committee report. The facts of the record show that while the minutes of the RLA Board of Directors are silent concerning the official adoption of the '50-percent rule,' a memorandum shows clearly that such rule was made known to the Chairman of the RLA Board and was used regardless of whether it was an official expression of the Board of Directors.

PARAGRAPH 10

RLA statement: "This paragraph raises a question as to the validity of the Federal Housing Administration's evaluation methods."

Answer: The committee report states that residual land use appraisals were used to establish land disposition prices at less than the fair market value and such appraisals were not by appraisers selected pursuant to contracts under the Redevelopment Land Agency. The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the committee report statement.

PARAGRAPH 11

RLA statement: "The Agency could not have procured appraisal services without informing the redeveloper as to the limitations to be placed on utilization of land in the project area."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report. The fact is that the act gives to the redeveloper no right to determine or influence the land disposition price which is to be the fair market value for the highest and best use permitted under the plan.

PARAGRAPH 12

RLA statement: "There has never been any gerrymandering of the boundary of an urban renewal project. When Congress adopted the Housing Act of 1954, the intention of Congress was that conservation areas have, as boundaries, major thoroughfares or natural geographical features bounding a neighborhood."

Answer: The statement in the committee report was that there had been gerrymandering of urban renewal boundaries so as to include single family housing areas which were free from substandard housing and blight.

The RLA statement denies any gerrymandering. The statement does not deny that urban renewal boundaries were established so as to include single family housing areas not affected by slum or blight conditions.

The substance of the RLA objection is to the use of the term "gerrymandering" as applied to the practice of including nonslum and nonblighted areas within urban renewal boundaries.

The second reference of the RLA to the Housing Act of 1954 relates to an uncited statement of intent regarding the establishment of boundaries. Even though such statement of intent was expressed by the Congress, it does not apply in the instance referred to; namely, the Adams-Morgan project, since the area identified in committee hearings as being without slum and blight was separated from the balance of the area by a major thoroughfare which could serve as a boundary and exclude the area in question. The documents and the survey of the RLA and the reports of the Housing Enforcement Branch of the Department of Licenses and Inspections showed no substandard conditions in the excellent residential area included within the urban renewal boundaries.

PARAGRAPH 13

RLA statement: "This paragraph oversimplifies the very difficult problem of determining whether the slum and blighted conditions in an area are such as to warrant public action."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report that project plans for an urban renewal area were approved when not one substandard housing unit existed within the project area on the date of the approval of the plan.

While the above statement of fact has never been challenged, there is a difference as to the application of the law as interpreted by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the HHFA compared to the interpretation contained in the committee report. The latter interpretation endeavors to delineate the language of the Redevelopment Act and the intent of Congress as applying to areas having existing substandard housing and blight conditions and which areas are residential in character. The RLA and HHFA interpretation would permit urban renewal under existing law in both residential and nonresidential areas with or without the existence of substandard housing within the area. The action of officials was based, according to testimony and documents, on a survey which showed existing substandard housing as of an earlier date, but which housing had been removed prior to the official action of approval of the project plan. The action of officials was predicated upon the acceptance of survey data which was no longer accurate in fact on the date of the action of the Commissioners in approving the project plan.

PARAGRAPHS 14 AND 20

RLA statement: "Every effort was made to explain to the subcommittee that the National Housing Act of 1939, as amended, prohibits the use of Federal funds for compensation of a municipality for vacated streets and prohibits the dedication of land purchased with Federal financial assistance to the municipality for the use as a part of a federally aided highway system. Apparently these paragraphs are based on a misunderstanding of the act."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the committee report statements in paragraphs 14 and 20.

The committee report statement in paragraph 14 was that the District of Columbia paid $2 million for land when it could have exchanged land for public uses without cost to the public.

Committee report statement in paragraph 20 was that the Agency charged the District $23.11 per square foot for land, but sold land of the same value to the redeveloper at $14.88 per square foot.

No statement in the committee report indicates any misunderstanding or other interpretation of law concerning the use of publicly owned rights-of-way in connection with urban renewal projects.

PARAGRAPH 15

RLA statement: "The assertion that 'private industry was ready, willing, and able to redevelop' is demonstrably not true."

Answer: The RLA statement endeavors to refute the statement in the committee report by basing their contention on an assumption which is not demonstrated. The documents referred to in the committee report statement indicate the willingness and ability of the owners of the majority of the land to redevelop the area without cost to the public, or under an approved urban renewal plan. The record and evidence indicates no response was ever made to the latter expressed purpose of the owners of the majority of the property.

PARAGRAPH 16

RLA statement: "This criticism ignores the fact that appraisals were obtained from competent disinterested appraisers who determined that there was no increment in land values resulting from the changes in the plan for the Columbia Plaza project."

Answer: The RLA statement avoids the substance of the statement in the committee report. The RLA refers to increment in land values. The statement of the committee report, alluding to the findings made by the appraisers is factual and correct in that by reason of the changes in the project plan the income to the redeveloper was increased substantially above the amounts the redeveloper would receive had there been no changes in the project plan.

PARAGRAPH 17

RLA statement: "The Redevelopment Land Agency is of the opinion that the assertion in paragraph 17 was not the subject of the inquiry during any of the hearings conducted over a 4-year period."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the statement in the committee report. The fact is that studies made by the General Accounting Office, which are part of the committee records, raised the question as to the propriety of residual land use appraisals which appraisals are not based upon the highest and best use of the land permitted under a plan. Evidence in the record indicated the transmission of redevelopers plans to appraisers, which plans were used in the course of determining the land reuse value rather than establishing such values on the highest and best use permitted under the plan.

PARAGRAPH 18

RLA statement: "The comments noted under paragraph 17 are applicable to this paragraph."

Answer: The RLA answer neither refutes nor denies nor is any way responsive to the statement in the committee report. The statement in the committee report was to the effect that the assembly of lands by private industry for private industry redevelopment had been discouraged by the imposition of an urban renewal program on such an area when private assembly of land had reached a point of substantial completion.

PARAGRAPH 19

RLA statement: "It is within the authority of the District of Columbia Commissioners to consider factors in designated urban renewal areas other than the failure of structures to meet their requirements of local codes."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report which was that the Agency used more restrictive housing standards than those used by the District of Columbia to classify housing structures as substandard.

The factors which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may consider in establishing an urban renewal area are determined by the Redevelopment Act enacted by Congress for application in the District and not by any other law. That act requires a finding that there is existing substandard housing conditions in order to qualify an area as a project area. The Agency represented the existence of substandard housing conditions based on its restrictive criteria and no examination of or comparison of such criteria with the District of Columbia Housing Code was made prior to committee hearings. There is no authority in the Redevelopment Act or in the District of Columbia Code or the Commissioners to arbitrarily establish more restrictive housing code standards in one area of the city than in another.

PARAGRAPH 20

(See comments on par. 14 above.)

PARAGRAPH 21

RLA statement: "* * * the redevelopment plan for the project in effect at the time of the execution of the contract provided that one-third of the dwelling units were to be rented at the rate of $17 per room per month, plus utilities. The plan was changed in this respect by virtue of the fact that at the time construction began it was not economically feasible to construct housing with this rental limitation, and it was determined to remove the restriction."

Answer: The RLA statement attempts to refute by avoidance the substance of the committee report statement that an original requirement of a developer that he construct low-rent housing was changed and high-rent housing only was built.

The RLA statement is correct only by playing on the word "contract" as distinct from the urban renewal plan. The contract while not specifying the types in rentals for housing to be provided, did require the carrying out of the urban renewal project plan, which plan required the construction of one-third of the housing units to be rented at a rate of $17 per room.

The RLA statement admits accomplishing the result stated in the committee report statement through the device of changing the project plan to which the contracts applied.

The RLA statement that low-rent housing at $17 per room was not economically feasible betrays an agency avoidance of the specific language and purposes of the Redevelopment Act. In the definition of "low-rent housing" in the act, Congress provided a formula for determining the rental rate per room per month to be applied in the future because of changing economic circumstances. The Agency chose to avoid the intent of Congress, remove the low-rent housing from the project by ignoring the formula provided by Congress to make such housing economically feasible.

PARAGRAPH 22

RLA statement: "This misstates the facts. The redeveloper was not in default under its contract in Project Area B. Because of delays occasioned by procurement of adequate financing and approvals of building site plans, it appeared that it would be impossible to proceed with the construction as necessary to comply with the contract."

Answer: The RLA statement denies the technicality but affirms the substance of the committee report statement that redevelopers who have defaulted or faced default were given new contracts, extensions of contracts, cancellation of penalties in some cases, or the execution of a more favorable contract.

The RLA statement alludes to Project Area B. The records show that with about 60 days remaining in the contract period during which performance was required, the redeveloper faced the physical impossibility of executing the contract and beginning and completing the construction of numerous housing units which would require a matter of months. The contract in every substantive sense was in default and would have been in default within 60 days except for the technicality that prior to such default a new contract was drawn, the old contract canceled, and the security for the performance under the old contract was released to the redeveloper.

Further, the statement in the committee report did not refer solely to Project Area B.

The RLA further states: "* * * in consideration of the Agency's agreement to extend time periods, numerous provisions of benefit to the Agency were included in the amended contract. The provisions included an increase in the ground rental rate from 5 to 6 percent, a requirement for a security deposit in the amount of 10 percent of the appraised value of the site, and payment of carrying charges at the rate of 3½ percent per annum of the appraised value of the property upon execution of each lease agreement."

Answer: While these statements do not deny or refute the statement in the committee report, they are an attempt to justify the Agency action. Questions which arise from the RLA statement are: (1) Why did the contract specify 5 percent ground rental rate when other contracts specified 6 percent; (2) why did the RLA surrender its performance security on the initial contract in the face of oncoming and obvious default; (3) why did not the original contract require the payment of 3½ percent carrying charges when the redeveloper had agreed to acquire the land but left the public paying the expense of taxes and interest on the acquired land?

PARAGRAPH 23

RLA statement: "The value established by the Agency was equal to the acquisition cost and in excess of the value placed upon it by the Agency's appraisers."

Answer: The RLA statement in substance admits the committee report statement that the Agency conveyed Government-owned land to the redeveloper to reduce the unit land cost to the redeveloper.

The RLA statement is correct that the price to the redeveloper equaled the price of acquisition of the land actually purchased by the Agency. The Government-owned land cost the Agency nothing and was included as part of the area conveyed to the redeveloper. The obvious result was a lowering of the unit cost to the redeveloper.

The further fact not mentioned in the committee report statement nor by the RLA was the fact that there was a collateral side agreement between the redeveloper and the owners of the private unacquired land, calling for the payment of more than $600,000 by the redeveloper to the original landowners

PARAGRAPH 24

RLA statement: "This deficiency (low-income and public housing) is primarily due to the fact that the National Capital Housing Authority has been unable to procure available sites within the District of Columbia for public housing."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the committee report statement that a deficiency of more than 8,000 units of such housing has developed in the District

of Columbia. NCHA has repeatedly expressed the desire to purchase sites within the urban renewal project areas, but has been excluded. Residential lands in urban renewal have been disposed of at prices ranging from $0.90 to $3.65 per square foot. The Housing Authority meanwhile was compelled to pay top prices, in instances almost equal to the highest residential land prices charged by the RLA.

RLA statement: "Even though it is essential that the public housing program be expanded to provide units for eligible families * * * we do not believe that social progress would be achieved by adoption of a policy of deferring urban renewal projects and other governmental activities until all families eligible for a publicly owned dwelling unit have been relocated."

Answer: The RLA statement does not deny or refute the statement in the committee report nor does it acknowledge the basic intent of Congress that the urban renewal program had as a first purpose the rehousing of displaced persons in low-rent or public housing where needed.

The RLA statement goes contrary to every concept and expression of intent in the National Housing Act, as amended, including the language in the pending housing bill, and the Redevelopment Act, as amended. The statement in substance says that the policy of the Agency is to continue high-rise luxury apartment development and commercial development regardless of the availability of low-rent housing for displaced persons and families.

PARAGRAPH 25

RLA statement: "We disagree with the stated observation of the Comptroller General that under criteria established by the urban renewal administration any building could be substandard and scheduled for acquisition and demolition."

Answer: The Comptroller General has had examinations made on numerous urban renewal projects throughout the United States and has published numerous reports stating the General Accounting Office findings. The Comptroller General is the one agency and the most experienced agency in government in interpreting the application of the language of the law and the intent of Congress. The RLA may disagree but when a valid question is raised, the RLA must go to the General Accounting Office for interpretation and is bound by the decision of the Comptroller General.

RLA statement: "The committee amendments in S. 628 relating to the definition of slum and blighted areas would preclude acquisition and demolition of structures unless they were so structurally unsound that they could not be rehabilitated without major constructural improvements."

Answer: The RLA statement distorts the reasonable meaning of the language of the committee amendment relating to slum and blight by stating that structures would have to be in total ruins before an area would be eligible for urban renewal. Such distortion is clearly apparent since existing law for the removal of unsafe and unsanitary buildings and the housing code for the District of Columbia would prevent the existence of any such structures in "total ruin" regardless of any provisions in the Redevelopment Act.

The restatement of the committee amendment in the affirmative rather than the negative is clearly the precise meaning of the language and the detailed expression of intent carried in the committee report and might read as follows:

"And that a sufficient number of structures exist, excepting those which can be rehabilitated so as to remove such dangers and detriments by making minor structural changes, improvements, or both."

Congress has stated no policy or intent in the Redevelopment Act that the Agency be permitted to designate as slum or substandard, for purposes of urban renewal, those structures which require only minor structural changes, and improvements, or both. Such deficiencies are or can be corrected by code enforcement.

PARAGRAPH 26

RLA statement: "This is a misstatement of the proposed plan. The urban renewal plan provision referred to in this paragraph was not intended to be used to acquire single family dwellings for the sole purpose of reselling them to the National Capital Authority for use as publicly financed units."

Answer: The RLA neither denies nor refutes the committee report statement. It injects the very important words "the sole purpose" into the substance of the committee report statement. This device enables the discussion of and the intermixture of two different concepts which confuse the issue rather than clarify it.

The committee report stated that the proposed project plan in question calls for scattered site public housing in a fine residential area. This type of housing was recommended in the 1955 report entitled, "No Slums in 10 years" prepared by Financier Consultant Roush, of Baltimore, and the former slum clearance Administrator Keith, of HHFA, while serving as consultants for the Redevelopment Land Agency. This program is a means of injecting subsidized single family housing units into residential areas on a scattered basis.

PARAGRAPH 27

RLA statement: "The delays referred to are not wholly the responsibility of the Redevelopment Land Agency inasmuch as the law under which the program is conducted requires action by a large number of agencies other than the Redevelopment Land Agency and acts of Congress have contributed to the delay."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the substance of the committee report statement that the RLA has approximately twice as many projects less than 50 percent completed than was the case 4 years ago when the Rabaut bill was approved calling for a moratorium on new urban renewal projects.

The delays, if they are such, caused by the Federal Government or Congress, involve only a small percentage of project area lands and those have no relationship whatsoever to redevelopments for private uses which are woefully delayed and behind schedule in southwest Washington.

The RLA answer is essentially a plea that, regardless of the lack of progress made toward completion of projects, the Congress should not provide any limitations on the number of new projects undertaken.

PARAGRAPH 28

RLA statement: "The reasons given in this paragraph for the action were not the reasons why the action was taken."

Answer: Regardless of the collateral reasons given by the RLA in its statement, the substance of the statement in the committee report was one of principal reasons presented in the documents urging HHFA approval of the plan for financing a private corporation to take over the Washington Channel waterfront area.

Testimony and documents received in committee hearings indicated an intent to avoid the relocation of displaced businesses on the waterfront on the priority basis provided by an act of Congress. It is worthy of note that at the end of the statutory period of 180 days after notice by the Agency during which time dislocated businesses might exercise their priority relocation rights, not one displaced business has succeeded in securing any type of agreement or understanding with the Agency despite their expressions in writing requesting such opportunity.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that it would appear to be the part of wisdom for Members to be present during the remainder of the week and to make arrangements accordingly. We do have important matters to dispose of which may come up this week, and, of course, Members must be present in order for us to transact business.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the majority leader knows, I have discussed with him personally the matter of the business for this week and when we might vote to adjourn sine die. I said to him a moment ago that I would forgo any further statements on my part until tomorrow, when we might possibly know better what the prospects may be.

In respect to tomorrow, because I have looked at the whip notice, may I say that I had understood there would be a request today to send the foreign aid bill to conference. I had some information that while there might be a motion to instruct the conferees, possibly that would not take too much time.

Could the gentleman tell us, except for sending the foreign aid bill to conference, what would be likely to come up tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the distinguished minority leader knows that there are bills on the whip notice which have been programed and they may be called up tomorrow. There is the matter of sending the foreign aid bill to conference and there is the likelihood later in the week that any one of several important conference reports which are pending, particularly the one on the National Defense Education Act, might be called up this week.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that, and I just want to express the hope at this time, with the indulgence of the majority leader, that tomorrow in respect to conference reports on the National Defense Education Act and possibly social security and as to what we might be finally doing this week as far as the Appalachia bill is concerned, that information could be given to the Members with respect to those matters so that they might know just how to plan their affairs. I am sure the gentleman knows, as I do on my side, that we are now in the midst of a political campaign. This is a representative form of government and can only function as the people who have come here in the House of Representatives particularly are permitted to know and to find out what their constituents are thinking about. They stand for reelection. It is no more than fair and right that they have an opportunity to get home. So I shall not press the matter further. I want to say

to the majority leader that as far as I know he is in complete sympathy with my feeling that we should have a definite determination as quickly as possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader, I assure him and Members of the House that I will not withhold any information from Members, and I will be glad to advise them—and this is the position of the leadership—of any new developments as promptly as we can do so. Some of these things are not within the immediate control, as the minority leader knows, of the leadership. Conference reports are within the control of conference committees. However, we will try to advise Members and keep them informed of progress toward our goal, which, of course, is to finish our business and adjourn as soon as possible.

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

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

Mr. KYL. When the gentleman from Oklahoma says it will be advisable to remain here on duty the rest of this week, does he include Saturday as a part of that week.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise the gentleman that I do not know of any business that might come up on Saturday, but with the legislative schedule we have and the session being what it is, I would think it would be the better part of wisdom to keep a flexible schedule. I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Might I just say that I had hoped some of these bills would be sent to conference as quickly as possible. I overheard this morning that there has now been another delay with reference to the National Defense Education Act which would not enable it to be acted on by tomorrow. That is impossible now, is it?

Mr. ALBERT. According to my understanding it may be called up later in the week but not tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. That is good enough. Just so we can get it done this week.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

SPENDING EXPLOSION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] 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. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the average citizen may sometimes wonder how he is affected by the combination of the spending explosion in Washington and accompanying scandals such as the Bobby Baker case.

What does it mean to the average citizen when the high cost of government is made even higher by the kickbacks and political payoffs?

One way to illustrate is to make some comparisons which bring home the real costs to ourselves and our children. The third House Office Building being built in Washington already has cost the taxpayers $85 million, twice the original estimate, and even this much-revised estimate will go higher before it is completed.

By comparison, the annual combined budgets of Springfield and Joplin in the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri is approximately $10 million. That includes everything, salaries, materials, road maintenance, fire and police protection, and the hundreds of other services provided by local government.

Thus, the cost of one single annex in Washington—the third building for Members of the House, excluding any Senate housing costs—would be sufficient to run the cities of Springfield and Joplin together for over 8 years.

Springfield, our largest city of over 100,000 people, could be operated for 13 years on the cost of a single building at Washington prices. That is the price we pay for the spending fetish that grips the Federal Capital under the Johnson administration. The most efficient government we have in America today is furnished at the local level—the most extravagant, wasteful, and corrupt-prone exists at the Federal level where there is so much honey to attract the bees. And the blame lies squarely on the philosophy which prevails here in L.B.J. land that waste and inefficiency—even kickbacks are acceptable as long as the money is used to "stimulate the economy." I suggest that this is a high price to pay for pumping money into the economy. It is not the people who benefit, it is the Billy Sol Estes', the Bobby Bakers', and others who drink at the public trough, while official heads are turned and eyelids closed.

If the tax dollars that are soaked up in Washington could be kept at the local level where they originated, cities like Springfield and Joplin, or for that matter, New York and Chicago, would not be forced to come hat in hand to Washington for Federal handouts. If tax sources now preempted by Washington could be returned to our local communities so they could meet local problems, we could begin the task of reducing the size of the Federal budget, which now costs every American family, an average of four, $222 a year in interest charges alone.

That is the cause for which we are fighting. To restore not only morality to government, but to stop living as though the Federal Government only needs to run the printing presses a little longer each night to make up the cost of kickbacks and payoffs. We disregard the tax famine that exists in many of our cities and States, while the Johnson administration builds ivory towers here in Washington.

Otherwise, Lord Macaulay was correct when he told Thomas Jefferson's biographer that our good idea of a republic would reach an early demise as soon as the people learned they could vote themselves unlimited benefits from the Public Treasury.

Have they, through us, reached this stage?

REAPPORTIONMENT IN MISSOURI

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] 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. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Missouri has been sold down the river by the Democrat platform through its failure to take any kind of position on the reapportionment issue now before the Congress.

If the Johnson administration stifles action on this, it will jeopardize the State legislative representation of 19 of the 21 counties in the Seventh Congressional District. Under the Supreme Court ruling, if the size of the Missouri house remains at 163 members, only those counties with over 28,000 population would be assured of individual representation in the Missouri House of Representatives. The Democrat machines in the two largest cities would dominate both the Missouri House and Senate and completely destroy Missouri's little Federal systems and its system of checks and balances patterned after the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court by assuming the authority to make law rather than to interpret it, has destroyed each State's historic right to have a bicameral system if that is what its citizens want. What sense would it make to have two houses both patterned on exactly the same basis without regard to geographical, economic, and other factors? One would merely serve as a rubber stamp for the other.

The Republican platform adopted at San Francisco clearly reaffirms the historic rights of the States to apportion at least one of their two State legislative bodies on factors other than population alone.

But the Democrat platform ignores this most crucial issue altogether, even though their leader in the Senate and their No. 2 man in the House of Representatives are supporting the Republican position. Not only do they ignore it, but the Johnson administration spokesman in Detroit, Walter Ruether, says in his publication Washington Report, volume IV, No. 35, dated August 31, 1964, that the reason the Democrat platform dodged the reapportionment issue is that a firm pledge was given by the White House to block any move to overturn the Supreme Court ruling when it hits the Senate.

If there is anybody who knows what went on behind the scenes at Atlantic City it is Walter Ruether.

Even the end does not justify the means, because many problems which Kansas City and St. Louis have had in

the Missouri Legislature often stem, not from any rural-urban impasse, but from differences of opinion among the city legislators themselves.

Both rural and urban interests are protected by our two house system which helps assure that the final product will not be strongly detrimental to either.

I think that candidates for public office in southwest Missouri should make clear whether they support the Republican platform position on the reapportionment issue or whether they support the Democrat platform which sweeps the issue under the rug along with Bobby Baker, Billie Sol Estes and the TFX contract.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind. I support the Republican position and believe citizens should have an opportunity to vote on a constitutional amendment to restore each State's historic right to apportion at least one house on the basis of factors other than strict population.

INSPECTION OF EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] 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. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from an intensive inspection tour of European atomic energy installations while participating as an official representative to the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva, Switzerland.

At the request of the Department of State, the Speaker appointed four Members of the House—Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD and three other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to participate in this Conference. I was designated as an alternate to Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts.

This was indeed an enlightening and gratifying experience. The opportunities provided by this personal participation in the Conference and visits to the various installations, permitted me to have a better insight into various aspects of atomic energy research and development, both domestic and foreign. The superior U.S. accomplishments, both public and private, in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy was evident not only at the Conference talks and exhibits, but at the other installations and facilities that I visited in Europe.

In West Berlin, that island of freedom surrounded by a hateful mortar and barbed wire wall, I visited the Hahn-Meitner Nuclear Research Institute. Here, in association with the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin, basic research is carried out on the fundamentals of nuclear science.

Available to the scientists of this institute for such research is a 50-kilowatt homogeneous nuclear reactor built by Atomics International, a U.S.-based subsidiary of the North American Aviation Co.

Research into the atom and its nucleus is also carried out with high energy particle accelerators or atom smashers. At the Hahn-Meitner Institute, a 5½-million electron volt Van de Graaff generator built in the United States will soon be installed.

In Scauro, Italy, about 60 miles south of Rome and 35 miles north of Naples just off the Mediterranean Sea is a 150-megawatt electric reactor, built by the General Electric Co. for Italy's electric power utility agency. This reactor, the largest in operation in continental Europe, known as the Senn reactor, is producing blocks of power for the industries of Rome and the developing industries of Naples.

The Senn reactor is indeed impressive on the valley floor of the Garigliano River. It became operational in 1964. This reactor was developed, with U.S. assistance, under the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and Euratom, the multinational European organization for the peaceful developments of nuclear energy.

In my own home State of Illinois at the Argonne National Laboratory the basic concepts for the Senn reactor and for all boiling water reactors were developed. The first full-scale commercial power reactor of this type—the Senn reactor type—was built by the General Electric Co. for the Commonwealth Edison Co. also in Illinois and is known as the Dresden Nuclear Power Station. The Dresden reactor went critical in 1959 and has produced electricity from the nuclei of atoms totaling more than 3.6 billion kilowatt-hours since that time.

My interests in Italy were not totally devoted to peaceful uses of atomic energy. I also had the opportunity to visit the U.S. Southern European Task Force Headquarters in Verona, Italy, and to meet and discuss with the commander of SETAF, Maj. Gen. G. W. Power, the defense problems of NATO's southern flank.

Together with General Power I visited several SETAF installations near Verona and at Vicenza; I found that the U.S. Army in northern Italy is indeed making a significant contribution to NATO's state of readiness.

On August 30, I arrived in Geneva to begin my participation in the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. The Conference formally opened on August 31. Here again, I was impressed with the major contributions that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and U.S. private industry have made to the development of nuclear technology for peaceful uses in supplying energy on the ground and potential space power for our satellites.

Aside from the many technical papers presented by U.S. delegates and the delegates from other nations, there was an exhibit held in the center of Geneva. The exhibit hall contained many different national exhibits. Our own country's exhibits certainly revealed the great progress we had made in the last 6 years since the 1958 Second Geneva Conference in advancing the atom for peaceful purposes.

Here, I cannot do more than just briefly hint at some of the highlights of this Conference. This Conference was devoted primarily to nuclear power for the production of electricity. It is clear that 1964 is an ascendant year for nuclear power. It has been demonstrated this year that there are many places in the United States and more such places in Europe and elsewhere in the world where nuclear power is on the threshold of becoming competitive with fossil fueled electric power.

Technical conferences are usually just full of future promise, rather than exemplary of present accomplishments. Although very optimistic with regard to the economics of nuclear power, this Conference, unlike the last one which was held in 1958, could point to real present accomplishments in the utilization of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. In the immediate future even further reductions in both capital and fuel costs are predicted, with assurance that further development of newer type reactors would lead to economic breeder reactors; that is, reactors that produce more nuclear fuel than they consume.

Of course, this is not a case of getting something for nothing. Scarce supplies of uranium will be utilized in producing power and plutonium, the latter in turn can be burnt in a reactor to produce energy, but you cannot make plutonium without uranium. As our needs for energy increase and more and more of our electricity comes from nuclear fuel, both economics and conservation will dictate the development of economic and efficient breeder reactors.

For the more distant future, there is hope in spite of mountainous difficulties that power will be available from controlled fusion devices. If controlled fusion becomes possible, the amounts of heavy hydrogen, the fuel for fusion, that is available in the oceans of the earth are sufficient for thousands of years of even-increasing power requirements. Papers on controlled thermonuclear developments were presented at Geneva by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations. The United States did not have any exhibits this time on controlled fusion. The U.S. paper presented gave a realistic and practical outlook with regard to harnessing fusion power. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, exhibited at Geneva a full handful of models of laboratory machines used to investigate fusion reactions.

In exhibiting these models of experimental fusion devices, devices which cannot presently produce more power than they consume, the Soviets rightfully claim to be looking to the future. However, I could not help thinking that this overstressing of what may be, in contrast to what is—is illustrative of the Communist philosophy. The good things, the good life, in the Communist world is always promised for tomorrow. The benefits for their people today, with or without the peaceful atom, are very meager.

There was one Soviet exhibit of especial interest—the "ROMASHKA" reac-

tor. A paper was also presented on this reactor. This is a device which converts the nuclear reactor heat directly to electricity by use of the thermoelectric effect. By heating silicon-germanium semiconductors, electricity is produced. The amounts of electricity promised to be available is 500 to 800 watts. This is small, but such small quantities can be used most effectively for space applications. The Soviet exhibit clearly indicated that their existing device is earthbound; however, a Soviet film on this reactor showed a mockup of this as flying in space. This device is very similar to the U.S. SNAP–10A—a 500-watt nuclear reactor-thermoelectric power supply for space purposes. I must note here that were it not for action taken by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last January the SNAP–10A program would have been a dead program. At Geneva we would then have been treated to a Soviet accomplishment, which would have led the administration to react with a crash program to the Soviets. Thanks to action by the Joint Committee we do not have to react. We have a going program where a reactor, and not a mockup, is scheduled to be flown and tested in space next spring. The Soviet "ROMASHKA" is not ready for testing in space. With a successful SNAP–10A flight in space next year we will be able to claim a first—another first in nuclear reactor technology and a first in space. Like many other firsts in nuclear technology—military and peaceful—nudging of the Atomic Energy Commission and the administration by the Joint Committee was an initial requirement.

Another highlight of this Conference was the presentation by Dr. Gerald W. Johnson, Associate Director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., of a paper on the engineering applications of nuclear explosives. This is our Project Plowshare. We have demonstrated in this country that a single nuclear explosion can be used to move millions of tons of earth and rock. There is still much to learn, however, about containing radioactivity and utilizing these methods for large-scale excavation and mining purposes.

In the 1958 Conference when the U.S. delegation first announced efforts planned for Plowshare, Soviet delegates, including Professor Emelyanov, denounced this program and stated that it could not serve constructive technical ends but only political ones.

In 1964, the Plowshare presentation by the U.S. delegate, Dr. Johnson, received a most friendly and enthusiastic reception. Not only did neutral nation delegates like one from the United Arab Republic show a technical interest in this program, but a senior Rumanian delegate queried Dr. Johnson as to the possibilities of cooperating in this area through the International Atomic Energy Agency. Professor Emelyanov also showed great interest and discussed with Dr. Johnson the possibilities of United States and Soviet cooperation in this area. Without concluding as to what the official U.S. position should be in this regard, I cite the above as an example of an area of research pursued by the United States in spite of initial international and some national criticism, and today many who previously criticized are beating a path to our door.

For me an especially satisfying highlight of my trip to Europe was flying up to Sweden from Geneva with Chairman Seaborg and many heads of other delegations to take an overnight cruise on the U.S. nuclear ship *Savannah*.

The N.S. *Savannah* had docked earlier at Hälsingborg, Sweden. The party boarded the ship there and for the next 5½ hours toured the various parts of the ship and had a detailed explanation of the ship's performance capabilities while the ship was en route to Malmö, the port at the southern tip of Sweden where the party disembarked for a return flight to Geneva and a resumption of conference activities.

Time and time again while I was aboard the *Savannah* I heard repeated exclamations from the delegates of the almost score of foreign countries who were with us on this brief sailing of how impressed they were with this practical demonstration of U.S. know-how in the field of the use of nuclear energy for surface ship propulsion. Dr. Seaborg, our AEC chairman, deserves a great deal of praise for this highly effective means of communicating to some of the most important countries in the world our actual technical prowess in this field.

Capable of steaming for about 350,000 miles or 14 times around the world on a single loading of fuel the N.S. *Savannah* fully justifies the confidence we had placed in her as a useful demonstration of this particular application of the peaceful use of the atom.

Unfortunately, I was not able to stay in Geneva till the end of the Conference. I returned to Washington on Sunday, September 6. The Conference went on until September 9. During the last days of the Conference the use of nuclear power to produce fresh water from salt water as well as simultaneously producing electricity for power was discussed. James T. Ramey, U.S. Atomic Energy Commissioner, and former staff director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy gave a paper on this subject. It is requested that this paper and Chairman Seaborg's summary paper on the Conference be reproduced here along with my remarks.

In summary, it was quite clear at the Conference in listening to both the general session and technical papers, as well as in visiting installations in other nations, that the United States is the preeminent leader in the field of nuclear energy—both as to its practical developments and its research effort. Such preeminence, however, is not going unchallenged. Many nations are developing their own capabilities in nuclear energy and related research, and this was fully demonstrated at Geneva.

Continued leadership by the United States in all aspects of nuclear energy can only be maintained in the future by greater efforts and fuller utilization of the resources—scientific and technological—that are available in the United States. Complacency on the part of the United States as a result of the great strides made by us in the last few years can only lead to our being overtaken in one field after another in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The competition is not solely from the Soviet Union; France, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Japan are on the threshold of developing nuclear technology—a technology which can compete not only for prestige but for commercial leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a summary of the Third United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy as presented by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Committee on September 8, 1964.

SUMMARY OF THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BY DR. GLENN T. SEABORG, PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, SEPTEMBER 8, 1964

INTRODUCTION

It is a great honor to be assigned the task of summing up this memorable Conference. After attempting to digest the enormous and diversified content of the sessions, I assure you that the challenge is equal to the honor. I therefore approach the task with humility. I ask the indulgence of the distinguished scientists and engineers assembled here; for in attempting to distill the essence from this notable meeting, I am painfully conscious that I shall be forced to leave out reference to work and points of view that are highly significant for world nuclear science and development. Fortunately, the deficiencies of this summary will be repaired by the publication of the full proceedings. Actually, I believe we shall all be affected by the Conference for a long time to come, and that we shall be able to integrate the profusion of technical material presented here only after reflection in the weeks and months ahead.

Before I begin my discussion of the Conference itself, I should like to remark briefly upon a matter of historical significance which has been noted by other speakers. We have met in approximately the 25th anniversary year of the great discoveries which are responsible for our being here today.

Fittingly, we have seen during this silver anniversary year the first ripening of our labors. We have achieved economic nuclear power in limited but important areas. I believe this Conference marks the beginning of the age of nuclear power. We can now foresee the end of the spector of an energy shortage which has haunted the world since the beginning of the industrial revolution. As nuclear power technology progresses, I believe we can provide in the future enough energy for all of the peoples of the world—the energy that is central to the banishment of hunger, poverty and fear of the future.

The magnitude of the accomplishment in this quarter of a century can be appreciated by retrospection. Some of you will recall, as I do, the impact on nuclear science laboratories around the world of the startling reports in late 1938 and early 1939 of the discovery in Germany of nuclear fission by Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassman, with elucidations by Lis Meitner and Otto Frisch. In only 4 years the late Enrico Fermi and his colleagues had operated a reactor. Even so, in this period many of us would have been content with the thought that nuclear power might be an economic reality by the turn of the century. I find it astonishing that so much has been accomplished in only 25 years.

The contribution of the three international conferences to this stage of progress has been immeasurable. The first conference, in

1955, dropped the shrouds of secrecy from many aspects of nuclear energy, and began a renewal of the channels of communication between nuclear scientists and engineers of the world. In the second conference, communications and international cooperation were further expanded, and fusion research was removed from the pale of secrecy. The third conference bringing us to the borders of the age of nuclear power, might be called the conference of fulfillment.

And, now, let me turn to my attempt to distill the essence of this notable Conference.

GENERAL REMARKS

Let me begin with some general remarks, directed first to world power needs and the place of nuclear power in meeting those needs and second to what some of us consider to be the three phases of nuclear power.

The Conference has dramatized the fact that the world will require huge increases in available energy during the remainder of the century. The accelerating pace of the scientific revolution in the developed countries will require huge new increments of power. At the same time, we sorely need to bring the developing nations into the orbit of today's technologies. As Secretary U Thant reminded us in his opening remarks: "The main theme of the present Conference is nuclear power and this is a key issue for the long-term development of over half the world. If per capita consumption of electricity in the developing areas in our day is to compare with that now found in the major industrialized nations, the amount of additional power required will be so vast as to dwarf even the earth's immense reserves of fossil fuels and hydroelectric power."

Dr. Bhabha of India observed, "there is no power as expensive as no power."

What does the Conference seem to have concluded regarding the advantages of nuclear power in meeting these energy needs? These advantages go beyond economics alone. They permit nations to manage wisely their fossil fuel resources as irreplaceable raw materials rather than as sources of heat. As President Emelyanov observed in his opening remarks, "The raw materials for the chemical industry, for the manufacture of plastics, fabrics, artificial leather and similar products are natural gas, oil, and coal. Organic fuels provide the chemical industry with its primary materials. If we go on using oil at the present rate, all our oil will soon be burnt up, and the chemical industry will be deprived of a most important source of raw material."

Let us see how the Conference gives us reason to believe in the future of nuclear power. Perhaps the most impressive indication of progress can be seen on the first slide. Here one can see how the installed nuclear capacity of the world has grown—from 1955 with only five megawatts to 1958 with 185 megawatts. Today, in 1964, we have about 5,000 megawatts. The future prognosis is also excellent. One can see that by 1970 the total world nuclear power capacity will be about 25,000 megawatts and by 1980 this will have increased to 150,000 to 250,000 megawatts.

As Commissioner Tape of the United States observed, "In the next century nuclear power could well, as wood, coal, and fluid hydrocarbons have all in their turn done, furnish over one-half of the Nation's energy."

The testimony of the technical papers to the fact that nuclear power has come of age is supported by corridor discussions reflecting the entry of commercial competition. This in itself is a strong sign of economic arrival and I should like to think that it has not intruded too heavily on the Conference. However, competition—sometimes aggressive—inevitably accompanies economic development. It plays an important role in driving costs down. Perhaps it is pertinent to note the observation of one delegate which implied that aggressive techniques are sometimes needed to convince conservative financiers and utility engineers of the value of new developments.

It should be noted that our projections of nuclear power development do not assume a breakthrough in controlled thermonuclear fusion or in any now-unknown energy source. Such a development is not on the horizon, but could occur. If fusion does become practical and if it is economical, I am sure there will be time to modify our plans.

The subject of my second group of general remarks deals with reactors as we find them today and as we expect them to be in the future. Many of the delegates to this Conference view nuclear power in three phases, as shown in the second slide.

The first is that phase reached in the past year or so—the coming of age of the three types of presently economic reactors: the graphite moderated, gas cooled reactor; the heavy water moderated, heavy water cooled reactor; and the light water moderated, light water cooled reactor.

The second phase of nuclear power is the improved or advanced converted reactors, including near breeders. These reactors, as indicated on the slide, run a gamut of types—including D_2O moderated, graphite moderated, H_2O moderated and even types using a variable moderation of D_2O and H_2O. This phase of nuclear power development promises to bring greater fuel utilization, preparation of fuel for breeders at a faster rate, and potentially even lower cost power than today's reactor. It must be recognized, however, that continued improvement of the present reactor types will probably keep them economically competitive during most of this time.

The third and somewhat concurrent phase of nuclear progress is the development of breeder reactors. This Conference has heard considerable discussion of fast breeder reactors using the plutonium and uranium 238 fuel cycle. Perhaps less discussion than they merit has been given to thermal breeders fueled on the thorium and uranium 233 fuel cycle. In either case these breeder reactors promise to extend by an order of magnitude and more the fuel utilization of our uranium and thorium resources since they will produce more fissionable material than they consume. In essence, they are our key to unlocking the energy stores in the nonfissionable but extremely abundant isotopes—uranium 238 and thorium 232.

It is important to note that not all delegates agree that these three phases can be arranged in a progression from the presently economic reactors to improved converters capable of even greater economies to a somewhat concurrent pursuit of a longer term program on breeder reactors. Some delegates feel there is no need for the intermediate converter phase and that nuclear power development programs of the respective countries should proceed directly to the breeder reactor phase as shown by the dash line on the slide. But the uncertainties still associated with the long-term economic outlook of breeder reactors would seem to provide a strong rationale for the concurrent and more immediate development of improved converters for many countries. Conversely, there are some delegates that feel that no appreciable effort should be expended on breeders at this time since the present reactor types and improved converters could provide abundant power for many decades to come. If, as reported to the Conference by the United Kingdom, it will be possible to produce uranium from seawater at prices not higher than $20/lb. of U_3O_8, this view may be considerably strengthened.

Clearly, the Conference shows that the aim of all of the nations is to achieve abundant economic nuclear power. We are approaching this goal in different ways, and it appears fortunate that alternative explorations are being made. It seems likely that the nuclear power base for some time to come will consist of a number of different systems paralleling each other in time. We are not likely to find a sharp cutoff point at which one type of reactor will cease to be useful. Moreover, it is unlikely that any advanced system—converter or breeder—will be widely adopted if it does not become economical. In my opinion, we will not see breeders in wide use, for example, if the technology is not advanced to the economically competitive stage. One, in fact, can see circumstances in which breeders could only become economic if the price of fuel is driven up high enough.

The proceedings here show that the focus of competitive nuclear power today is on large-size plants, 500 megawatts of electrical output each. Plans for even larger plants of 1,000 electrical megawatts each are just quietly assumed. When we look toward the reactors for desalination of sea water—one of the most remarkable future human benefits spilling from the cornucopia of nuclear energy—we consider plant sizes as large as 2,500 Mw(e). But the other end of the spectrum also requires attention. Not all countries can use power in these large blocks. Hopefully, one of the outcomes of the large-scale development of nuclear power will be the advent of economic power reactors in the smaller sizes more suited to many of the developing countries. As we have heard, nuclear reactors below the 500-megawatt size are already showing economic benefits in certain of these countries.

ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR POWER

Let me turn now to details, first by following the central thread in my general remarks; that is, the economics of nuclear power. The next slide attempts to give a comparison of the three presently developed types of nuclear powerplants. This slide shows some of the costs of reactor plants which have been reported to the Conference. I feel a word of warning is necessary here since some in the audience will be tempted to compare the figures from one country with those of another. Without considering the specifics that go into making up these figures, it is very much like comparing apples and oranges. I might state it in another way, which I overheard during the Conference: These are the opinions upon which I base my facts.

As you know, the cost of power from any generating station, nuclear or conventional, is generally governed by four main factors: construction costs, operating costs, fixed or carrying charge rate, and system characteristics which determine the plant capacity factor. Except for the fixed-charge rate, these subjects have been extensively discussed in various sessions of the Conference. It is perhaps unfortunate that more consideration was not given to fixed charges, since apparently much of the controversy over the relative merits of various reactor systems stems from differences in this fixed-charge rate. In fact, some efforts toward international standardization of the bases for computing reactor economics would probably have been welcomed.

Technical and economic factors have restricted the number of reactor types that are well enough developed to be candidates at present for immediate large-scale power programs. The reported prospective construction costs for the three predominant reactor types in the world today are only about one-half the costs of the first large reactors.

These construction costs range from $140 to $280 per kilowatt.

Running costs range from 1.3 to 2.8 mills per kilowatt hour. I have not attempted to combine construction and operating costs to arrive at total power costs due to the difference in fixed-charge rates between countries.

The significant fact is that those systems which tend to have high capital costs tend to have low running costs. Those countries which have concentrated on the development of those reactors with low fuel costs have low fixed-charge rates which tend to offset their higher capital costs. In fact, the lower carrying charges were one of the main reasons which made these lines of reactor development attractive. It speaks well for these reactor technologies that they have been able to become more competitive with other fuels in their own countries in spite of increases in some elements of the fixed charges such as the interest rate increases noted by both Dr. Lewis and Sir William Penney. This has been very severe in the case of the United Kingdom program where the rate of earnings used for economic assessment of reactor costs has risen from 4 percent in 1955 to 7½ percent at present.

All of these reactor types still have considerable potential for economic improvement through increased unit size, through multiple unit stations, through large-scale production by replication of designs, and through steady engineering improvements of the type that have substantially reduced the cost of conventional stations over the years. The reported improvements by the United Kingdom in their initial 5,000 Mw(e) national power program based on the magnox reactors are illustrative of this.

Experience has also demonstrated that many power reactors can operate safely at power levels considerably higher than their initial design ratings, thus substantially reducing unit costs. The Yankee reactor has had its power level increased from 110 Mw(e) initially to 175 Mw(e). Reactors now in the design and construction stage still have this "stretch capability." For example, the Oyster Creek plant has a minimum capability of 515 Mw(e) but if the expected power density is achieved in the core, 640 Mw(e) is possible. Soviet experience with the first 210 megawatt unit at Norovoronezh has made it possible to increase the capacity of the second unit, which is a modernized version of the first, to 365 megawatts or more. As experience accumulates, new plants will increasingly be rated initially closer to their ultimate capacity.

The reports have further indicated that there remains the possibility of substantial reductions in fuel cycle costs. The reductions to be achieved between the costs we have experienced up to now and future costs may be much greater than the 50 percent by which we have already reduced capital costs, although the amount of reduction will vary with reactor type. Fuel fabrication costs will be greatly reduced as we go on to develop improved fabrication techniques and increase the scale of the fabrication industry. Illustrative of this is the United Kingdom experience in fabricating almost 2 million magnox elements. The French reports on scaling up their fabrication efforts are also noteworthy. Increases in irradiation levels, which reduce fuel cycle costs, are also in prospect for all types of reactor fuels. Again, the recent increase of the guaranteed irradiation level of the magnox fuel from 3,000 to 4,000 Mwd/T is clear evidence of these achievements. Other components of operation, maintenance, and fuel cycle costs such as the reprocessing of spent fuels, also have potential for cost reduction.

As far as the fuel itself is concerned, possibilities for further savings have also been reported. Natural uranium prices are currently well below the cost of the uranium used in the early cores of existing reactors. The widely quoted $6/lb. figure is probably only an upper limit at present. Over a period of years this will help the economics of reactors fueled with both natural uranium and enriched uranium. Utilization of increased percentages of the uranium material mined, as conversion ratios increase, will also tend to reduce costs. However, certain of these potential reductions in fuel cycle costs may require some concomitant increase in capital costs just as the choice of natural uranium fueled reactors necessitates higher capital costs to start.

Perhaps the most encouraging economic evidence of all lies in the projections of nuclear power growth given to this Conference. It appears quite certain that nuclear energy will play an increasing role in meeting the electrical power needs of many countries. The role of nuclear power will vary from country to country depending upon the extent and costs of their conventional resources. In this respect, the relative economics of nuclear power will be most important. The managers of the electric utility systems in all countries seem to insist, quite naturally, on economic competitiveness before they will engage in large-scale nuclear power programs.

FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

The present economic types of power reactors, as developed to date, represent only a first step. Many reports on forthcoming converter reactors promise substantial improvements in economics and fuel utilization. While opinions may differ on the paths to pursue for the future, there is substantial agreement that we must develop improved converters to obtain these greater efficiencies. In looking toward ultimate future needs, there is almost general agreement as to the need to develop breeder reactors although some nations, like Canada, support the opinion that breeder reactors may not be required for many years in the future, if at all. The general consensus, however, is evidenced by the program plans reported upon by the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France, Germany and the United States.

A variety of forthcoming converter reactor types is presently under study and development in many parts of the world. Some of the potential advantages of these reactors include such properties as high conversion ratios, high specific power with resultant lower fuel inventory, high temperature and high thermal efficiency, larger single unit capacity, more efficient use of natural uranium, thorium, and plutonium, and a potential contribution toward ultimate breeding systems. In some cases these converter concepts are based on design variations and extensions and combinations of the technology of the proven reactor types. In other cases, they represent innovations in technology.

As an example, heavy water moderated reactors, long of interest to many countries, represent a class of reactors which has good long-range as well as short-range potential. Reported at the Conference were extensions of the heavy water moderated technology to designs which are under study and development, incorporating such coolants as gas, organic compounds, water and steam. The organic cooled, heavy water concept, being developed under the ORGEL project, by Euratom, the OCDRE project in Canada, the DON project in Spain and the recently planned program in the United States in connection with desalting appear to offer considerable promise, as do the French and Czechoslovakian programs using gas cooling with a heavy water moderator and the United Kingdom work with steam cooling. It is clear from the scope of organic work planned that many countries have now mastered the handling of organics as coolants in reactors, by establishing and maintaining satisfactory purity standards in the cooling system.

Other examples of the evolution of advanced converter reactors from the present types of large power reactors are the spectral shift reactor design (employing a variable mixture of light and heavy water), the Swedish designs for pressurized and boiling heavy water reactors, the seed and blanket pressurized water concept, and nuclear superheating. The experience in Sweden in achieving a very low heavy water leakage rate is very encouraging. The work in superheating appears to be particularly advanced in the U.S.S.R. with the operation of the Beloyarsk power station.

Advanced reactor versions of graphite moderated gas-cooled reactors are also being developed leading to high temperature, improved fuel cycle, and higher conversion ratio performance. The AGR and Dragon projects in the United Kingdom (the latter a broad multination effort) and the HTGR in the United States represent principal efforts in this direction.

We find substantial development effort is also being directed toward sodium-cooled reactors. The development of the sodium-cooled graphite-moderated reactor in the United States has as it prime objective an economic, high temperature large power reactor system; in addition it is also contributing a significant amount of sodium technology which is applicable to the sodium-cooled fast reactor systems. It is noteworthy that the Hallam Nuclear Power Facility in the United States, a reactor of this type, is the largest sodium-cooled reactor in operation today. As a part of its overall reactor program, Germany is developing the KNX reactor project which will use a sodium-cooled and zirconium hydride moderated reactor. The U.S.S.R. program also indicates substantial development of sodium components.

The reports reflect that emphasis on fast reactors has increased spectacularly in many countries during recent years. Germany, the United Kingdom, United States, and U.S.S.R. all have announced or reaffirmed their intentions to proceed with relatively large prototype reactors, of several hundred Mw(e) capacity. We have heard reports from the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom on their operating experience with fast reactors, the BR–5 and Dounreay plants, respectively. The integrated power of Dounreay has reached a total of 9,080 MWD and total electric power production is over 36 million kwh. Dounreay has been successfully demonstrated at full power and its continued use as a fuel test facility should contribute significantly to the United Kingdom's fast reactor program.

It has been reported that the EBR II at the U.S. National Reactor Testing Station is now producing power and it is anticipated that this reactor, as well as the Enrico Fermi plant, will produce valuable information on fuels, components performance, and systems reliability. In France, the Rapsodie fast reactor is being constructed which will give important data on physics behavior, including the kinetics of fast reactor cores. The program in Germany is progressing rapidly with an intensive evaluation being made of the various coolants and systems which may be applied in fast reactor technology.

In the programs just described there has been major emphasis placed on the eventual use of the plutonium and uranium 238 cycle to effectively use these materials by taking advantage of the high breeding ratios which appear feasible with this cycle. Both metallic and ceramic fuels are being evaluated for achieving high efficiency, low-cost performance. This has led to the development of strong programs directed toward evaluation of the neutronics and of inherent safety of such fast reactor fuel systems.

On the fuel evaluation side, we find that a series of experimental fuel assemblies are being irradiated in the United Kingdom Dounreay reactor. Fuel material also has been irradiated to some 6 percent burnup in the U.S.S.R.'s BR–5. There are firm plans to carry out sample and fuel subassembly irradiations in the very near future in Rapsodie,

Fermi, EBR II and in the fast flux loop in Belgium's BR–5. Further, the United States is building a fast test reactor, FARET, in which valuable physics measurements will be made and in which small cores can be tested at high power densities and to high burnups. The U.S.S.R. also announced plans for their 60 Mw(e) reactor, BR–60, in which they hope to demonstrate fuel burnups in excess of 10 percent.

On the safety studies side, Doppler and sodium void coefficient measurements for fast reactor systems are under theoretical and experimental investigation in several countries. The session papers and discussions indicate general agreement on Doppler coefficient contributions to reactor kinetics and safety—it will be negative, large and reliable. Experimental work is being carried on in the critical facilities: Zebra, Vera, and Quagga in the United Kingdom, ZPR–III and ZPR–VI in the United States, Bfs in the U.S.S.R., and FR–0 in Sweden. A number of facilities are planned for operation within the next 5 years; namely, Masurka in France, Sneak in Germany, and ZPPR in the United States. Another planned fast reactor project is the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor, SEFOR, which is being undertaken in an international partnership of Euratom, Federal Republic of West Germany, Southwest Atomic Energy Associates (a group of American utilities), General Electric Co., and the USAEC. SEFOR will be used to measure Doppler and sodium temperature coefficients on mixed plutonium-uranium oxide cores under transient conditions.

Although the main effort in breeder reactor development is in the direction of sodium-cooled fast reactors, the reports here reflect that other fast reactor systems are being studied which would use other coolants such as gas and steam. During this Conference a paper by the Swiss delegation describing a fast gas-cooled system and a paper on the evaluation of different coolant systems in Germany were presented.

Work in several countries which may lead to thermal breeder reactors also was presented, utilizing the thorium and uranium 238 fuel cycle. Three of the reactor concepts described which offer the potential of utilizing the important energy reserves now locked in thorium, and eventually of breeding, are the high temperature gas-graphite system, the heavy-water system, and the seed and blanket pressurized light-water system. The potential advantages of fluid fuel reactors, such as the slurry-oxide or molten-salt systems, for thermal breeding also should be noted.

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

Let me turn to the manufacture of nuclear fuel, one of the most important technologies of nuclear power, where we find steady improvement through a diversity of approaches. These improvements have accounted for a slow, steady gain in fuel performance over the years, with operating temperatures becoming higher and an increase in the heat output of each unit of fuel throughout.

While the number of separate reactor concepts being pursued has narrowed somewhat in recent years, there are still many options as to the fuel cycle. Uranium metals are being used in low-exposure natural uranium systems. For water-cooled reactors the presently favored and most thoroughly proven fuel material is uranium oxide. The results reported to this Conference indicate that this fuel will continue to be favored in these reactors because it can sustain high irradiation exposures. A number of papers suggest that carbide fuels appear quite promising for nonwater reactors. Other compounds such as nitride, sulfide, silicide, etc., are also being studied, and have been reported upon.

Stainless steel and zirconium alloys continue to be prominent cladding materials, although fuel designers continue to be concerned about high temperature embrittlement under irradiation. Magnesium alloys have been serving well in low-temperature gas-cooled systems. For future applications ceramic fuel particles coated with carbon offer a good fuel for high-temperature gas-cooled reactors.

In Canada, typical fuels are natural uranium oxide clad in zirconium with fuel exposures estimated at 10 MWD/KgU. In France, the fuel is natural uranium metal with magnesium alloy cladding with fuel exposures around 3½ MWD/KgU. In the U.S.S.R., the light water reactors use enriched uranium oxide clad in stainless steel alloys and will produce greater than 20 MWD/KgU. At the present in the United Kingdom, "adjusted" natural uranium metal is clad in magnesium alloy and produces 4 to 5 MWD/KgU.

In the United States the fuel is largely UO_2 clad in stainless steel or zircaloy with exposure expectations of 16 to 25 MWD/KgU.

A number of fluid fuel concepts such as molten salt, molten plutonium and aqueous slurries are also being studied and developed. These concepts are very intriguing and offer the promise of significant reductions in fuel cycle economics, but they pose formidable problems that are still to be solved.

In view of the excellent progress experienced in developing long endurance fuel and reducing the costs of the various unit operations required to support the fuel cycle, it now appears that the economic optimum fuel exposure for converter type reactors will be in the same neighborhood as a reasonable integrity lifetime of the fuels.

There have been several reports on the final phase of the fuel cycle—spent fuel reprocessing where there are a number of competing methods. At present the aqueous solvent extraction process is the accepted means for recovery of nuclear fuels. Other recovery processes such as pyrometallurgical and pyrochemical processing, however, are advancing rapidly. In the end, the types of fuels that need to be processed will largely determine the most economic fuel recovery process.

As reported, the economic recycle of the bred fuels—plutonium and uranium 233—can now be clearly foreseen. Within a few more years, plutonium recycle should be demonstrated in large commercial power reactors and it will be an important step in assuring the economics of the complete fuel cycle. Similarly, recycle of uranium 233 will follow a few years later.

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

An important factor in the development and application of the peaceful uses of atomic energy—as important as its economic and scientific impact, has been the continuing concern for and emphasis on nuclear safety and reasoned management of nuclear wastes. The public has manifested concern in many countries over the safety considerations associated with the location, design, construction, and operation of nuclear powerplants. This is only natural in view of the increasing number of nuclear plants actually being operated, built or planned, and the desire to place these plants nearer to the centers of the electrical power needs.

Fortunately safety has been a foremost consideration, from the start, in developing the peaceful applications of nuclear energy. The remarkable safety record is powerful and eloquent testimony to the high degree of importance attached to this aspect of nuclear energy activities, and to the efforts and accomplishments by workers in this field throughout the world. For example, the United States has been operating reactors of various types for about 20 years—with an accumulation of over 1,200 reactor years of operating experience. In that time there has been no known instance of public injury or even public inconvenience outside an immediate plant site that can be attributed to a reactor operation or accident.

From the reports given at this Conference it would appear that throughout the world a general safety philosophy is developing for these nuclear reactor systems. The approach appears to be based largely on two related but separated and conservative paths. First, to prevent accidents, the reactor is generally designed conservatively, taking into account the kinetic or neutronic behavior of the system, the characteristics of the materials used in its construction, and the incorporation of redundant instrumentation and control systems made as fail safe as possible. In addition, reactor operators are carefully trained and detailed plant operating procedures are carefully followed. Second, most power reactors are equipped with a variety of engineered safeguards and emergency systems to minimize the consequences of an accident should it somehow occur. For example, in some countries it is common practice to enclose the entire reactor system in a containment structure built to withstand considerable pressure and with a high degree of leak tightness.

To support these policies, extensive nuclear safety research, development, and test programs are conducted in almost all countries supporting reactor development programs. I believe we can be quite confident that these investigations, which cover a broad spectrum of subjects from reactor kinetics to fission product behavior and materials research, and in which a rather wide variety of scientific and technical disciplines are involved, will continue to contribute to nuclear energy's generally excellent safety record and will keep pace with the requirements of the industry as it develops.

The concern for nuclear safety does not cease with the continued safe operation of nuclear reactors. Their radioactive wastes must also be disposed of safely. Significant advances during the past years have been made and reported on here by Czechoslovakia, France, India, and the United States in the handling of radioactive waste products from nuclear energy operations, including power reactor installations. There has been a strong impetus throughout the world for vigorous waste management research and development programs directed at further reduction in the quantities of radioactive materials being discharged to the environment.

As indicated in reports by France and the United States, the strict management and disposal of radioactive waste at nuclear power stations are not limiting the development of large-scale and widespread nuclear power generation, and it may be noted, also, that during the past years, these waste handling operations have not resulted in any abnormal release of radioactivity to the environment. Radioactivity concentrations in power reactor plant effluents, with no environmental dilution, have been in the low range of 1 to 3 percent of the internationally accepted radiation protection standards.

The disposal of certain types of solid and liquid low-level waste effluents to the ground has proven to be safe and acceptable in many countries, including Canada, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. The growth of land burial or storage sites, with the resulting economies, have essentially eliminated ocean disposal as an important waste management operation in many nations of the world with available land area.

More than 15 years' experience in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. with the improving methods of handling highly radioactive liquid waste from fuel reprocessing by storage in special underground tanks has shown such storage to be a safe and practical interim measure. The long-term usefulness of this method is limited, however, by the long, effective life

of the waste (hundreds of years) and the comparatively short life of storage tanks, estimated at several decades. Accordingly, a number of countries are developing means to convert high level liquid waste to stable solids.

After high level liquid wastes are converted to solids, there still exists a requirement for permanent storage of these solid wastes. Manmade structures may not be adequate to last for the hundreds of years that must pass before the wastes become relatively harmless; underground salt formations appear to offer an attractive alternate site for solids and concentrated liquids wastes because of their unique geologic characteristics. Salt formations are dry, impermeable, have good structural strength and thermal conductivity, and are not associated with usable ground water sources, and they exist in many parts of the world. Future developmental work in several countries along this path will be watched with interest.

With continued attention to this area of nuclear safety and waste management, I firmly believe that we can achieve the potential benefits of nuclear power and at the same time protect—or even improve—our general standards of public health and safety. The increasing use of nuclear power may indeed help to lessen atmospheric pollution, largely a result of the widespread use of fossil fuels.

ADVANCES IN ENERGY CONVERSION

To this point my remarks have been largely limited to nuclear reactors providing the heat for the conventional generation of electricity. The progress reported to this Conference in the area of energy conversion techniques, nuclear thermoelectric and thermionic conversion and magneto hydrodynamics, is opening new vistas for power generation.

The conversion of the heat of nuclear fission directly into electrical energy by means of the thermionic emission of electrons has been demonstrated as a practical concept in the short time since the last Conference. The potential of this concept is perhaps best indicated by the extent of the effort, reported at this Conference, underway in the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France, and the United States. Out-of-pile tests of converters with both uranium carbide and refractory metal emitters have shown lifetimes of thousands of hours. In-pile tests with both uranium carbide and uranium oxide fueled converters have operated for several hundreds of hours. Naturally the potential of these devices has stimulated materials development. As the technology of refractory metals is advanced to allow higher temperatures in reactors, the efficiency of the thermionic concept increases to the point where there is more and more incentive to overcome the many remaining problems.

The generation of electric power using magneto hydrodynamics techniques is being actively pursued in a number of laboratories. Here again the high temperatures of the plasmas required pose serious materials problems although the use of an inert working fluid would reduce the severity of the materials problem. The closed cycle converter operated in conjunction with a high-temperature gas-cooled nucelar reactor appears attractive. Proposals have been reported upon in this connection for reactors operating in the temperature range of 1,800–2,000° C.

Generation of electric energy by the direct thermoelectric conversion of the decay heat of radioisotopes has become an established technology since the last Conference. The technology is now being demonstrated not only in space but also in a number of terrestrial applications including weather stations, navigation buoys and lighthouses. The barge-mounted weather station powered by a 60-watt strontium 90 generator on exhibit here in Geneva is identical to the U.S. station operating in the Gulf of Mexico. The U.S.S.R. reports the successful operation of an automatic weather station in the middle part of their country powered by a 5 watt Ce^{144} fueled generator.

The direct thermoelectric conversion of the fission heat of a nuclear reactor has been demonstrated. The efforts in the U.S.S.R. which culminated in "Romashka" are of great interest. This uranium dicarbide (UC_2) fueled fast reactor, coupled to Si-Ge thermocouples, has been operating at about 1,800° C and generating power at a level of several hundred watts since the middle of August.

The United States hopes to demonstrate in the spring of 1965, with a developmental orbital flight of SNAP–10A, a 500-watt reactor unit also employing thermoelectric power conversion. This uranium 235 fueled and zirconium-hydride moderated reactor with liquid metal coolant will weigh less than 1,000 pounds, including payload shieldings. These reactor units in larger sizes will permit future communication satellites to broadcast simultaneously several channels of television directly to individual homes.

It seems clear that these reactor concepts, SNAP and Romashka, while receiving their impetus from the needs for space power, will find equally important roles as compact, reliable terrestrial power sources.

NUCLEAR DESALINATION

As I indicated earlier, one of the more exciting new applications for nuclear reactors is the desalting of sea water. We have heard reports of the U.S. studies for combination power and desalting application and the studies by Israel and Tunisia and Mexico. The U.S.S.R. and France have presented interesting data on reactors for process applications such as would be the case in desalting situations. We are encouraged by these reports and expect that one or more combination nuclear power and desalting installations producing millions of gallons per day of fresh water will be constructed and in operation within the next 4 to 8 years.

The potential of nuclear energy in the combined production of power and water is not only a very fascinating peaceful use of the atom, but one which can provide tremendous benefits for all mankind. The availability of economic power and water could open new frontiers throughout the world for population growth and industrialization. To achieve these benefits, however, nations of the world must work together. We have witnessed a step in this direction just today in the IAEA panel meeting on desalting. During the Conference we also have heard of other steps such as the cooperative efforts between various nations in nuclear desalting to meet their future water and power needs. These steps are a commendable start.

The studies that have been undertaken to date indicate that combination nuclear installations in the next few decades will be able to produce fresh water and electric power at costs which may be attractive for many municipal and industrial needs throughout the world. The water from these combination plants may even find economic potential for selected agricultural use when compared with other alternatives in specific situations.

As the nations of the world develop and populations increase, the economic natural water sources are likely to become depleted, especially in some geographical regions. Other areas, already deficient in water, will need water for development to support larger populations. Thus, desalting of sea water by nuclear energy will become more and more important. What today is a matter of interest could well become tomorrow's necessity.

Portable nuclear power plants: Another immediate application of nuclear reactors is to supply power and heat in remote locations. We have heard a Soviet Union report on the 750 Kw(e) ARBUS organic cooled and moderated package plant. This plant, which began operation in the summer of 1963, uses a carbon steel primary loop and pumps and auxiliaries available from the oil industry for lower cost, and consists of 19 packages each weighing not more than 20 tons. Soviet scientists have also described the 1,500 Kw(e), TES–3, a pressurized water plant arranged on four large, tracked vehicles. U.S. scientists described their portable pressurized water reactors, using compact cores of UO_2-stainless steel cermet fuel, together with details of operating experience at several sites in the United States, the Arctic, and the Antarctic. The success of these plants which generate up to 2,000 Kw(e) in addition to a substantial quantity of space heat provides the technology which is applicable to any small nuclear powerplant for remote installations, be it for mining, a scientific mission, or for other needs.

MARITIME NUCLEAR PROPULSION

The hopeful outlook for the maritime application of nuclear power expressed in the 1958 Conference can now be supported by successful operating experience with two nuclear powered vessels. The icebreaker *Lenin*, during its nearly 5 years of operation, has demonstrated the advantages of nuclear power for this important service. The N.S. *Savannah* is now completing its second European voyage and is also meeting its expectations.

Two countries, West Germany and Japan, already have firm projects for construction of their first nuclear powered ships. Others are carrying on development in preparation for future projects, and the U.S.S.R. announced during the Conference that it expects to build two new nuclear icebreakers, with the first one coming into operation in 1971.

Thus, with successful operating experience amounting to well over 100,000 miles for the two existing ships and with new prospectively economic projects already under way or planned, we can have confidence in the ultimate success of expanding nuclear propulsion programs for the merchant marine.

PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVES

The U.S. plowshare program for developing peaceful uses of nuclear explosives has received considerable attention. Despite the fact that this program is in an early stage of development and many data are needed before useful projects can be undertaken, the potential for use of nuclear explosives in excavation, mining, recovery of gas and oil and as a research tool appears promising. Significant suggestions for methods of international collaboration and participation have been proposed by delegates from a number of nations. It is hoped that through such international support and cooperation that nuclear weapon technology can be converted into a valuable research and engineering tool for the benefit of all mankind.

RESEARCH AND HIGH-FLUX REACTORS

Although nuclear power has been the major focus of interest at this Conference, there has been considerable discussion of research and high-flux reactors and their associated programs, and the applications of radioisotopes to the physical and life sciences.

Conference papers suggest that the uses of newer research reactors fall plainly into three main kinds of activity: First, there is the continuing examination of radiation effects on materials for the construction, moderation and fueling of reactors. Second is the more fundamental and better controlled kind of physical research made possible by reactors designed to meet more specific research needs. A good example of this is the work reported on pulsed reactors. The third area

is the production of radioisotopes for medical therapy, for tracer uses and now for the production of relatively large quantities of transplutonium elements, in both the United States and the U.S.S.R.

My personal bias is evident when I say that the prospect of performing basic and exploratory research on gram quantities of californium isotopes, hundreds of milligrams of berkelium, milligrams of einsteinium and up to a milligram of fermium produced in these reactors is one of the most exciting to which we have been exposed in decades.

The shift from all-purpose to specialized research reactors is most clear when one considers the construction of high-flux reactors for either materials testing or isotope production. In operation or shortly to be in operation, are the HFIR, HFBR, and ATR in the United States, the MP, MPR, and SM-2 in the U.S.S.R., and the PEGASE in France.

This desire for higher neutron fluxes has stimulated technological developments of an order of magnitude, or more in some cases, beyond the conditions existing in present power reactors, thus paving the way for further improvements in power reactors. Such major advances include the development of fuel elements and cores to operate at very high power densities and heat fluxes.

We have also learned how to specially tailor the flux in experimental areas, and through past experience have come to appreciate the need to carefully coordinate the design and construction of the reactor with our research needs. The new knowledge has resulted in such notable experimental facilities as fuel element testing loops in the U.S.S.R. MR reactor and the French PEGASE reactor, the high temperature gas-cooled loop in the United Kingdom Pluto reactor, the liquid hydrogen cold sink in the French high-flux beam reactor and the liquid hydrogen moderator chamber in the British DIDO reactor.

RADIOISOTOPES

Another area exemplifying the research applications of nuclear energy is that of radioisotopes. More than 30 papers at this Conference have been devoted specifically to radioisotopes, their applications, and their methods of production or separation. If I were to include papers on subjects of a closely related nature, such as high-flux reactors, stable isotopes, and the productive utilization of ionizing radiation, the number would increase substantially.

It is clear that the technology associated with isotopes now permeates every scientific and engineering field. It is indeed one outgrowth of the atomic age that can be employed by all countries regardless of size or state of technological advancement.

In my judgment, an outstanding technical accomplishment of the past few years—as represented by papers presented here—has been the effort to produce, separate, and purify radioisotopes in quantities sufficient to permit consideration of their use as sources of thermal and radiation power. Several countries have reported major progress in this area. Another area of outstanding achievement has been the use of radioisotopes in medicine to alleviate man's suffering; this is the domain of what I have called "The humane atom."

From the scientific viewpoint, the widespread establishment of neutron activation analysis as a standard technique for measurement of trace quantities of almost every element in the periodic table represents a contribution of immeasurable value to medicine, agriculture, and the physical sciences. In fact, its application has been extended even to law enforcement.

Ionizing radiation—whether the source be radioisotopes, machines, or reactors—is finding a place in the processing of organic chemicals, plastics, and other materials in sterilization of medical supplies and in the preservation of foods.

CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR REACTIONS

The disclosure of previously classified research on controlled thermonuclear reactions was one of the main features of the 1958 conference. That year and its aftermath was an age of innocence for this intriguing field of research—a field of research which could lead to the extraction of an inexhaustible supply of energy from the oceans. The papers presented here show that we have learned a great deal in the intervening years. Plasma physicists now know well the hard scientific and engineering realities of suspending, squeezing, and holding in space gases with temperatures of the order of those found in the stars. They have learned that the prospects for an easy engineering shortcut to controlled fusion are not bright. They have demonstrated, to the satisfaction of themselves and the nuclear community, that controlled fusion is one of the most difficult scientific and engineering problems ever encountered.

The early optimism followed by the sobering experience of the last 6 years should not, however, blind us to the truly significant progress that has been made. An important and exciting new area of fundamental science in plasma physics has grown up. I shall mention three of the many evidences of the maturing of plasma physics. One is the increasing sophistication of the field, represented in part by the development of a new language which is getting beyond the comprehension of the rest of us in the nuclear field. The second is sheer size—the general increase in the number of scientists in controlled fusion research, the increased investment in scientific facilities by governments, and the expanding literature. The number of scientific papers per year on plasma physics has increased about 45 percent since 1959, as have the number of workers in the field. A rough count indicates that work is now going on with 10 major experimental devices in the U.S.S.R., 14 in the United Kingdom and Western Europe, 4 in Japan and Australia, and 10 in the United States.

The most important indicator of growth, however, lies in the scientific results of these years, contained in papers presented here. Whereas in 1958, plasma scientists were only on the verge of producing fusion reactions with thermal neutrons truly attributable to the reaction, a number of laboratories today regularly produce plasma with ion-energies exceeding the so-called minimum ignition temperature.

A usable controlled fusion reaction would require nuclear reactions of adequate duration, temperature, and density of plasma.

Today one machine may best approach the production of the required temperature, another the required duration of nuclear reactions, and another the desirable destiny of plasma, but no one machine is capable of meeting all three requirements. The aim now—and it is a long-range one—is to achieve reactions combining all of these factors satisfactorily in a single machine.

An important foundation of knowledge has been erected on the most important problems of controlled fusion, namely plasma stability. The pioneering work of Ioffe in the Soviet Union on the confinement of plasma in a region where the pressure of the magnetic field is at a minimum, the so-called minimum-B confinement, is to be admired. It is also encouraging to learn of the many new experiments underway to measure the limits of plasma stability under varying conditions, such as the NTSE in the United Kingdom, DECA in France, and the DCX-2 in the United States.

There is a growing ability to predict plasma behavior. Numerous good checks between experiment and theory have been achieved—for example, in the Phoenix experiments in the United Kingdom, and in the Levitron and ALICE experiments in the United States. Such agreements did not exist in any laboratory results in 1958, and these are a strong indication of the growing maturity of plasma science.

We cannot be absolutely sure that controlled thermonuclear power can be developed, although the general feeling at the Conference is that this will be accomplished at some time—perhaps before the end of the century. Certainly the benefit—essentially unlimited power for the earth's population for all time—is one we cannot overlook. Indeed, I agree with expressions of some of the delegates that the approximately $100 million spent worldwide each year in the nuclear fusion field is too low an investment for research with such vast potential benefit.

EXHIBITS

A word should also be said about the many fine scientific exhibits displayed here in Geneva in connection with this Third Conference. Also I am sure many of you have been impressed as I was by the excellent quality of the scientific films prepared for this Conference by many of the countries. These will certainly be a lasting contribution. The many people involved in these exhibits and films should be congratulated for their excellent efforts.

CONCLUSION

In my closing remarks, I should like to depart again from the form of the technical progress summary. I wish to review some of the human implications, especially in an international context, of what has been said here. The degree of international cooperation in the development of this coming major energy resource in the last decade is surely unusual, and perhaps unique, in world history. We can point to these conferences, to the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the variety of cooperative programs among nations, and to the nuclear assistance programs of a number of nations. Important specific projects are the Norway-Poland-Yugoslavia project, the Dragon project and the SEFOR project. Close at hand is CERN, one of the outstanding examples of international cooperation in science, which many of us have had an opportunity to visit during this Conference.

The Conference has demonstrated many reasons why international cooperation must be continued and strengthened. The free flow of information, not only in science but also at the more restrictive technological level, is the key to the most rapid technical progress for all people.

This international collaboration practiced so successfully in nuclear energy gives further strength to the thesis that science can serve as a common ground between all nations of the world. A uranium or plutonium atom knows no nationality. Through international conferences such as this, and other broader and more intensive progress of exchange and collaboration, science may be a leading factor in resolving the differences which still remain between countries.

The Conference has also dramatized the fact that practical achievement of material well-being for the peoples of the developing nations rests upon this structure of close international cooperation. The Conference has again made us aware of the relative shortages of fossil fuels and hydroelectric potentials in many of these nations. For these nations to reach and maintain living standards presently found in the developed countries by the end of the century will require nuclear power energy on a large scale. Indeed, we see the possibility that through nuclear power the developing nations may partially circumvent the long years of the Industrial Revolution and greatly telescope the time required for those nations to enter the scientific revolution upon which so many of the developed nations have already embarked.

Such a hope will be illusory, however, without a solid foundation consisting of cadres of scientists, engineers, and technicians as well as facilities for productive work. Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, reminded us that "the development of certain scientific institutions and the training of at least a small number of scientists in some of the advanced disciplines is by no means a luxury for any of the new nations."

Technologically advanced nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency have already made progress in training and in establishing science centers in the developing nations. Much more needs to be done by a number of the developed nations. We need to find ways, especially through science centers, to enable trained scientists and engineers of high caliber to do meaningful work in their own countries. We have found that they otherwise migrate to advanced centers of science abroad.

It is clear that these efforts should not be limited to nuclear science and technology. The nuclear field, however, has much more to offer than nulcear power. The breadth and attractiveness of nuclear science and technology make the field an excellent focal point for a start in broader research and development. We are all aware of a number of good examples of such beginnings with the nuclear field.

If we are to implement the major conclusion of this Conference—that nuclear power will become an increasingly powerful force in the world's work—it will be necessary to evolve as rapidly as possible an appropriate world body of nuclear law. Considerable progress has been made in the development and application of appropriate safeguards under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As Dr. Sigvard Eklund, Director General of the IAEA, told us, it is important to have accepted an "international safeguard system now when the number of power reactors is still small." The future growth of the international atom must be paralleled by the future growth of an effective safeguards system.

By the turn of the century, our Conference suggests, more than half of the world's electricity will be generated by nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is, therefore, the hope of the peoples of the world for a good life. If the major future energy base of the world continues to evolve in an environment of international development and law, nuclear energy can be an important unifying force in a world of peace, security, and human well-being.

Nuclear power: megawatts past, present, and future

	1955	1958	1964	1970	1980
Belgium	------	------	12	--------	----------
Canada	------	------	20	--------	----------
France	------	------	150	--------	----------
Germany	------	------	15	--------	----------
Italy	------	------	525	--------	----------
Japan	------	------	12	--------	----------
Sweden	------	------	9	--------	----------
United Kingdom	------	120	2,300	--------	----------
United States	------	60	1,057	--------	----------
U.S.S.R.	5	5	,900	--------	----------
Other	------	------	------	--------	----------
Total	5	185	5,000	25,000	150,000/ 250,000

(Chart omitted from the RECORD.)

OUR POLITICAL PARTIES—SOME DIFFERENCES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] 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. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in the 64 years since the turn of the century, the control of the U.S. Government has rested in the hands of the Democratic Party for 30 years, and in the hands of the Republican Party for 34 years. For two of those years, 1947 and 1948, Mr. Truman was in the White House, but the years are assigned to the Republican Party because they controlled Congress during that time, and Mr. Truman disclaimed any legislation put through by the 80th Congress.

With such an even distribution of time since 1900, it is possible to examine now what has happened in America, and to America, during the years when each party was in power. In making this examination, I have chosen a limited number of items of reference, items which are important and which have a truly current application. The items I have selected are: spending, unemployment, taxes, and corruption in government.

SPENDING

There is a current myth that spending Federal money is something that touches us very lightly, if at all. This is false. You pay, or your children pay, or their children.

In 34 years of control of the Government, the Republican Party had 22 balanced budgets, 12 unbalanced budgets. It accumulated a national debt of $13.4 billion in that time. This is 4.4 percent of our national debt.

In 30 years of control, the Democratic Party had three balanced budgets, 27 unbalanced budgets. It accumulated a debt of $293 billion. This is 95.6 percent of the national debt. It is significant to note that if you subtract the total deficits accumulated during three wars when the Democrats were in power, the total still comes to over $70 billion.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Every 4 years the specter of unemployment and depression is hauled out of the closet by some of our opponents, and the promise of prosperity is heard in the land. But it is interesting to note the unemployment statistics during the years each party was in power.

During 34 years of power the Republican Party saw unemployment top 5 percent for 14 years. For 20 of its years the unemployment rate stayed safely below that figure.

During 30 years in power the Democratic Party saw unemployment top 5 per cent for 16 years. For 14 years the mark stayed below that figure. But in all fairness, four of those years when unemployment was low during the Democratic regimes, we were in the Second World War, and unemployment was unthinkable.

During its 34 years in power the Republican Party saw an average unemployment rate of 5.6 percent.

During its 30 years in power, the Democratic Party saw an average unemployment rate of 8.5 percent.

TAXES

There have been 9 reductions in taxes and 15 increases in taxes since the tax law was passed in 1913. The Republican Party was responsible for eight reductions and two increases. The Democratic Party was responsible for three reductions and 13 increases.

In 1932 the personal exemption was $1,000 for an individual and $2,300 for a married couple. The normal tax rate was 4 percent. By the end of the New Deal and Fair Deal, the exemption had been lowered to $500 and the tax rate had risen to 20 percent—an increase of 500 percent. The Republican 80th Congress raised the exemption to $600—over the veto of Mr. Truman; the same Republican 80th Congress raised exemptions for all over 65 from $500 to $1,200—again over the veto of Mr. Truman.

CORRUPTION

Virtue is not the private possession of any one political party. We will always have people in government who cheat, who use their influence for crooked ends, or who hedge on virtue while not actually crossing the line into criminal behavior.

The Teapot Dome scandal occurred during a Republican administration. But the moment the scandal broke, the President suspended the Attorney General and put two men, one a Democrat and one a Republican, to work to ferret out every bit and piece of that scandal for all to see.

A comparable scandal broke during the Truman administration. Mr. Truman denounced the investigators. He denied any possibility of scandal. When the investigators finished their work, 88 members of the Treasury Department were suspended for accepting bribes; 40 suspended for embezzling Government funds; 51 failed to pay their own taxes; 3 were indicted for operating a blackmail ring; and 2 were convicted of operating as bookies in their tax offices. A total of 101 indictments were obtained for Federal crimes, including a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, an Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a Chief of the Alcohol Tax Unit, a top official heading the Income Tax Division in the Department of Justice, and a top White House aide.

In the present administration, a new cloud has arisen out of the office of one Bobby Baker, Democratic majority clerk of the Senate, the man who was described by the then majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, as his "strong right arm." We had an investigation of this scandal. It was the sort of investigation where the minority members of the committee were permitted to call not a single witness. The investigation of the scandal has become itself a scandal—and it is clearly a Democratic scandal.

SUMMARY

That is the record of the 20th century. In its 34 years in power the Republican Party has worked to build this country into a magnificent power in the world. It has exercised wise fiscal prudence. It fought to give the taxpayer every possible chance to keep enough of his money to give himself and his family

a decent living in the most prosperous nation in history. It fought, too, to provide the jobs for the people of America. It worked with clean hands, and when soiled hands attempted to move into government, the hands were driven out with dispatch.

Above all, it did not give to the children and their children a legacy of debt that will linger for generations to come.

For the other party—the record speaks for itself.

THE HONORABLE WALTER NORBLAD

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the facts of any man's life may be recounted in a very brief space, but the grief which his passing leaves in the hearts of those who knew and admired him cannot really be expressed at all.

I had the great pleasure of knowing the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the First District of Oregon, as a colleague whose integrity, warmth, humor, goodwill, and ability were outstanding among men noted for the possession of these qualities. Moreover, he was my neighbor in the halls of the House Office Building where we occupied adjoining offices. I find it difficult to come to terms with the realization that I shall now never be able to greet him as he walks along the corridor to his office, see his friendly smile, or hear again his cheerful hello.

He was the son of a former Governor of the State of Oregon, and served in the Oregon Legislature from 1935 to 1939. He was born in Escanaba, Mich., and was reared in Astoria. He attended the New Mexico Military Institute, the University of Oregon, and the University of Oregon Law School. He pursued graduate legal studies at the Harvard Law School, and was admitted to the Oregon bar in 1932.

During the war he served as a combat intelligence officer in the Eighth Air Force, and was awarded the Air Medal. Returning to civilian life, he was elected to the 79th Congress in a special election in January of 1946, and was reelected to each succeeding Congress.

He strived unceasingly as a member of the Armed Services Committee to assure the taxpayers of America strong and efficient military and naval forces. His constant concern for the well-being of his devoted constituents was always apparent. His high reputation among his fellow Members of the House of Representatives testified to his high competence as a legislator and his character as as man and a friend.

WALTER NORBLAD will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress by his colleagues, his constituents, and his loyal and faithful office staff. Sharing their grief, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones, his wife, his son, his sister, and his mother.

ELLIS ARNALL—THE COASTAL STATES EXCITER

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in the August 1964 issue of the Southern Insurance magazine, Louie E. Throgmorton has sketched a "Profile" worthy of preservation. The article entitled, "Ellis Arnall—the Coastal States Exciter" is more than justified in the tribute it pays to such a magnanimous personality.

Ellis Arnall's efforts as chairman of the board of the Coastal States Life Insurance Co. of Georgia, which could tell the story of that company's success, are inspiring in themselves. But delving further into the career of this resourceful man, we discover that his accomplishments do not begin nor will they likely end here. As former State assemblyman, attorney general, and Georgia's youngest Governor at age 36, Ellis Arnall's versatility, ingenuity, and tireless energy bespeak the qualities of a great American.

The synthesis of these qualities with a gentle nature and a profound sense of fair play exemplify the ideal American success story and serve as a "confirmation of our American way of life."

A man of dynamic leadership, faultless integrity, and inestimable accomplishment, Ellis Arnall stands a man among men.

It is with pleasure that I recommend the reading of this article and include it as an extension of my remarks:

ELLIS ARNALL—THE COASTAL STATES EXCITER

(By Louie E. Throgmorton)

The story of the career of Ellis Gibbs Arnall, chairman of the board of the Coastal States Life, approaches pure fiction. When his full story is told by posterity, and placed in a book, the librarian will be tempetd to file it under fiction. Running along, side by side, is the story of the Coastal States Life of Georgia. The birth and growth of CSL is downright fascinating. This exciting company, with the big thrust now in progress, overcame mountaintop difficulties. Claude Poindexter, its beloved organizer and president, had to make many decisions and properly exercise the various options of difficulties. The breakthrough came and the seat belt sign is down, despite the fact that Claude and CSL are ever climbing higher.

I have been asked often, "What is the difference between company A and company B?" My answer, after years of participation and observation is people. The people who run them. Their imagination, their spunk, dedication, and loyalty, plus their honesty and beneficent purpose, and chiefly their ability to make things happen.

Ellis Arnall and Claude Poindexter fit this formula. Mr. Poindexter is the big dynamo that generates the power, and I like to think Ellis, the exciter needed in every powerplant. These two great men are the David and Jonathan of the insurance world. Their paths crossed early in their business life. Claude was a furniture dealer and doubling as a funeral director, with a charter to write burial insurance. The story of how he acquired the insurance idea will come in another essay. Ellis was the attorney general for good old Georgia. Ellis grew up in Newnan, Ga., and Claude's business was in Baxley, Ga. Their meeting was at opposite ends of a long table, while trying to work out the ragged details necessary to the granting of a charter. Later the charter was granted, signalizing the beginning of the present Coastal States Life.

Later, in 1953 and 1955, Ellis Arnall and Claude Poindexter really teamed up. Mr. Arnall was president of Dixie Life of Newnan, and Claude approached him on merging the two companies. At last this happened. Ellis became chairman of the board and Claude, chief officer and president. This partnership has been perfect, and harmony has existed over the years. Their singular talents are dedicated to giving Georgia and the South another financial giant.

I have known former Governor Arnall for 20 years. I consider him a genius. The things he has accomplished astound me. All the Who's Who in America list his accomplishments, and I can say I don't understand how one man could and still does accomplish so much. He has a card index mind. He can study a difficult situation and come up with a workable solution. He is a prober after facts. It seems to me that Shakespeare had his caliber in mind when he wrote, "His life is so gentle and all the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to the world, here is a man."

Mr. Arnall and his career represent a confirmation of our American way of life. He has verified that America offers "meritoracy" at its best. (Meritoracy means the power of merit.) His hometown of Newnan is a friendly Georgia city, with the usual signs upon the edge of the city reading Newnan, Ga., city limits. Of course this is physical. The human "unlimits" of at least three native sons have influenced America and the world. William (Bill) Terry, star first baseman and later manager of the New York Giants, is from Newnan, and internationally known Baptist minister, Dr. Landrum P. Leavall, and Ellis Arnall. These three went beyond the city limits. However, Ellis so loved Newnan he refuses to leave, and so he commutes to Atlanta where he has an enormous law office.

HE KNEW WHERE AND WHAT

Early in life Ellis knew where he wanted to go. He also knew what it would take for him to attain it. As a kid he wasted no time. Even on trips with the Newnan football team he was observing. He learned much from his grandfather and from his retail groceryman father. Here is where Ellis began to grasp the wonder of business. Ellis had an urge for politics, after getting out of college. He opened up as a lawyer in his hometown. He could charm a dog off a meat wagon, and everybody loved him. So he lit out to test his political possibilities by running for his county's seat in the Assembly of Georgia. He won this. However, he wanted to be the speaker pro tem. He was barely age 26 and looked even younger. He filled his jalopy with white gas and buttonholed every representative in every county of that large State. This mission was accomplished. He made good. Natural ability was demonstrated and the call to run for the office of attorney general came. At age 32 he was elected. These 4 years gave Ellis rich experiences and confidence. As any boy would dream, the office of governor beckoned. Believe it or not, at age 36 Georgia had its youngest Governor.

His work as attorney general must be reckoned with. It was here that he began to give to Georgia the impetus to expand. The big thrust came because of Mr. Arnall's

courage to fight and break the vicious hold the northern railroads had on the South at that time. Ellis as the attorney general began to break these chains and tear down the barriers. Space won't permit to tell the real story of this impact, so I recommend buying a copy of "The Shore Dimly Seen" and read some startling prophecies made by Mr. Arnall that have now been accomplished. You might also get a copy of "What the People Want." Through his effort, the State of Georgia became the empire state of the South. His beloved Atlanta was the first city of the South to reach the million mark. The one big accomplishment of the attorney general and his staff was the crushing of the stranglehold the northern railroads had upon the South through the rate structures. This fight, all the way to the Supreme Court, is known, as the "Northern Railroad Conspiracy." I hope the next face carved on the famed Stone Mountain will be that of Ellis Arnall, in just tribute to his zeal in fighting for his State and the South.

Alex DeTocqueville wrote many years ago this accurate statement: "It is true that around every man a fatal circle is drawn, beyond which he cannot pass, but within that range he is powerful and free." Within his own circle Ellis used his own slingshot to fight his Goliath.

Here is a man fully endowed with the knowledge of our constitutional law, the American dream and the ability to get results, working with and through others. He has a sense of fairness and always rises above small politics. He, to me, is the perfect example of what a President of our country must have. I sincerely wish he could have been. However, he had two strikes against him; he was born in the South. All Ellis would have had to do, to make a great President, was just take the blueprint of what he did for Georgia while its Governor.

WIPED OUT STATE DEBT

Here are some of his accomplishments. The State was debt free for the first time in over a hundred years—in spite of this he operated the State on a budget of less than $50 million a year—and managed to leave $34 million in surplus. He raised teachers' salaries by a third, he eliminated the poll tax and lowered the voting age to 18. He started the University of Georgia on a building program that is still going on.

Mr. Arnall, along with Claude Poindexter, is giving the Coastal States Life the same type of dynamic leadership. Their results are the talk of the insurance world just now. The Coastal States Life is in the center of the stage and the spotlight of outside interest is upon it. Stockholders are in every State of the Union and in eight foreign countries. Insurance in force is within shaking-hands distance of one-half billion. Their goal is a billion by 1970, and I predict this will be reached by late 1968 or early 1969; I don't see how they can miss. Oh, to be 39 again and grab a hold of the wings of the morning of the Coastal States Life, and flop around the world. Talk about new frontiers: Here is one.

I think of Browning's verse when I think of the future of Coastal States Life:

Grow old along with me,
The best is yet to be
The last for which the first was made.

I have but one word for Ellis Arnall—the word is magnanimity. He is gracious at all times, and he, like Will Rogers, never met a man he didn't like. I have been with Mr. Arnall on many occasions and never heard him speak ill of any man, even his toughest political opponents.

THE ARNALL FAMILY

The family is God's masterpiece. The Arnall family is a masterpiece. His wife, the beautiful Mildred DeLaney Siemons, is his inspiration and partner. Reams could be written about his delightful daughter Alice. "Princess Alice," as she is known, has won beauty contests and about every honor available at Hollins College in Virginia. Alice is now a student there. She was born in the Governor's Mansion at Atlanta while her daddy was Governor. Her visit there recently was the subject of a story in the Sunday magazine of the Atlanta Constitution of September 13, 1963. My favorite writer of the Sunday magazine, Doris Lockerman, did a swell job. Princess Alice has beauty, charm, and brains. This combination will never spoil her. Her daddy may.

Their son Alvan is equally famous. He—now in his twenties—is assistant attorney general of Georgia, but right now is doing a stint for his country. He is a Marine and a first lieutenant.

Arthur Mayer of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Motion Picture Co., drank this toast to Ellis—"To Ellis Arnall with profound admiration for his services not only to the movies—but to all phases of American life—with admiration and affection."

What a Supreme Court Justice Ellis Arnall would make. I know he would rank along with Oliver Wendell Holmes. He has the daring of a Ty Cobb, the poise of a Bobby Jones, the love of Georgia of a Margaret Mitchell, and the sportsmanship of a Bobby Dodd. In addition, he has the warm prose power of a Grantland Rice. For Ellis Arnall, the family of the Coastal States Life is thankful, and the life insurance industry is a little taller because of him.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER NORBLAD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has lost a most able and intelligent legislator with the death of Representative WALTER NORBLAD, and I have lost a personal friend. It is, therefore, with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to our late colleague whose death deprived the First Oregon Congressional District of the dedicated and hard-working Representative. Since 1946, WALTER NORBLAD has been relentless and unceasing in his determination to discover how to serve best the interest of his district, the State of Oregon, and the country.

I wish to speak of WALTER NORBLAD as a friend and colleague—a kind and valued colleague. When I first came to the House in January 1955, I found in WALTER NORBLAD a person who was more than anxious to be of assistance and to share with me the wealth of experience that was his. We worked together on many occasions on Oregon projects and programs and consulted frequently on problems which were common to the Northwest. During these last 10 years, as I came to know him better, I came to admire him more and more for his fairness and his intellectual courage.

He always showed great kindness to all. I have never known him to utter an unkind remark about another person, which is indeed a rare quality in public service. He always looked for and emphasized the positive qualities in his friends and colleagues. In going about his congressional duties, WALTER NORBLAD carried himself with affability, warmth, and humor. The observation that courage is grace under pressure is most suited to WALTER NORBLAD.

His able service on the Armed Services Committee is known to all. There he was second ranking Republican and there he dedicated his efforts to make sure that this would be a safe and secure Nation. Many, many people will miss him, but one group of citizens which will particularly miss WALTER NORBLAD will be those members of the armed services whose welfare and well-being were a constant concern of his.

This summer, WALTER was stricken with a heart condition. He was urged to slow his pace and let the burdens of the office be carried by other colleagues and members of his most capable congressional office staff. But WALTER NORBLAD had a restive spirit and his dedication and concern drew him back to his congressional duties.

Now he is gone. We shall miss him in Oregon; we shall miss him in the House and I shall miss him as a friend.

I wish to express my sorrow to his immediate family; his wife, Elizabeth, his son, Albin Walter, and his mother. I hope that they will find comfort and solace in knowing that WALTER NORBLAD'S good work has literally affected the lives, the future, and the welfare of countless individuals in our land.

The editor of the Oregon Journal expressed very well the sentiments of countless Oregon citizens when he wrote on September 22:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, Sept. 22, 1964]

WALTER NORBLAD SOUND LEGISLATOR

U.S. Representative WALTER NORBLAD, who served more than 18 years in the Congress of the United States, was a man who "wore well" with the folks at home and with his colleagues in the legislative halls.

A good share of his life, following his admission to the Oregon bar in 1932, was in public service. He served in the Oregon Legislature from 1935 to 1939, was in military service from 1942 to 1945, and has represented the First Oregon District in Congress since January 11, 1946.

NORBLAD took a dim view of the lightning and thunder type of political oratory, and he was seldom in the midst of hot controversy, but he was alert and sympathetic to the needs and wishes of his constituents. He took a special interest in military affairs, and was the second ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee. On matters affecting the military security of the United States in the cold war, he was considered one of the best informed men in Congress.

Although NORBLAD was the only Republican in the Oregon congressional delegation, he concentrated more on serving his State than on partisan politics, usually being in what might be called the moderate camp. The State has lost a veteran legislator who never lost his sense of balance or sense of values in the heat and swirl of political battles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; I would be very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the majority leader from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD, had passed away. WALTER and I served together almost from the beginning of our careers in the House of Representatives. He was my dear friend over the years.

He was a distinguished Member of the House who represented his constituency and the Nation with ability and dedication. His talents won him the respect of his colleagues; his fineness and gentility won him their affection.

I had no idea that WALTER's health was not good. I have never heard him complain. The last time I talked with him he appeared to be in the best of spirits and in good health. His youthful appearance belied his years, even though he was still in the prime of life. His death was a shock and leaves a void in this House. I shall miss him.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying my respects to our late colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to come to a realization that WALTER NORBLAD is no longer with us. WALTER and I were the closest of friends. Our families were close. We enjoyed many wonderful times together.

For the last 10 years or so we have also been neighbors, living in the same area.

I suppose if there is any one adjective that could be used to describe WALTER, it is that he was an extremely kind man.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has referred to this fact.

In all the years and in all the times I have been with WALTER and we visited together, I never heard him say an unkind thing about any of his colleagues or any person he knew. He always looked for the best in people.

WALTER was a conscientious Member of this Congress; he was a conscientious citizen. He tried always to do what he thought was not only best for his country, best for his district, but best as far as the individual citizen was concerned.

WALTER was a warm person. He loved people. He liked to get into conversations with perfect strangers just to be able to visit with them and talk to them and express, as it were, mutual feelings on various subjects.

It is difficult for me to speak with respect to him, because I feel his departure most deeply, but I must say that WALTER will live in my memory as long as I am on this earth because to me he was one of my finest and closest friends.

My sympathy and that of Mrs. Byrnes goes to his wife, Elizabeth, his son Albin, whom we have seen grow from a small boy to a young man, and to WALTER's mother.

We know that words cannot heal the grief that they have, but at least the knowledge that all who knew him loved him and feel a great loss in his passing, I hope may be of some solace to them.

We have lost an able colleague. I have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress quite some time ago I had already been familiar with the name of Norblad in the great State of Oregon. After WALTER came here I came to know him very, very well, and I considered him to be one of the most able, honest, trustworthy and conscientious Members of this body. He was my good friend and, as I am sure he understood, I was his friend. He came to this body with a fine background, a man of high educational qualifications who had served his country in World War II with distinction.

So, in his passing this body has lost one of its truly distinguished Members, and I have lost a great personal friend. I mourn his passing. I wish he could still be with us. We all appreciate that while he died much too young, none of us determines when the inevitable shall come about. This is something all of us must understand. So to his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in the hope that they will gain consolation from the knowledge that WALTER NORBLAD's life and career and his accomplishments will stand as a real hallmark of achievement of which those who survive him may well be proud.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying tribute to one of the real great men that we have had the privilege of serving with here in the House of Representatives.

WALTER NORBLAD was a very close friend of mine, and I feel I am the prime beneficiary of that friendship. For several years we were neighbors in the House Office Building, and on several occasions he and I have had occasion to spend several days together in connection with our official duties in places other than Washington.

I concur in the splendid statements that the gentlewoman from Oregon has made about his traits of character. Certainly no man was more trustworthy, more diligent, or more able than was WALTER NORBLAD.

It was always a happy occasion for the people in my office that often in the late afternoons, as WALTER would be leaving his office he would come by and make some pleasant remark to the people working in the office.

He was in his last illness in the hospital when an accident occurred in my own family. While out in Denver, Colo., I was quite pleasantly surprised to receive a letter handwritten by WALTER from his hospital room expressing concern about one who really was not the subject of as much concern as was he.

To me, this gentler side of this great man will be one of the many things that will remain in my mind and memory and will be the cause of a feeling of great appreciation for having had the privilege of being associated with the late gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in extending deepest sympathy to the family of our departed friend and colleague.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was terribly distressed to learn of the passing of our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. I was in Illinois when the news came to me, and although I knew he had been ill I had hoped that the good Lord would restore him to good health.

WALT NORBLAD to me was one of the finest gentleman I ever knew. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services we sat side by side over the many, many years he was privileged to serve in this Congress. WALT NORBLAD took an intense interest in his work on the Armed Services Committee. He was devoted to the purpose of having the finest national defense our country could possibly have. He was always diligent in those things which he felt would be in the best interests of his country, his State, and his district.

WALT NORBLAD was one of those fellows I could always say, "I am proud to call him my friend"; lovable, fair, honest, honorable, and objective. As time goes on I am sure he will be appreciated more and more by those he was privileged to represent.

To his fine wife and son I extend my sincere sympathy in this time of their bereavement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentlewoman from Oregon in mourning the passing of WALT NORBLAD. I had the privilege of knowing him when he served on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]. At that time we recognized Mr. NORBLAD as being a fine Member of Congress. I have always recalled the pleasant relationship that took place between Mr. TOLLEFSON, Mr. NORBLAD, and myself. I regretted it when he left the committee because I saw him serve faithfully and loyally there. I watched him on the floor of the House and observed him in the duties he was assigned to later. I noticed he was always diligent, thorough, and fair. It is my opinion that his friendships existed on both sides of the aisle, as has been demonstrated here this afternoon. I shall miss him greatly, because I considered him an outstanding Member of this body. I regret very much his passing, and express my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of WALTER NORBLAD, I like many others in the House of Representatives lost one of our closest personal friends. He had many, many friends on both sides of the aisle. Everyone who knew him thought WALTER NORBLAD was a wonderful fellow.

I knew WALTER intimately for 16 years. During that period of time his family and our family were very close. We enjoyed a great many family get togethers over the years. WALTER and his wonderful wife were the godparents of our youngest child, Susan who adored him. Our families used to get together quite frequently for the holidays, particularly on Christmas Eve. Their fine son, Albin, was always a great favorite with our children. Our whole family lost a real friend with WALTER's untimely passing.

But aside from the close associations that our families had, during my contacts with WALTER in the House of Representatives, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities in representing his constituents in the State of Oregon. He was not a flamboyant type. He was not the kind who made many speeches in the House Chamber. Nevertheless, he did his job and did it most effectively. Because of his long service on the Committee on Armed Services he became an authority on military matters and was highly respected by our military leaders for his fairness, his sound judgment, and devotion to a strong national defense. When the chips were down and when the hard, controversial issues had to be resolved, there was never any failure on his part to stand up and be counted.

I know, we all know, that during the time that he served here, almost 20 years, the people of his congressional district in Oregon were most ably represented by a mighty fine person who took very seriously his responsibilities as their Representative. His constituents, the State of Oregon, and our country have profited from his efforts. WALTER NORBLAD will be greatly missed.

I was shocked to get the news of WALTER's passing. Unfortunately, he had been ill for several months prior to his death. We all hoped—we all prayed—we all thought that he was making a recovery. He has left us but we have countless memories of a wonderful person. He has left an indelible mark on each of us personally and on the House as a whole.

In closing I wish to say from the bottom of my heart that our whole family extends to his wonderful wife, Elizabeth, and to his fine son, Albin, our deepest sympathies and condolences.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned within hours of the passing of my friend, WALTER NORBLAD, while I was deep in the wild country of the lower Rogue River a week ago Sunday. How the sad word got into that country devoid as it is of telephone or telegraph connections, I do not know. But I do know that every Oregonian who brought me this news was as touched and as saddened as I was by the passing of my friend, WALTER NORBLAD.

There is no one who was any more hospitable and who was any more kind to my family and me when we first came to the Congress 2 years ago than was WALTER and his wife, Elizabeth.

Different political affiliations did not and could not dampen the very genuine friendship and respect which I came to feel for WALTER NORBLAD.

I will miss him and so will his colleagues in the House who knew him as an honest, compassionate and dedicated public servant incapable of malice or rancor.

Because he had a deep and rugged inner sense of character, because he was unafraid of the truth, because he always kept his word, and because he understood and fulfilled his full responsibilities as a public official and as a man, I am proud to have known WALTER NORBLAD and to have been able to call him my friend. Many there are who feel he would still be with us had he been willing to take the time from his congressional duties to rest and restore his health. But all of us saw him day after day on the floor of the House which claimed so many years of his life and finally his life, itself.

He, as his father before him, leaves behind a long record of service to his State and to his Nation. His family's loss is shared by all who knew him. My wife and I extend to his wife, to his son, and to his mother our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD was my good friend. We lived in the same neighborhood in Washington, D.C., for many years, and our only sons were playmates in grade school.

I recall that last July, before I went to San Francisco to attend the Republican Convention, I received a little note from WALTER, who was then in the hospital, expressing the hope that I would look up his son Albin, who was a member of the Oregon delegation—I believe the youngest Republican delegate attending the convention. I did see Albin and we had a delightful visit.

WALTER NORBLAD loved his boy, his only child. On many occasions, he and I discussed the welfare of his son and my own son. Our two boys ripened our friendship of many years.

Furthermore, WALT NORBLAD's office was on my floor in the Longworth Building, and we have had rather an intimate acquaintance throughout our joint service in the Congress.

WALT NORBLAD was a good man who was kind and considerate of his fellows. He had a pleasing personality and was well liked by all who knew him. WALT kept in constant touch with his constituents, and I often marveled at the way mail poured out of his office to the folks back home. WALT was a good citizen and a great American who served well his day and generation. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to WALTER's wife Elizabeth, and his son Albin.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD's untimely death was a heavy blow to all of us who knew him, who loved and admired him, and who were proud to call him a friend. Our State and our Nation have suffered a great loss.

WALTER NORBLAD had those qualities of personal warmth, sincere good will, and a generous concern for his fellow men that made him loved and revered by all who came in contact with him. He had an unusual capacity for genuine friendship—and went out of his way to make the path of his fellow men a bit easier. From the time I came to Congress, I always found him ready with a helping hand.

Only one other Oregonian served longer in the House than WALTER NORBLAD. WALTER came here in 1946 serving quietly and effectively for 18 years. He sought neither headlines nor controversy, preferring to live at peace with his fellow men, handling his problems on a personal basis.

WALTER NORBLAD never resorted to narrow partisanship. He was respected and admired on both sides of the aisle.

From the time Mrs. Ullman and I first met them, Elizabeth and WALTER NORBLAD have been our good friends. Their genuine warmth of heart, their open candor, and their total lack of affectation were all in the finest traditions of the beautiful western Oregon area that WALTER represented.

To Elizabeth and their son, Al, Mrs. Ullman and I offer our heartfelt condolences. Their loss is a heavy one and words have little power to ease their burden. May God bring comfort to their hearts in these difficult hours.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a departed brother who served so long and so well in the House of Representatives. I well remember when WALTER NORBLAD came to Congress in the special election following the death in office of James Wheaton Mott on November 12, 1945. In the past score of years, I had come to know WALTER well and to admire him greatly.

He was like a breath of fresh air out of the West. He was immensely effective in the representation of his district and of his constituency. He had an enormous capacity and gift for making friends.

So, it is not surprising that so many fine things are being said of WALTER today and have been said of him in the days following his death—compliments and tributes like that paid him by Joe McCaffrey, of ABC, on his broadcast last week; reassurances like that of the splendid sermon delivered by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick B. Harris, at the services held for WALTER in Alexandria, Va.

It was again my sad privilege to join the funeral delegation which attended the service held in the First Presbyterian Church of Astoria, Oreg. There I heard the Reverend L. E. Knoll, pastor of that church, deliver another fine sermon. Dr. Knoll included in his sermon two poems which were favorites of the Norbald family and which were often quoted by them. And, because it is strangely true that the poetry which attracts families is reflective of their mores and morals and explains so much of their conduct, I would like to repeat these poems here:

HE GIVETH MORE

(By Annie Johnson Flint)

He giveth more grace when the burdens grow greater,
He sendeth more strength when the labors increase;
To added affliction He addeth His mercy,
To multiplied trials, His multiplied peace.

When we have exhausted our store of endurance,
When our strength has failed ere the day is half done,
When we reach the end of our hoarded resources,
Our Father's full giving is only begun.

His love has no limit, His grace has no measure,
His power no boundary known unto men;
For out of His infinite riches in Jesus
He giveth and giveth and giveth again.

Dr. Knoll concluded his sermon with this poem:

SOMETIME WE'LL UNDERSTAND

(By Maxwell N. Cornelius)

Not now, but in the coming years,
It may be in the better land,
We'll read the meaning of our tears,
And there, sometime, we'll understand.

Then trust in God thro' all the days;
Fear not, for He doth hold thy hand;
Though dark the way, still sing and praise,
Sometime, sometime, we'll understand.

WALTER has left us, it is true, but in the hearts of all of us who knew him, there remains a warmth that is a living monument to his memory. Mrs. Horan joins me in extending our deepest and most sincere sympathies to his widow, Elizabeth, and to their son, Albin Walter III.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for the very fine tribute that she has paid to our deceased colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. I think she has expressed most accurately the sentiments of all of us who have known WALTER NORBLAD over the years. He had many friends in the House, and I am proud to have been counted as one of them. I am sure that his people will miss him tremendously. They recognized him as one of the most able Members of the House of Representatives. Through his death they have lost a great spokesman for their cause. The House of Representatives has lost a splendid Member. We will miss him in the years ahead. I counted him as one of my first friends in the House of Representatives. We officed close together, and I have always found him a most helpful, most considerate, and cooperative Member of the House of Representatives. I shall personally miss him. My family and I knew his wife and son very well. Mrs. Tollefson and I desire to extend to his wife and to his son Albin and to WALTER's mother, Mrs. Norblad, our deepest sympathies.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I grieve the passing of my esteemed friend the honorable WALTER NORBLAD. My heart goes out to Mrs. Norblad and to their fine son and their entire family. May the same God who called WALTER to his heavenly home give his loved ones strength to bear the great loss they have suffered. God rest his soul.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to join with my colleagues in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Norblad and Albin and our sense of loss at the passing of our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. WALTER NORBLAD was a blithe spirit. Meeting him on the House floor always made the day seem brighter. We who have served with him in the House feel much better because we have known him.

He was an effective and capable Member of this body. He had a great love for his constituents, for his colleagues in the House and a great regard for the House as an institution.

After WALTER's first illness, he came back to the House to vote. In fact, he spent a lot of time here. One day I said to him, "WALTER, why do you not adjourn? I do not know when the House is going to adjourn, but why do you not adjourn?" And he said, "I have thought of it, but I am sure that I would worry if I were away. I think I am better off here. This is where I like to be." And this is where he was right up to the time of his final illness.

The devotion to duty which he exemplified, the fine work which he did as a member of the very important Committee on Armed Services, the duties which he performed not only as a Member of the House but as a Representative of his people in the Nation's Capital, all have endeared him to the people of the Nation, to the people of his State, the people of his district and his colleagues in the House. The people of the country have lost, in the passing of WALTER NORBLAD, a great legislator, a great friend, a fine American, and an articulate exponent of our way of life.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Elizabeth and Albin and to the constituents of WALTER NORBLAD in Oregon, because I know they are grieving for his passing as deeply as are any of his other friends.

May God rest his soul.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad one for me. Today we pay our respect to a departed friend. WALTER NORBLAD was one of the first Members of Congress that I had the opportunity to meet when I arrived here in Washington. He was quick to extend a welcome hand and continued to do so the rest of his life.

Many of those who knew him and had the pleasure to call him friend will find a great void in their lives. I was a neighbor of WALTER and my children used to run in and out of his home. When we told them WALTER had passed away their comment was "I am sure he has gone to heaven." This I am sure is correct.

We cannot say enough but from my personal point of view, my life is far richer from having known him.

To his wife and family my wife and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we do not know what the hereafter holds. However, I must say to the gentlewoman from Oregon that if in that "great beyond" it is possible to still observe the activities on earth, our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, would be more than pleased with the tribute the gentlewoman paid him in her opening remarks. I think perhaps she summed up what all of us think. We all recall at such a time when we lose a colleague, that passage, "By their deeds ye shall know them."

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things that I have heard about WALTER was the comment that was made by those wives who knew WALTER and his charming wife Elizabeth so well.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that shortly after we met WALTER my own wife said, "Isn't he always so nice to Elizabeth," a great quality in every man.

Also, having observed WALTER's association with his son Albin over 14 years it became very apparent the great inspiration the father was to the son. I remember out at a little cottage on Scientists' Cliffs when Albin was just a lad, he had purchased, probably with the help of his father, his first .22 rifle. He came out into the woods to try it out. I shall never forget WALTER saying to him, "Albin, that is not the way to do it. You will hurt yourself." He was just as gentle as he could be, without a word of criticism. He showed his son the art of handling that weapon.

As the years went by he became an inspiration to WALTER, and as was mentioned earlier, WALTER made certain that those of us who were going to be attending the Republican Convention in San Francisco carried his personal message down to Albin. He said to me, "When you see the boy, tell him the old man is all right." He knew his condition was of concern and worry to Albin.

Then, Mr. Speaker, right up to the very last WALTER was worried about his obligations—what he thought was an obligation to his colleagues. Many of you know we have an organization here in the Congress which was organized before I came here, among the Republican Members, that meets once a week to discuss legislation and various political situations throughout the country. It is called the "Chowder and Marching So-

ciety." WALTER seemed to have a premonition that something was going to happen to him before our next meeting on Friday before he died. His staff people called me out in Akron, Ohio, and asked if I could take the meeting, that WALTER did not believe he would be up to it, it being his turn. I came back to Washington. We did not meet. Instead we attended the funeral here the day before.

But, Mr. Speaker, up until the very last WALTER was concerned about what he felt was his obligation. Of course, all of us, knowing his condition, realized that WALTER had no obligation, but not WALTER. Then, too, when one is recognized by those who know him best, those are the comments that really count.

Mr. Speaker, WALTER was very close to the editor of our Capitol Hill newspaper, "Roll Call." I believe the tribute that Mr. Yudain paid to WALTER in his editorial, commenting on WALTER'S death, is most appropriate because here is a publication read by his colleagues and written by a man who had known WALTER for a number of years:

WALTER NORBLAD

A man involved in national politics for 18 years is bound to incur the enmity of some of those who share his path. Yet, it seems that WALTER NORBLAD was a friend of everyone who was privileged to know him. His passing over the weekend brought sadness to the Hill community—from messenger boys to congressional leadership.

WALTER NORBLAD was a Republican, but his personality was such that most of his friends and acquaintances regarded him as a fine fellow first, a partisan second. His many acts of kindness to staffers and his colleagues will long be remembered. His geniality and his intense interest in congressional life and the game of politics endeared him to all on the Hill.

It will be a long time before another WALTER NORBLAD comes along.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the sudden death of our beloved colleague from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD. He was honored and respected by all who knew him. He was friendly and understanding. You never had to worry about WALTER because he was always willing to cooperate.

We who had the privilege of knowing him through the many years he was a Member of this Congress knew that his heart was in the right place. It was my privilege to become well acquainted with him, as well as with many other people in Oregon who subsequently came to my district. The respect and honor we pay to him today is a small tribute to the sacrifice he has made for his country.

I extend my sympathy to his wife and son.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD and I came to the Congress in the same year. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Armed Services with WALTER, and to serve with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We traveled extensively together. I do not know where you get to know a man better than through travel with him in foreign lands. Although we did not see eye to eye on political matters, I had a warm feeling for him. You never found him partisan, you never found him mean. He was a congenial, likable fellow.

I know that we all miss him here, and I want to join other Members in extending to his good wife and family my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying tribute to our late colleague WALTER NORBLAD. I know that I as a freshman Democratic Member of this body was truly amazed at the friendliness, helpfulness, and cooperative attitude the gentleman from Oregon displayed toward me. He was one of the first Members of the House to introduce himself and to make me feel at home in the House of Representatives.

I can say that on this side of the aisle I have never heard an unkind word said about WALTER NORBLAD. He was an outstanding statesman, a great American in every way in addition to being a devoted family man and friend. WALTER NORBLAD truly followed the teaching of Christ, "do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

I am sure we all were shocked to learn of his sudden passing, and I join the gentlewoman from Oregon and my many colleagues offering my condolences and sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to the list of other dear friends who have been lost to us during the 88th Congress must now be added that of the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the First District of Oregon. He served long and ably in the House of Representatives which he loved. Elected to the Congress in a special election in 1946, he soon became a valued friend and colleague.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee his labors were unceasing to protect the taxpayers of America from unjustified expenditures while preserving our military and naval strength at peak efficiency. His quick intelligence, his legal acumen, his patriotism, his great good will, all will be greatly missed. He served his district, the House of Representatives, and his country with great ability and devotion. The citizens of the First District of Oregon have lost a distinguished representative and the Members of the House of Representatives have lost a friend.

May I extend to his grieving wife and son my deepest sympathy. His career as a Member of this House was a credit to them and to those he represented here.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with heavy heart I join with those others of my colleagues who have noted the passing of our friend and colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon.

In the past several months, all of us have been aware of the physical problem faced by our friend but, while I am sure he was equally aware of the severity of his condition, he did not dwell on it to us, nor allow it—insofar as he was able—to interfere with his fulfillment of those congressional responsibilities which he has carried out so well, here, since early in January of 1946. Throughout these past few weeks, WALTER NORBLAD—in the finest tradition of public service—was a "good soldier" just as he, in fact, was earlier in his career when he served with distinction in the 8th Air Force during World War II.

WALT was not, perhaps, one to give his friendship lightly. It was almost as if he wished to think about you, and watch you a bit, before he did so. But once he tendered you the greatest gift one man can give another, he did so without reservation—without qualification. I am grateful to have been his friend.

In thinking of WALT—and in seeking better in my own mind to assess the loss we all feel so deeply—I am reminded of these lines written by Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician who died in 1919:

I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward (those) committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

WALTER NORBLAD measured fully up to those ideals and, as a result, his contributions as a respected and beloved Member of this House cannot be assessed solely on the basis of service to his State and Nation, but in terms of what we, who now continue on, have learned from him, as well.

Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy and regrets to his wife, Elizabeth, and to their son, Albin Walter Norblad III.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, was one of my closest and dearest friends in the House of Representatives. He was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted in 1953 when I first entered the Congress and throughout the years our friendship grew. There were many occasions when his help and assistance to me was invaluable. He was always generous with his time and efforts in behalf of a colleague.

We all knew him to be an honest, courageous, and sincere Member of this body who was dedicated to the service of his beloved country. He gave great ingenuity, ability, and a devotion to duty unexcelled.

The Congress of the United States and his congressional district in Oregon will suffer as a result of the passing away of WALTER NORBLAD.

I join with my colleagues in expressing our grief and sympathy to his beloved family in this hour.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, we join today to pay tribute to the memory of our colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, late a Representative from Oregon. We are privileged for having made the acquaintance of his congenial personality and having shared in his conscientious efforts as a fellow Member of the House of Representatives.

WALTER NORBLAD served long and well as Oregon's Representative from the first district, in the 79th Congress and in all of the succeeding ones thereafter.

His career as a Congressman was marked by the loyal dedication he accorded his position as the second ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee. He devoted ceaseless time and energy to the cause of our national defense. The waste of public funds anywhere and their utilization for a better American was of continuing concern to him.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Norblad and to the members of his family.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we gather today in the lengthening shadows of this session of Congress to honor a man who answered his last call of the House and has now adjourned to that place where the law and order of nature reign supreme.

WALTER NORBLAD was a man among men. He stood tall in these Chambers, with his height measured in dedication, performance, understanding and wisdom. His was a life of accomplishment that ended all too soon.

WALTER NORBLAD'S memory will be with us for a long, long time. His example will remain for all of us to follow. While we will never again see him on this earth, his presence will be felt.

WALTER'S work on the Armed Services Committee will long be remembered for its high quality and tireless effort. He ranked as number two minority member on that committee, working his way up the ladder through 18 years of service. It was an assignment for which WALTER was particularly fitted. He not only had the probing mind of a successful attorney, but had the understanding necessary to deal with the problems facing our Armed Forces. His own military career was distinguished. He served in World War II as a combat intelligence officer with the 8th Air Force and was awarded the air medal for combat flights.

WALTER NORBLAD'S critical eye has saved the taxpayers of this Nation untold millions of dollars. His unique qualifications and talents enabled him to work for a strong America through wiser use of defense appropriations. He was critical of any and every segment of our Government that spent money on unnecessary frills and luxuries. He believed that the affairs of this Nation constituted a deadly serious business that should be conducted in the best interests of the people who paid the bills. We who remain might well follow his example.

The stories of WALTER NORBLAD'S fearless encounters with high-ranking military men and bureaucrats are legion. He never criticized unduly, but expected top performance from the men who had been entrusted with our Nation's future.

The Nation knew what to expect from WALTER NORBLAD the very first year he served in the Congress, back in 1946. He startled all when he arrived at the House restaurant and dined on canned pork, dehydrated cranberries and lemonade made from canned lemon juice powder. All of the ingredients had been rescued from a Navy garbage dump, and that famous dinner was to prove WALTER'S point that the Navy was discarding good food.

He criticized such things as too many high-ranking brass in relation to the number of men under them, of fashion coordinators being hired by the Air Force, using Marines in Hollywood motion-picture films, and a host of other situations where taxpayers dollars were being misused. But during all of this, he proved to be the servicemen's best friend, showing a genuine concern for the living conditions and future of our men and women in uniform.

In 1955, WALTER NORBLAD again startled the Nation by recommending that a post office be closed in his congressional district. Why? Because it was not needed. This was courage that is seldom seen in these Halls.

The conscience of the armed services and of this Congress has left our midst. But his record of accomplishment and his concern for America's future will live on.

I was one of WALTER NORBLAD'S friends. To be his friend was an honor, a privilege, a rare experience that left you stronger for it. A bit of WALTER will live on through all of the people he has known, because you cannot have known him without absorbing at least a portion of his wisdom and philosophy.

His family will grieve him, and it is hoped that time will work its inexorable magic in easing the pain of parting. Perhaps the only words that seem appropriate for us and his family are that a rich life, fully lived, is in itself the only lasting monument to a man. WALTER NORBLAD was such a man.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Representative WALTER NORBLAD was a highly respected gentleman whose analytical legal mind contributed much to the passage of worthwhile legislation in the public interest.

His decisions were based on realistic factual data and were unassailable. He was a friendly person who was interested in the problems of his State and the Nation.

He came to the Congress well prepared for his legislative duties having served from 1935 to 1939 in the legislature of his State.

His retiring nature belied his mental brilliancy. He was a rugged individualist who knew a man in his study of the human personality. His dedicated services to the Congress for nearly 20 years made him a proud Member. He enjoyed the confidence and trust of his constituents and his colleagues. He was a fair foe and a good friend.

His courage under fire was reflected in the honor conferred upon him by our Government—air medal—in World War II for services beyond the call of duty as a member of the 8th Air Force for combat flights—1942–45.

The members of the Illinois congressional delegation extend to his dear wife Elizabeth and his son Albin Walter, our deep sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

The State of Oregon has lost one of its most celebrated sons and the Nation a valiant patriot and distinguished lawmaker.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing deep sorrow over the untimely death of a good friend and associate, WALTER NORBLAD. He was an able legislator and dedicated public servant in the highest tradition of this body, and was never reluctant to draw on his fund of experience to help a younger Member define the right approach to a difficult problem.

A man of high principle, strong personal integrity, and extreme dedication to the work of the Congress, his fine personal qualities and rare capacity for clear-sighted leadership will be severely missed in the coming years.

We cannot hope to convey to his family the measure of sorrow we feel, but we can hope that they will gain some comfort from the knowledge that he will not be soon forgotten. I extend to them my most sincere condolences.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a real privilege for me to know and have the friendship of our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

I traveled with him on several occasions on official business and I found him to be a most congenial man—a pleasant companion.

Only a few weeks ago, he told me that he was going to stand for one more term in Congress and then retire. He planned to do so, knowing full well that his health was failing.

But, that is the kind of man WALTER NORBLAD was. He had high ideals and gave the most of himself for the preservation of his country and the goals he sought for it.

He had a thorough knowledge of the Armed Forces of the United States and served with considerable distinction on the Armed Services Committee.

Many times I sought his advice on military matters and always found his counsel extremely helpful.

WALTER NORBLAD was a great friend of military servicemen. He always had their welfare close to his heart and fought many legislative battles on their behalf.

We will miss WALTER NORBLAD. The State of Oregon and our country has lost a faithful servant.

To his family I offer my deepest sympathy. Although he has departed, his service to his country and his people will not be forgotten.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the loss of WALTER NORBLAD is an unexpected tragedy, the more grievous because we have been deprived of a vigorous and capable colleague in the very prime of his life and patriotic service.

His death came toward the end of this long and brutally strenuous 88th Congress, and he might well be counted a victim of the heartbreaking demands

these last two sessions have made on Members of the House. He was a man who did not spare himself in his dedicated work for his constituents and his Nation. Almost all of his life was given to public service, from the day he became a member of the Oregon Legislature nearly 30 years ago, through his heroic combat service with the 8th Air Force in World War II, up to the moment of his untimely death September 19.

We shall miss his keen and effective work in this Chamber, we shall miss his pleasant camaraderie. The State of Oregon and the Nation are deprived of the many additional years of his devotion we all assumed would be his.

My heartfelt condolences are extended to Mrs. Norblad and their son.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay my personal tribute to the memory of my departed friend, WALTER NORBLAD. I could scarcely believe my ears when, upon returning from a brief visit to North Carolina a week ago, I learned of his sudden passing. I, of course, knew that he had not been well but believed that he was recovering, as he himself told me on several recent occasions, and I had looked forward to the day when he would be fully restored to health and be his old self again. So the news of his tragic and sudden death was a shock from which I have not fully recovered.

One of the satisfactions of serving in Congress, in intimate association with other Members, is the opportunity it gives us to form close and lasting friendships. I had no better friend in this House than WALTER and this friendship, which began shortly after I first took my seat here in January of 1953, ripened as the years passed and became so close that I feel his loss as if he were a member of my own family.

And aside from my own personal sense of loss, I am thinking today of the loss that has been suffered by the people he so ably represented in Congress, and of the loss sustained by the State of Oregon and the Nation. It is a tragedy that one so able and distinguished in his service to district, State, and Nation should be stricken down at the height of his career and when he had so much to offer his people. It will not be easy to find one who can fill his shoes.

I am thinking also of the sadness that has come to his beloved wife, Elizabeth, and his son, Albin. As great as his loss is to us, it cannot begin to compare with the loss to them of a devoted husband and father. My heart goes out to them in sorrowful sympathy and with the prayer that God in His infinite mercy will help them bear up under their grief, and that a deep faith will help sustain them in this period of sorrow.

I join WALTER'S many friends in mourning his passing.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely passing of the distinguished gentleman from the First District of Oregon has been deeply and personally felt by all those who had the opportunity of knowing him.

For the last 6 years I have had the good fortune of serving with him on the great House Committee on Armed Services. I particularly got to know him on several special investigating assignments.

WALTER NORBLAD was a distinguished lawyer, a great airman, and a devoted servant of his Oregon district. By some of us he will be especially remembered for his rare and delightful sense of humor. I shall miss him as will all his colleagues on the committee.

This country has lost a fine and conscientious legislator and we a good and able friend.

Mrs. Cohelan joins with me in extending heartfelt condolences to his wife and son.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, our esteemed colleague so recently departed.

He was indeed a most distinguished Member of this body, an outstanding American, and a good friend. It was a privilege to serve with him these many years in the House of Representatives. He was a man who served his district, his home State of Oregon, and our Nation with ability and distinction.

He will be remembered for his interest in the armed services and his efforts toward the welfare of servicemen. He will be remembered by his colleagues for his jovial, cheerful, and friendly attitude. He always had a kind word and warm greeting for all. He was considerate of and sympathetic to the problems of his fellow man.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his wife and his son. May they derive some consolation from the thought that we all share in their deep grief.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my other colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the State of Oregon.

During the 15 years I have served in the Congress I worked intimately with him on the House Armed Services Committee where we sat side by side. I have traveled with him on armed services inspections in many of the farflung areas of the world where our servicemen are stationed and, in some cases, fighting. He was a quiet man who spoke only infrequently but when he did so his thoughts were the reflection of a broad experience and a penetrating mind. He was a pleasant individual and I never heard him speak unkindly of any man. He was respected by those who served with him in the Congress and we shall miss his guidance as well as his congenial personality which made association with him a pleasing experience.

I wish there was something I could say to lessen the grief which has befallen his family. Perhaps they can take some comfort in the knowledge that while he lived he performed an outstanding service for the country which he loved and the deep affection in which he held his family is something of which they must be very, very proud.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and service of our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

It would be superfluous to say here that I express my sorrow, because every Member knows of the fondness and friendship in which WALT was held by his fellow Members. We all mourn his passing, in particular because WALT always had a kind word for each of us, and I do not know any Member of the House who had more friends or a warmer personality.

As to the public service of WALTER NORBLAD, I can speak personally as to his interest in fisheries. He constantly asked me, because of my membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, about pending fishery bills and matters of that nature. But, of course, his great contribution was as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Here, again, he kept me and others I know of posted on developments which he thought were important to us and our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I think that especially WALT NORBLAD'S important public service is recognized in his efforts to eliminate waste and unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money. But, actually, his talents were not limited to any one field; he was—as those of us who served with him know—a well-rounded, able and conscientious Representative. He was close to his constituents and served them well.

Of even greater importance, however, he was a U.S. Representative whose first consideration always was the welfare of the entire country.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to associate with WALT, day in and day out, now, for the first six terms I have been here. I am going to miss him, but I will always remember him with respect and affection.

Meanwhile, my wife and I extend to his beloved wife and son our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Representative WALTER NORBLAD was a good friend of mine and his wife was a good friend of my wife. We were terribly distressed to hear the sad news about WALTER. He was not only an alert, able, and distinguished Member of Congress with a great record, but on top of that he had a most engaging personality. Just being in his company was a lot of fun. We shall miss him and extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of WALTER NORBLAD is a cause of great sadness among us. He truly was one of the best liked, and most respected Members of this body.

Having served 12 years with him on the Armed Services Committee, I had come to know him quite well. I know that his judgment in the military affairs of this Nation was of considerable influence on the committee. Through his years of experience with our armed services, he had developed a skeptical view when skepticism was justified; but he also had an experienced understanding which helped the committee to act intelligently and with dispatch on many occasions.

It also became obvious that WALTER'S strong sense of humor made him many friends in the House, and his ability to see things with some perspective was another much respected characteristic.

Knowing of his previous attacks, many of us wondered what kept him plugging along, working diligently and seeking reelection. I am convinced it was a strong sense of duty and of dedication to this country and to this body.

To his widow and children, we extend our deepest sympathy and we share greatly in their sense of loss.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my good friend, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. WALTER was one of the strong, stabilizing Members of the House, and his experience, thorough knowledge of his committee assignment, and sound judgment were respected by all.

He was a student of government and always thought in terms of what was best for all the people. He worked hard, was always on the job, and never considered his own personal welfare. We are especially saddened when we reflect on the fact that while suffering a series of physical setbacks this year, WALTER NORBLAD conscientiously pursued his duties as Representative, feeling at all times his first obligation was to his constituents in Oregon. His firm belief in the fundamental virtues of our Nation was reflected in the dedicated representation he gave to the people of his district for 19 years.

However, WALTER NORBLAD was also a true friend and will be missed by the Members who knew him as well. He was always calm, helpful, and thoughtful in his dealings with other Members and left an indelible impression on all who knew him.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great Member of Congress, and Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending to his wife and son our deep sorrow at their great loss.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this occasion to express my sadness over the passing of our beloved colleague, WALT NORBLAD. In my 12 years in the House, I have valued his friendship and wise counsel very highly. I am going to miss WALT greatly but shall always treasure the memory of his warm personality with affection.

WALT NORBLAD was a dedicated public servant, able and conscientious in the performance of his duties to his constituents, the people of Oregon, and his country. He probably will be remembered best for his hard and effective work on the Armed Services Committee, where he labored with great zeal in the interests of a strong and secure United States. His views on defense matters always commanded the respect of his colleagues, both on the Committee and in this House as a whole, because he was considered one of the best informed Members on matters affecting the military security of our country in the cold war.

Because of WALT'S kindness, his gentility, his fairness, and his trustworthiness, I am sure we may all agree that he enjoyed the friendship and respect of as many of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as does any Member of this body. Everyone who ever knew him will remember him as a fine and honorable man.

Mrs. Hosmer and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Elizabeth, and their son, Albin.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock when I learned of the untimely passing of our colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. WALTER was a conscientious and able legislator, and ever since he was elected to the House of Representatives by special election in 1946, he was dedicated to fulfilling the duties of his office with loyalty and distinction. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, WALTER was critical of unnecessary expenditures but the welfare of our men and women in uniform was always his first concern.

Because of WALTER NORBLAD'S personable ways, there was no partisanship in the respect and affection which the Members on both sides of the aisle felt for him. He was my friend and I shall greatly miss him.

To his wife, his son, and his mother I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much distressed to learn of the sudden death of WALTER NORBLAD, whose friendship I cherished and whose example of devoted service to his country I admired.

He was a man of the highest ideals and his courage in living up to them and expressing his feelings without fear was a great inspiration. He served his country well in times of war and in times of peace and his passing leaves a great void in the hearts of his many friends.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and son and I hope that the memory of his example of a good life will sustain and comfort them.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late WALTER NORBLAD was one of the most honorable men I have ever known. He was a dedicated public servant who never faltered in his devotion to duty. Throughout his service here in this body he was my personal friend. I respected him very much. During his long period of service he made an enviable record in behalf of the people he represented, and in behalf of the national interest. I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service here in the House, it has been my pleasure to know and serve with WALTER NORBLAD. I have never known a more dedicated, faithful, and conscientious Member of the House. He loved this House as a great institution directly responsible to and close to the people. He gave the best years of his life to his country in war and to preserve the peace and promote the strength of this Nation through his service in Congress. He early recognized the importance of the Western Pacific to the security of the United States and the free world. WALTER NORBLAD supported a strong national defense and a forthright stand against aggression as the only means to contain the Communist menace.

We have lost a great Member and the American people have lost a devoted, patriotic, public servant. The Congress has been fortunate to have known and associated with WALTER NORBLAD.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Norblad and his outstanding son.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we people in Congress have friends, and it is always so hard to lose a personal friend that we have enjoyed, admired, and respected.

WALTER NORBLAD, "WALT" to so many of us, certainly was in my group of "good friends." Regretfully, both his family and good friends must note his untimely passing.

I did enjoy WALT NORBLAD'S good humor, ready wit, and constant activity, and recall with pleasure and friendship our hours, talks, and trips together.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, he gave good service, and was interested in economy and efficiency of the branches of the U.S. armed services, and particularly in the welfare and security of the men and women who serve our good country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late WALTER NORBLAD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGNING IN THE 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, since Labor Day, Vice Presidential Candidate Hubert Humphrey, our First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, and Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., have been campaigning in my 14th Congressional District. Yet to come, I have been told, will be the President of the United States, former President Truman, Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze, Postmaster General John Gronouski, and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

This is indeed a most formidable list of prominent officials. They come not to campaign for the national ticket but in support of my opponent in the congressional race. I would not be so presumptuous as to make this statement if the full evidence was not so convincing. Senator HUMPHREY spent his entire time in my district with my opponent at his side. Mrs. Johnson frankly stated that she was in the district to assist the candidacy of the lady opposing me. She put in the whole day speaking for her. Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., devoted his entire speech to a bitter attack on me.

I need not tell you that it was a personal attack full of untruths about my voting record. All of you know full well Mr. Franklin Roosevelt's ability as a character assassin. One has but to recall his attacks on Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in the 1960 Democratic national primary campaign. Among other things, he branded him as a draft dodger, a statement that angered me.

Many Members of the House are puzzled by the priority given to my opponent. Colleagues from both political parties have expressed their wonderment to me and have asked me as to the reason for this effort to purge me. No one, watching the activity in my district, can doubt that this is a "purge."

Thirty-nine Democratic Members of this House are in marginal districts. Many others are in peril of losing their seats. They have asked for help. They would be happy to have any one of the prominent officials that are coming into my district. They would think that they were indeed blessed if all of the top level of Government was coming to their aid.

Before continuing further, I would make clear to you that I have no complaint about this method of attempting to cause my defeat. I have never stood for reelection on any other platform than my record in this Congress and my service to my constituents. I have never requested outside help. A Member of Congress speaks for the people of his district. They have no other voice but his. He should be chosen for and only for his merits.

Let us review some of the possibilities for this attempt to purge me. Many reasons have been brought forward.

Some say that it is because the Democratic Party is making an all-out drive to carry my State of Ohio. If this were true most certainly they would not concentrate solely on the 14th District. Ohio has 23 districts. A recent poll of this district by the Akron Beacon Journal showed that Lyndon Johnson would receive 62 percent of the votes. No poll in any other district gives him that advantage.

I have been asked whether my opponent had so great a strength that she could help the national ticket. Once more I refer to the Akron Beacon Journal poll. It showed that she would only secure 21 percent of the votes against 72 percent for me. If projected this would give me a 50,000-vote plurality. This is certainly not an indication of a strong candidate. Instead this is an indication of a candidate without public support.

Mike Di Salle, when he attempted reelection as Governor of Ohio 2 years ago, never received such support and he was a candidate at the request of a President. Senator YOUNG, up for reelection now, is not receiving it. According to what I have seen in my district, they have practically abandoned him. My opponent, and my opponent alone was given the spot in the sun.

One could well understand such support by the President, the Democratic National Committee, the First Lady, and the President's Cabinet if it was directed toward the reelection of some of the Democratic leaders of this body. By their all-out support of the President, often at the peril of their own political future, they have earned such aid. I know of no case where it has been forthcoming in anywhere near the degree that it has been for the person running against me.

Cleveland is but 30 miles away from my hometown of Akron. It has not received this attention. In the next district to me, two nonincumbents are engaged in a close battle. The distinguished people who came into my district gave its Democratic aspirant no recognition.

There can be but one conclusion. The entire power of the administration and the Democratic National Committee is determined to use its influence and wealth that I be removed from office.

As I have said earlier many Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, have told me that they cannot understand why I have been chosen for this purge.

They know that I was among the very first to call for the support of President Johnson in all international affairs when he took office after the assassination of President Kennedy. I appeared on every radio and television program available to me, to assure the people of our Nation that the future of our country was in safe hands. I spoke highly of the President's first speech to this Congress.

That there be no question about this, I, under unanimous consent, include my television and radio speech, made the second day that President Johnson assumed the reins of Government, in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

I believe that it is my duty as a Member of Congress to make a complete report to you on the state of the Nation following the cruel assassination of President Kennedy. This report will be both objective and nonpartisan. I will not minimize the dangers nor enlarge upon them.

I, too, felt the tremendous shock at the death of the President. Despite the differences that we felt on certain types of legislation, we had a friendship of 13 years standing. We, also, had a mutual respect for each others views. I had long believed that the President of the United States should be entitled to have his proposals be considered by the whole Congress. With this thought in mind, I voted for the enlargement of the House Rules Committee.

I was in my district when the news came to me of his death. I returned to Washington. We, in Government, cannot allow ourselves the luxury of a mourning period. Above all things there must be a continuance of Government. We are not without enemies who might take full advantage of any lapse in concentration of our functions. It was necessary to show the world—friend and foe alike—that the operation of the U.S. Government and all of its facilities would continue with a united front. Many of the countries of the world do not understand the American political way of life. In these countries, the assassination of the head of government is considered an opportunity for rival parties to seize the control of that government. They do not understand that here Republicans and Democrats alike consider themselves Americans first and party members after. This is doubly true in the times of possible international crisis.

A new President was at the head of our Government. The world had to be told that he was the spokesman for all the people of these United States of America—thus his voice on international affairs was the voice of both the majority and minority parties. The governments of the world knew that he had the support of his own party. It needed to know that we members of his opposition party were in complete support of his international position. This has been done. Too, President Johnson had to have this same assurance. This was also accomplished within minutes of his return to Washington. Before any action could be taken by any foreign nation, they knew that the United States of America had united in complete support of the new President.

We must remember that the United States has assumed a position of leadership in world affairs. Any sign of weakness during a transition period could have cost us dearly.

We also had a wish that the citizens of our own Nation might not have concern for the future of their Government. They were entitled to immediate assurance that we—their representatives in Washington—recognized our responsibilities in the perpetuation of Government.

It was indeed with a heavy heart that we went about our duties. As one of those assigned to represent the Congress at the late President's funeral, I had a deep compassion for the widow and children of my late friend.

Our indignation at the murder of President Kennedy was as strong as yours. I have—together with others—called for a full investigation of the assassination. The results of the investigation should be made public. I recall the rumors, many of which have persisted to this day, which followed the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. If there are others who contributed in any way to the murder of our President, they should be brought to justice.

At the first session of the Congress following our late President's funeral, I introduced a bill that would make the killing of a President or Vice President, any Member of the Congress or a member of the President's Cabinet a Federal offense. Without meaning it as a censure of any local police force, I felt that the highly trained men of our national law-enforcement agencies should be permitted to function. These agencies are equipped with the most scientific crime detection equipment and can operate beyond municipal or State boundaries.

The greatest precautionary measures can but lessen the opportunities for the murder of a public official. We who assume national office must recognize that we can be the target of an assassin's weapon. It is not a common thing in this country but from time to time, it does occur here. I can still remember the day that I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and heard gunfire—looking up, I saw men in the gallery shooting down upon us. They fired 30 shots—five of my colleagues were struck down. The rest of us who survived that baptism of fire continued on with the affairs of Government.

The founders of this great Nation made provisions that the Government of the United States would continue despite any assassination. This is one of our securities.

Within 3 days after the murder of our President, the great leaders of the world were gathered in Washington to pay their respects to his memory. As I sat in St. Matthews Cathedral but a few feet away from such leaders as President de Gaulle of France, King Baudoin of the Belgians, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, Queen Frederika of Greece, Chancellor Erhard of West Germany, Prime Minister Douglas-Home and Prince Philip of Great Britain, Soviety Deputy Premier Mikoyan, Prime Minister Ikeda of Japan, and 83 other heads of government or their representatives, I had the assurance that they would carry back the message to the

entire world that there was no weakness here.

Incidentally, the responsibility of the Secret Service was great here. Can you imagine the effects on the nations of the world if a bomb had exploded here?

I would not close this phase of my talk without paying homage to the widow of our slain patriotic President. She set aside her own feelings that her countrymen and the representatives of the other nations of the world might pay tribute to her martyred husband. A truly great First Lady.

This has been my report on the crisis that our Nation faced upon the killing of President Kennedy. We are a strong, unified country and our allies and enemies know it well.

The crisis is now past history. We must now turn to the future. I shall speak of that now.

As I sat in the Congress listening to President Johnson's speech, I was pleased by some of the points that he made. He spelled out to the friendly nations that they had our continued support. He also emphasized to our enemies that any testing of our courage will find us strong.

We, who had served with the President in the Congress, knew that as a Member of that body, he was a firm believer in the division of the Government into the legislative, executive, and judicial branches—each branch to have complete freedom of action. We now wished to be told that as Chief Executive that he retained that viewpoint. I quote his remarks on this subject: "I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this"—end of the quotation. By this statement, he disavowed any wish for a rubberstamp Congress. Earlier in his remarks, he said, and again I quote President Johnson: "Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness; wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a Government, we can unite upon a program which is wise, just, and constructive," end of President Johnson's quotation.

We firmly believe in a program that is "wise, just, and constructive." Such a program cannot be enacted in a wave of emotionalism during the few days remaining in this session of the Congress. I think that all would agree that it should take place in the calmer atmosphere of the next session of the Congress which would convene but a few short weeks from now. I noted that President Johnson set no deadline for pending legislation.

I also noted that our new President pledged "thrift and frugality" in government. I had hoped that he would have mentioned a balancing of the national budget. This then is my report on the state of our Nation.

We are a strong Nation fully able to meet any crisis. It is needful that we use our strength wisely.

President Johnson has pointed out that we are a "representative" form of government.

As an elected Representative—your voice in the U.S. Congress—I pledge to you that my principal concern shall be the protection of the welfare and liberties of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have never voted in blind opposition to the wishes of the administration. I voted for the enlargement of the Rules Committee in the belief that the President's legislative requests should be brought to the floor of this House for final disposition.

In committee, I have cooperated with my chairman so that sound legislation might be enacted. As the ranking Republican on the House Veterans' Committee, I have never allowed any partisan feelings to interfere with my dealings with the distinguished chairman of that committee. The welfare of the veteran was our only concern. As the second ranking Republican on the Education and Labor Committee, I have worked toward the solution of all problems that have been brought before us.

I firmly believe that I have voted the wishes of my constituency. They have returned me to office six times. The present polls in my district show that they overwhelmingly believe that I have truly represented them in the Congress. My support is not limited to members of my own party. Certainly the administration must know that they might alienate these people by such an obvious effort to purge me.

I run my office in a nonpartisan manner. Every person in my district is entitled to and receives equal service. I have never checked the voting record of any constituent asking for aid. I serve all of the people of my district.

In speaking of my cooperation with the administration, I would not mislead you. It has only been so when I in good conscience felt that it should be done. My arm does not lend itself to twisting—even by a master twister.

I did not rise today to protest the opposition to my candidacy by the Democratic Party. The able Democratic congressional committee has aided all of my opponents. This is fair and just—but they have not aided them to a degree in excess of other Democratic congressional candidates.

President Johnson but recently said, and I quote him:

This Congress has enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, and disposed of more national issues than any other session in this century or the last.

Can anyone say that this was despite my actions? Can anyone deny me a small share in this praise?

Administration purges are not new. We, in Ohio, saw such an attempt in 1950. The victim was to have been that great Senator, Robert A. Taft. National forces opposed him with all of their might and wealth. They attempted to tear down his character. Despite their despicable tactics, the people of our State rose in his defense and overwhelmingly returned him to his seat in the Senate. He carried every Democratic district in the State. Attempted administration purges are also well known by my Democratic colleagues in the Congress. They too have either been subject to such attempts or have suffered the threats of them.

These efforts are only made when the administration would usurp the powers of the legislative branch. If Senator Taft had been defeated in 1950, his opponents would have been able to threaten every other Member of the Congress with like treatment unless they acceded to their demands. His victory was a victory for a truly representative form of the Congress.

This election contest in my district is another such test. My defeat would be a threat to every Member of this Congress who did not vote 100 percent with the administration. You may be certain that my opponent made that agreement before she secured such support. The people of the 14th Ohio District would lose their voice in this body if she was elected.

Certainly you will agree, as I do, that my national importance is not great enough to justify such an attack of might and power. Why then, you might well ask, have I been so selected?

There has been but one action on my part in this Congress that could have brought this about.

During the debate on the antipoverty bill, I revealed several sections of a letter written by that high member of the administration, Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky. In that letter, written to an executive of the Defense Department, Mr. Yarmolinsky stated methods of administering that act that were in opposition to the methods that the proponents of that measure had assured us would be done. He also outlined the method by which political advantage might be taken.

The distinguished author of the antipoverty bill then stated on this floor that Mr. Yarmolinsky would not be considered for the high position in this program for which he had been scheduled. The President later confirmed this. Mr. Yarmolinsky has been returned to his position as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Those of us who have observed Mr. Yarmolinsky in his lobbying activities around this Congress, were made aware of his high place in the administration.

Vengeance for this action of mine seems to be the order of the day.

I enter the fray with confidence. The people of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio are not easily misled. The electorate will cast their ballots for the candidate who has done more rather than one who claims that they can do more. They are people of firm convictions. They can see through the camouflage.

All of the might of Washington will not dictate their choice on the ballot. They are for me because they know that I am for them. I shall be returned to this Congress.

THE ATTITUDES AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PEOPLE OF DALLAS, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, last week I attended the American Legion National Convention at Dallas, Tex. As our plane reached the city proper, the sight of the tall structures, built and being built, silhouetted against the silver clouds, tintingly reflecting the golden hues of the setting sun, was an inspiring spectacle.

As our plane glided over the sparkling waters of Lake Bachman, on its approach to the runway of Love Field, I felt a

returning sadness in my heart, of what transpired here, months ago. The people of Dallas, to this day, display a spirit of sensitive remorse as a silent tribute to their martyred President.

I was received at the airport by two intimate, long-time friends, chairman of the distinguished guests committee, Al Starshak, of Chicago, and Robert F. Murphy, assistant director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion's Washington headquarters.

As we drove past the square, Dealey Plaza, below the scene of the tragedy—at the stone facades at either side—were flowered wreaths and bouquets deposited by these patriotic Americans, in memory of President John Kennedy. There is not a day passes but that these floral offerings are placed there as a tribute to his memory, manifesting the sympathetic admiration of a grateful people, saddened by the assassination of their courageous and indomitable leader.

Dallas, a commercial and industrial city, cotton market, and oil center, with beautiful parks and highways, theaters, and museums. Of interest are the John Neely Bryan Cabin, Dallas Cotton Exchange, Southern Methodist University, Museum of Fine Arts.

Dallas is progressing rapidly in its cultural, commercial, spiritual, and realty development, toward ultimately becoming the giant city of Texas and the Southwest. The beautiful, spaciously modern homes are testimonial to the affluence and aggressive determination to succeed of its citizens.

The advance of architectural art in design and structural plan of the hotels and motels, together with the most modern room accommodations and services, can be enjoyed by the most particular guests. Swimming pools add to the recreational features of these hostelries. Skyscrapers of tremendous heights dot the area—others are being rushed to completion. Dallas is spreading out—good fortune has blessed her with vast areas of land for expansion. The convention hall in municipal auditorium, is one of the largest in the Nation. Her place among the leading convention cities of the Nation is assured.

The citizens, ever alert to the needs of their city, have spared no expense to further internal public improvements. The people of Dallas were kind, considerate, and proud in their heartfelt welcome, extended to every Legionnaire. The rugged nature of the Texan was never better displayed than when they stood by the thousands, for hours, in the rain, watching the parade of the American Legion State units on Monday. Their happy spirits, applause and cheers as we passed on, tingled our American pride.

Our martyred President John F. Kennedy, and his darling wife, Jacqueline, and the then Vice President Lyndon Johnson and the lovely Lady Bird experienced the same warm hospitality and friendly greetings on that fateful day—and yet it could have happened anywhere—but the people of Dallas, today with heavy hearts, mourn his death, and cannot forget the desecration of the sacred soil of their beloved city through this nefarious deed.

The prosperity of any community can best be measured by the ingress and egress of individuals through the avenues of transportation. The economy is stimulated through the activities of traveling representatives of concerns doing business with the community.

Being interested in the operations and facilities of Love Field, a representative of the chamber of commerce, Kenneth Tubbs, transportation manager, made it possible to arrange a conference with the director, Mr. George Coker, Jr., and his assistant, Mr. Howard Megredy.

The interview was educational and interesting. The several problems confronting the management were discussed and analyzed by these individuals.

One of the important questions involved the location of the field being proximate to the city—an important advantage to travelers—but objectionable to residents in realty developments near the airport—the explosive vibrations of jets, et cetera, and the constant arrival and departure of aircraft, continuously disturbs the enjoyment of their property rights.

In this instance, Love Field was in operation years before the realty developments existed—the choice of residential proximity to Love Field was considered as their responsibility. The Congress has given attention to this problem and appropriated moneys for research in this field, to alleviate the harmful effects resulting from sonic boom.

Another situation that vexes the Authority is the proposed merging of operations with Greater Southwest International Airport, Fort Worth, and the abandonment of Love Field only 6½ miles distant from the city of Dallas. The Authority is adamant in its opposition to this plan. After a thorough study and survey it was determined that the greater distance, 18 miles, from Dallas would diminish the passenger patronage and create freight problems that were disturbing, not only increasing costs of the truck haul to Dallas, but, also, deprive the community of an efficient, time-saving relationship with those having business conferences. And further, Dallas' loss, on a competitive basis, would redound to Fort Worth's gain. Naturally, this is a decisive point to negate the idea.

To the credit of the Authority, Love Field and Redbird Airport have established an enviable record as a major airport, doing extraordinary business. The passenger and freight traffic has grown by leaps and bounds. The record is outstanding. The following tables depict the development of not only the airport, but reflects the importance of Dallas as a center of tremendous growth in business.

The 22 "domestic operations of large hubs" [1] in America's air transportation system, calendar year 1963

Airline service volume		Passenger traffic volume		Airmail volume		Air cargo volume	
Community	Aircraft departures	Community	Total enplaned	Community	Tons enplaned	Community	Tons enplaned
Chicago, Ill	166,045	Chicago, Ill	6,914,545	Chicago, Ill	36,092.8	Chicago, Ill	92,765.2
New York, N.Y	129,844	New York, N.Y	5,626,772	New York, N.Y	25,686.0	New York, N.Y	72,075.3
Washington, D.C	110,506	Los Angeles, Calif	3,797,161	Los Angeles, Calif	17,173.1	Los Angeles, Calif	64,032.5
Los Angeles, Calif	96,990	Washington, D.C	2,980,898	San Francisco, Calif	12,699.5	San Francisco, Calif	39,450.2
Atlanta, Ga	80,569	Atlanta, Ga	2,453,074	Washington, D.C	10,524.7	Newark, N.J.[2]	37,695.4
San Francisco, Calif	65,017	San Francisco, Calif	2,416,230	Atlanta, Ga	8,808.2	Detroit, Mich	30,342.1
Newark, N.J.[2]	62,160	Boston, Mass	2,090,438	Dallas, Texas	8,578.4	Dallas, Tex	24,419.7
Dallas, Tex	60,879	Dallas, Tex	2,068,067	Newark, N.J.[2]	5,640.5	Boston, Mass	23,499.4
Boston, Mass	60,024	Newark, N.J.[2]	2,042,094	Detroit, Mich	4,811.2	Cleveland, Ohio	21,646.6
Philadelphia, Pa	56,946	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla	1,738,183	Denver, Colo	4,559.6	Atlanta, Ga	18,641.8
Detroit, Mich	56,606	Detroit, Mich	1,546,860	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	4,450.6	Philadelphia, Pa	18,625.5
Pittsburgh, Pa	49,701	Pittsburgh, Pa	1,379,175	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla	3,934.7	Washington, D.C	15,204.6
Cleveland, Ohio	49,228	Philadelphia, Pa	1,328,430	Philadelphia, Pa	3,921.1	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	12,369.0
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	46,254	Denver, Colo	1,317,329	Cleveland, Ohio	3,781.4	St. Louis, Mo	11,098.6
St. Louis, Mo	42,009	Cleveland, Ohio	1,290,831	Boston, Mass	3,753.2	Cincinnati, Ohio	10,380.9
Denver, Colo	38,441	St. Louis, Mo	1,198,891	St. Louis, Mo	3,502.5	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	10,221.3
Kansas City, Mo	33,502	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,067,522	Kansas City, Mo	3,329.1	Denver, Colo	9,256.7
New Orleans, La	33,022	Kansas City, Mo	993,667	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	3,173.1	Kansas City, Mo	8,983.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	32,643	Houston, Tex	926,085	Pittsburgh, Pa	3,020.8	Pittsburgh, Pa	8,162.5
Cincinnati, Ohio	31,407	New Orleans, La	856,657	Houston, Tex	2,529.1	Houston, Tex	6,605.3
Houston, Tex	30,247	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	762,925	Cincinnati, Ohio	1,810.8	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	6,278.0
Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	24,284	Cincinnati, Ohio	680,462	New Orleans, La	1,618.6	New Orleans, La	3,794.6

[1] "Large hubs" as defined by the Federal Aviation Agency (1 percent or more of total U.S. enplaned passengers).

[2] Newark, N.J., in previous reports, was included in the figures for New York, N.Y.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Dallas Love Field enplaned 2,068,067 passengers in calendar year 1963[1]

[Airlines obtained average of 34.3 passengers per scheduled departure]

Dallas Love Field	1963	1962	1961	1960	Percent change 1960–63
1. Annual totals					
Scheduled departures	60,247	59,874	57,190	62,041	−2.8
Enplaned passengers	2,068,067	1,811,377	1,575,125	1,313,158	+57.4
Enplaned passengers per scheduled departure	34.3	30.2	27.5	21.2	+61.7
2. Scheduled departures, by airlines					
Trunklines:					
American	14,063	14,560	14,447	16,906	−16.8
Braniff	19,878	19,161	18,820	20,263	−1.9
Continental	4,599	4,857	5,453	6,490	−29.1
Delta	8,348	7,692	6,338	6,587	+26.7
Eastern [2]	1,033	1,350	938	----------	--------
Local service lines:					
Central	5,025	5,887	4,648	4,877	+3.0
Trans-Texas	7,301	6,367	6,546	6,927	+5.3
3. Enplaned passengers, by airlines					
Trunklines:					
American	672,510	580,776	504,782	431,668	+55.7
Braniff	778,986	705,630	632,099	463,868	+67.9
Continental	118,261	118,021	119,991	112,687	+4.8
Delta	311,746	260,149	213,518	226,552	+37.6
Eastern [2]	37,036	22,507	10,655	----------	--------
Local service lines:					
Central	43,534	41,759	26,352	21,389	+103.5
Trans-Texas	105,994	82,535	67,728	56,994	+85.9
4. Enplaned passengers per scheduled departure by airlines					
Trunklines:					
American	47.8	39.8	34.9	25.5	+87.4
Braniff	39.1	36.8	33.5	22.9	+70.7
Continental	25.7	24.3	22.0	17.4	+47.7
Delta	37.3	33.8	33.6	34.4	+8.6
Eastern [2]	35.8	16.6	11.3	----------	--------
Local service lines:					
Central	8.6	7.1	5.7	4.4	+95.8
Trans-Texas	14.5	12.9	10.3	8.2	+76.4

[1] Domestic service only. Dallas international enplaned passengers, 36,183.
[2] Service inaugurated 2d quarter 1961.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board, as compiled by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

Scheduled departures and enplaned passengers at Dallas and Fort Worth, 1963

1. DEPARTURES AND PASSENGERS, BY AIRLINES[1]

Carrier	Dallas		Fort Worth	
	Scheduled departures	Enplaned passengers	Scheduled departures	Enplaned passengers
American	14,063	672,510	1,636	16,421
Braniff	19,878	778,986	3,532	14,135
Central	5,025	43,534	2,237	3,084
Continental	4,599	118,261	1,668	3,521
Delta	8,348	311,746	844	1,717
Eastern	1,033	37,036	322	961
Trans-Texas	7,301	105,994	3,656	6,468
Total	60,247	2,068,067	13,895	46,312

2. ENPLANED PASSENGERS PER SCHEDULED DEPARTURE

	Dallas	Fort Worth
American	47.8	10.0
Braniff	39.1	4.0
Central	8.6	1.3
Continental	25.7	2.1
Delta	37.3	2.0
Eastern	35.8	2.9
Trans-Texas	14.5	1.7
Average	34.3	3.3

3. TRENDS IN AIR PASSENGERS AND SERVICE AT DALLAS AND FORT WORTH, 1960–63

	1960	1961	1962	1963	Percent of change 1960–63
Scheduled departures:					
Dallas	62,041	57,190	59,874	60,247	−2.8
Fort Worth	24,614	19,991	16,651	13,895	−43.5
Enplaned passengers:					
Dallas	1,313,158	1,575,125	1,811,377	2,068,067	+57.4
Fort Worth	148,585	113,020	56,925	46,312	−73.5

[1] Domestic service only. International service: Dallas enplaned passengers, 36,183; Fort Worth enplaned passengers, 0.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board, as compiled by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

The comparative tables, with cities of greater community population in the Nation, is noteworthy. Its central location, no doubt, has contributed much to its importance as the key city in air traffic activity in the Southwest.

The people of Dallas are not living in the clouds—they are Doers—one need only visit this fair city, the jewel in the Texas crown of achievement, to observe the great prosperity, through laborious effort and careful city planning, that resulted from their efforts to achieve success in building a great city. Mayor Eric Jonsson has contributed much to this progress, as well as the chamber of commerce, civic organizations, spiritual, business, and union leaders.

Congressmen JOE R. POOL and BRUCE ALGER are most highly regarded in the community.

The police of Dallas have borne the brunt of national public criticism, since the fatal attack on Oswald—the fact that he killed Officer Tippit to prevent his arrest, is forgotten, as well as the courageous action of Patrolman N. M. McDonald, who was slugged by Oswald, with a drawn gun that misfired, as he was grappled to the ground by the officer. The solution of several bank robberies in Dallas, last week, carried no significance in recognizing excellent police work. The courageous and dedicated police work of members of the Dallas Police Force, in carrying out their duties to a public trust, are appreciated by the citizens of Dallas. Authorities in police work know that its police department ranks, under Chief Curry, among the best in law enforcement in the Nation.

The purpose of this discourse and compilation of data is to, in some significant way, register the sentiments of the Legionnaires about the attitudes and the accomplishments of the people of Dallas, and their officials—whose kind, courteous, and solicitous treatment was impressive and appreciated—as patriotic Americans, we were in search of the truth, and we found it in Dallas.

I dedicate this poem to the people of Dallas:

NOT OUR SIN

Oh, Lord—ill deeds have ere been done
Throughout this glorious Nation.
But seldom one so cruel, to numb
The hearts of generations.

We bow in shame for this ill fame
That fate has cast upon us,
And pray to Him, whose Holy Name
Has given Christians justice.

To one who died—our Nation's pride,
We kneel in supplication,
And mourn the fatal day he died—
A martyr to the Nation.

DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dallas, Tex., September 18, 1964.

Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Gen. Phil Bethune has told us that you have indicated an interest in Dallas Love Field and its operation.

I have tried to reach you several times by telephone, but so far have been unsuccessful. My purpose in trying to get in touch with you was to assure you that if there is any information which we can supply you with respect to Love Field, its operations, its traffic statistics, its place among national airports, etc. we would be glad to hear from you.

It would be our pleasure to call upon you during your stay in Dallas, or to mail you any information which you might desire.

Sincerely,

KENNETH P. TUBBS,
Manager, Transportation Department.

DATES IN HISTORY OF DALLAS LOVE FIELD
LOVE FIELD

Love Field was set up as an Army base in 1917 and was maintained as such until 1928. The city of Dallas purchased Love Field from the Army in 1928. This purchase consisted of an initial investment of $325,000 for 327 acres.

Love Field was named by the Army in 1917, honoring a Lt. Moss Love, who was a cavalry officer killed during World War I in a noncombatant accident in California and who actually had never seen Love Field.

Year 1917: U.S. Army selects site northwest of Dallas for a new flying field.

October 19, 1917: Army names new flying field "Love Field."

August 28, 1925: Chamber of Commerce guarantees 100 pounds of air mail per day to Chicago for 6 months.

January 1926: First boundary lights installed for night flying.

May 12, 1926: A National Air Transport plane piloted by Herbert Kindred took off from Love Field for Chicago with first air mail.

September 17, 1927: A full load of three passengers went out of Love Field for Chicago on National Air Transport plane.

December 15, 1927: Taxpayers authorize a $400,000 bond issue to be used for purchase and development of a municipal airport.

June 22, 1928: City of Dallas acquires 167.10 acres of land at a price of $325,000.

October 31, 1928: First land purchased for second airport—"Hensley."

Year 1929: Safeway Airline established—later sold to American.

June 1, 1929: Delta Air Service, Inc., starts first passenger service from Dallas to Jackson, Miss., via Shreveport and Monroe, La.

August 9, 1929: Dallas' second airport officially named "Hensley."

September 1, 1929: Braniff Airlines begins express and package freight services at Love Field.

October 15, 1930: Southern Air Fast Express, Inc., starts mail and passenger service between Dallas Love Field and Los Angeles, Calif.

April 9, 1932: First paved runways at Love Field completed.

May 17, 1934: Braniff Airways begins service to Love Field on Chicago-Kansas City—Tulsa-Dallas mail route.

July 4, 1934: Delta starts air mail service from Dallas Love Field to Charleston, S.C.

January 1, 1935: Braniff moves home base to Love Field from Oklahoma City, Okla.

July 1, 1935: Delta operates first night schedule at Love Field.

February 1, 1937: Dallas begins operation of control tower at Love Field.

October 6, 1940: Love Field terminal building dedicated.

April 1, 1941: AMF opened at Love Field.

May 16, 1942: CAA takes over operation for control tower.

September 1943: Construction completed on northwest-southeast and north-south runways to 5,200 feet.

October 15, 1943: Delta Airlines start service from Dallas to New Orleans.

Year 1944: City purchased 1,026 acres of land 7 miles southwest of city—Redbird Airport.

May 16, 1945: City officially adopts master plan for Love Field.

January 29, 1947: CAA commissions ILS at Love Field.

February 19, 1947: Pioneer Air Lines begins service at Love Field.

October 11, 1947: Trans-Texas Airways begins service at Love Field.

March 16, 1948: City officially adopts amended master plan for Love Field.

March 9, 1948: East wing of terminal building completed.

August 10, 1948: North wing of terminal building completed.

September 1949: Central Airlines begins service at Love Field.

May 8, 1950: Pioneer Air Lines moves base from Houston to Love Field.

March 26, 1952: Extension of northwest-southeast runway to 6,200 feet completed.

April 19, 1954: CAA, commissions ASR at Love Field.

June 1, 1954: East-west runway closed.

December 3, 1954: Extension of northwest-southeast runway to 7,750 feet completed.

August 5, 1955: Work order issued for construction of new terminal building. Contractor given 22 months to complete terminal building.

December 1955: CAB awarded to Braniff and Delta new routes to Washington and New York.

October 20–27, 1957: Open house in new terminal.

January 20, 1958: New terminal placed in commission.

April 1, 1959: Continental Airlines placed jet schedules into Love Field, with Viscounts.

July 12, 1959: America started first Turbojet service.

July 23, 1962: Contract awarded for construction of parallel northwest-southeast runway.

July 11, 1963: Work order issued for parallel northwest-southeast runway.

October 1963: Work finished on demolition of old terminal.

Dallas Love Field: Enplaned passengers

Year:	*Number*
1932	12,993
1933	13,741
1934	11,989
1935	24,557
1936	28,587
1937	33,434
1938	41,119
1939	58,721
1940	102,045
1941	127,884
1947	368,520
1948	361,030
1949	438,640
1950	442,450
1951	610,444
1952	704,814
1953	623,511
1954	713,350
1955	868,037
1956	994,871
1957	1,004,545
1958	1,036,103
1959	1,236,846
1960	1,387,517
1961	1,575,125
1962	1,844,160
1963	2,026,580

DALLAS LOVE FIELD

Plane movements, takeoffs and landings

Year	Air carrier	Civil	Army	Navy	Local	Total
1932						25,296
1933						27,365
1937	13,178					78,758
1938	15,189					72,325
1939	20,179					97,959
1940	26,371					89,638
1941	26,748					[1] 95,500
1942	[1] 22,524					[1] 106,932
1943	23,926	1,002	43,986		124,572	193,486
1944	32,551	1,212	190,695		27,596	252,054
1945	47,708	6,037	169,219		7,741	230,705
1946	61,912	34,662	34,195		11,479	142,248
1947	64,562	50,224	575		6,059	121,520
1948						
1949	[2] 67,083					139,239
1950	[2] 79,270	59,051	4,096	1,360	8,769	152,546
1951	[2] 91,402	64,576	11,870	3,021	10,167	181,036
1952	[2] 99,132	64,668	15,792	2,837	18,514	200,944
1953	[2] 102,209	66,829	13,470	4,340	30,633	217,481
1954	[2] 105,234	69,533	9,762	3,740	20,181	208,450
1955	[2] 114,891	76,301	11,361	4,310	16,565	223,428
1956	[2] 122,201	79,113	13,085	5,723	15,440	235,562
1957	[2] 158,461	104,618	15,406	7,087	22,780	308,352
1958	[2] 162,674	98,327	15,127	4,467	19,449	300,044
1959	[2] 146,965	96,681	7,163	1,088	8,945	260,842
1960	[2] 147,874	95,442	5,674	259	9,443	258,692
1961	[2] 134,558	98,937	4,374	290	7,193	245,352
1962	[2] 133,770	104,644	3,842	695	6,140	249,091
1963	[2] 122,569	93,862	3,288	287	5,480	225,486

[1] Estimated.

[2] Taken from city, fiscal year ending Sept. 30.

Operating revenue and expenses

Fiscal year	Revenue	Expenses	Available for debt service
1931-32	$7,767	$11,695	(−$3,928)
1932-33	8,680	12,373	(−3,693)
1933-34	7,746	10,234	(−2,488)
1934-35	8,812	11,586	(−2,774)
1935-36	7,076	11,158	(−4,082)
1936-37	8,775	13,026	(−4,251)
1937-38	9,746	15,483	(−5,737)
1938-39	9,154	16,610	(−7,456)
1939-40	13,689	26,135	(−12,446)
1940-41	41,702	50,700	(−8,998)
1941-42	44,179	47,727	(−3,548)
1942-43	59,676	39,603	20,073
1943-44	66,503	51,026	15,477
1944-45	77,042	67,693	9,349
1945-46	105,055	78,382	26,673
1946-47	262,859	132,102	130,750
1947-48	$272,097	$128,406	$143,691
1948-49	298,485	117,627	180,858
1949-50	306,675	110,622	196,053
1950-51	343,141	152,317	190,824
1951-52	402,486	143,682	258,804
1952-53	425,558	154,475	271,083
1953-54	407,614	201,419	206,195
1954-55	468,095	214,722	253,373
1955-56	505,732	238,215	267,517
1956-57	1,153,450	172,675	980,775
1957-58	1,614,185	441,564	1,172,621
1958-59	1,949,736	562,573	1,387,163
1959-60	2,042,342	669,972	1,372,370
1960-61	2,103,537	704,389	1,399,148
1961-62	2,154,133	727,414	1,426,719
1962-63 [1]	2,338,352	782,973	1,555,379

[1] Not audited as of this date.

Investment in Dallas Love Field as of Nov. 1, 1963

I. Land [1]		$11,972,249.92
II. Runways, ramps, lighting taxiways and roadways [1]		9,538,646.87
III. Equipment [1]		155,376.57
IV. Buildings and related facilities:		
(a) Old terminal [2]	[1] $567,229.22	
(b) New terminal [2]	8,218,412.28	
(c) Continental hangar [3]	290,743.95	
(d) American hangar [3]	1,363,040.99	
(e) American kitchen [3]	523,373.33	
(f) Braniff hangar [3]	6,306,965.44	
(g) Delta hangar [3]	1,152,225.71	
IV. Buildings and related facilities—Continued		
(h) Southwest Airmotive Co.: [3]		
(1) Hangar buildings	$2,940,300.64	
(2) Paving	351,926.67	
(3) Engine shops	812,618.36	
		$21,959,607.37
(i) Auto parking deck [2]		11,015.50
(j) Love Field fueling facility [4]		1,164,942.79
(k) Surplus Government property [5]		2,575,000.00
(l) Cross Roads Aviation [4]		71,500.00
(m) Mustang Aviation Co. [4]		87,230.00
(n) Investment on privately owned property on airport [4]		2,000,000.00
Total investment on airport		49,535,569.02

[1] Old terminal now demolished; not included in total.
[2] By city.
[3] Through revenue bonds and private investment. Revenue bonds to be paid off by operator.
[4] Private investment only.
[5] $1,000,000 (estimated). Runway, taxiway, and lighting, $1,575,000. Approximately 100 acres of land.

Dallas Love Field employment summary, July 1, 1963

Activity	Airport ground base employees		Flight personnel		Off-airport personnel		Total	
	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary
I. Airlines: Total airlines	2,234	$14,390,787.76	1,628	$19,176,726.70	1,266	$7,672,999.00	5,128	$41,240,513.46
II. Concessions: Total concessions	304	914,393.00			44	181,880.00	348	1,096,273.00
III. Nonairline: Total nonairline	346	1,520,372.28					346	1,520,372.28
IV. Federal Government: Total Federal agencies	243	1,797,331.00					243	1,797,331.00
V. City of Dallas: Total city employees	122	458,638.44					122	458,638.44
VI. Private aviation: Total private aviation	1,078	6,259,858.06	27	214,843.28	56	233,502.52	1,161	6,708,203.86
Grand total	4,327	25,341,380.54	1,655	19,391,569.98	1,366	8,088,381.52	7,348	52,821,332.04

Total of ground and flight personnel, 5,982; $44,732,950.52.

Dallas Love Field: Sources of revenue

(a) Rental (off airport)	$27,563.68
(b) Rental (on airport)	663,479.34
(c) Fees	315,676.46
(d) Concessions	1,138,502.57
(e) Service charges	20,570.09
(f) Miscellaneous	6,102.44
(g) Interest on bank balance	105,610.10
(h) Taxicabs	13,193.82
(i) Sales outlay	47,653.23
Total	2,338,351.73

EXPLANATION OF

(a) Rental of acquired expansion properties until needed and regarded as "recapture of capital outlay."

(b) Rental of ground space and offices in terminal building, but excluding revenue bond payments by airlines, which are made directly to special accounts held by city auditor to meet sinking fund requirements.

(c) Airline landing fees and gasoline fees paid by private aviation.

(i) Sale of improvements from airport expansion property purchased for enlargement of airfield.

Other items are self-explanatory.

Estimated investments by Federal Government as of Nov. 1, 1963

(I) Runways, taxiways	$1,000,000
(II) Federal Airport aid in airfield improvements	429,604
(III) Land purchased and deeded to city (approximately 100 acres)	1,575,000
(IV) Equipment, navigational and landing aids	1,585,000
Total	4,589,604

INVESTMENTS AND COMMITMENTS AT DALLAS LOVE FIELD BY AIRLINES, OPERATORS, AND CONCESSIONAIRES (AS OF NOV. 1, 1963)

(I) Underground fueling facility by airlines		$1,164,943
(II) Concessionaires in terminal building:		
(a) Leasehold improvements	$600,443	
(b) Equipment and fixtures	520,162	
Total		1,120,605
(III) Privately owned hangars, shops, etc		2,000,000
Total		4,285,548

HISTORY OF REDBIRD AIRPORT

The City of Dallas acquired the Redbird Airport site—1,030 acres—in 1945. The municipal investment there, prior to 1954, totaled approximately $1,785,000.

Preliminary development at the airport included grading and drainage for three runways—only one of which was paved (100 feet by 3,000 feet).

Two steel hangars each 146 feet by 161 feet were erected by the City of Dallas, one of which was leased to Texair, Inc., a fixed base operator, and the other of which was leased by Collins Radio Co. for use in its installations of aircraft communications and navigational systems.

Lack of balanced facilities prevented Redbird from making more substantial contributions toward meeting Dallas' development airport requirements.

When the $12.5 million airport bond issue was submitted to Dallas taxpayers in January 1953, $2 million were earmarked for further development of Redbird.

After taxpayers approved the airport bond issue, the Dallas City Council ordered a complete master plan study of Redbird Airport to determine the role which it could best serve in the community's aviation program, and to establish a realistic, carefully timed program for its further development.

The Redbird master plan study was received by the city of Dallas late in 1953. On the basis of master plan recommendations, the city of Dallas proceeded with the improvements which are now being completed.

REDBIRD'S ROLE

The Redbird master plan contemplates this airport's continuing development to:

(1) Serve the nonairline airport requirements of the portion of Dallas south and west of the Trinity River.

(2) Provide sites for prospective airport-based industries.

The master plan contemplates that facilities at Redbird will be provided on a progressive basis, as demand develops.

Obviously, balanced facilities were required before Redbird could attract substantial usage—before it could begin to fulfill the role for which it was originally provided.

DESCRIPTION OF REDBIRD AIRPORT

Current improvements

Additional acreage was acquired, to bring the land area of the airport to approximately 1,200 acres.

The northwest-southeast (instrument) runway, which had been paved to a width of 100 feet and a length of 3,000 feet, was widened to 150 feet and extended to 4,450 feet.

The master plan contemplates that this runway will ultimately be 150 feet by 6,250 feet.

A north-south runway was paved, 150 feet by 3,800 feet.

Paralleling taxi strips, 50 feet wide, were paved for both runways.

Medium intensity lighting has been installed on both runways, to permit night flying operations.

A rotating lighting beacon, and obstacle lighting, have been provided.

A new terminal building and control tower has been built and staffed.

Entrance road has been improved and parking lot in front of terminal building has been built and lighted.

Control tower has been completed and aircraft traffic into and out of Redbird is now controlled from the Federal Aviation Agency manned control tower.

Current activities at Redbird

(a) Airhaven, Inc.: Fixed base operation, with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as gasoline and sale of supplies to planes.

(b) Aviation Enterprises of Dallas: Fixed base operation and pilot training, with overhaul, storage of planes and sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(c) Executive Aircraft, Inc.: Overhaul and reconditioning of planes inside and out.

(d) Modern Aero Sales: Fixed base operation with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(e) Texair, Inc.: Fixed base operation with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(f) Redbird Airport Restaurant: Restaurant operation in the terminal building, as well as catering to planes.

CITY INVESTMENT IN REDBIRD AIRPORT

Land has been purchased and added to the airport in accordance with the master plan. The airport now consists of approximately 1,230 acres to facilitate expansion as it is justified and necessary.

The current city of Dallas investment in Redbird Airport is $3,435,601.42, including land, buildings, roadways, parking lots, runways, taxiways and airport lighting.

AIRCRAFT TRAFFIC—REDBIRD AIRPORT

The new airport traffic control tower, as constructed by the city of Dallas, was opened and placed into operation in June 1962. This control tower is equipped and operated by the U.S. Federal Aviation Agency and only 1 fiscal year's operation has been completed with a control tower in operation.

During the Federal fiscal year of from July 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963, the following aircraft movements were accommodated at Redbird Airport:

	Itinerant movements	Local movements	Total
Redbird	48,539	36,408	84,947
Shreveport	48,629	52,800	101,429
Corpus Christi	40,253	87,646	127,899
Wichita Falls	46,401	57,388	103,789
San Angelo	30,119	39,354	69,473
Waco	32,896	61,574	94,470

An itinerant movement is a landing or a takeoff involving a flight that arrived from or departed to a point other than Redbird Airport.

A local movement is a landing or a takeoff involving a flight that involves only the Redbird Airport, such as a test flight or a training flight.

Redbird airport—operating revenue and expenses

Fiscal year	Operating income	Operating expenses	Operating P/L
1950–51	$12,101.14	$6,120.61	$5,980.53
1951–52	18,541.92	5,615.18	12,926.74
1952–53	15,696.12	5,751.42	9,944.70
1953–54	14,915.78	5,493.96	9,421.82
1954–55	15,386.82	5,764.53	9,622.29
1955–56	17,467.71	6,772.04	10,695.67
1956–57	17,394.08	7,836.56	9,557.52
1957–58	18,417.42	10,604.84	7,812.58
1958–59	22,496.36	8,677.76	13,818.60
1959–60 [1]	25,580.97	25,250.61	330.36
1960–61	27,418.50	52,144.81	−(24,726.31)
1961–62	29,397.21	55,110.02	−(25,712.81)
1962–63	40,280.98	63,769.05	−(23,488.07)

[1] Opened new terminal building August 1960.

NOTE.—Operating expenses include 10 percent of aviation department administrative expense and 5 percent of "off-airport" rental collections as made by property department.

WHO LOSES IN A SMEAR CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in signing the code of fair campaign practices today, I could not help but think about past campaigns and compare them to the one presently at hand. This year the smear artists are already at work practicing their trade.

The tactics used in an attempt to smear my name and confuse the issues before the voters of Montana have reached alarming proportions and are about the same as reported in other parts of the Nation. Subtle in approach, based upon half-truths and lies, they put out false charges designed to create doubt.

The people involved in this deceptive practice do a great disservice to the candidate they support and the party he represents. Apparently, they have no feelings, no personal ethics, no regard for family and must be lacking in Christian teaching. They must believe their own propaganda and lose all sense of direction. Certainly they have a warped understanding of American Government and the American voter. They ask the voter to elect a man to office but use divisive means to secure their goal.

The tactics vary. Organizations are formed with names similar to those of well-established groups and by innuendo and by association an attempt is made to take on the dignity and respect of the original group. I think particularly of an organization in central Montana that uses the name League of Men Voters and by this means it trades on the name of the League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan group which does an outstanding service for the voting public by publishing the candidates' stand on the issues.

Another approach the smear artist uses is that of the so-called shocker. Charges are made which are false on their face but since they are heard over radio or television or found published in a newspaper, many well-meaning people think they must be true. This technique is designed to force the candidate to spend all his time answering false charges and none of the time talking about the issues. It is a dangerous course the smear artist follows, for he goes over the edge on libel and slander and opens the way for a lawsuit against himself and the news media. Most radio, television, and newspaper companies are careful to screen advertising; but there are those who look upon an election year as a windfall, for a great deal of advertising is done by the candidates for public office.

I think specifically of the charge often made that a candidate is financed by big corporations or associations. Here again the person making the charge knows that most people are not acquainted with the law and by the time the voter can find out what the facts are or what the law is, the election is over. For example, the Congress passed a law many years ago which prohibits a corporation from making any contribution to a political candidate or political party. The law further restricts any individual from contributing more than a specified sum to any political candidate or political party. In my own case and that of every candidate for office in Montana, we must file a statement under oath of contributions received and expenditures made with the secretary of state and these files are on record for all voters to see. I have always been proud that a great number of people contribute and help finance my campaign. Then, too, we should remember that both great political parties have made a national effort to solicit door to door to raise funds and secure more grassroots support for political activity. All this, for some reason, is overlooked by the peddlers of the "big lie."

Unfortunately, few people realize that the truth is readily available. We have accurate public records on all votes before both Houses of Congress and the law requires vouchers for the expenditure of all public money. However, the smear artist has figured out that most people are unaware of this fact or will not take the time to find out.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House today to point out that we do have in our society those who believe that "the end justifies the means." Theirs is the course of divide and conquer.

This year, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be more of this type of underhanded activity than usual. The rumor mills, the whispering campaign, the handbill approach, planted stories, false advertising—all are calculated to destroy the person seeking public office. I am sure

that every Member of this House is willing to discuss any vote that he had made or any action that was taken. But how do you answer the warped minds of those who will do anything and say anything to achieve their purpose?

The question is often asked why we seek public office and subject ourselves to slanderous charges and outrageous stories. The typical remark, I believe, is, "Politics is a dirty business." The answer is obvious. We are not willing to turn over, without a fair fight, responsible elective positions in government to people who use the gutter and the back alley to fight their political wars. Ask yourself the next question. What would these same people do if they found themselves in a position to influence legislation?

Every Member of this House is proud of his name and proud to be a Member of this great legislative body. We disagree on political questions but use the civilized method of debate to win our point. I have never heard a Member of this House attack another on the basis of personality or hearsay. No, the attack comes on the issues. The character assassin has no place in our great society. If the artist of the big-lie technique wins, the people lose—remember, this is our Government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all candidates, whether they sign the code or not, will live up to the code of fair campaign practices, which has been endorsed by both political parties. In the name of honesty and decency, I hope the coming campaign will be waged on the issues and not in the gutter—the voters of this country have a right to know the truth and should demand the answers.

In order that the reader of this RECORD can see and judge for himself just what the code of fair campaign practices calls for and how necessary it is, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

CODE OF FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

There are basic principles of decency, honesty and fair play which every candidate for public office in the United States has a moral obligation to observe and uphold, in order that, after vigorously contested but fairly conducted campaigns, our citizens may exercise their constitutional right to a free and untrammeled choice and the will of the people may be fully and clearly expressed on the issues before the country; therefore:

I shall conduct my campaign in the best American tradition, discussing the issues as I see them, presenting my record and policies with sincerity and frankness, and criticizing without fear or favor the record and policies of my opponent and his party which merit such criticism.

I shall defend and uphold the right of every qualified American voter to full and equal participation in the electoral process.

I shall condemn the use of personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaign, libel, slander, or scurrilous attacks on any candidate or his personal or family life.

I shall condemn the use of campaign material of any sort which misrepresents, distorts, or otherwise falsifies the facts regarding any candidate, as well as the use of malicious or unfounded accusations against any candidate which aim at creating or exploiting doubts, without justification, as to his loyalty and patriotism.

I shall condemn any appeal to prejudice based on race, creed, or national origin.

I shall condemn any dishonest or unethical practice which tends to corrupt or undermine our American system of free elections or which hampers or prevents the full and free expression of the will of the voters.

I shall immediately and publicly repudiate support deriving from any individual or group which resorts, on behalf of my candidacy or in opposition to that of my opponent, to the methods and tactics which I condemn.

I, the undersigned, candidate for election to public office in the United States of America, hereby endorse, subscribe to, and solemnly pledge myself to conduct my campaigns in accordance with the above principles and practices, so help me God.

Date:---------- Signature:----------

RESOLUTION TO BRING JUSTICE TO CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that the historical American principle of self-determination should be applied to Cyprus and that the people of Cyprus should be assured against any further military attacks against their island by Turkish forces.

The resolution further provides that there should be no partition of Cyprus; that there should be no military aid sent to Cyprus either by the Soviet Union itself or Soviet sinews sent through the United Arab Republic; and that the strengthening of democratic principles on the island, including the principle of self-determination, will enable the people of Cyprus to promulgate such programs which, in keeping with the highest principles of freedom and human dignity, would assure freedom and security of life, religion, and property for all minorities on Cyprus.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will accept this resolution as an expression of our determination that Cyprus shall remain within the orbit of free people and not become but another victim in the cold war.

I believe this resolution is most timely because of the serious situation which now prevails in Cyprus.

It has been my long contention that the Greek Cypriots should first of all be assured of their freedom to self-determination, and if the majority of Cypriots choose enosis—union with their motherland, Greece—they should have the privilege to make such a determination as free people.

The free world must take a stand regarding justice for Cyprus. The alternative is to leave this very important bastion of freedom in the Mediterranean an easy prey for Communist subversion.

We can all be grateful that President Johnson has diligently been trying to resolve the difficult problem which now exists in Cyprus. The United States as early as 1947 supported the doctrine of enosis for Cyprus, and it is my hope that this principle will again be forcefully reaffirmed.

It would also be my hope that the United States will serve notice upon the Soviet Union that sending any of its military aid into Greece will be viewed by this Nation and the free world with the same vigor and determination which led to the removal of such equipment from the island of Cuba in 1962.

The Cypriots must be given an opportunity to resolve their internal difficulties through the process of self-determination and without any outside interference.

It is my hope that the United States will continue to take the lead in removing outside influences from interfering with the Cypriots' right to resolve their own problems. It is my hope that the free world will insist on retaining NATO forces as the only peacekeeping force on Cyprus until the Cypriots have had a chance to resolve their own differences through free elections.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have introduced today follows:

H. CON. RES. 369

(Introduced by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI in House of Representatives Sept. 23, 1964)

Whereas the people of the United States respect the principle of self-determination and majority rule for all nations; and

Whereas the people of the United States deplore the violence and civil conflict that has erupted on the island of Cyprus where the right of the people of Cyprus to majority rule has been restricted; and

Whereas this conflict has brought two NATO allies into a quarrel endangering the long-term interests of both nations and of the Western alliance; and

Whereas the principal benefactors of the conflict are Communist nations and neutralist dictators trying to destroy NATO and eliminate American defenses and Western influence throughout the eastern Mediterranean; and

Whereas self-determination for the people of Cyprus, including possible union with Greece, would strengthen democratic rule in Cyprus; would reduce Communist infiltration in Cyprus; would bring Cyprus within NATO, and would eliminate the threat of war between Greece and Turkey: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the historic American principle of self-determination should be applied to Cyprus; that the people of Cyprus should be assured against any further military attacks against the island by Turkish forces; that there shall be no partition of Cyprus; that there shall be no military aid sent to Cyprus either by the Soviet Union itself or Soviet sinews sent through the United Arab Republic, and that the strengthening of democratic principles on the island, including the principle of self-determination, will enable the people of Cyprus to promulgate such programs which, in keeping with the highest principles of freedom and human dignity, would assure freedom and security of life, religion, and property for all minorities on Cyprus.

REPUBLICANS ENDANGER CALIFORNIA JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect to

find many charges, attacks, and even smears leveled during the course of a presidential election campaign. This is consistent with our political tradition, and though at times these tactics can be carried too far and can become distasteful they are anticipated by the voting public.

It is rare, however, that a major political party will lie to the American people, and stoop to outright distortion and deceit to gain a few extra votes. But such is the situation in this year of 1964.

Members of the Republican Party, in the most cynical way possible, are attempting to perpetrate a hoax and fiction on the people of California by confusing and distorting the employment picture in my State. On the one hand we find Republican candidates demanding that more jobs be brought to the west coast, and on the other hand we find California Republicans in this House voting against the bills which are the very life blood of Federal job opportunities in my State.

Just how brazenly false is the Republican boast of "We can do more for California" I shall soon demonstrate. Just how dangerous is the real Republican policy toward California defense and aerospace employment I shall soon make clear.

On August 13 of this year the appropriation bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was approved on the floor of the House of Representatives. Republican Members of Congress bitterly attacked the whole concept of our space research, and made a strong effort to cutback the Project Apollo program.

Before examining the Republican Party vote on the Project Apollo program it will be of interest to study the impact defense and aerospace industry employment has had on our California economy.

As of 1963, aerospace and related industry employment provided jobs for 524,000 people in my State. This industry in fact accounts for 37 percent of all manufacturing employees in California, and no other State in the country has such a high ratio of workers involved in the space race. At the present time, 10 percent of all nonagricultural wage and salary workers in California are employed by the aerospace and related industries.

In the nonspace field, California also has more Federal employees than any other State. In 1963 Federal employment provided jobs for 266,500 people in my State, and this reflects a 40-percent increase over the past 12 years. Today, California has nearly 15 percent of all the Defense Department employees in the United States, and 9 percent of all Federal nondefense workers.

It is clear from the figures I have cited that any cutback in defense, aerospace, or other Federal spending would have a damaging effect upon the California economy. A logical person would expect to find all California Republicans in Congress, if they are honestly concerned about the unemployment problem in our great State, united with the California Democrats in opposing such a move from any quarter.

Such, however, is not the case. The Project Apollo program is almost entirely a California work project, but as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1963 plainly shows on the Republican motion to cut $200 million from this space program the 15 Republicans from California in the House of Representatives voted as follows:

Five voted for the cut, and two others were absent or did not vote. The eight remaining Republicans to their credit voted against the proposed cutback this year, but this cannot hide the fact that almost half the Republican delegation from California were prepared to endanger the jobs of thousands of Californians.

No California Democrat voted to support the slash at our vital space program, but of course the issue of whether America is to be first in the race for space leadership far overrides the interests of any one State. Our prestige as the major world power, and perhaps our very survival as a free people hinges upon our scientific supremacy. Despite this fact, in 1964 a total of 109 Republicans voted to support the irresponsible cutback and only 55 Republicans opposed it. The contrast between the two parties is clearly shown when we note that only 5 Democrats supported the proposed cut, while 215 Democrats opposed it and soundly defeated it.

Election year considerations, moreover, may have had something to do with the August 13 vote of Republican Members. Bad as it is—their vote a year ago on the same Project Apollo program was even worse. In 1963 a similar attempt was made to cut $200 million from this California work project. At that time 126 Republicans supported the cut and only 15 Republicans opposed it. The entire Republican delegation from California supported the attempted cutback in 1963 except for four members, and two of those were either absent or did not vote.

Once again we find that deeds count for more than cynical electioneering propaganda. In 1963 two-thirds of the Republicans from California, and the Republican Party as a whole by an 8 to 1 majority were prepared to inflict a serious blow upon our prosperity in California. The 1964 vote on the same issue shows almost half the Republicans from my State, and the Republican Party as a whole by a 2 to 1 majority determined to pursue the same course of action. We can be thankful both these attempts failed.

Another often-heard boast from unprincipled Republican candidates is the claim, "we can bring more Federal contracts to California." Now, Mr. Speaker, my State is but one of 50 States and yet after only 4 years of Democratic leadership in Washington the record in this area stands as follows:

In fiscal year 1963 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration placed almost $2 billion in contracts and procurement orders with California companies. This high figure is in fact 50.4 percent of all the business done by NASA during this period. To demonstrate how massive is California's share of NASA contract awards we need only see that the second-placed State in receipt of NASA contracts received only 9 percent of the total business for the year. My State alone, therefore, is performing half or more than half of all the work on our national space programs, and I wonder just how our Republican candidates plan to improve upon this figure.

In the nonspace field, California also leads the Nation in the number and amount of Department of Defense contracts and procurement awards received. During fiscal year 1963 approximately 25 percent of all Defense Department orders came to California, and no other State in the country receives anywhere close to this much business. I wonder once again just how our Republican candidates expect to improve upon this figure.

For the past 3 years, without any help from the Republican Party, we have had accelerating prosperity in this country. In fact, the past 3-year period has been one of the longest continuous peacetime booms since the great depression. President Johnson's ability to create harmonious labor-management relations, and the general aura of good will between the White House and the business community guarantees continued good prospects for the future.

In southern California business activity maintains a brisk pace reflecting the buoyancy of conditions at the national level. Led by sizable increases in building, real estate, and automobile sales the local economy has been operating between 7 and 8 percent above the first-quarter levels of 1963. Total employment in California has risen 2.5 percent from a year ago, and this increase is slightly above the national increase for the same period.

Unemployment, however, remains at the same level in California as a year ago, and this is the one dark cloud in an otherwise bright economic picture. I understand that some Republican candidates are offering magic cures to solve this problem also, but when we consider the Republican Party opposition to the war on poverty program and the general disregard on the part of Republican officeholders for the welfare of the working men and women of California we know that in this area too we can expect no help from the GOP.

Simply stated, the fact of the matter is that under the leadership of the Democratic Party our country is experiencing the best conditions—for the largest number of people—in history. California is receiving its full share of this prosperity, and many citizens of other States believe we are receiving much more than our fair share of the national good fortune. Any candidate for public office who makes the claim he can bring more Federal work to California, or who claims that the Democratic Party has not done enough for California is either ignorant of the true situation or is deliberately attempting to mislead and confuse the people.

In some instances these same Republican candidates have attempted to paint

a frightening picture of America's image in overseas countries. Our national prestige was low in 1960, but the determination displayed by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis, and the courage shown recently by President Johnson in answering attacks made upon our warships in the Tonkin Gulf have assured the world of our intention to resist Communist aggression wherever and whenever necessary.

I think it is interesting to recall that both the Berlin blockade and the Cuban quarantine were instituted by Democratic Party Presidents, and these policies enhanced rather than detracted from our prestige overseas. Our policy to isolate Communist Cuba has been so successful in fact that now only one Latin American country still maintains diplomatic relations with the island.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is in excellent condition, and in spite of the irresponsible statements of Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER our national prestige has never been greater. The policies of the Democratic Party, both foreign and domestic, have clearly established our Nation as the unchallenged leader of the free world, and as the one nation wherein the average man can enjoy, to an extent undreamed of a hundred years ago, the fruits of his labor.

This does not mean, of course, that no problems remain to be dealt with either at home or abroad. Difficult problems are present and they require speedy solutions. Our young people must be encouraged to a greater extent to apply themselves and learn a skilled trade or profession. Young people who have left school, and older workers faced with the threat of automation, must be trained in the skills that will provide them with a better than minimum standard of living. Our older citizens must receive dignified treatment in their senior years, and they must not be left to the whim of charity or the ruinous costs and hazardous protection of private medical care when they are sick.

Yes, many problems remain for our attention and concern, but I know the Democratic Party will tackle them and we will not rest or relax until realistic solutions are found. I point with pride to the record of my party over the past 2 years, and it has been a great honor for me to have participated in the accomplishments of the 88th Congress. It should be clear to all, on the other hand, that the Republican leadership did not add in any great measure to the progress made during the past historic session and no amount of campaign demagoguery on their part can hide this fact.

President Johnson has dedicated himself to the building of a "great society" for all Americans. I intend to assist the President in this most worthy enterprise, and I am sure this program meets with the overwhelming approval of the great majority of our citizens. I hope the members of the Republican Party will lay down their fears and prejudices and join with us in building a better life for all Americans. This is their choice to make, and I believe this is also their responsibility.

URBAN RENEWAL IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL NEEDS PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of September 29, 1964, states editorially, on behalf of the proponents of the compromise version of S. 628, which was brought to the House floor earlier today, that:

> The purpose of the bill is to permit Washington to redevelop the declining commercial section between the White House and the Capitol. This legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country.

The proponents also say, as today's Washington Post reports Acting Attorney Nicholas deB. Katzenbach as stating, that the compromise version of S. 628 brought to the floor by the House District Committee today will give District property owners adequate and "appropriate" protections, and that it will prevent local officials from undertaking arbitrary and capricious renewal projects.

Let us examine these assertions in some detail.

First, let us look at the assertion that this legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country.

It is my belief that this bill departs from what Congress has offered other cities, for, as President Lyndon B. Johnson said, in signing the Housing Act of 1964 at the White House on September 2:

> The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to move from the path of the bulldozers.

The Housing Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, in a letter published only yesterday, September 28, in the New York Times, declares that:

> The Housing Act of 1964 affords new tools for coping with rehabilitation and relocation. The act provides that no displacement of families or business can be made from a renewal area until the Housing Administrator has determined that rehabilitation is not suitable for the area.

Enactment of S. 628 by the Congress, the compromise measure reported by the House District Committee, would change the District's housing legislation.

The Comptroller General, in his analysis of S. 628 as submitted to the House District of Columbia Committee—hearings, "Urban Renewal in the District of Columbia, Part 4"—stated:

> We also should like to call your attention to the definition in the bill of a "slum or blighted area," as contained in the amended subsection (r) to section 3 of the act. In our opinion, the definition is so broad that any area of the District of Columbia could conceivably be classified as a slum or blighted area. The bill provides that one or more of several factors must be prevalent in order for an area to be so classified. These factors may include, but are not necessarily confined to, such conditions as deteriorating buildings, obsolete buildings, and overcrowded buildings. In the absence of more precise guidelines, such factors can be applied to an area on the basis of subjective determinations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We note, also, that the definition of a slum or blighted area gives no cognizance to the degree or severity of deterioration, dilapidation, et cetera. Thus, an area may be considered to be a slum and may be scheduled for large-scale demolition even though the blighting factors can be readily corrected. For example, an overcrowded or deteriorating building may be substantially improved through normal enforcement of codes or through normal maintenance. Although the bill does recognize degree in a sense, it does so in terms (e.g., severe social liability, impaired sound growth) which are also susceptible to subjective evaluations.

I have prepared two amendments which incorporate the housing regulations issued by the Housing Administrator, and which he requires of communities throughout the Nation in connection with both commercial and residential urban renewal areas, as well as urban renewal areas which combine both commercial and residential areas. I commend these two amendments to my colleagues for their consideration in providing true urban renewal in the Nation's Capital. Should there be objections to these amendments, and insistence on the present language in the compromise version of S. 628, then I ask where the present language defining slum and blight in the compromise version of S. 628 came from. It obviously did not come from the housing regulations and requirements which apply to all other communities of our country.

If the proponents of this compromise version of S. 628 want only what other communities have, no more and no less, then they should be willing to adopt my proposed amendments.

I include the text of these proposed amendments to the compromise version of S. 628 at this point in my remarks. I also include the text of a third amendment to S. 628, which I consider necessary because of the concentration of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency on luxury housing and prime office space and its complete unwillingness to heed the District Commissioners' recent request to provide a substantial amount of moderate income housing in the Southwest urban renewal project area.

These amendments, as well as the disclosures in committee hearings, as shown in House Report No. 1481, 88th Congress, 2d session, filed June 15, 1964, by the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, are included at this point in my remarks:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Page 7, strike out line 17, and all that follows down through line 3 on page 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(r) 'Slum area' or 'blighted area' is a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof—

"(1) which contains at least two environmental deficiencies,

"(2) in which at least 20 percent of the buildings contain at least one building deficiency, and

"(3) in all parts of which environmental or building deficiencies are present to a reasonable degree (unless the redevelopment objectives or the necessity of bringing the project to a sound boundary require otherwise).

"(s) 'Environmental deficiency' means—

"(1) overcrowding or improper location of structures on the land.

"(2) excessive dwelling unit density,

"(3) conversions to incompatible types of uses, such as rooming-houses among family dwellings,

"(4) obsolete building types, such as large residences or other buildings which through lack of use or maintenance have a blighting influence,

"(5) detrimental land uses or conditions, such as incompatible uses, structures in mixed use, or adverse influences from noise, smoke, or fumes,

"(6) unsafe, congested, poorly designed, or otherwise deficient streets,

"(7) inadequate public utilities or community facilities contributing to unsatisfactory living conditions or economic decline, or

"(8) other equally significant environment deficiencies.

"(t) 'Building deficiency' means—

"(1) defects to a point warranting clearance,

"(2) deteriorating condition because of a defect not correctable by normal maintenance,

"(3) extensive minor defects which, taken collectively are causing the building to have a deteriorating effect on the surrounding area,

"(4) inadequate original construction or alterations,

"(5) inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities, or

"(6) other equally significant building deficiencies."

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Add after section 11 the following new section:

"SEC. 12. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 25. Notwithstanding subsection (1) of section 20 or any other provision of this Act, after the date of enactment of this section the District Commissioners shall not approve any slum clearance and redevelopment project (as such term was defined in section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by section 311 of the Housing Act of 1954) unless the project area is an area—

"'(1) in which either—

"'(A) more than 50 percent of the buildings (other than accessory outbuildings) are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, or

"'(B) more than 20 percent of the buildings are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, and additional clearance, in an amount bringing the total to more than 50 percent of the buildings, is warranted to effectively remove blighting influences; and

"'(2) which does not contain—

"'(A) an unjustifiably large number (i) of buildings proposed to be cleared which are structurally sound or (ii) of parcels proposed to be acquired which are of basically sound property involving high acquisition costs, or

"'(B) any building proposed to be cleared which is (i) of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the redevelopment objectives for the affected area, and (ii) capable of being improved and successfully integrated into such area after redevelopment.'"

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Page 12, after line 24, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 5–706 (d)) is amended by striking out 'and (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(3) give satisfactory assurances that not less than fifty percent of any rental housing or cooperative housing which may be constructed on such real property under the plan will be designed primarily for occupancy by persons from the low- and middle-income segments of the population (as determined by the Agency); and (4)'."

And redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT NO. 1481, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, FILED JUNE 15, 1964

DISCLOSURES IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Following are brief statements of disclosures regarding the District of Columbia urban renewal program received by your committee in more than 5,000 pages of transcript of testimony and from records submitted in public hearings held by four subcommittees in the past 4 years.

1. The purpose and intent of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act for the District of Columbia, discussed hereafter, has been severely distorted, to the utter neglect of the clearly stated purpose of the act. The present law was designed to eliminate substandard housing conditions existing in the District of Columbia and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary low-rent housing, or public housing when needed, by the redevelopment of cleared, urban renewal project areas (S. Rept. 591, 79th Cong., Sept. 25, 1945; H. Rept. 2465, 79th Cong., July 8, 1946).

2. The financial statement of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency as of June 30, 1963, shows an expenditure of at least $100 million of public funds during the nearly 14 years of operation by the Agency (District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Annual Report balance sheet, June 30, 1963).

3. Not one unit of low-rent or public housing has been built in Washington under any urban renewal project plan, nor has the program provided any middle income housing.

4. The use of the powers in the present District of Columbia Redevelopment Act have been diverted to provide high-rent and luxury-type residential units at monthly rentals upward of $40 per room, to plush family units to be sold for as much as $75,000 per unit, which redevelopment invades the type of housing facilities which can be and are being furnished abundantly by private enterprise at no cost to the public (Area B, hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590 et seq.; Harbour Square, hearings, vol. 2, p. 1115; Columbia Plaza, vol. 2, p. 1105).

5. "Chosen instrument" redevelopers for renewal projects have been selected many months before any official approval of a project plan (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2).

6. Architectural design competitions have been conducted in which competitors were not equally notified and informed as to specifications and plan requirements with the result of award to the designers having the benefit of knowledge of the changed requirements (Tiber Island, vol. 4, p. 1084, hearings).

7. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency received, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency accepted, required forms showing financial responsibility of a developer of a $20 million project, which representation of financial responsibility was without authorization and denied in sworn testimony before your committee (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, p. 1135).

8. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Agency entered into agreements to sell U.S. Government property to "chosen instrument" redevelopers years before the approval of any project plan and without any knowledge or consent of Congress (Washington Channel waterfront, hearings, vol. 1, p. 192).

9. The Agency has used an unauthorized and secret formula for the disposition of project area land to a "chosen instrument" redeveloper, knowledge of which formula was withheld from other interested developers fully qualified under the formula (Columbia Plaza, 50 percent rule, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 253–254; 720; 770; 899–903).

10. Land disposition prices for high-rent housing have been established at less than the fair market value by means of residual land-use appraisals and use of appraisals not conducted by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (Hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590u).

11. The Agency has prepared land-use appraisals to establish fair market value for sale of project lands before the approval of any project plan under which land usage was established (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, chronology, p. III.)

12. The National Capital Planning Commission and the Agency have resorted to a gerrymandering of urban renewal boundaries so as to include choice, single-family housing areas which were free from any substandard housing and blight (Adams-Morgan hearing transcript, pp. 1150–1168).

13. Project plans for an urban renewal area have been approved in an area in which there existed not one substandard housing unit within the project area boundaries on the date of approval of the project plan (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 530–536; 1176).

14. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency charged the District of Columbia $2 million plus for land needed for public use in a project area, when public land could have been exchanged without cost to the public (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1344–1345; vol. 1. pp. 295–297).

15. The Agency has made application for public funds to redevelop land where private industry was ready, willing, and able to redevelop without the use of public funds (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 638–654).

16. The Agency has approved changes in urban renewal plans without adjustment in land costs where increased uses provided windfall profits to the redeveloper instead of lowering the project cost to the public (Columbia Plaza, area B, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1087–1111; vol. 4, pp. 1590g–1590h).

17. Low land appraisals have been based upon the redeveloper's proposed use of the land rather than upon the highest and best use of land provided in the redevelopment plan.

18. Clearance and redevelopment by private industry in the District of Columbia has been discouraged by the action of the Planning Commission and the Agency in imposing urban renewal project plan on an area in which almost all the property had been assembled under one ownership which had substantially demonstrated accomplishment toward the purpose of private development (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1253–1256, 619–668).

19. The Planning Commission and the Agency have used special housing standards, more restrictive than those used by the District of Columbia government, to classify housing structures as substandard in order to provide the quantity of existing substandard housing to qualify an area as an urban renewal area (Adams-Morgan hearing transcript, pp. 1173–1185).

20. In a project area where the District of Columbia required land for public use, the Agency charged the District $23.11 per square foot but sold equally valuable land noncompetitively to the redeveloper at $14.88

per square foot (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 310–313).

21. An original contract for land disposition to a redeveloper, who was to build a substantial number of low-rent housing units, was changed to provide for the construction of high-rent housing only (area B, hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590g).

22. The Agency has released redevelopers from the obligations of redevelopment contracts after default or in face of default, and in some cases there followed a cancellation of penalties, extension of the contract, or execution of a new more favorable contract (area B, vol. 4, pp. 1590p–1590t).

23. The Agency conveyed to a "chosen instrument" redeveloper, U.S. Government-owned land of approximately $2 million value in order to reduce the unit land cost to the redeveloper (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, p. 323).

24. A deficiency of more than 8,000 units of low-rent or public housing units has developed in the District of Columbia even though the present law requires that there be assurance that decent, safe, and sanitary housing will be available for dislocated people (Commissioner's housing report, 1962).

25. Concerning the first three sections of S. 628 as referred to your committee, the Comptroller General observed that under Urban Renewal Administration criteria, any building could be considered as substandard and scheduled for acquisition and demolition. The American Law Division of the Library of Congress stated that the limits of the increased breadth of authority could not be stated (hearings, vol. 3, p. 1508a). Committee's amendments are designed to require more selective treatment of private property without hindering redevelopment authorized and intended by Congress.

26. The Agency and the Planning Commission proposed a project plan providing for the acquisition of single family dwellings in a fine residential neighborhood for use as scattered site public housing for subsidized rent tenancy (Adams-Morgan, hearing transcript).

27. Despite the favorable action of your committee and the House of Representatives in 1960 proposing a moratorium on new projects until existing projects were 50 percent completed, four additional projects have since been approved, or are in the preliminary stages, and only one project plan is more than 50-percent complete after 12 years.

28. In 1961 the Agency, financed and aided in the organization of a private corporation to undertake functions of the Agency relating to the Southwest area C waterfront 11-acre parcel and justified the action on the ground that its staff was too overburdened by projects to devote sufficient time to the small waterfront area (Washington Channel waterfront, hearings, vol. 1, p. 222).

Mr. Speaker, the second point made by the proponents of the compromise version of S. 628 is that it will prevent local officials from undertaking "arbitrary and capricious" renewal projects, and that it gives District property owners adequate and "appropriate" protections.

On the other hand, the recently formed Committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community says this is not so, and says that the compromise bill provides no compensation for loss of goodwill by businesses forced to move.

The fact of the matter is that the compromise version of S. 628 does not provide full and just compensation for the District's businessmen, and homeowners, and the powers of eminent domain have been abused, not only in the Nation's Capital but throughout the country. It was to alleviate these abuses that the Republican housing bill, H.R. 9771, which I developed and which was cosponsored by Senator JOHN TOWER, and several of my colleagues in the House, included a far-reaching title which would provide just compensation.

The House of Representatives recognized the manifest abuses of eminent domain when it created the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition in the House Committee on Public Works. This subcommittee has held hearings around the country, it has published these hearings, and it will shortly bring out its report. The House and Senate Housing Subcommittees have promised to act early next year in providing full and just compensation. The Acting Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, certainly knows of these significant and long overdue steps the Congress is taking in this neglected field, but his curbstone opinion, which was reported by the Washington Post this morning—September 29—in time to help influence the vote on the compromise version of S. 628, completely ignores these congressional developments. Why?

The Sunday Star of September 27, 1964, reported that when the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency began buying property in one 80-acre tract in southwest Washington 11 years ago there were 914 individual parcels owned by 686 persons or firms. Today, all the residential property is owned by James H. Scheuer and the HRH Corp., both of New York City. According to the Sunday Star:

> In getting rid of the slums in area B, the renewal agency also got rid of multiple ownership of the residences. The present 1,739 dwellings are of the rental type including the 400 townhouse units, and there are no individually owned homes.

The Star newspaper report points out that luxury apartments in the southwest urban renewal project rent up to $500 a month, and that:

> A total of 288,752 square feet of land in the area was sold by RLA to the District for the Southwest Expressway at a price of $1,607,919, or more than $5.50 a square foot. Townhouse and apartment land was leased at a fee value of from 91 cents a square foot to $2.50 a square foot.

The compromise version of S. 628 would continue and, in fact, actually increase these kinds of practices throughout the District of Columbia, and this is not anything which this Congress should fasten on the voteless citizens of the Nation's Capital.

I include here a letter I sent to the able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, as well as several newspaper articles, which will shed light on the subject I have been discussing:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. September 4, 1964.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, House District of Columbia Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: I appreciate your recent letter thanking me for my statement on urban renewal in the District of Columbia.

I took the trouble to make this insertion because the president of the Federation of Citizens Associations requested it. Also, the newspapers have not given a balanced picture in their news columns, or in their editorials about urban renewal and the work of your committee and Subcommittee No. 4 under Congressman JOHN DOWDY. There seems to be a paper curtain. Actually, the radio and television stations are doing a much better job, for some reason.

Having said this, I would like to say that I am considering offering some amendments to S. 628 to strengthen it if and when it reaches the floor. Among the amendments I have in mind are (1) the amendment offered by Senator JACK MILLER to S. 628 in the Senate last year; (2) an amendment providing that not less than 50 percent of any rental housing or cooperative housing in an urban renewal area will be designed primarily for occupancy by persons from the low- and middle-income segments of the population; and (3) amendments similar to those I offered in my H.R. 9771 to make certain that relocation housing would be provided to displacees. These are the three main areas which I think should be given particular consideration by S. 628.

The Washington Post today said editorially that the District Commissioners are trying to work out a compromise redevelopment bill with the House District Committee, but clearly opposes the amendments included in S. 628 by the House District Committee. My own view is that these amendments should be retained, and the bill be strengthened by the amendments I have outlined above.

I would appreciate the opportunity of talking with you about the amendments I suggest at your earliest opportunity. I enclose them here for your consideration.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

AN ACCEPTABLE COMPROMISE

At last the House District Committee has arrived at a compromise in its long internal struggle over urban renewal in Washington. The new version of the bill drops the most malicious of the amendments written into it, earlier this year, by Mr. Garber, the committee's counsel. The compromise now deserves to be passed.

The purpose of the bill is to permit Washington to redevelop the declining commercial section between the White House and the Capitol. This legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country. From Alexandria and Baltimore to the Pacific coast, American cities are already at work rebuilding their commercial centers and protecting the tax bases upon which city schools and welfare services depend.

The compromise bill still contains several unfortunate additions. It will generally require redevelopment land to go to the highest bidder, a procedure full of hazards as Alexandria recently discovered. It will require further legislation before the Anacostia-Bolling site can be redeveloped. But on balance the merits of even this compromise vastly outweigh its defects, and the city's interest will be greatly served by its enactment. The elimination of the Garber amendments is owed to the leadership of Congressmen SISK and SPRINGER, who correctly perceived them to be an attack on urban renewal, not merely in Washington, but throughout the country.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1964]

RENEWAL SHOWDOWN STIRS FINAL MOVES

Washington's compromise downtown renewal bill stirred last minute moves by its backers and its critics yesterday as it neared a showdown in the House.

Representative B. F. SISK, Democrat, of California, one of the leading backers of commercial renewal powers for the District, cited support from the Justice Department.

Opponents distributed flyers warning downtown merchants that the bill "leaves the small businessmen out in the cold." Members of the recently formed Committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community urged the businessmen to wire Congressmen to defeat the measure.

The House is expected to vote on it today.

SAFEGUARDS ADEQUATE

SISK disclosed that acting Atty. Gen. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach considers the safeguards in the measure more than adequate in preventing local officials from undertaking "arbitrary and capricious" renewal projects.

SISK said he hoped Katzenbach's report would stem fears about the guideline accepted by a House District Subcommittee last week.

The bill passed the Senate last year as a simple piece of legislation designed to let the city use urban renewal powers in nonresidential neighborhoods. All other major cities have the authority.

But a divided House District Committee added a string of amendments that an 11-member minority complained would virtually halt urban renewal in Washington.

Under a compromise worked out last week, committee members of both sides agreed to accept the Senate-passed standards for determining just what constitutes a slum eligible for urban renewal.

In his opinion, Katzenbach said this would give the District property owners adequate and appropriate protections.

Under the House Committee's restrictions, he said, "presumably only the cores of slums could be urban renewal areas.

"The public investment in renewal areas," Katzenbach added, "might thus be jeopardized because those areas would be surrounded by deteriorating areas that had been excluded from renewal because most of the buildings were not yet physically dangerous."

The House version would have tied urban renewal solely to the structural condition of buildings in a proposed project area while the Senate bill would allow consideration of conditions that represent "a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare."

Katzenbach said the House restriction was weaker than the Senate provision in some spots since it would allow urban renewal for buildings that are "detrimental" rather than "a serious and growing threat."

FOES PRESS DRIVE

The fight over the measure will apparently continue down to the wire.

In flyers entitled "The Bulldozer Is at Your Door," members of the recently formed committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community called for a last-minute campaign to defeat the renewal bill.

Atty. James F. O'Donnell, a committee spokesman, said the bill provides no compensation for "loss of goodwill" by businesses forced to move.

And without any restrictions limiting renewal to physical building conditions, he maintained, property owners will be left at the mercy of local urban renewal officials.

"Even buildings and businesses in strict compliance with the District of Columbia Building Code can be declared blighted under the new amendments," the committee charged.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 27, 1964]

A BRANDNEW NEIGHBORHOOD IS BORN

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Tucked away in Southwest Washington is an elegant new neighborhood of special interest and believe-it-or-not rarity. It is the first urban renewal project area to be started in Washington. Soon it will be marked "completed."

Popularly, this 80-acre section, one of three projects in the much-delayed 560-acre Southwest Washington renewal area, is known as the Capitol Park neighborhood. It takes this name from the Capitol Park development of apartments and townhouses of which it is almost entirely composed.

Legally, this first renewal project in Washington's history is known as "Southwest Urban Renewal Project Area B." Planning for it started almost as soon as the District Redevelopment Land Agency's operations were begun 14 years ago. But not until 12 years ago was a redevelopment plan adopted for the area.

As now bounded, Capitol Park roughly extends from Fourth Street to Half Street and from the Southwest Expressway to I Street SW. Besides this area, Southwest Area B also contains the Amidon playground, the Randall Junior High School, the uncompleted Randall Recreation Center and the Skyline Motel at South Capitol and I Streets SW.

Also included is the Southwest Market Center and the Phillips Petroleum gasoline station, along E Street, north of the expressway.

When RLA began buying property in the area 11 years ago, there were 914 individual parcels owned by 686 persons or firms. Much of it was slum property.

Ninety-nine percent of all the buildings were demolished and the land was either leased or sold by RLA. Today all the residential property is listed as owned by James H. Scheuer and the HRH Corp., both of New York.

The residential land earlier was earmarked for lease by RLA to Mr. Scheuer and Roger L. Stevens, New York real estate dealer and theatrical producer who heads the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Subsequently, Mr. Stevens disposed of his interest. HRH Corp. was brought in as an owner and builder after the first apartment building at 800 Fourth Street SW., was completed 5 years ago.

Since then, 3 additional apartment buildings and 400 townhouses have been completed. A fifth apartment building is expected to be finished early in 1965.

With completion of this building, the project area itself will be largely completed. It will have 1,339 apartments in 5 elevator buildings, plus 400 rental units in the townhouses, many of which are 2-unit apartments.

In getting rid of the slums in area B, the renewal agency also got rid of multiple ownership of the residences. The present 1,739 dwellings are of the rental type including the 400 townhouse units, and there are no individually owned homes.

Developers of the Capitol Park area are generally credited with having achieved an outstanding architectural result by having retained Architect Chloethiel Woodard Smith to design the development.

An early area development plan by Elbert Peets, former member of the Fine Arts Commission, emphasized rehabilitation rather than demolition of dwellings, but it was scrapped by RLA and the National Capital Planning Commission. The plan calling for demolition was drawn up by Mrs. Smith and Louis Justement.

The Federal Government, contributed $4,564,345 as a grant to carry out the work, and the District government spent $5,761,994, RLA said. The District contribution was $2,319,881 in excess of legal requirements, the agency said.

A total of 288,752 square feet of land in the area was sold by RLA to the District for the Southwest Expressway at a price of $1,607,919, or more than $5.50 a square foot. Townhouse and apartment land was leased at a fee value of from 91 cents a square foot to $2.50 a square foot.

Townhouse rentals in the Capitol Park development range from $190 for each of two apartments in a single dwelling, to a maximum of $310 monthly for an entire four-bedroom house, with utility costs extra.

Elevator apartment rentals range from a minimum of $135 monthly for the lowest-price efficiencies to a maximum of $500 a month for the highest rent two-bedroom apartments. The highest rent apartments will be located in the building to be completed early next year.

Except for eight of these apartments in the $450 to $500 range in the final elevator building, the maximum apartment rental in the other buildings is $280 monthly for two bedrooms. One-bedroom rentals range up to $218 monthly.

SYMBOLS AND REALITIES IN REPUBLICAN ECONOMICS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Dr. Henry Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University, provides a clear, decisive presentation of the basis of much Republican economic thought. The article, "Symbols and Realities in Republican Economics," which was prepared for the Journal of Commerce, dismisses the myths and shibboleths associated by the opposition with Republican economic thinking and discusses the underlying realities.

Because a symbol or phrase, such as the "balanced budget," often clouds the real issue it is intended to identify, Professor Wallich concentrates on what are the three most commonly confused, and abused symbols. These are the balanced budget, gold, and the dangers of the public debt.

The balanced budget as a symbol is frequently misinterpreted as requiring a budget in exact balance every year. Few Republicans believe in such a rigid interpretation, but rather see a balance over the business cycle. Too rigid an interpretation, of course, would eliminate the role of surpluses which should be used to retire part of the public debt. As Dr. Wallich points out:

> When the Government runs a surplus, it is generating savings through the budget. These take the form of debt repayment, and the funds become available for private investment. This in turn contributes to the rate of economic growth.

He adds that the goal of a balanced budget fulfills another, more basic, function. It serves as a "means of maintaining fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility." Republican concentration on the goal of a balanced budget, Dr. Wallich observes, expresses a concern over the size of the public sector which Republicans know can become a threat to individual freedom.

Dr. Wallich points out that gold still retains international importance with world confidence in the dollar resting in large part on our gold stock. He also suggests another reason why gold is an

important issue in Republican economic thinking. He states that "gold and its symbolism provide a useful counterpoise to inflationism."

The concern over the public debt is the third Republican economic symbol dealt with in the article. Here again, this concern reflects the larger, more fundamental issue of fiscal responsibility. Republicans believe, as Dr. Wallich points out, that "the public debt handled irresponsibly can become a great menace." This is another example of a key Republican concept being used as a measuring rod to test the fiscal performance of the administration in power.

I include Dr. Wallich's article, "Symbols and Realities in Republican Economics," at this point:

SYMBOLS AND REALITIES IN REPUBLICAN ECONOMICS

(By Henry C. Wallich)

With the approach of the election campaign, both parties are reformulating and sharpening their philosophy and their rhetoric.

The parties have real differences, although between the middle of the roaders of both sides these are not unbridgeable. Both parties, however, also have symbols which they believe, or try to make believe, to stand for these real differences. These symbols—"balanced budget," "full employment," "gold," "public needs," and many more—become the focus of discussion and confuse a realistic analysis.

If taken seriously by the politicians, they will also confound good policy making.

I shall pick out here three Republican symbols: The balanced budget, gold, and the dangers of the public debt. All three have a perfectly sound grounding in the real issues. All three issues are in danger of becoming hopelessly muddled by their respective symbols.

THE BALANCED BUDGET

A balanced budget is a frequently voiced Republican demand. If the speaker is a liberal Republican, he may argue for balancing the budget over the business cycle with deficits in recessions and surpluses in booms. But deficits are always tainted.

What is the underlying reality? Basically, it is concern over the size of the public sector of the economy. This concern in the last analysis is a concern less over money than over governmental power. Republicans object not only to large scale Government activities, they object to the extension of Government power because of the threat they see in it to individual freedom.

There are many other facets, of course, to the Republican rejection of a large public sector. People in the upper income brackets dislike it because under a progressive tax system, they pay a disproportionate part of the bill. Many of the services the Government provides go to the lower income groups. Big Government also implies the prospect of greater dependence of business upon Government, expanded controls and "intervention."

At the same time, the experience of the last few years does little to refute the critics of a large public sector. Government expenditures are up sharply, but are "public needs" really substantially better taken care of? Has the "public squalor" of which Galbraith complained been significantly remedied? Many things need to be improved in our society, but more spending for them does not seem to guarantee a solution.

There are the realities of the case against a large public sector and big Government spending. Obviously they have to do with a balanced budget, but this symbol falls short of covering the case. And insistence on a balanced budget as a means of limiting big spending creates difficulties for a rational fiscal policy which the advocates of the balanced budget seem wholly to disregard.

To begin with, the budget is a highly arbitrary collection of figures in two columns, the equality of whose sums is not particularly meaningful. About 30 percent of Federal expenditures are outside the administrative budget in any event. The Government's books are kept on principles so primitive that a businessman might have great difficulty living with them.

The Government cannot capitalize any of its expenditures. If a rapidly growing business were compelled to expense all its investment outlays, it might very often find itself operating in the red. It does not follow from this that the Government should have a capital budget—this would invite even larger spending. But the difference between governmental and business bookkeeping should be borne in mind.

In political rhetoric, deficits are automatically equated with inflation. They are indeed inflationary if they create a scarcity of resources, or if they are financed by money creation that in turn generates excessive private demand. But business "deficits" in the Government bookkeeping sense, i.e., investment expenditures financed by borrowing, are equally inflationary under the same conditions. Soundly financed, and in the absence of a strain on resources, neither public nor private deficits are inflationary.

An analogy frequently is drawn between Government deficits and business deficits. Quite aside from the difference in bookkeeping, the analogy is wholly misleading. Profitable operation is indeed the test of efficiency for an enterprise. Government operation may be inefficient or not, but a surplus or deficit in the budget is not the test.

On grounds quite different from those of political rhetoric, however, a good case can be made for keeping deficits down and even trying to achieve a surplus. The case has nothing to do with the supposed merits of a balanced budget, but with the contribution to economic growth that Government savings can make.

When the Government runs a surplus, it is generating savings through the budget. These take the form of debt repayment, and the funds become available for private investment. This in turn contributes to the rate of economic growth.

Whether such a policy is possible depends on whether high employment can be maintained in the face of surpluses. Monetary policy can help here. If interest rates can be kept sufficiently low, investment of the funds repaid by the Treasury is facilitated. A proper tax structure can help, which gives incentives to investment.

The conclusion, for fiscal policy, is that under some conditions there are merits in surpluses, under others in deficits. Surpluses are preferable, because they can help speed up growth. But when these conditions cannot be met, the case of deficits must be faced. In neither circumstance is there a special value in a balanced budget. It just happens to be the middle between the two.

Nevertheless, the popular symbol of the balanced budget, with all its defects, has merits of a different sort that Republicans should not easily sacrifice. The ideal of a balanced budget serves as a means of maintaining fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility. Perhaps that is the reason why so many public figures, who are quite well informed about the economics nevertheless continue to harp on budget balancing.

The pressures for spending are always great. We know that ordinarily we shall spend a little more and take in a little less than we ought. From the reasonable position that deficits are appropriate under some circumstances, it is only too easy to move to the belief that they are appropriate under all.

The proper analysis of what is appropriate in a given situation is bound to be difficult. There is a large group among politicians and voters who are hard to persuade that there are limits in any particular case. This calls for a counter bias, which is provided by the balanced budget symbol.

The symbol does not stand up under technical analysis. But it admirably fits what Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has called the puritan ethic of the American people.

As a brake on excesses, it has its value. Its virtues lie in the preaching rather than in the execution.

So long as the preaching it not taken too literally, so long as politicians do not fall for their own propaganda, the balanced budget performs a genuine service.

GOLD

Gold is another of the symbols that in political rhetoric takes the place of complex realities.

These symbols can get badly in the way of rational policy. Taken with a large dose of political salt, however, they do have value.

Gold, in addition to being valuable, has the advantage as a symbol of being mysterious. Few people feel quite sure that they understand what it is about. Any tampering with it nevertheless brings strong outcries.

When the Kennedy administration, a couple of years ago, moved to abolish the 25 percent gold requirement for the Federal Reserve, the outraged onslaught of the opposition forced retreat in short order. What are the realities behind the gold symbol?

Gold symbolizes sound money. This means two things: Stable prices at home, a fixed and secure value for our currency abroad. Both are economic objectives of the first order.

The relation of gold to stable prices is less strong than it was before the domestic gold circulation was ended in 1933, but it was tenuous even then. The Federal Reserve was managing the currency, and a stable price level was its primary objective.

But gold did little to enforce this objective. The Federal Reserve, at almost all times, had substantial excess reserves. The discipline of gold would not have prevented an increase in the price level, although substantial inflation no doubt would quickly have caused leakages of gold abroad and into domestic hoarding.

Today gold does not serve as a backing, nor gives value to our currency in any meaningful sense. Americans are no longer allowed to own it, at home or abroad. Yet the opposition to a removal of the 25-percent Federal Reserve requirement is strong, even virulent.

The relation of gold to a stable international value of the dollar is more direct. A country that wants to serve as banker to the world must have large liquid reserves. It must inspire confidence abroad that it can meet its liability without a shadow of doubt.

Given this confidence, however, the United States can conduct its international financial operations very largely on the basis of credit. In the financing of our huge balance-of-payments deficit of the last 6 years, credit has played a much greater role than gold payments. The world has been willing to accept dollars in payments, and to hold them.

With some justification it has been said that gold is on a dollar standard, and so is the rest of the world. If the United States were to devalue dollars, it is a virtual certainty that the rest of the world would follow suit. Gold would be worth more in terms of all foreign currencies. The dollar, in all

likelihood, would be worth what it was before.

Under these conditions, a good case can be made for removing the 25-percent Federal Reserve requirement.

It would make all our gold available for international support of the dollar. It would demonstrate to the world that we are prepared to use our full resources to meet our obligations.

Our determination to maintain the internal and external value of the dollar would be in no way reduced thereby. If a policy of stable prices and stable exchange rates is pursued, as it must, the compelling element is the good economic sense of these objectives. It is not the limitation imposed upon our actions by our gold holdings.

Nevertheless, I would not today recommend removing the 25-percent requirement. This is mainly because of the terrific fight that would be provoked, and the uncertainty of the outcome. But one must recognize also that the symbol of gold has a stabilizing value.

In the perpetual struggle between those who believe that stable money is an essential basis of a free economy, and those who want to push the economy beyond the limits of its capacity regardless of inflation, gold and its symbolism provide a useful counterpoise to inflationism. In defense of our gold reserve, policies become feasible for which otherwise it might be hard to rally a majority.

Gold is an anchor not to be pulled up lightly.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The crushing burden of the public debt is another of the great Republican symbols that never fails to attract attention when the national conventions meet.

Political rhetoric sees the country mortgaging its future. A ruinous burden is being passed on to future generations to pay, it is said, and we must do all we can to pay it off now.

What are the realities behind the symbol? The fundamental issue is fiscal responsibility. The public debt, handled irresponsibly, can become a great menace.

If the counsels of those prevail who want to keep the Government's interest payments down, want to finance the debt cheaply through the banking system, we are in for serious inflation. And if it should be widely accepted that the public debt does not matter, because we owe it to ourselves, some further restraints on big spending and on the enlargement of the public sector will have been removed.

But symbolism strays very far from realism in the way it pictures the burden of the debt. There is no analogy between the debt burden of an individual or business and the debt burden of the Federal Government. The debt of the Nation is the assets of millions of citizens. The interest is their income.

To say that "we owe it to ourselves" is, to be sure, an oversimplification. The debt is not altogether with adverse effects, even when it is properly managed. Higher taxes must be levied, with their inevitable disincentive effects. The interest charge crowds other expenditures out of the budget that otherwise might be worthwhile.

Perhaps the best way of describing the situation is to say that the public debt is like a debt owed to one's father-in-law, it is within the family, but it can create friction. The overriding fact nevertheless is that it is within the family.

The public debt is not particularly large relative to our economy and to the budget. The annual interest of $11 billion is 1.8 percent of the gross national product and 11 percent of the budget. In 1929, the interest of not quite $1 billion was 1.1 percent of GNP and 11 percent of the budget. In 1920, it was 1.2 percent of the GNP and 16 percent of the budget. Ever since World War II, of course, the dollar value of the debt has been shrinking in relation to the GNP and to other debt, although the interest charge has crept up.

It is particularly noteworthy that during the postwar period the Federal Government has gone into debt much more slowly than other debtors. Business, consumers, homeowners, the State and local authorities have all been stepping up their indebtedness at rates commensurate with the growth of the economy or a good deal faster. The Federal debt has inched up slowly.

This is as it should be: the Government should not deprive the private sector of full access to the Nation's savings when there is strong demand for them. Preferably, it would at such times repay debt in order to increase the supply of investible funds.

This was done during the 1920's, with very beneficial results for the rate of economic growth. In any event the facts indicate that the Federal debt is in no way becoming a crushing burden.

Neither need we be concerned about passing the debt on to our children. After all, we are also passing on the corresponding assets. Each generation bears the main burden of the public debt created during its lifetime. In our case, the burden took the form of the material waste of World War II, during which hard work was done with not much in the way of consumption or investment to show for it.

The consequences in the shape of a somewhat smaller economy, due to low investment during those years, do also touch our children. But in general, what we are passing on is not the burden of the debt, but the problems of managing it.

Nor need we worry if we fail to pay off the debt. I have indicated why it would be advantageous to do so; under favorable conditions, this is a means of speeding economic growth. But a going concern need not eliminate its debt, so long as it can expect to have the earnings to pay the interest. Many of our leading corporations give no sign of reducing the volume of their debt.

Corporate debt, to be sure, is reflected in productive assets. Whether this can be said of the Federal Government is questionable. But what counts is not assets, but earning power. The assets of a bankrupt enterprise are of limited value to its creditors. About the "earning power" of the Federal Government there can be little doubt.

The "earning power" of the Federal Government is its tax base, and that means the American economy itself. Any single enterprise may eventually decline. But the American economy is likely to grow, barring nuclear disaster, and so will the tax base. At the level of a nation, even death is not sure, but taxes are.

Yet with all the misunderstandings that surround the public debt, it remains a useful symbol helping to enforce fiscal responsibility. It would be a disaster if some of the things said about the debt were taken literally, and if all our policies were bent toward reducing it under all circumstances. Taken with the appropriate dose of salt and treated accordingly, proper concern about the public debt and its management is an essential Republican symbol.

FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Native Daughters of the Golden West recently sponsored an essay contest throughout all of the schools in California on "The Place of Fray Junipero Serra in California History and the Importance to the Development of California of the Missions He Established." Mrs. Elmarie Hurlbert Dyke, of Pacific Grove, Calif., past grand president of the Native Daughters of the Golden West was chairman of the Fray Junipero Serra essay contest.

I am proud and pleased to report that the first and fourth place winners came from my congressional district. It is not surprising that a high percentage of the winners should come from my district. Seven of the 21 California missions are located therein.

The author of the first place essay is Miss Mary Helen McCommons, Salinas, Calif., who attends Santa Catalina School for Girls at Monterey. The fourth place winner is Miss Denise Mallette, Box 4301, Carmel-by-the-Sea, who attends Junipero Memorial High School in Monterey.

I submit these winning essays to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

THE PLACE OF FRAY JUNIPERO SERRA IN CALIFORNIA HISTORY AND THE IMPORTANCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF CALIFORNIA OF THE MISSIONS HE ESTABLISHED

(First place essay by Miss Mary Helen McCommons, 108 Sycamore Road, Salinas, Calif.; Santa Catalina School for Girls at Monterey; instructor: Sister M. Isabel O.P.)

Miguel Jose Serra was 56 years old in the spring of 1769. For 20 years, as Fray Junipero Serra, he had established missions in New Spain and Lower California and labored to bring the faith to the Indians of the Spanish New World. But in March of 1769 this commission ended. Alarmed by the increasing Russian colonization of northern California, the Government of Mexico initiated plans for an expedition of soldiers and missionaries to settle and civilize the fertile lands of California. Led by Captain Portola, then Governor of Lower California, the party set out from Loreto. With them walked the gray-robed Father Serra, perhaps a little more slowly than the others, for Fray Junipero was lame in one leg. Those were the first steps in building what was to become Father Serra's rosary of missions. With a prayer and a dream, he trod the difficult path northward.

Fray Junipero had already carried his dream for half a century and across half a world by that spring of 1769, but the light of his hope never failed him in the dangerous and discouraging months and years following his departure from Mexico.

When Portola decided to return the weary, starving band to Mexico, less than a year after the founding of the first mission at San Diego, it was Fray Junipero's prayers and faith which saved the seemingly doomed expedition. When this same mission was completely razed by hostile Indians, he was more convinced than ever of the necessity of his work. The Franciscans rebuilt the mission and Padre Serra continued to set the gems of his "rosary" along a bejewelled sea from San Francisco to San Diego, separated by the length of dawn to sunset.

In a decade and a half Father Serra had brought a new way of life to the Indians of California and played a leading role in the colonization of one of the brightest jewels in the Spanish crown. He had converted and educated thousands, a tireless example to both his converts and his brother missionaries. Besides bringing them the way

of life, he had taught them a way of living: the embryonic industries of agriculture and cattle raising were centered around the missions, citrus orchards and vineyards sprawling over the surrounding hills; weaving and sandal making, saddlery and candle dipping were learned at the hands of the gray-robed friars. A legacy of language and liturgy, fraternity and love echoed from the bells of the mission towers, and resounds even today against the rolling hills which skirt the thunderous sea. The vineyards still exist, and the citrus groves, their size hardly dreamed of by the gentle Fray Junipero. The loveliest homes in California reflect the influence of the old mission style, and daily speech reechoes the soft tones of the Spanish tongue: streets and cities, festivals and holidays, mountains and seas and rivers still bear their proud Spanish names, recalling the missionaries of two centuries ago.

But perhaps more important than the tangible legacy left by Fray Junipero Serra is the pride in a heritage won not by gun nor greed nor bloodshed, but by the cross of love and the peace of understanding. It was devotion when discouragement seemed the only end, and a passion for the fulfillment of a dream, that inspired Father Serra, and, in turn, inspired others to follow him. He has taken his place as the Father of California, and his place is undisputed.

Father Serra died on August 28, 1784, in his beloved Mission Carmel, a tired but never defeated man. He had seen a wilderness become a prosperous colony, and he knew that he had taken part in the transformation. He knew, also, that the work was far from finished, and he entrusted it to those who followed him—the gray-robed friars, the Indians—and you—and me.

THE PLACE OF FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA IN CALIFORNIA HISTORY AND THE IMPORTANCE TO CALIFORNIA OF HIS MISSIONS

(Fourth place essay by Miss Denise Mallette, Box 4301, Carmel-by-the-Sea, Calif., Junipero Memorial High School, Monterey, instructor: Sister M. Colette, O.P.)

Once there was a man of faith and vision—

Fray Junipero Serra was a Spanish Franciscan whose writings and works give witness both to a deep and sincere faith and to broad vision. At the dedication of Mission San Antonio in 1770, Serra summed up what was at once his life work and his contribution to the California of today when he spoke of his trust in God and expressed the hope that the mission would become a great town of many Christians.[1]

Father Serra was the spiritual and physical force behind the California missions. He faced the ignorance of the natives, the opposition of the Spanish governors, and the physical hardships of 18th-century California, but his courage and faith never failed him. When the Spanish wished to leave San Diego in 1770 soon after its foundation, it was Serra's persistence that prevented the abandonment of the fort and the mission. Fray Francisco Palou wrote that "He [Serra] felt that if the port were then abandoned, after formal possession and settlement had been effected, it might easily happen that many centuries would pass before it would be settled again."[2]

Between 1769 and 1782 Serra founded the missions of San Carlos Borromeo at Monterey, San Antonio de Padua, San Luis Obispo, San Juan Capistrano, and San Buenaventura, and he dedicated, or repeatedly visited San Gabriel, San Francisco and Santa Clara which had been founded with his encouragement by his coworkers.

The establishment of San Carlos Borromeo demonstrates the commonsense and foresight that characterized so much of Serra's work. He decided that the mission should not remain at its original site: it lacked ground for cultivation; there was little water for irrigation. Serra therefore moved the mission to nearby Carmel Valley where conditions were better and where there was good land, sufficient water, timber, and a large Indian population.

Another example of Serra's good planning is found in a letter written in 1777 to Palou in which he noted that "the procession of missions is very disjointed" and that to achieve unity it would be necessary to make three foundations along the Santa Barbara Channel.[3] In time, San Buenaventura, La Purisima Concepcion and Santa Barbara filled in the gap.

Today, all the mission sites established by Father Serra are surrounded by thriving towns or cities. None has been abandoned. His practical approach in selecting the best locations for a future generation is evidenced by the fact that even later, Californians could find no better places in which to settle.

The tremendous growth of present day California, the achievements that have brought the State to top rank in population, in agriculture, in trade, and in education, all had their beginnings in the Spanish period. As a contemporary writer has pointed out: "The first Spanish explorer is mentioned more often than the builder of the first cement plant. The Franciscan Fathers are much better known than the fathers of irrigation, the citrus industry, or refrigeration and canning."[4]

Not least among the men who put their mark on 20th-century California was Father Junipero Serra, and as Palou so accurately foretold, "His memory shall not fail, because the work he performed when alive shall be impressed in the minds of the dwellers of this new California; despite the ravages of time, they shall not be forgotten."[5]

Once there was a man of faith and vision—and his work has endured.

FIVE STARS DUE ADM. RAYMOND A. SPRUANCE

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in my reading and study of naval history of World War II, it becomes increasingly apparent that one of our greatest naval tacticians was never given the honor which he earned and still deserves. His command in the Battle of Midway achieved for him the title "Victor of Midway," according to Samuel Eliot Morison, the foremost naval historian in America. Combined with the leadership of Admiral Fletcher, he is credited with turning the tide of World War II in the Pacific.

He led the 5th Fleet in taking the Gilbert Islands, the Marshall Islands, and supported General MacArthur's return with raids on Truk, Palau Islands, the Caroline Islands, and Hollandia. History has proved that his direction of the Battle of the Philippine Sea was a master stroke. Other actions in which his fleet participated included the conquest of Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

Adm. Raymond A. Spruance is the man who built this amazing record of accomplishments. He deserves no less recognition than being awarded the rank of five-star admiral. I welcome the support of my colleagues and all interested parties across the United States in bringing about this late, but deserved, recognition.

To quickly refresh memories and remind those who today are secure in the Pacific by dint of his unsurpassed ability and extraordinary achievement, I recall some significant aspects of the World War II career of our greatest admiral, Raymond A. Spruance.

In the first months of World War II, Admiral Spruance commanded the cruisers in a carrier task force commanded by Admiral Halsey. He participated with Halsey in the carrier raids on the Marshalls, Wake, and Marcus, and in the Doolittle raid on Tokyo.

Halsey then became ill, whereupon Spruance took command of his carrier force, and the overall fleet command in the Battle of Midway—June 1942—went to Admiral Fletcher. Both Spruance and Fletcher are credited with the amazing feat of sinking four Japanese carriers and turning the tide of war, but in that action Fletcher's flagship *Yorktown* was torpedoed, whereupon Fletcher turned the command over to Spruance. In the remaining 2 days of the battle, Spruance handled the fleet with such skill and good judgment that Morison calls him "the victor of Midway." Admiral Nimitz was so impressed that he ordered Spruance to Pearl Harbor to be his chief of staff and to groom him for command of the great Central Pacific Fleet, then building.

Meanwhile, Halsey, now out of the hospital, was ordered by Nimitz to take command of the South Pacific Force and area with headquarters at Noumea, New Caledonia. In this position he gave general direction to the conquest of Guadalcanal and the rest of the Solomons and the neutralizing of the great Japanese base at Rabaul.

As Halsey was completing his reconquest of the Solomons, Spruance assumed command of the new Central Pacific Fleet—designated 5th Fleet—and in November 1943, led it in the assault and reconquest of the Gilbert Islands, including Tarawa. The following February, he led the 5th Fleet in the conquest of the Marshall Islands. He then supported MacArthur's advance on New Guinea with raids on Truk, the Palau Islands, the Caroline Islands, and Hollandia.

In June 1944, Spruance led the 5th Fleet in an invasion of the Mariana Islands, which would provide airfields within bombing range of Japan. At last now the Japanese fleet came out to offer battle. Spruance shifted his flagship from the amphibious force to the carrier force and gave general direction to the 2-day battle of the Philippine Sea. He was criticized at the time for not advanc-

---

[1] Maynard J. Geiger, "Life of Fray Junipero Serra" (Washington, D.C., 1959), I, 281.

[2] Francisco Palou, "Life of Fray Junipero Serra" (Washington, D.C., 1955), translated by Maynard J. Geiger, 86.

[3] Geiger, op. cit., II, 209.

[4] John W. Caughey, "California" (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1953), 593.

[5] Palou, op. cit., 256.

ing to meet the enemy—instead of letting the enemy come to him. He refused, however, to run the risk of letting an enemy naval force get between him and the beachhead, which it was his primary duty to protect. Had he uncovered the beachhead, he might have sunk more enemy carriers only three were sunk during the battle. But by remaining near the beachhead and attacking enemy aircraft with fighters and antiaircraft fire, he stripped the Japanese fleet of planes, "the Marianas Turkey Shoot," the Americans called it. Admirals King and Nimitz supported Spruance's decision at the time, and practically everybody supports it now. For we now know that Japan was most vulnerable in her aircraft pilot training program. She simply could not train enough aviators in time to replace those lost in the Battle of the Philippine Sea.

Meanwhile, Admiral Nimitz had worked out a switch on the old stagecoach plan of changing horses. In the Central Pacific Fleet, he would keep the horses and change drivers. While Spruance was driving from the Gilberts to the Marianas, Nimitz had called Halsey and his staff to Pearl Harbor and set them to planning future operations in the Central Pacific. In August 1944, after Spruance's conquest of the Marianas, Spruance, and his top commanders were relieved by Halsey and his top commanders, and the 5th Fleet changed its name to 3d Fleet. Spruance and his officers went to Pearl Harbor to plan for operations when they should resume command.

Halsey's 3d Fleet supported the invasion of the Palau Islands in preparation for the invasion of Leyte, Philippine Islands, in October 1944. The invasion of the Philippines brought about the Battle for Leyte Gulf, the last standup naval battle of World War II, a battle which for complexity, and magnitude is without parallel in naval history.

In some respects the battle for Leyte Gulf was a duplicate of Spruance's battle of the Philippine Sea. There were, however, two important differences: First, this time there actually were powerful Japanese surface fleets advancing through the Philippines' to attack the American beachhead, and Halsey knew it; and second, when Halsey learned that a Japanese carrier group was coming down from the north, he uncovered the beachhead and went after it with his 3d Fleet. What Halsey did not know was that the Japanese carriers had no properly trained aviators. The carrier group had been sent down as a decoy to entice Halsey into doing exactly what he was doing—so that the beachhead would be exposed to attack by the Japanese surface forces.

The next morning Halsey's carrier aircraft had all four Japanese carriers in a sinking condition when he learned that during the night the main Japanese surface fleet had penetrated to the Pacific and was approaching the American beachhead. On a radio prod from Nimitz, he detached all his 3d Fleet battleships and a carrier group and with them headed back south. He thus had left inferior American forces both north and south. By great good luck and Japanese miscalculation, neither the landing force nor the inferior naval forces were annihilated. Before Halsey could get back south, the confused commander of the main Japanese surface force had slipped back through San Bernardino Strait. Meanwhile, through the heat of the battle, all six battleships of the 3d Fleet, with Halsey in the battleship *New Jersey*, were racing 300 miles north and then 300 miles back south without ever making contact with the enemy.

After the Battle for Leyte Gulf, Halsey and the 3d Fleet valiantly supported MacArthur in his conquest of Leyte, Mindoro, and Luzon. Then at the end of January 1945, Halsey delivered the fleet to Spruance, and it changed its name back to 5th Fleet.

Under Spruance's command, the 5th Fleet supported the conquest of Iwo Jima and then went on to support the invasion of Okinawa. To assure that a steady stream of vital supplies should reach the Americans on Okinawa, the 5th Fleet had to remain in Japanese waters for weeks. Here it came under heavy attacks by Kamikazes and took appalling losses. The strain on the top commanders, who never left the area, was so great that Nimitz took the unprecedented step of relieving them in the midst of a campaign. As the Okinawa campaign approached its end, Halsey and his senior officers replaced Spruance and his, and the fleet continued to take punishment under the name 3d Fleet.

After the conquest of Okinawa, Halsey paraded his 3d Fleet up and down the Japanese coast, raiding almost at will. He was thus occupied when he received word of the cease fire. He thereupon radioed his aviators over Japan that if they met enemy planes they were to shoot them down, "not vindictively but in friendly fashion."

There is no doubt that Spruance and Halsey were among the most effective officers of World War II. Halsey had one quality that Spruance lacked—a bellicose personality that not only made headlines but lifted the hearts of men under his command. Our forces on Guadalcanal were on the verge of defeat when Halsey took command in the South Pacific and somehow infused into them confidence and a will to win. Spruance, quiet, distant, intellectual, shunned publicity and rarely showed himself. He inspired confidence not by personality or salty statements but merely by the realization in his command that, when he took over, things ran more smoothly and more efficiently.

To Halsey's name we attach the word "daring." Time and time again his daring paid off.

To Spruance's name we attach the word "prudent," but I know of no case where his prudence did not point to the wisest course. He was criticized in 1942 for withdrawing eastward in the night of June 4–5 in the Battle of Midway, but we now know that this move avoided a night battle with a powerful Japanese surface force that was looking for him. He was criticized in 1944 for remaining near the Saipan beachhead, but by doing so he avoided exposing his amphibious forces, kept his fleet damages to a negligible minimum, and fatally hurt the Japanese where they were most vulnerable.

Both were men of strategic vision as well as tactical skill. We have Halsey to thank for the suggestion of a landing at Leyte instead of at Mindanao, as MacArthur had planned—a move that shortened the war by 3 months. We have Spruance to thank for the suggestion of the conquest of Okinawa, a move that enabled American bombers to attack southern Japan and to mine the Sea of Japan, thereby sealing Japan off from the continent.

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. LIBONATI, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables and charts.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 1 hour, on Thursday, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BATTIN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 30 minutes, on October 1, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. GARY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. MINSHALL.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL in six instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1851. An act for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 28, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;

H.R. 2509. An act to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance;

H.R. 2753. An act to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.;

H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3642. An act for the relief of Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami;

H.R. 4972. An act for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture;

H.R. 4989. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district and to authorize a term of court at Ann Arbor;

H.R. 5042. An act for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann;

H.R. 5759. An act for the relief of Connecticut Beverage Co., Inc.;

H.R. 5932. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act, to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers, to provide for retroactive salary increases for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7788. An act for the relief of Jack B. Fisher;

H.R. 8300. An act for the relief of Gordon W. McGrew;

H.R. 8596. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Clyne;

H.R. 9201. An act for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.;

H.R. 9435. An act to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects;

H.R. 10204. An act to extend the Osage mineral reservation for an indefinite period;

H.R. 10294. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lois Graybill;

H.R. 10328. An act for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10526. An act for the relief of Marvin S. Kline;

H.R. 10634. An act for the relief of the Quality Bedding Co.;

H.R. 11332. An act to authorize certain veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training;

H.R. 11626. An act to authorize the payment of expenses incident to the evacuation of dependents of military personnel from Panama and Cyprus;

H.R. 11913. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 12033. An act to further amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes;

H.R. 12091. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile;

H.R. 12289. An act to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as White Cane Safety Day; and

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2573. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting report on title I, Public Law 480, agreement with the Republic of the Congo and including copies of previous agreements with the Republic of Guinea, the Governments of Tunisia, Greece, Vietnam, and the United Arab Republic, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2574. A report that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund," for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2575. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, transmitting report of Federal contributions—personnel and administration—obligations by States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to subsection 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2576. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2577. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General relative to a report submitted July 24, 1964, concerning certain administrative problems in Vietnam; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. A report of the Select Committee on Government Research on Manpower for Research and Development (Rept. No. 1907). 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. BARRY:

H.R. 12707. A bill to establish the Hudson River Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12708. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12709. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 12710. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 12711. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 12712. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to com-

memorate the 20th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to encouraging participation by additional free-world countries in the activities of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 890. Resolution providing for printing hearings on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 12713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred C. Cadwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12714. A bill for the relief of Domenico Dell 'Aera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12715. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Amooi and his wife, Sedighi Tan Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12716. A bill for the relief of Nadina Nasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 12717. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Nicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Kada and Mr. Gabor Kada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12719. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Fillingeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12720. A bill for the relief of Helen H. Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12721. A bill for the relief of Immacolata Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12722. A bill for the relief of Elfiadis Veronica Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12723. A bill for the relief of Emilio S. Binavince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12724. A bill for the relief of Carolina Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 12725. A bill for the relief of Nandalal Yepuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12726. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Arsena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12727. A bill for the relief of Calogero DiPeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12728. A bill for the relief of Etheline Garriques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12729. A bill for the relief of Fitz Neptune (also known as Fitz Mims); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York.

H.R. 12730. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Jara, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12731. A bill for the relief of Joseph Codrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12732. A bill for the relief of Elena Fernandez Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1046. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Harry Reynolds, San Leandro, Calif., relative to the Bill of Rights-U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1047. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to the erection of a memorial to the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Loans to Optometry Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a bill is pending before the House which provides loans to students of optometry. I wholeheartedly support this legislation and strongly urge its passage by this body.

The bill, H.R. 8546, authorizes loans up to $2,000 a year to students of optometry and it establishes the administration of this program under the Health Professions Education Assistance Act.

This legislation is vitally needed. Today we are short on trained optometrists. It is generally recognized in the profession that we need one optometrist for every 7,000 of our citizens in order to render adequate care. However, today we have only 1 optometrist for every 10,300 people.

H.R. 8546 will help solve the problem in at least two ways by providing more money in loans to these students and by giving a 3-year grace period after graduation during which time no repayment of the loan is required.

The optometrist affects the lives of nearly every American. He performs 65 to 70 percent of all eyesight examinations in the United States. The optometrist does 75 percent of all contact lense work. He performs 80 percent of all work in orthoptics and visual training. In short about three-fourths of all persons who seek vision care turn first to an optometrist.

The optometrist renders about 85 percent of all eyesight treatment to the members of our Armed Forces in every branch: Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Statistics show that the number of optometrists in the United States is declining in proportion to the growth of our population.

H.R. 8546 certainly does not solve completely this growing shortage of optometrists. However, this program of liberalized loans to students will help considerably, and I am hopeful the bill will receive strong support in the House.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Introduction, I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia by "peaceful" means in 1948, our foreign policymakers have been confronted with a new and serious problem:

How can the United States best meet the Communist challenge on the political and ideological level?

What must we do, apart from our military programs and our international economic aid and trade undertakings, in order to first, counter Communist efforts to penetrate and subvert the free world nations; second, help prevent complete communization of countries already under Communist control; and third, more effectively advance U.S. foreign policy objectives on the world scene?

These questions have concerned both our policymakers and the American public for more than 15 years. This concern has been fully justified because of the profound change which took place since the end of World War II in the conduct of international relations.

Events transpiring since 1945 have demonstrated clearly that the traditional tools of foreign policy—diplomacy, military power, and economic policy—no longer suffice to advance the legitimate objectives of a nation in its relations with the rest of the world.

The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in communications, science, education, and in other fields—have opened a new dimension for foreign policy operations. On a scale unmatched in the past, they brought the masses of people into direct contact with the conduct of foreign relations.

The revolution in communications has played an important role in this development. By using modern means and techniques of communication, governments can now appeal to target audiences in foreign countries over the heads of their leaders. They can inform, convince, even strive to motivate entire populations to a specific course of action.

In turn, these foreign audiences exert increasing pressures on their own governments to continue, or to change, given policies.

In this new dimension of foreign policy operations, the ideological and psychological, words and ideas serve as weapons. Persuasion is the goal—and, frequently, the principal means for the attainment of political objectives.

The Communists have been quick to appreciate the potential of this new dimension of foreign policy. They adopted ideological warfare—political agitation and propaganda—as a key instrument for carrying out the strategy of Communist world revolution. Their massive effort in this field, and the political successes it has achieved, presented the governments of the free world with a serious challenge.

During the past two decades, the U.S. Government has used a variety of programs in coping with the Communist challenge on this plane. These programs range from exchanges of persons and oversea information activities to strategic psychological operations. All of them are intended to serve a single overriding purpose: to provide support abroad for U.S. foreign policy by combating Communist propaganda, by counteracting Communist political agitation, by promoting understanding of U.S. foreign policy goals, and in other ways.

How well are these programs administered? Are they fulfilling their primary mission? Do they meet the requirements of our foreign policy? Are they effective in meeting the Communist challenge in the cold war, and advancing our foreign policy objectives?

These are legitimate questions. Unfortunately, the answers to them have not been forthcoming very readily.

The Congress, of course, periodically reviews these programs. Generally, however, a given congressional committee will look only at those programs which come under its immediate jurisdiction. For years now, there has been no overall review of all the programs in this category, of their relationship to each other, and to our foreign policy, and of their effectiveness in coping with the threat posed by the Communist ideological offensive. The last congressional inquiry which concerned itself with such questions as they related to our oversea information programs, took place over a decade ago.

Because of this, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in March 1963, to undertake a comprehensive review of all programs which operate in the fourth dimension of our foreign policy. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am taking this opportunity to report to the House of Representatives on our undertaking and on its progress during the two sessions of the 88th Congress.

In initiating this study, the subcommittee concentrated on four immediate tasks. We decided:

First, to inquire into the nature of the ideological challenge presented by the international Communist movement, and to explore different views about the best ways to meet it;

Second, to inventory all governmental programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in nature, but which are intended to provide support abroad, on the ideological and psychological level, for our foreign policy;

Third, to study the relationships which exist between these programs, and to see how they are coordinated and brought to bear on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy; and

Fourth, to survey the oversea programs of private U.S. organizations which have an impact on the American image abroad and thus either directly or incidentally affect the implementation of our foreign policy.

In subsequent parts of this report I shall describe what my subcommittee did during the past 18 months in carrying out the above-described plan. In the sixth and concluding part I will comment on some of the changes which took place, partly as a result of our subcommittee's activities, in the administration of various governmental programs. I will also attempt to outline very briefly the job that remains to be done before this study can be considered successfully completed.

Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates seem to delight in misrepresenting the facts regarding immigration legislation in this session of Congress.

The following statement by the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Senator HUMPHREY, outlines the true facts concerning this legislation.

The New York Post editorial of September 11, 1964, gives valuable facts on U.S. Immigration legislation.

HUMPHREY SCORCHES MILLER ON IMMIGRATION STATEMENT

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY today assailed as "patently false and nonsense" the claim by Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER that President Johnson's immigration bill would triple immigration and cause unemployment.

Noting that "we are a nation of immigrants," HUMPHREY asked:

"When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America?"

The Democratic vice-presidential nominee pointed out that if present laws were effective 100 years ago Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

MILLER, in a speech on Monday in South Bend, Ind., said that if the administration bill passed, "the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold."

Following is the text of Senator HUMPHREY'S statement:

"First of all, Congressman MILLER has his facts wrong. He states that if President Johnson's immigration bill is passed, 'the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold.' Now, of course that is patently false and nonsense. The present law allows 155,500 persons to enter the United States each year. The President's immigration bill increases this by only 14,500. Now that surely doesn't mean a threefold increase. That kind of arithmetic just doesn't make sense.

"But the important question is: When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America? Why, we are a nation of immigrants. Not 6 weeks ago Senator DIRKSEN, Republican leader in the Senate, offered in nomination a man whom he described as 'the grandson of a peddler, a proud honorable and spirited man who left his ancestral home in Europe at an early age and came to this land a century ago.' Now it is a fact that for the past 40 years our immigration law has in effect, discriminated against some peoples because of race, creed or national origin. In fact if the present law had been in effect 100 years ago, Senator GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

"Now this is an area of discrimination in our national life that we have not yet brought into line with the rest of our laws and we ought to change that pattern of law. If Congressman MILLER is against the change that's his business. But we are for it and the people can make their choice on November 3."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Sept. 11, 1964]

GOP Vice-Presidential Candidate MILLER'S attack on the administration's proposals for immigration reform has quickly backfired. And well it should have.

MILLER asserted that the administration's immigration proposals "would open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and work in this country."

This happens to be nonsense. The purpose of the bill is not a substantial rise in the annual number of immigrants but abolition of a national origins quota system which discriminates against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe and contains overtones of bigotry.

As President Johnson has said, our question to an immigrant from Italy or Poland should not be, "Where do you come from?" but "What can you contribute to America?"

The administration's bill would carry out objectives originally projected by President Truman and reaffirmed by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. All party platforms except the 1964 GOP document have favored the goals it embodies. The measure bears the support of many distinguished GOP Congressmen.

Once again Mr. MILLER was as misinformed about his facts as he was impoverished in spirit. Has he ever visited the Statue of Liberty?

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Communist Challenge, II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, what are the basic elements of the Communist strategy for winning the cold war—a strategy that employs ideological as well as military and economic weapons?

What part do the ideological elements—Communist doctrine, propaganda and political agitation—play in that strategy?

What can the U.S. Government do to counter Communist efforts on this nonmilitary plane?

What role can private initiative—business, labor, the academic community, and other private organizations—play in the struggle to win men's minds?

The answers to such questions were sought by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements during the initial part of a study which we initiated in March 1963.

To obtain the answers, the subcommittee invited a cross section of leaders in business, industry, labor, and in communications, as well as writers, commentators, and other interested persons, to present their views in open hearings.

The hearings opened on March 28, 1963, with the testimony of Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and continued intermittently through September 13. In the course of those 6 months, the subcommittee received testimony from 53 witnesses, as follows:

Thomas Aitken, Jr., vice president, INFOPLAN, of Interpublic, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee, Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.

Stanley Ballard, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Adrian Berwick, senior editor, the Reader's Digest international editions, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Theodore Bikel, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Ralf Brent, president, Radio New York Worldwide, New York, N.Y.

Edward S. Butler, Executive Vice President, Information Council of the Americas, New Orleans, La.

Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Louis Cheskin, of Louis Cheskin Associates, Chicago, Ill.

James B. Conkling, president, International Educational Broadcasting Corp., Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Hon. George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator on International Labor.

Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

George Englund, motion picture producer-director, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City, Calif.

Lionel C. Epstein, attorney, Ginsburg & Leventhal, Washington, D.C., and member of board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living.

Hy Faine, National executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

Rudolph Faupl, U.S. Worker Representative to the International Labor Organization and international representative, International Association of Machinists.

Lloyd A. Free, president, Institute for International Social Research, Princeton, N.J.

John W. Gardner, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Carl Harms, actor, recording secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

Miss Melissa Hayden, prima ballerina, New York City Ballet Co.

Hal Holbrook, actor, member Actors' Equity Association.

Dr. Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Robert T. Holt, department of political science, University of Minnesota.

Earle Hyman, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Richard A. Humphrey, Director, Commission on International Education, Washington, D.C.

Walter Joyce, managing editor, Printers' Ink, New York, N.Y.

Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Dan Lacy, managing director, American Book Publishers Council, New York.

John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of International Organization Affairs, International Affairs Bureau, Department of Labor.

Dr. Arthur H. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Governmental Affairs Institute.

John McMullan, news director, Washington Bureau, Knight Newspapers.

Henry Mayers, president, the Mayers Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and chairman, Cold War Council.

Rosario Mazzeo, personnel manager, Boston Symphony Orchestra.

George Meaney, president, AFL–CIO.

Herbert C. Merillat, executive director, American Society of International Law.

H. Philip Mettger, president, Governmental Affairs Institute.

Dick Moore, editor, Equity magazine.

John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace Co., and chairman, U.S. Inter-American Council.

Hon. Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Stanley Plesent, General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, USIA.

Stanley F. Reed, president, Reed Research Foundation, and president, Technology Audit Corp., Washington, D.C.

Hon. J. Leonard Reinsch, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee, New York, N.Y.

Hon. James Roosevelt, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Kermit Roosevelt, vice president, Governmental Relations Department, Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C.

Robert H. School, director of public relations, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York.

Eric Sevareid, author, commentator, and news analyst, New York, N.Y.

Thomas C. Sorenson, Deputy Director for Policy and Plans, USIA.

Miss Blanche Thebom, concert and opera singer, Metropolitan Opera Co.

Dr. Theodore Vallance, director, Special Operations Research Office, American University, Washington, D.C.

Hon. George L–P Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.

Eddie Weston, actor, second vice president, Actors' Equity Association.

In addition, the subcommittee received a number of written statements which addressed themselves to the subject under study and which were prepared by civic-minded citizens, without cost to the U.S. Government.

The testimony of witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, together with a number of additional statements, has been printed under the title "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts I Through V." Other papers submitted to the subcommittee have also been of help to its members and were retained for possible future publication.

The five volumes of hearings mentioned above make fascinating reading and in the opinion of at least one news correspondent, point to several far-reaching conclusions.

First, that ideological activities—teaching of the Communist doctrine, persuading people to its cause, and motivating them to take political action in support of Communist objectives—constitute an integral and eminent part of the Communist strategy of world revolution.

Second, that the thrust of the Communist ideological effort, added to the impact of the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century in science, education, communications, and rising expectations of the masses of people of the underdeveloped countries, has profoundly influenced the entire character of the East-West confrontation and created serious challenge for the foreign policy of the United States. This conclusion—that the nonmilitary conflict is not only significant but may prove decisive to the outcome of the global struggle between the world Communist movement and those who oppose it—was underscored in a statement made by the late President John F. Kennedy on April 2, 1961, and cited by one of the witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee. President Kennedy said:

> We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it, whether in Cuba or South Vietnam. And we dare not fail to realize it is this struggle which is taking place every day without arms or fanfare, in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe. * * * No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. * * * Too long have we fixed our eyes on the traditional military needs; on the armies prepared to cross borders; on missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear this is no longer enough; that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Third, that the U.S. Government has not attempted to meet the nonmilitary challenge posed by the Communist movement, and to advance our own foreign policy objectives abroad, with anything

approaching a well-coordinated campaign of the size and scope of our other foreign policy undertakings. Rather, in the opinion of several witnesses, the U.S. Government has pitted a handful of limited, fragmented and frequently uncoordinated programs, against a massive, integrated, worldwide Communist ideological offensive.

Fourth, that private American initiative, embodied in programs conducted abroad by private American individuals and organizations, may play a vital role in deciding the outcome of the cold war—and that this realization was slowly beginning to produce positive results.

These broad conclusions emerged from the testimony of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee during the initial part of our study. This does not mean that all of the witnesses agreed upon each and every conclusion—nor even that two or more witnesses would define any single conclusion in precisely the manner in which it appears above. Any attempt such as this to summarize the rich variety of views and ideas advanced by a group of thoughtful and well-informed persons is bound to do some injustice to each individual presentation. The same, of course, applies to the membership of our subcommittee. I know that each of its members could well improve upon this summary.

Nevertheless, these four tentative conclusions became the base from which the subcommittee continued its study. We were fully conscious of them as we moved into the next phase of our undertaking. That phase will be the subject of part III of my report.

Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., Completes Term as Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, the then national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and my good and longtime friend, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, a distinguished attorney of Brooklyn, N.Y., completed his tenure as the highest official of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was succeeded in the office of commander in chief of the VFW by another outstanding patriot, Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala. I rise at this time to express, not only for myself, but I am confident, on behalf of the many Members of this House who know and admire Joe Lombardo, our deepest appreciation for the truly important services which he has rendered to our Nation and to the cause of freedom throughout the world during his year as commander in chief of the VFW.

It would be impossible, due to limitation of time, to itemize even briefly his many acts of constructive leadership. However, there are some things which Joe Lombardo did during his time as commander in chief of the VFW, which especially merit our attention and gratitude.

Throughout the past year he has demonstrated abundantly his qualifications to join that long list of veteran leaders who have risen to the high position as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and who have, additionally, demonstrated high qualities of national leadership. During his tenure, the VFW, and veterans as a whole, had in Joe Lombardo a truly wise, strong, and effective spokesman.

He championed, logically and forcefully, every just cause of U.S. war veterans. As Members of this House, I am sure, are aware, the important veterans' legislation passed in this session is a reflection, in large measure, of the understanding and effort with which Joe Lombardo fought for those things which our Nation's veterans so rightfully deserve. Examples of legislation, which the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, helped bring to successful accomplishment are the new laws providing nursing care for aging invalid veterans, and providing educational assistance for children of veterans totally disabled in service.

Although continually and deeply interested in the specific problems of veterans, Joe Lombardo, as commander in chief of the VFW, also exerted a strong and wholesome influence on our Nation's defense and foreign policy. Under his leadership the VFW continued its role in the forefront of national organizations supporting a strong military posture for our Nation, and a sound commonsensed, and farsighted foreign policy. Repeatedly, during his year as head of the VFW, his statements with respect to South Vietnam, Cuba, and our military weapons helped pinpoint basic issues and contributed toward a better understanding of these issues by our citizens.

I believe it particularly pertinent to point out that although he never played favorites and never pulled his punches, Joe Lombardo's views are recognized as fair, forthright, and based upon logic and reason. While not slow to criticize, neither was he slow to praise. His consistent public support of our Government's policy of resisting Communist aggression in South Vietnam is but one example of how the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, has helped strengthen our Nation.

One of the things that gained such widespread admiration and respect for Joe Lombardo was the fact that in discussing defense and foreign policy matters, he knew what he was talking about. He was not an "armchair strategist." Almost invariably, his press releases and policy speeches were based upon his personal observations.

During his tenure as commander in chief of the VFW he saw communism in action: He stood at the Berlin wall. He saw the indispensable role being performed by a great naval base in Guantanamo Base, Cuba. He visited the Far Eastern outpost of freedom—the embattled island of Quemoy. He visited the outpost of combat in South Vietnam. There, incidentally, he went far north into the mountainous area and met with the American, South Vietnamese, and tribal leaders who had been fighting to turn back Communist aggression.

He has visited our fleets at sea, and our Strategic Air Command headquarters.

And each place where Commander in Chief Lombardo went, he carried with him an inspiring message of the VFW's support of, and faith in, our men in uniform.

But, the VFW, under the leadership of Joe Lombardo, as under his predecessors, knows that in spite of highly technical upon which our Defense Establishment, and complicated weapons, it is still people in the final analysis, rests.

During his time as commander in chief, Joe Lombardo continued to give meaning to the VFW's determined efforts to protect the interests and improve the lot of our military personnel: Active, retired, and their dependents. With good reason, the VFW has continued to be looked upon as an understanding and effective champion of our servicemen.

Our Nation is, indeed, fortunate to have veterans organizations that produce leaders such as Joe Lombardo. We who are his longtime neighbors and friends in Brooklyn are proud of Joe Lombardo. We know that he has served his Nation well as commander in chief of the VFW, and we know, too, he will continue to serve his community, and his Nation in the future.

I am confident Joe Lombardo's many friends in this House join with me in expressing sincerest appreciation for the services which he has performed for the VFW, for veterans everywhere, and for our Nation.

Excerpts From Speech by Congressman Bob Taft, Jr., at the Republican Veterans Convention, Marietta, Ohio, September 19, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., before a group of Ohio veterans, did much to cast away the cobwebs of doubletalk and obfuscation from a question that has troubled Americans for many years: Should the present military draft laws be changed?

This is just one of many national issues that have been avoided purposely in this year's campaign dialog by the incumbent administration. In the following remarks, Mr. TAFT does much to dispel the cloud of fog that has been permitted to surround this question of vital

importance to millions of our Nation's young men, their wives and mothers.

Because of its high degree of clarity and conciseness, I recommend BOB TAFT's remarks to my colleagues in the House and Senate who—sooner or later—must finally come to grips with this problem:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN BOB TAFT, JR., AT THE REPUBLICAN VETERANS CONVENTION, MARIETTA, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 19, 1964

Under present draft laws, we continue to play with the liberties and opportunities of millions of American young men. We do so unfairly and unnecessarily.

Yet the Johnson administration and the congressional majority continue to stall. They are studying the problem to death in an apparent attempt to forestall both criticism and change. Tragically, it appears certain that Congress will adjourn without taking action on any of the meaningful bills which propose a comprehensive congressional study of the draft system.

The excuse to be given? It's this: Because the Defense Department has initiated its own study of the selective service program, both it and the Bureau of the Budget—two arms of the Presidency—are opposed to any independent study by Congress.

Completely overlooked is the fact that the draft has far deeper implications than mere manpower procurement for military purposes. Then again, perhaps the point isn't missed at all. There may be those who view the draft as a sociomilitary scheme directed to other ends which justify its perpetuation.

I am certain the American people do not agree with this contention.

The draft system is a congressional responsibility, especially so since it is the most direct of all Federal interferences with individual liberty. Only the Congress can and should decide what policies to follow. The special interests of the social and military planners should disqualify any report they may submit.

In view of the explosive nature of the issue, it is not surprising to see it played down in an election year. Still, the Nation must make a choice. The voice of the people, as expressed in the Congress, deserves a chance to be heard.

The degree of administration opposition to a congressional draft study can be seen in its refusal to consider a prompt moratorium on induction of young men to judge its effect upon enlistments, something I suggested more than a year ago. Such a test might prove conclusively the absence of a need for the draft.

Some claim such a test would be discriminatory in that a number of young men would be freed of their service obligations during the test period. But how could it be any more so than the present hit-or-miss system of exemptions for fathers, deferrals for students, and rejections for physical misfits?

There are many other valid reasons for criticism of the present system. A number of them were outlined recently by Congressman THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri. He said:

"1. The draft is an invasion of individual liberty. The existence of an aggressive world Communist conspiracy necessarily means that freemen must relinquish some freedom of choice in order that the great remainder can be preserved. But individual liberty should be infringed upon only when no effective alternative means exist for achieving the goal. Conscription should be the last resort, not the first expedient.

"2. The draft actually impairs national security. Men who enter the services of their own free will make far better servicemen than those who are drafted or who enlist from the threat of the draft. The high personnel turnover produced by the draft system—73 percent of Army first-term enlistees, 97 percent of all draftees—means that the Armed Forces lose far too many reliable and experienced men and must fill those positions with fresh trainees. The draft produces draftees at age 22, about 4 years older than the Army would like.

"3. The draft is inequitable. Today every other young man never enters any form of military service. The draft favors the physically and mentally unfit, those who marry early, those who can afford to stay in college to age 26, criminals, perverts, and those who can obtain an occupational or hardship deferment. The principle of universality, upon which the present system was sold to the public years ago, is today a transparent falsehood.

"4. The draft produces the evasion mentality. Young men attempt to avoid induction. If unsuccessful, they attempt to avoid responsibility while in the service. Upon their discharge, should we be surprised if they evade their responsibilities to their community, their nation, and their fellow man? The existence of a whole generation of men imbued in various degrees with the evasion mentality is a matter of the gravest concern to society and especially to Republicans.

"5. The draft has harmful social effects. It encourages early marriages, which in turn raise the national birth and divorce rates. The higher incidence of broken homes results in an increase of psychological and welfare problems both for parents and for children. The draft contributes to youth unemployment because employers are reluctant to hire a man who may be snatched away by the draft after expensive training. Thus, many youths float around until draft age, 22, unable to get a job, but unwilling to volunteer for induction or enlistment because they know they have a good chance of avoiding service altogether.

"6. The draft is inefficient. Instead of recruiting men with the needed skills by offering incentives comparable to the private sector, the services are forced to spend great sums on personnel training. Thus, instead of attracting experienced, middle-aged bakers, who can bake if not fight, the Army drafts an unskilled 18-year-old, trains him to be a baker, and most likely watches him depart in 2 years.

"7. The draft is costly. The high turnover rate caused by the draft system is extremely wasteful of training funds. Without the need to justify the draft, many functions could be transferred to the private sector at a saving.

"8. The draft law, as written, is unworkable. It forces administrators to find ways of circumventing the clear intent of the law. This is always a dangerous practice in a democracy. Administrators should be given a law that will work as written and not be forced to resort to tricks of interpretation."

But perhaps even more important than any of these, to the individuals threatened, is the adverse effect of the draft on employment opportunities. As I stated on April 21 on the floor of the House:

"We have found in our studies on manpower and employment in the Committee on Education and Labor in various hearings that we have had on measures before us in this session of the Congress, that the rate of unemployment of those under the age of 22 in this country is double the rate of unemployment of those over the age of 22, or indeed of the entire unemployed labor force.

"The rate is now, I believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 or 11 percent. Certainly, without doubt, one of the contributing causes for the unemployment rate has been and continues to be the fact that the average induction age under the draft is now about 22 years of age. This means that many employers or potential employers, who seek someone for a particular job in existence today, must give careful consideration to any young man who perhaps is out of high school—who may or may not be a dropout—or who may have completed his high school training. Employers are faced with a problem. Employers know that if they hire this young man, within a year or two he may have to leave his employment and go elsewhere, and he will return with employment rights—which he should have. Nevertheless, the employer is faced with that possibility, and the employment of older men under these circumstances is far more likely, with the rejection of the younger man, who has not yet completed his military obligation."

Certainly, all of us agree that we cannot—and we will not—endanger our national security by cutting off the draft permanently, without assurances of a substitute procurement policy adequate to our defense needs.

But the problems created by the present system are so serious as to justify some immediate action and a trial suspension of inductions, higher pay, if necessary, and a fairminded bipartisan study of the entire problem by the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

A Rousing Speech by the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party and the Nation is privileged to have the services of the Honorable John A. Gronouski in the office of Postmaster General. As well as being a most able public official, Mr. Gronouski is making himself noteworthy as a public speaker in this election year.

It was with great pleasure that I and several other Los Angeles Congressmen were the honored guests at a gathering of postal workers this past week, and we were doubly honored to have the Postmaster General as the main speaker for the evening. I consider Mr. Gronouski's speech to be of interest to all my colleagues and to the country at large, and I therefore submit it at this time for the attention of all concerned with the future of our country:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL

I am delighted to be here among my fellow Democrats. It's such a pleasure belonging to a political party that isn't ashamed of its leaders. That's quite a contrast with the Republicans, you know. I've traveled all over the country during the past several months, and no matter where I go, local Republican leaders and candidates are trying to pretend they've never heard of BARRY GOLDWATER. We Democrats have had to refresh their memory a bit.

And isn't it wonderful that we have a real two-party system again? A party of hope and a party of memory. For all this we can thank Mr. GOLDWATER. He was determined from the beginning to give the Nation "a choice, not an echo."

Some choice.

The Republican Party hasn't had a progressive idea since Calvin Coolidge decided not to seek reelection in 1928. And now they're desperately trying to stamp out the ideals of Abraham Lincoln.

Well, if the Republicans don't want Lincoln, we'll take him—and everything he stood for.

Here in California you have a U.S. Senator who has never been afraid to stand up and be counted when questions of human decency arise. And that Senator's name is PIERRE SALINGER. PIERRE is an old and close friend of mine and I know that he has strong convictions about the dignity of the individual—all individuals—and I also know that he has the courage to back up those convictions.

I believe, too, that the vast majority of Americans feel the same way. I believe that Americans have a heritage of fairplay and respect for their fellow man. I believe they would rather follow the honorable lead of a GEORGE BROWN or a GUS HAWKINS or an ED ROYBAL or a CHARLIE WILSON—rather than the lead of bigoted men who seek to fan the flames of hate and discrimination to promote their own political ends.

And in this context, I must say I am tremendously impressed with the quality of your representation here in the Los Angeles area. Your four Congressmen—freshmen all—have already earned reputations for themselves, in Washington and in California, that far exceed their length of service. I could speak extensively about their records, their dedication to their jobs and their abilities, but I think there is one example I can give you that sums it all up.

As you know, President Lyndon B. Johnson recently signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act—better known as the Anti-Poverty Act. It represents the most massive attack on poverty in the history of mankind. One of the unique aspects of this law is that it places on the local communities the responsibility for developing their own programs. The National Government will assist—and will supply the funds—but the local government must decide what needs to be done and how to do it.

Thanks to the foresight of Congressmen BROWN, HAWKINS, ROYBAL, and WILSON, an organization has already been set up that will probably give this area a decided head-start over much of the rest of the Nation.

I speak, of course, of the Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency. This organization, which has already done so much good for your poor, your needy, your youth, your aged and your unemployed, will now dovetail with the antipoverty program to bring a new dawn of hope to hundreds of thousands of less fortunate citizens in this area.

The way of the Los Angeles area is the way of progress: progress through Congressmen of outstanding experience, demonstrated vision, and forthright convictions.

Such, I am sorry to say, are not qualities readily found in the Republican Party under the temporary leadership of BARRY GOLDWATER.

Experience?

Mr. GOLDWATER has been a Member of the Senate for 12 years, and in that time, he has compiled one of the most lackluster records of any Senator of our generation. The fact is that not a single piece of major legislation bears his name.

Vision?

Senator GOLDWATER is afraid of the future—and you don't wonder when you hear what he proposes to do. In his own words he tells us: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones."

Convictions?

They certainly don't concern the welfare of the citizens of this Nation or this State. You have only to look at the record.

This administration—under the leadership of President Johnson—is committed to a realistic and humane program of health care for the aged; a program designed to assure them "dignity in sickness, as well as in health."

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the aged by voting against medicare.

This administration believes that our generation—for the first time in history—has the knowledge, the wealth and the tools to eradicate poverty in America; to give all our citizens, no matter how lowly their station or inadequate their education, a new opportunity to help themselves.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the poor by voting against the antipoverty bill.

This administration believes that social security represents one of the great social achievements of our century, providing peace of mind and a better life for millions of retired citizens.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on these people by advocating policies which would destroy the very fabric of our social security system.

This administration is committed to the proposition that our workers are entitled to a decent salary for an honest day's work.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on labor by voting against increases in the minimum wage.

This administration is determined to wipe out the cancer of long-term unemployment and hopelessness in the chronically depressed sections of our Nation.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the unemployed by voting repeatedly against area redevelopment.

This administration believes that every child in America deserves a decent meal, no matter who his parents may be.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on hundreds of thousands of hungry children by opposing the food stamp and the school lunch programs.

This administration believes that our Nation cannot achieve its full measure of greatness until our young men and women—all of them—have an opportunity to develop their minds to their full capacities.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on our young people by voting against aid to education.

This administration believes that every man, woman, and child has the constitutional right to an equal opportunity in our society, regardless of the color of his skin or his religion or the accent with which he speaks.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on millions of Americans by voting against the Civil Rights Act.

This administration believes it has the moral and awesome responsibility of protecting every living creature from the poisonous effects of radioactive fallout.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on all the people by opposing the test ban treaty.

Yes, Senator GOLDWATER has turned his back.

While President Johnson seeks to unify our people behind a great national cause, the opposition seeks to obstruct, divide, and conquer.

And the hallmark of its approach is extremism.

I know there is an effort being made to hide extremism under the elephant's trunk. I know the temporary Republican leader went to Gettysburg and began talking like a "moderate" for the sake of party unity.

But I also remember what he said in San Francisco: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," and "Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

The echo of those infamous words will be reverberating throughout this Nation long after the last ballot is cast next November 3. They represent an open invitation to any radical of the left or right to take the law into his own hands by wrapping the American flag around his devious ends.

Extremism is hate and divisiveness. It is spitting on the Ambassador to the United Nations. It is labeling the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a traitor and a Communist. It is storing up arms against what is called a "Communist menace," against the day when you brand everyone who disagrees with you a Communist.

Extremism is a racial issue. It is justification for turning dogs loose on Negroes, or bombing churches, or pouring acid into newly integrated swimming pools.

It is a program to foment prejudice among ethnic groups by playing on their economic insecurity. And it is a cynical disdain of those same ethnic groups by perpetuating a discriminatory immigration policy.

Extremism is encouraging lawlessness by stirring the passions of the disgruntled and the maladjusted.

And finally, extremism is reckless and suicidal nuclear irresponsibility. It is the surrender of life-and-death decisionmaking authority from the President of the United States to military field commanders.

But BARRY GOLDWATER insists that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice."

Hate: "in the defense of liberty."

Suspicion: "in the defense of liberty."

Prejudice: "in the defense of liberty."

Fear: "in the defense of liberty."

Assassination: "in the defense of liberty."

Divisiveness: "in the defense of liberty."

Economic deprivation: "in the defense of liberty."

And nuclear holocaust: "in the defense of liberty."

This Nation cannot afford such a "defense of liberty"—and neither can liberty itself. Because in the end, it would be liberty as defined by a rabid group of radicals—which means liberty for them to rule as they see fit.

We have long since passed the point where we can treat the radical elements among us as a joke. There is no shrugging it off. This is a grave national threat.

The extremists are organized, well financed, disciplined, and highly motivated. They have captured a major political party. The only way to defeat them is to expose them to the voters; to tell the American people that these people are not traveling the road of freedom and liberty; they are traveling the road to anarchy and chaos.

They must be repudiated before they poison our system completely. And the time to repudiate them is now.

Thank you.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Government Agencies and Programs, III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier part of this report, I indicated that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am the chairman, was deeply concerned about the apparent lack of meaningful information relating to one important part of our Government's effort in the cold war.

We knew, of course, what our Government was doing on the economic plane because the foreign aid program and our foreign trade policies are subject to a systematic, regular review by the Congress.

We knew, also, what our Government has been doing to meet the Communist threat on the military plane. Our national defense budget and our military assistance program are studied each year by the appropriate congressional committees and debated at length by both Houses of the Congress.

We did not have readily available, however, similar information about the total U.S. Government effort on the ideological plane: an effort designed to counter the Communist ideological offensive and to provide support abroad for our foreign policy through oversea information programs, exchanges of persons, strategic psychological operations, and related activities.

There was no single document, congressional or executive, no single source, which contained adequate information about the full range of these activities—who was doing what, why, and at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

And we had to have this information before we could begin to study these activities and reach some judgment about their worth and effectiveness.

In order to meet this need, the subcommittee directed its staff to prepare an inventory of governmental programs operating in this field. The inventory was to be brief in order to be suitable for quick and easy reference. Also, it was not to contain any material with a security classification. Such material could not be published but had to remain in appropriate files, available to Members of Congress and other authorized personnel.

In cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the work on the compilation of the inventory began in May 1963. Dr. Allan S. Nanes, analyst in U.S. foreign policy in the Legislative Reference Service, prepared the document under the supervision of the subcommittee and its staff. It was published on January 3, 1964, as a committee print, entitled "The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs."

With the publication of this document, the subcommittee and the Congress as a whole had available to them an extremely useful reference work which contained the answers to the basic questions: who was doing what, under what authority, and, generally, at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

I shall not attempt at this point to describe the inventory in detail because it is readily available to all Members of Congress. I would like, however, to comment on its three main features.

First, the inventory revealed that over 20 Government departments and agencies are currently engaged in conducting programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in character but which can provide support for U.S. foreign policy.

Second, it indicated that the annual expenditures on these programs are in excess of $500 million per year.

Third, it pointed to an area of apparent weakness in the U.S. ideological effort: lack of adequate coordination.

This third point became the subject of the next step in the subcommittee's inquiry.

Having inquired into the nature of the challenge confronting our foreign policy on the ideological plane;

Having brought together information about governmental programs operating on this plane;

The subcommittee was now ready to take a closer look at the programs themselves. And we began at the top by inquiring into the direction and the management of the U.S. ideological effort in the cold war.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in Washington.

The 2d session of the 88th Congress convened the first Tuesday in January and extended more than 9 months before its preelection adjournment. The combined first and second sessions were the longest in peacetime history. Adjournment of the first session did not come until Christmas Eve, leaving less than 2 weeks between sessions instead of the usual 3 or 4 months.

Several legislative programs which were instituted under the administration of the late President Kennedy became law during the first 6 months of this year.

The tax bill of 1963, which was written last year by the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was adopted with few changes in the Senate and subsequently returned for final passage in late January. Following the enactment of this important legislation, the administration's civil rights bill, which had been passed out of the Judiciary Committee late last year, came to the floor and was finally passed after several days of heated debate during which time 14 amendments were adopted. It was signed into law by President Johnson on July 4.

Later in this report, I will outline other major legislative action of the second session of this Congress.

While the Federal budget announced by President Johnson was $98.6 billion, slightly higher than that of the previous year, Federal spending is actually well over $6 billion above what Congress appropriated. It is $23 billion higher than President Eisenhower's suggested 1961 fiscal budget which will carry the total spending figure to $105 billion for the current fiscal year. This exceeds the highest spending during World War II and promises a deficit of nearly $10 billion which is twice the deficit of the current fiscal year. Significant is the fact that this budget contains $6 billion in Federal agency expansion for the fiscal year which began on July 1. Whether one likes it or not, the sale of $2.3 billion in Government assets and an additional billion dollars in trick bookkeeping in the Commodity Credit Corporation were used to make the budget figure look lower. This was because CCC losses for fiscal 1964 are more than $2½ billion. Notwithstanding this fact the budget asked for only $1.1 billion because the administration canceled out $931 million in interest of it to the Treasury by the CCC. It is interesting to note, too, that back-door spending of $1.4 billion for urban renewal will actually be paid by the taxpayers even though it does not show up in the budget. These facts are not generally known because the result will not show up until the turn of the year.

Our international monetary situation is still the source of great concern although it is quietly being tucked aside this election year of 1964. U.S. gold stocks have been reduced from $24.5 billion to a current reserve of slightly more than $15½ billion. Presently, our legal gold requirements are $14.62 billion which includes $12.7 required for our domestic fiscal needs together with borrowing from the International Monetary Fund, foreign currency borrowing by the Federal Reserve bank, and foreign currency borrowing by the Treasury. This would appear to leave $833 million but such is not the case since aggregate foreign claims of approximately $26 billion are outstanding at the present time. This year foreigners have drawn only $50 million from our gold reserve which would lead to the conclusion that the dollar which has been inconvertible at home for more than three decades has become inconvertible de facto abroad.

Perhaps the readers of this report might wonder why I am presenting this summary of our domestic and international fiscal situation in a legislative report of this nature. I do so because I do not believe we can afford to ignore this situation in evaluating the legislative actions of the Congress obviously because they are tempered—or certainly ought to be—by these fiscal facts. To suggest that there is no direct relationship would be folly. In fact, ignoring the fiscal problems of the United States either at home or abroad in legislative deliberations would merely be heading blindly toward economic and fiscal chaos.

In the presentation of this report, I shall provide a breakdown of the major legislative activities on a category basis since it would be impossible to list all important legislation in these respective areas.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Seventeen bills including authorization and appropriation measures will probably have been signed into law by November 1 of this year. The total defense

budget for fiscal 1964–65 is $39.6 billion. Of this sum, nearly $17 billion was for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and research and development. Another $5 billion has been earmarked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1965 research, development, construction, and administration. This includes $2.6 billion for the Apollo man-to-moon project. The Atomic Energy Commission will draw an additional $2.6 billion and another billion and a half is earmarked for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The major legislation in this area was the authorization of $3.25 billion for foreign aid and a proposal to provide a $750 million increase in the lending capital of the International Development Association along with 16 other participating nations. A bill to increase U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank and an expansion of Peace Corps operating costs to $115 million for fiscal 1965 were approved and signed into law.

Interestingly enough was a House joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that every effort be made to obtain payment of dues of delinquent nations, including the Soviet Union, was adopted. It provides for pressing for the penalty of the voting rights in the General Assembly for those who fail to pay. However, it will be more interesting to see whether a conscientious and determined effort will be made to force the "dead beat" nations in the United Nations to pay their dues as well as special assessments since the United States has been the prime contributor since the inception of the U.N.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Never before in the history of the country has as much legislation been enacted in a single session of Congress to deal with economic programs as well as provide the means of increasing or extending revenues. A bill creating an Office of Economic Opportunity, better known as the antipoverty program, was passed in the sum of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. An authorization to provide $1.1 billion annually for fiscal years 1966–67 as the Federal contribution to construction costs of State highways and various road projects was approved along with the extension for 3 years of aid to States and communities in the amount of $75 million for the construction of airports on a matching-fund basis. Another bill to increase from 33⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels was approved, including an extension program for 5 years to July 1, 1968, with authorization of $10 million annually. In the area of our domestic economy were several bills which were reported by the committee of which I am a member, Ways and Means; including the 1964 tax bill discussed previously, extension of current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, telephone service, and airline tickets. The committee also voted to impose taxes on the purchase of certain foreign securities as well as a 3-year proposal of $375 million in grants and loans to States and communities for mass-transit facilities. Needless to say, it is again necessary to raise the national debt by $9 billion from $315 billion to $324 billion for fiscal year ending July 1, 1965. This represents an overall high in the public debt and an aggregate increase in the debt ceiling of $24 billion in 2 years' time.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the major piece of legislation in this field although 11 others were approved and signed into law, including an act to increase and adjust basic pay rates of postal and classified employees as well as officers of all three branches of the Federal Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND PUBLIC WELFARE

In the area of social security, both the House and the Senate passed bills to increase monthly payments to 19½ million old-age survivors and disability beneficiaries. It also liberalizes eligibility provisions and lowers the retirement age of widows to 60 years. This, of course, means increasing the social security tax again beginning January 1, 1965, and continuing on a rising scale thereafter to 1971. As of the time this report was written, the House and Senate conferees had not reached any agreement with regard to the medicare provisions under the bill.

In a separate item of legislation, Congress extended to June 30, 1967, authority of the HEW to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returning from a foreign country under emergency hardship circumstances. Both Houses also extended to June 30, 1967, the provision of the Social Security Act permitting States to transfer dependent children from unsuitable foster homes to nonprofit institutions.

The National Defense Education Act was extended for 3 years to July 1, 1967, and increased authorization for college student loans from $135 million currently to $195 million for fiscal 1969.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Pay increases totaling $275 million monthly for all men and officers in the Armed Forces was approved and became law in midyear. The bill excepted those in the service less than 2 years, however. Approved also was a 5-year, $5 million per year program of aid to States on a matching basis for nursing home facilities and State veteran homes, and another measure which liberalizes nonservice-connected pensions for needy veterans and widows, and revising limits of permissible income without loss of pension. H.R. 2664, a bill exempting from draft induction a sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service was enacted into law. Congress also voted to raise the authorized strength of the Cadet Corps of the U.S. Air Force and Military Academies and fixing the period of obligated service now at 5 years.

AGRICULTURE

Most controversial and important of farm legislation this past session was the passage of the bill which continues cotton price support and the subsidy for exporters as well as providing a new subsidy for domestic processors. In the same bill was an authorization for a new wheat marketing program to maintain a $2-a-bushel price support domestically and a minimum of $1.55 for export. Other agricultural bills included one requiring registration of all pesticides before they can be sold to the public, extension of the food-for-peace program, and a bill to permit the purchase of process food grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation for donation under domestic welfare and foreign aid programs. Because of the sharp drop in domestic beef prices, a bill restricting importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to 6.5 percent of domestic consumption was passed as a compromise to several more restrictive import bills.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Most important of the natural resource legislation was Senate bill, S. 4, establishing a national wilderness reservation system on 35 million acres closed to commercial use and retained in their preservative state. In other bipartisan supported legislation, authorization of a 10-year, $82.5 million program to finance water resource research centers in colleges and universities was approved as was a $2 billion land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs. Senate bill, S. 1363, providing for increased payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located became law this year, also.

Bills which I introduced during the 88th Congress were:

H.R. 1904, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income gain from sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer at age 60. Included as provision in Revenue Act of 1964.

H.R. 3286, Commission on Aircraft Noise.

H.R. 3927, to provide for medical and hospital care through voluntary health insurance.

H.R. 5501, for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon. Approved and signed into law July 11, 1964.

H.R. 5986, amend duty on broomcorn. Passed by both the House and the Senate.

H.R. 6490, repeal excise tax on communications.

H.R. 6926, increase the amount of outside earnings under social security.

H.R. 8204, remove inequities from Federal Employees Compensation Act for survivors.

H.R. 8535, right to be represented by an attorney before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9804, amend title II of the Social Security Act. Amend benefits for a person forced to retire at 60 years.

H.R. 9805, amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deduct higher education expenses.

H.R. 9978, amend Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers excise tax on TV sets.

H.R. 10838, to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921.

H.R. 11385, establish a U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County, Ill.

H.R. 11767, amend Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

H.R. 12512, amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widows' benefits.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Since the Congress has jurisdiction in many areas in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, it passed a dozen major items of legislation ranging from pay increases for District of Columbia teachers and Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments, to strengthening enforcement procedures against owners of unsafe structures in the District. Bills to permit suspension or dismissal of unruly school pupils, increase the number of man-dog teams authorized for the District of Columbia Police Department, and legislation permitting principals and teachers to use reasonable force in maintaining order in public schools were passed in the House but did not get through the Senate this year.

PERSONAL REPORT

The spring and summer months of 1964 were marked by the greatest influx of tourists of any of my 8 years in the Congress. The 10th Congressional District, which has the largest population of any in Illinois and is among the largest congressional districts in the country, naturally had perhaps the largest number of visitors than any district of its distance from the Nation's Capital. Families who normally spend their vacations in other sections of the country came to Washington en route to the World's Fair in New York this year in great numbers. Our guest book shows more than 500 residents of our district visited my office where members of my staff arranged for visits to the White House, Gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and tours of places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Congressional mail, expected to be heavier this election year than in previous years, actually maintained a normal volume. The number of personal problems with the various agencies of Government referred to us by constituents during the course of the year increased sharply, however. These range from matters pertaining to assistance in social security, immigration, and servicemen and veterans' requests. Each of these was handled on an individual basis and every possible assistance given each inquiry.

In closing, let me state that while the 2d session of the 88th Congress was marked by certain achievements and admitted failures, we must expect to make even more difficult decisions next year. New crises in many areas of the world have cast their shadow over U.S. foreign policy and the need for changes in our posture abroad.

Although this report appears to be lengthy, it is actually but a brief and comprehensive analysis of the legislative activity of the Congress during the past year. For this reason, my office is prepared to provide detailed information on any and all bills of special interest to my constituents. Requests may be made either by writing to my Washington office, room 1026, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., or by telephoning my district office at 749–4115.

Urban Renewal in Norfolk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Norfolk is an acknowledged leader in the urban renewal program and is a dramatic example of how an older city can be rejuvenated. The effort to modernize Norfolk and clear out and rehabilitate its rundown areas has the broadest possible support among business and civic leaders. Those who have not seen the city for 15 or 20 years would hardly recognize the new Norfolk. Through urban renewal and other programs, and through the enlightened leadership of the city, tremendous new investment has been generated and employment and civic pride have grown apace.

This progress has been well described by Norfolk's Representative, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., in an article which appeared in the New Norfolk, published by the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce. I regret that we cannot include the illustrations which show the dramatic changes, but the gentleman from Virginia's [Mr. HARDY] words well describe the modernization of Norfolk. I hope all of my colleagues will give them careful attention:

AFTER 15 YEARS OF URBAN RENEWAL, NORFOLK SHINING EXAMPLE

(By Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.)

The lack of decent housing for millions of Americans in slums, and the growing decay of our cities in the past, presented overwhelming problems. No individual, no private organization, nor even any local government could successfully tackle them alone.

The urban renewal program was established by Congress in 1949 during the Truman administration. It grew out of a recognition that blight in urban areas and all its attendant evils constituted problems that had to be faced. The sound growth and development of our cities was recognized as an important goal of national policy and the accomplishment of this goal required Federal encouragement and assistance.

Urban renewal has been a bipartisan program from the start, sponsored and approved by Republicans and Democrats alike. Senator Robert A. Taft was one of its original three sponsors, together with Senator Ellender of Louisiana, and Senator Wagner, of New York. During the Eisenhower administration in 1954, and again in 1956 and 1959, it was expanded and strengthened. Substantial improvements were made and additional funds were authorized by the Congress in 1961, the first year of the Kennedy administration.

Urban renewal has not been limited to any particular region of the United States, nor has it been limited to big cities. In 1963, nearly one-half of more than 700 localities actively participating in the program had populations of less than 25,000—many of them in the Southeast. Of 1,556 federally assisted urban renewal projects or activities in the Nation at the end of 1963, a total of 339 were in the Southeastern States, and 35 in Virginia. This has become truly an effective national program, serving well all sections of the country.

The Congress stipulated in its 1949 declaration of national housing policy that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can" in order to attain "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities, and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation."

The primary emphasis on private enterprise has remained a basic principle of the American urban renewal program.

Through urban renewal, local governments help and support private industry to achieve what it cannot do alone. The Federal Government, pursuant to requests from the localities, provides necessary additional funds and technical know-how which local governments cannot supply from their own resources.

FOUR BILLION DOLLARS SPENT TO DATE

The total Federal expenditure authorized by the Congress for urban renewal to date is nearly $4 billion. That is a lot of money. But compared to some other Federal programs it is relatively small. Notwithstanding the few instances of mismanagement which have been identified, the results this $4 billion has achieved are tangible and truly phenomenal. Aside from helping to build the physical environment we want for ourselves and our children, it is proving to be a good investment financially.

Recent congressional hearings on urban renewal legislation have brought out the impressive fact that every dollar of Federal investment in urban renewal generates about $6 in private investment—in building construction and related activities that are of direct benefit to the growth of our national economy, and of permanent financial gain to cities and local governments.

With mushrooming increases in municipal costs and limited tax sources, local governments need money. Cities, through urban renewal, have been able to raise their revenues to realistic and responsible levels, to strengthen their economic sinews through real estate tax gains. They have increased commercial and industrial activity and achieved higher returns from land put to new and better uses and more receipts from business privilege taxes. New jobs, new markets, and business expansion have resulted from better location, improved traffic, and adequate parking. There has been considerable attraction of new enterprises—particularly distributive and wholesale firms—that do not want to be trapped in undesirable sites. Thus cities, through urban renewal, once again can stand on their own feet.

NEW BUILDINGS STRENGTHEN TAX BASE

One building in a 35-acre section of one urban renewal area in Norfolk today pays two times the taxes formerly received from the entire section. One new downtown hotel, on 5 acres of former crime- and disease-infested slum, produces 18 times the real estate tax revenue of the structures it replaced.

It is well established that city governments cannot be strong without a sound real estate tax base. I know of no public program which can do more to strengthen and reestablish American local government to its rightful place than urban renewal.

No city wants to sit and rot. Now most of them are working out of this dilemma through our national housing legislation and are voluntarily initiating their own programs of urban renewal. There is no compulsion about it. Urban renewal is planned, initiated, and executed locally. The full responsibility for carrying out the program rests with the community.

All of us are proud that Norfolk has been a pioneer in urban renewal, and proud that it was cited in congressional hearings as an outstanding example among cities that are building and rebuilding with confidence for the future. Norfolk's preurban renewal expenses for crime prevention, public health, police and fire protection, and other slum costs were tremendous. Its slum areas were a festering drain on the city's resources, a drain that could not be allowed to continue without ultimately destroying the community.

BEST IN COUNTRY

Today, after 15 years of urban renewal, Norfolk is a shining example of what urban renewal can help to achieve—a growing, thriving metropolis that is well on its way to clearing most of its slums, providing improved and more efficient locations for business and industry, and for new educational and cultural facilities. Norfolk has carried out its urban renewal and related community development activities, trade expansion projects, and transportation improvements, in fulfillment of the intent of Congress that urban renewal should be a program for the benefit of the cities and the people of the land.

The ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, was so impressed by Norfolk's achievements that he made the following statement on October 24, 1963, to Norfolk officials who had just finished their congressional testimony for this subcommittee headed by the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama:

"I certainly want to congratulate you on having what appears to be the best urban renewal program in the country.

"For some time many of us who are interested in urban renewal, have understood that you used all the tools that are necessary to make an urban renewal program work. We wish you good luck in the future.

"Keep up the good work, and I hope that you can still continue your good, sound program."

Norfolk has undergone a transformation which only those who have seen it can realize and appreciate. I am proud that my colleagues in the Congress on both sides of the aisle have been outspoken in recognition of the fact that the rest of the Nation looks to Norfolk, a bustling world seaport and naval base to maintain leadership in urban renewal.

Explanation of Voting Positions of Representative James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 22, 1964, and on Wednesday, September 23, 1964, I was in my Pittsburgh congressional office making myself available for consultations and conferences with my constituents. This saves trips to Washington, D.C., for my local people, and I am glad to cooperate by making these appointments in Pittsburgh. As the present session of Congress has extended much longer than expected, it is necessary for me to meet these commitments previously made.

On rollcall No. 260, Tuesday, September 22, 1964, on the final passage of H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 262, September 23, 1964, on the final passage of the National Ice Age Scientific Reserve, I would have voted "nay."

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Uncoordinated Effort, IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the fourth dimension of foreign policy: the ideological and psychological.

This dimension embraces a wide range of programs and activities which are intended to communicate information and ideas to foreign audiences, to influence them, or to move them to a particular course of action.

Included in this category are radio and television broadcasting, distribution of publications, community relations projects, educational and cultural exchanges, strategic psychological operations, and a host of other programs.

As shown in the inventory published by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements ("The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs," Foreign Affairs Committee Print, 1964), operations of this type are currently conducted by more than 20 departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Their cost runs into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. They constitute the third and increasingly important dimension of U.S. foreign policy.

How do these programs operate? How are they coordinated with each other? How is the experience and information derived through these programs channeled and brought to bear on the formulation of foreign policy decisions? How are foreign policy decisions transmitted to the operational heads of these programs and implemented?

In a series of executive hearings held in January and February 1964, the subcommittee addressed these and many other questions to the representatives of the four governmental agencies principally involved in foreign policy decisions: the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense.

The testimony of these witnesses, after the required security deletions, was published under the title, "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts VI Through VIII." In addition, this three-volume set contains an appraisal of "The Cold War Since 1960," prepared by the Department of State, as well as several research studies of the U.S. Information Agency.

On the basis of information received in the course of the two sets of hearings conducted by the subcommittee—March–September 1963 and January–February 1964—the subcommittee issued report No. 2 entitled "Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," House Report No. 1352, 88th Congress, 2d session, 1964. The subcommittee's findings, outlined in that report, may be summarized as follows:

First. The basic goals of U.S. foreign policy have been expressed clearly and have remained fairly constant. They are designed to advance our national interests and security by encouraging a peaceful world community of free and independent countries whose governments are responsive to the just aspirations of their people, and by combating Communist designs for world domination.

Second. The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in science, warfare, communications, education, and other aspects of life—have in turn revolutionized the practice of diplomacy. Foreign policy operations have acquired a new dimension: the ideological or psychological. This revolution has been recognized only recently by the United States—much later, in fact, than by many other countries.

Third. In the pursuit of its basic objectives in the world, the United States, unlike the Soviet Union, has assigned relatively low priority to the ideological and psychological area of foreign policy operations. The attention and the resources devoted to these operations do not begin to approach those expended on foreign military and economic activities.

Fourth. There exists in the executive branch a broad range of nonmilitary and noneconomic programs which are directed at foreign audiences and can provide support for U.S. foreign policy. These, however, are yet to be orchestrated into an effective instrument of our foreign policy. The concept of an "ideological offensive"—of coordinating these programs and their application—thus far has been only partially implemented by the executive branch.

Fifth. A number of U.S. Government programs which operate in the third dimension of foreign policy suffer from fuzziness of concept. Their purposes and the roles which they are supposed to play in the execution of U.S. foreign policy have not been clearly defined.

Sixth. The coordination of programs operating in a particular field—for instance, information, research, exchanges of persons—is less than fully effective. While considerable progress has been made in recent years to improve coordination, there is evidence that greater effort will be required to complete the job and to eliminate duplication and underutilization of resources.

Seventh. The implementation of the country team concept has improved the

oversea coordination of U.S. programs. Careful selection and adequate training of personnel placed in charge of U.S. country teams is indispensable to the success of U.S. operations abroad.

Eighth. Perhaps the weakest aspect of the U.S. ideological effort in support of foreign policy is the apparent lack of a clearly defined, operational authority. Such direction is necessary, in our opinion, to coordinate programs operating on this plane and thereby maximize the effectiveness of our effort.

Ninth. The fragmentation of congressional supervision over programs comprising the third dimension of U.S. foreign policy presents another problem. At least six major committees and an even larger number of subcommittees exercise jurisdiction over programs in this area of foreign policy operations. From the standpoint of legislative authorizations and appropriations, programs are judged, supported, or criticized, as the case may be, on an individual basis rather than in the context of the total effort in support of U.S. foreign policy.

Tenth. Too little effort has been expended in exploring the contribution of private American citizens and organizations abroad to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy objectives. These private operations have a tremendous potential.

At the conclusion of its report, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. The need for organizing U.S. Government operations on the ideological and psychological plane and blending them into an effective effort in support of U.S. foreign policy, particularly with respect to the cold war challenge on this plane, should be acknowledged at the highest level in our Government.

Second. Operational authority for the management of ideological and psychological activities in support of U.S. foreign policy should be unified and placed at an appropriately high level in the executive branch.

Third. A systematic evaluation of all Government programs with a potential for influencing the attitudes of foreign audiences should be undertaken with a view to eliminating duplication, abandoning programs which are no longer related to the requirements of our foreign policy, and providing those which are, with a clearly defined mission.

Fourth. The coordination of programs operating in each of the several fields—exchanges of persons, information, strategic psychological operations, and others—should be greatly improved. The implementation of recommendation No. 2 appears indispensable to the attainment of this objective. In addition, responsibility for coordination at lower levels should be clearly defined and adequate authority provided to make possible effective discharge of such responsibility. The cumbersome structure of interdepartmental coordinating committees should be streamlined by reducing the number of such committees to the minimum required for effective operation.

Fifth. To the extent possible, educational and informational activities should be brought into a single agency or department—as suggested by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Existing division of operations and responsibility between the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and, to some extent, the Agency for International Development, is illogical and not conducive to efficiency and economy.

Sixth. Government officials and personnel responsible for the conduct of ideological and psychological operations should be trained in the requirements and techniques of ideological warfare. It is not practical to try to bring all of these activities into a single Government department or agency. It is both feasible and necessary, however, to provide appropriate training to the personnel of Government departments involved in this type of foreign operations.

Seventh. The input of the ideological and psychological dimension of foreign policy—particularly in the field of basic research in behavioral sciences—should be increased.

Eighth. Cooperation with private enterprise should be strengthened. Prompt attention should be given to ways and means of achieving that goal.

After issuing report No. 2, the subcommittee turned its attention to programs conducted abroad by private American organizations. That subject will be discussed in the next part of my report.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Impact of Private Initiative, V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in submitting its Report No. 2 to the Congress, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements stressed the important role of programs conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations. The subcommittee found that—

These private activities—personal contacts, exchanges, assistance programs, mass media communications activities, and other endeavors—and in large part responsible for the conditions of the U.S. image abroad. These activities mirror the diversity of our people's interests, talents, and convictions. They serve as an excellent indicator of the condition of life attainable in a free, democratic society. And they demonstrate to the world the peaceful, humanitarian sentiments of the American people.

The subcommittee further suggested that because of their diversity and volume, these private endeavors undoubtedly have "some implication for the attainment of U.S. foreign policy goals." Unfortunately, the subcommittee was in no position to gage the impact of these activities because information relating to their direction and scope, available to the subcommittee, was frequently inadequate and inconclusive.

The need to explore the potential of private American initiative abroad without attempting to bring it under Government control, was explained in the following passage from the subcommittee's report:

The subcommittee is convinced that it would be improper and harmful for the Federal Government to attempt to control or direct for political purposes the activities abroad of private American citizens and organizations. At the same time, the subcommittee believes that closer contacts should be established between responsible Government officials and private efforts in particular fields. On the one hand, the Government ought to know at all times what private American individuals and organizations are doing in a given country—if for no other reason than simply to prevent duplication of effort and waste of scarce resources. On the other hand, ways and means could be devised to keep such private individuals and entities informed about U.S. policies and programs in particular regions or fields of endeavor—again, to prevent duplication, to point out areas into which private effort could be channeled constructively, and to indicate in what respects private undertakings might work at cross-purposes with Government programs.

In an effort to help meet the need clearly evident in this area, the subcommittee undertook to survey the oversea activities of private American organizations. A questionnaire designed to elicit information about the size and scope of such undertakings, their direction and relationships—if any—to U.S. Government-sponsored programs, and related factors, was prepared by the subcommittee staff under my direction. This questionnaire was mailed earlier this month to a sample of approximately 1,500 foundations, universities, labor organizations, church-related groups, voluntary organizations, and people-to-people projects.

We are hopeful that the results of this survey will prove of interest and help not only to our committee and to the Congress, but also to the many private American organizations which are interested in, or are conducting, oversea programs. We are planning to release the results early next year.

Space Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SEPTEMBER 25, 1964.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FULTON: Enclosed herewith is copy of a paper entitled "The Boundary

Between Territorial Airspace and International Outer Space." This was read for me at the Federal bar meeting in Washington while I was in South America at an aviation meeting. I consider the subject matter of this paper of real importance.

The present administration on several occasions has indicated that it is too early to negotiate an international convention fixing the boundary between airspace and outer space. But this does not answer the need for the United States to fix its own boundary. We must, in my judgment, continue to insist on full control of all flight in the airspace which we use for our normal military and civil flight. We need the legal veto applicable to any flight in that area. Now, however, we have agreed that outer space is free for all international peaceful flight, and perhaps for military flight as well. Obviously, there must be a decision as to the height above our lands and waters where our right of national control comes to an end.

The problem is somewhat similar to territorial waters, as I have pointed out in this article. We have no international agreement as to the outer boundary of these waters, but this has never deterred us from asserting our own outer boundary as against all other nations.

I realize that this session in the House has about ended, and nothing can be done this year. However, I would like to suggest that you ask the staff of the House Space Committee to study the problem. I feel strongly that a bill should be introduced in the early days of the next House session, which would fix a definite boundary above the surface of our lands and waters as the upper boundary of national airspace.

Hoping that this letter will reach you personally, I am sending the original by special delivery to Washington and a copy to your Pittsburgh office.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN COBB COOPER.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Mr. JOHN COBB COOPER,
Princeton, N.J.

DEAR MR. COOPER: It is a pleasure to receive your letter of September 25, 1964, together with your paper entitled, "The Boundary Between Territorial Airspace and International Outer Space," which was read at the Federal bar meeting in Washington, D.C.

I have read your article with interest, and am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I feel it deserves wide recognition by Members of Congress and the American people.

In addition, I will be glad to introduce a bill in the next House session for a congressional commission to study the question of a definite boundary above the surface of our lands and waters, as the upper boundary of national airspace.

Any time my office in Pittsburgh or Washington can be of assistance to you, let us hear, and we will be glad to cooperate.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. FULTON.

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON SPACE LAW—FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN TERRITORIAL AIRSPACE AND INTERNATIONAL OUTER SPACE

(By John Cobb Cooper)

The United States should not delay longer in stating a definitive position as to the upper boundary of its territorial airspace. The unanimous adoption of the United Nations on December 13, 1963, of Resolution 1962 (XVIII) has created a new and urgent situation. It is understood that the United States assisted in drafting the resolution and the United Nations records clearly show vigorous American support. One of the major purposes of that resolution was to fix the legal status of the areas generally called "outer space" in which satellites and other spacecraft may operate with minimum interference from the earth's atmosphere. The effect of the resolution was to declare that such outer space is a highway which is and must remain open for the use of all nations, free of any claim or rights of sovereign control by any nation. The declaration of principles set out in the United Nations resolution contains the following statements:

"Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law."

"Outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means."

The legal status of outer space as thus stated is in direct conflict with the accepted legal principles applicable to our national airspace.

The legal status of national airspace as part of our territory is not subject to question. The United States assisted in drafting the Paris Convention of 1919 with its much quoted statement in article I that the parties to the convention "recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." For other reasons we did not ratify the Paris Convention, but in adopting the Air Commerce Act of 1926 a provision was carefully inserted in section 6 to the effect "that the Government of the United States has to the exclusion of all foreign nations, complete sovereignty of the airspace over the lands and waters above the United States."

This was the declaration to the effect that such airspace is part of our territory. The same principle was even more forcefully stated in section 9 of the same act defining the term "United States":

"The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, means the territory comprising the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia (including the territorial waters thereof), and the overlying airspace; but shall not include the Canal Zone."

Substantially the same definition was carried forward into section 1(31) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (omitting the reference to the Canal Zone) and has since been repeated in subsequent statutes. The United States has thus firmly declared that the airspace over its lands and waters is part of its national territory.

As a result the United States has the same right to complete unilateral control of all foreign movement within its airspace as it has in other parts of its territory. The only recognized exception to this right of absolute control is that which is enjoyed by foreign merchant ships in time of peace passing through the territorial waters of the United States. But even this limited right has never been accorded to foreign aircraft flying in the airspace over our territorial waters.

While it is true that the 1963 United Nations resolution quoted above has not yet been incorporated into our statutes nor into a duly ratified treaty, nevertheless it would be most difficult for the United States hereafter to claim any rights of territorial control in "outer space."

Admittedly there is as yet no general agreement as to the lower boundary of outer space but this does not obviate the necessity for the United States to fix its own upper boundary of its national airspace territory.

It has been said that there is no general agreement as to the outer boundary of territorial waters and this fact has been used as an argument to support delay in reaching agreement as to the boundary between the airspace and outer space. The argument is unsound so far as it applies to our national action. It overlooks the fact that every State which has maritime boundaries has formally asserted a fixed outer boundary for its territorial waters so that no other State can question its position. The high seas are an international highway open to all. A ship leaving a U.S. port passes through part of our territory which we call territorial waters and thence into the high seas which is not part of our territory. Since the early years of our history, we have repeatedly asserted that there is a definitive boundary out to which the United States has territorial control of all foreign movement. In these territorial waters we are sovereign. In the high seas we are not. Similarly in national airspace over our lands and waters we are sovereign, but with the passage of the United Nations 1963 resolution we have joined other states in asserting that there can be no claim of sovereignty in outer space.

To prevent international misunderstanding we have always asserted the right to fix an outer boundary for our territorial waters. Exactly the same situation now exists as to flight. We have the right to control all flight in our territorial airspace. We have in substance surrendered that right, if it ever existed, in the area termed "outer space." But where lies the boundary between these areas? Can any logical reason be brought forward as to why the United States must not promptly assert its upper airspace boundary so as to give notice to the world of the area above its lands and waters in which it reserves the right to control all flight?

The time is not far distant, and in fact may be with us today, when the right of foreign spacecraft to pass through our territorial airspace will require an immediate and vigorous answer. Are foreign spacecraft, military or civil, to be permitted to fly within 25 miles above our lands and waters, or 50 miles, or 100 miles? A decision must be made.

This decision is necessarily political. It involves consideration of matters of great importance both civil and military. The accepted boundary should have reasonable scientific background. For example, 25 miles above sea level is perhaps the maximum height for the practical use of aircraft requiring aerodynamic support to sustain flight and using air-breathing motive power. Fifty miles above sea level is perhaps the maximum height at which the atmosphere is sufficiently dense to provide any appreciable aerodynamic lift. A point somewhere between 75 miles and 90 miles is perhaps the lowest point of practical orbital unpowered flight around the earth.

The most urgent reason for an early decision is the problem of the flight of spacecraft through the airspace when ascending or descending. Careful examination of the known records of past successful flights into or from outer space indicate that no such flights have ever been recorded at an altitude below 75 miles above a foreign state. Perhaps 90 miles might be an even more correct figure. But this will not continue. Problems of launching and landing are becoming more complex.

Until now flights have passed only through the airspace of the state of launching or the airspace over the high seas when ascending toward or descending from outer space. The airspace over the high seas is as free for flight use as are the high seas themselves for shipping. The spacecraft launced into orbit from Cape Kennedy (formerly Cape Canaveral) have ascended through airspace over the United States lands and territorial waters and thence over the high seas into outer space. When descending, our manned orbital flights have started the descent in outer space over the Pacific Ocean and have thence proceeded downward through the airspace over the United States and finally through the airspace over the Atlantic Ocean

to a landing at sea. No foreign airspace has been used. It is understood that Russian spacecraft when being put into orbit or brought back for landing have passed solely through Russian airspace before entering the outer space and before landing at the end of orbital flight. The enormous Russian national landmass permits this procedure.

But, as orbital flights become more frequent and diverse, it is certain that we will face the very practical question of whether or not foreign spacecraft should be permitted to use our territorial airspace for ascent and descent, and we will certainly wish to know whether we have similar privileges in the airspace of other states.

The adoption of the United Nations resolution discussed earlier did not directly or indirectly grant any privileges of passage to foreign spacecraft through the national airspace of any state. In the case of the United States, national airspace has by statute been made a part of the territory of the United States, carrying with it our right to determine unilaterally what flight instrumentalities may enter or otherwise use such airspace. No resolution of the United Nations could alter our law so as to grant rights of passage. Historically the United States has permitted foreign aircraft to enter and use United States airspace only when and to the extent that such use has been authorized by treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is a party, or at times by special permission or authority. No general rights of passage for foreign aircraft exist in the United States airspace even though we accept the rule of international law that the airspace over the high seas is free. In other words, an aircraft approaching our shores and intending to land here cannot proceed past the outer boundary of the airspace above our territorial waters unless it has specific authority so to do. Obviously the same rule is applicable legally to the use of United States airspace by any foreign spacecraft.

But it must be noted that academic suggestions have been made that the United Nations resolutions as to the freedom of use of outer space have carried with them a consequential privilege of passage by spacecraft through foreign airspace in order to enjoy the rights of use of outer space. To some this theory may be politically attractive, but it is certainly legally unsound. The United States, for its part, should without delay fix a definite statutory upper boundary of its national airspace. When this is done, existing law will without question require the operator of any foreign spacecraft to seek authority to use our airspace if such use is found necessary in connection with the free international use of outer space.

When the upper limit of our national airspace has been fixed and our unconditional sovereignty thus reasserted, the United States will be in a position to deal reciprocally either by general convention, or through bilateral arrangements, so that the United States will enjoy for its spacecraft the same privileges extended to the spacecraft of other states who are parties to such arrangement.

Ultimately, a broad international convention will certainly be arrived at fixing the height of national airspace and determining what rights of passage, if any, will be permitted. In a convention of this kind the United States might alter its own upper national airspace boundary if then deemed useful, and could also determine what rights of passage, if any, foreign spacecraft would reciprocally enjoy.

Certainly the unilateral right of each state to control all flight in its national airspace can be modified only by direct national act, or international agreement, and not by inference or interpretation based on any theoretical effect of any agreement for the use of outer space. The legal status of territorial airspace and international outer space is diametrically opposed. May I say that I have long recognized the need to determine by international agreement any rights of airspace passage for spacecraft. In the convention which I proposed in 1956 to the American Society of International Law, this problem was considered. I suggested that a new convention might include the following as then stated:

"(a) Reaffirm article I of the Chicago Convention, giving the subjacent state full sovereignty in the areas of atmospheric space above it, up to the height where 'aircraft' as now defined, may be operated, such areas to be designated 'territorial space.'

"(b) Extend the sovereignty of the subjacent state upward to 300 miles above the earth's surface, designating this second area as 'contiguous space,' and provide for a right of transit through this zone for all nonmilitary flight instrumentalities when ascending or descending.

"(c) Accept the principle that all space above 'contiguous space' is free for the passage of all instrumentalities."

As I have often explained, my 1956 suggestion of 300 miles in paragraph (b) above was based on erroneous scientific views existing before sputnik that atmospheric conditions below a 300 mile altitude would make free satellite orbital flights difficult, if not impossible. Subsequent developments have indicated that this scientific position was not correct and that satellite flight is practical at much lower altitudes. It will be noted, however, that I carefully recommended rights of transit through the extended sovereignty zone for nonmilitary flight instrumentalities when ascending or descending. So far as I recall, this is the first time that the problem was considered.

Considering present conditions, scientific, political, and legal, the type of international convention which I proposed in 1956 might be very practical if the upper boundary of territorial space were now fixed at 25 miles above sea level and the upper limit of "contiguous space" were fixed at 75 miles, or in the alternative, at such other figure as might be scientifically determined to be the lowest limit of practical free orbital flight. The principle that all space above what I called "contiguous space" should be free for the passage of all flight instrumentalities has now been accepted by the United Nations resolutions with the strong support of the United States. The principle that the United States has full and absolute sovereignty in its airspace is still part of our law.

A convention of this kind is desirable as an early goal. But this objective does not minimize the urgency of present definitive action by the United States fixing the upper limit of its territorial airspace, thus notifying the world of its assertion of unilateral sovereign control of the usable areas below this national boundary. This control is applicable to all flight instrumentalities, whether they be rockets, missiles, aircraft, spacecraft, or any combination of these basic types.

Security Agents Told To Burn Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a typical American mother who lives in the 15th District of Illinois, which it is my privilege to represent:

Bob and I are extremely concerned over this article and would appreciate it if you would investigate the directive and, if possible, instigate a movement to have it abolished. Please note the time limit of October 1:

"U.S. SECURITY AGENTS TOLD TO BURN RECORDS

"(By Willard Edwards)

"WASHINGTON, September 24.—The State Department's Security Office has directed its agents in 20 major cities of the United States to destroy the bulk of their field office records, containing data on Government security risks.

"By October 1, according to a directive dated August 28, resident agents 'will destroy all completed investigative reports by burning process with a special agent in attendance,' as a witness.

" 'RAW FILES' TO GO

"The Department's security agents investigate State Department employees and applicants for employment to ascertain if they are loyal to their country, have Communist connections, or have difficulties in character, such as drunkenness or homosexuality, which would make them potential security risks. They also investigate passport frauds.

"The data to be destroyed will include not only copies of reports forwarded to Washington but what intelligence agents call 'raw files.' These include data useful in subsequent investigations such as names of prospective witnesses and leads to subversive activities.

"A field agent has complained to his Senator that the destruction of his records will seriously impair his usefulness in the future and hamper his inquiries into the background of State Department employees.

"Henceforth, under the order, the agents will receive only that information which the Office of Security in Washington sends them and they are forbidden to accumulate data for future use. All security records will be based in the Washington headquarters.

"In issuing the order, the Office of Security asserted it was designed to effect efficiency and economy.

"These agents, especially veterans of many years' service, have accumulated filing cases full of data which they must now burn, with a witness looking on. They may keep no records in the future of their cases. They will dictate a report and send it to the field office which, in turn, will transmit it to Washington.

" 'He—the agent—will be operating out of his hat,' commented an intelligence authority. 'The new system is calculated to handicap investigative work, if nothing worse.'

"The Office of Security maintains field offices in Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles."

The clipping which she attaches appeared in the Chicago Tribune of September 25. Other Members of the House from the Chicago area have received equally strong protests from their districts.

I have written the Secretary of State as follows:

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me State Department Office of Security letters C-64/17 dated August 6, 1964, and C-64/18 dated August 28, 1964. These obviously will curtail field office activities of your security division. I should like to know the reasons underlying such a decision. If you have evidence which establishes that the threat of Communist

imperialism has lessened to a degree which permits relaxation of security procedures in your Department, I believe the Congress and the people should share this information. If, however, this is an economy measure, I would like to know if there is not some activity which could be curtailed with less risk to our Nation.

A story based on these letters appeared in the Chicago Tribune, September 25, 1964, and has aroused grave concern among the people of Illinois. It appears from this article that the August 28 letter will, in the opinion of some of your employees, handicap the investigative work of the State Department. If their understanding of this order is incorrect, I suggest immediate clarification in the interest of maintaining the high level of security and efficiency which I am certain we both wish to see in all of the activities of your Department.

I feel that in fairness I must withhold judgment in this matter until I have heard what Mr. Rusk has to say. Nonetheless, the timing of this action is strange. Last Sunday the Washington Star reported a Presidential directive demanding tighter security checks on Government appointees. According to that paper the directive reads as follows:

TEXT OF MEMORANDUM

We have been somewhat concerned about our procedures in requesting security name checks, particularly from the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for appointees to the Federal service. Such procedures are an essential part of any effective security program.

In most instances it would seem desirable to request such checks prior to serious consideration being given to an individual, and most certainly before a firm commitment is made to the interested party or parties. Not only should this be observed in the respective departments and agencies, but also in instances in which recommendations for appointments are made by departments or agencies to the White House.

These procedures can prevent considerable embarrassment both to the Government and to the potential employee himself. Irreparable harm can be done to a person's reputation in instances where publicity is given to his possible appointment to a Government position, yet subsequent security checks result in a decision to suspend action on the appointment.

SOUND BUSINESS SENSE

It would be unfortunate if undesirable individuals were put on the Federal payroll simply because sufficient precautions were not taken prior to their appointment. This is merely sound business sense and should not be construed as an unwarranted invasion of privacy or violation of any person's constitutional rights.

Commonsense must naturally be exercised in the administration of name checks requests. For example, high-ranking military personnel who have possessed top-ranking clearance normally would not require security checks prior to appointment in the civilian service.

It would be desirable for all departments to examine their procedures in the above regard. This practice is in effect at the White House now and will be strictly adhered to in the future.

As we all know, a subcommittee of the other body has recently completed a 2-year investigation of security procedures in the State Department, which I am told will be made public sometime after the first week in November. I think Mr. Rusk would have been wise to see what that committee had to say before making these changes. It is also strange that Mr. Rusk has curtailed security activities at a time when the President has decided that stricter security investigations are necessary.

I am confident Secretary Rusk will provide an early explanation of this seeming difference of opinion within the administration.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—An Encouraging Beginning, VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in parts 1 through 5 of this report, I outlined briefly the progress of the investigation undertaken 18 months ago by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This investigation is concerned solely with programs which comprise the fourth dimension of our foreign policy; namely, programs which provide support for our foreign policy by reaching, informing, and influencing foreign audiences. Our activities in this dimension of foreign policy, their effectiveness and success, may well decide the outcome of the cold war.

In summary, during the past 18 months, my subcommittee:

First. Held two series of hearings during which we received testimony from some 70 witnesses. These hearings have been published in eight volumes;

Second. Had prepared under its direction, and published, an inventory of governmental programs operating in the third dimension of foreign policy;

Third. Issued two reports which included a number of specific recommendations for strengthening our effort in this field; and

Fourth. Initiated a survey of activities conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations—activities which have a bearing on the implementation of our foreign policy.

This summary of the subcommittee's activities does not convey, of course, the full impact of our undertaking. I say this because it is often impossible to measure the indirect effects of an investigation of this type. We have concentrated primarily on getting together a body of information about the subject under study. Simultaneously, however, we have pointed out shortcomings which exist in some of our programs, suggested areas in which new approaches could be tried, and lent our support to innovations and improvements which, in some cases, were being considered in the executive branch and which, on the basis of our investigation, appeared sound to us.

The results of our efforts in such cases are reflected in a number of tangible improvements which have been put into effect during the past year and a half. We do not claim full credit for them. But I believe that our activities were at least partly instrumental in bringing them about.

Last month, for instance, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to exert every effort to assure that competent, qualified citizens of the United States be available for service on the staffs of international agencies—a development which has been of interest to our subcommittee and which was dealt with in our Report No. 1 on "U.S. Participation in the International Labor Organization."

Similarly, earlier this year there was established in the executive branch an interdepartmental Foreign Area Research Coordinating Group—an innovation which was strongly recommended by our subcommittee in Report No. 2. In that report, we dealt at length with the shortcomings in the coordination of governmental research in foreign affairs. We also made this recommendation:

Effective methods must be evolved to insure that the results of research conducted by Government agencies are promptly made available to all agencies concerned with foreign policy operations. Other arrangements must be worked out to divide research assignments and make certain that all requirements are covered to the extent that funds are available. A system of priorities must be established and enforced to insure that scarce resources—human and financial—are applied first to the most urgent tasks.

The establishment of the coordinating group is a step in the direction recommended by this subcommittee.

Similarly, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency earlier this year established a Social Science Advisory Board to advise the Agency on matters of social science research—another innovation which our subcommittee considers significant and desirable from the standpoint of foreign policy operations.

In still another field, the representatives of several government agencies who have contact with private American organizations operating abroad, have put their heads together and are trying to devise steps which will promote more effective cooperation—a development which we have encouraged.

There is one more area that I would like to mention—the area of cultural and educational exchanges—in which our subcommittee has been active. We have seen a number of improvements in these programs in recent times. For example, greater effort is being made to evaluate and to improve current methods for handling foreign nationals brought to the United States under Government sponsorship for education, training, or observation. These visitors are being afforded much greater exposure than ever before to our way of life, our political and social institutions, our philosophy of government, and the goals of our foreign policy. This has been vigorously advocated by our subcommittee.

These are but a few examples of changes which have been put into effect during the past year and a half with the encouragement and support of this subcommittee.

On the negative side, there are a number of recommendations which our subcommittee has made but which have not been implemented to date. I hope that we will see some improvement in this situation during the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this report, I want to make one thing clear: while the beginning has been encouraging, the job which our subcommittee undertook is far from being completed. We have much work ahead of us. And we intend to see it done.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose understanding and support have made our project possible.

I also want to thank the distinguished members of my subcommittee: Representatives L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; OMAR BURLESON, of Texas; DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota; PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York; and H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, whose ability, patience, and tact have enabled us to move as far as we have during these past 18 months. Their devotion to the public good warrants the respect of every patriotic American.

A Bill To Amend Public Law 874, Federal Impact Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session we leave some very important unfinished business.

One of the laws needing serious study and amendment is the so-called Federal impact aid bill, which pays Federal funds to school districts impacted by Federal peoples and properties.

In this regard I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news release on H.R. 12670 as well as the full text of this proposed act for the information of the membership of the House.

With 306 out of 435 Members of this House representing districts receiving this type of aid it is imperative that all of us understand the proposals fully.

The material follows:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced a new bill, H.R. 12670, for the purpose of amending Public Law 874, commonly known as the Federal impacted aid law.

This legislation as now written extends Federal aid presumably to those areas injured taxwise by the activities of Federal installations and the excessive influx of Federal employees' families into school districts.

Congressman DENT, after a series of hearings and extensive studies on the Federal impact problems, believes that in a substantial number of areas the impacted conditions caused by Federal activities benefit the total economy of the communities involved rather than injure them.

Impact payments under the present law are based on the loss of taxes from real property which has been removed from local tax rolls due to Federal activities. Based on this formula, many of the school districts which have excellent financial positions are receiving this assistance while a much larger number of needy school districts are unable to qualify for these funds. This new proposal of the Congressman will not injure any school district presently receiving Federal impact assistance but will simply permit school districts, which are impacted as a result of the presence of certain federally connected needy children, to qualify for this aid.

In his new bill, H.R. 12670, Congressman DENT seeks to broaden the base of Public Law 874 to include new categories for elementary and secondary schools. The Congressman proposes to further schedule a series of "grassroots" hearings in a selected number of areas in order to fully crystallize the subcommittee's opinion on this important issue.

In recent hearings on this problem in Los Angeles, Calif., the subcommittee found that due to one of the inequities in the present law, Los Angeles failed to qualify for approximately $10 million because Public Law 874 requires that districts of over 35,000 children in average daily attendance must be federally impacted by a minimum of 6 percent—Los Angeles was impacted by only 5.6 percent. Practically all the $300-odd million appropriated last year for the impact program has been paid to small districts which under the present law qualify with an impact of as little as 3 percent while larger communities with far more federally connected children, numerically, have been denied any assistance under the present program.

The Congressman pointed out this same type of restriction existed in the Library Services Act until he introduced a bill and successfully guided it through Congress which removed restrictive features and included all libraries on a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. DENT said that his new bill, H.R. 12670, will amend Public Law 874:

(1) To recognize the Federal connection for school district payment purposes of:

(a) Children of school age on whose behalf parents are currently receiving payments under the Aid to Dependent Children welfare program.

(b) Children of persons residing in local school districts who have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation.

(c) Children of persons residing in the local school districts who received payments pursuant to titles, I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for a period of 6 or more months during the previous fiscal year.

(2) The bill provides that if the number of children of school age in one or more of these three new categories and the old category "B" (during the previous fiscal year) is 10 or more and amounts to 5 percent or more of the total number of children who were in daily average attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is being sought, the local educational agency would be entitled to a payment for each child equal to 25 percent of the payment made under Public Law 874 for a child whose parent both works and lives on Federal property (category "A" children).

H.R. 12670

A bill to amend Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally affected areas, to provide assistance in certain cases on account of children in needy families

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 3(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the total number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, resided on Federal property and (1) did so with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency, or (2) had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code)."

(b) Section 3(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall also determine the total number of children (other than children to whom subsection (a) applies) who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, either resided on Federal property, or resided with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency. A child of a parent who commenced residing in or near the school district of such agency while assigned to employment, as a member of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code) on active duty, on Federal property (situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or within reasonable commuting distance from such school district) and who was subsequently assigned elsewhere on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces, shall continue to be considered as residing with a parent employed on such Federal property for so long as the parent is so assigned elsewhere."

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (A) the local contribution rate (determined under subsection (d)) multiplied by (B) the sum of the number of children determined under subsection (a) and one-quarter of the sum of (i) the number of children determined under subsection (b), (ii) the number of dependent children residing in the local school district for whom payments pursuant to title IV of the Social Security Act were made for a period of three or more months during the previous fiscal year, (iii) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district whose entitlement to unemployment compensation under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act was exhausted during the previous fiscal year, and (iv) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district who received public assistance grants under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for six months or more during the previous fiscal year. In determining the number of children for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) and of this paragraph, the Commissioner may rely on a certification of the number of children to be counted by the State or local educational agency official or official administering the applicable Social Security Act program or State unemployment compensation program."

(d) Paragraph (2) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more. No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (b) and clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (c) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more, amounts to 5 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is sought and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that such 5 per centum requirement need not be met by such agency for any period of two fiscal years which follows a fiscal year during which such agency was entitled to payment under the provisions of this section, but the payment, under the provisions of this section to such agency for the second fiscal year of any such two-year period during which such requirement is not met, shall be reduced by 50 per centum of the amount thereof. However, the Commissioner may waive the 5 per centum condition of entitlement wherever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this Act."

(e) Paragraph (3) of section 3(c) is repealed.

(f) Paragraph (5) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) No payment shall be made to a local educational agency if the Commissioner determines that for the preceding fiscal year the State has reduced its contributions to the school district of that local educational agency because of Federal contributions under this Act."

(g) Section 4(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) If the Commissioner determines for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1965—

"(1) that, as a direct result of activities of the United States (carried on either directly or through a contractor) an increase has occurred in the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of any local educational agency at any time during the previous fiscal year, which increase so resulting from activities of the United States is equal to at least 5 per centum of the difference between the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency during the second preceding fiscal year and the number of such children whose attendance during such first previous fiscal year resulted from activities of the United States (including children who resided on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property);

"(2) that such activities of the United States have placed on such agency a substantial and continuing financial burden; and

"(3) that such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance but is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the increased educational costs involved,

then such agency shall be entitled to receive for such fiscal year an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the number of children which the Commissioner determines to be the increase, so resulting from activities of the United States, in membership during such previous fiscal year; and

"(B) the amount which the Commissioner determines to be the current expenditures per child necessary to provide free public education to such additional children during such year, minus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and Federal sources for such purpose (not counting as available for such purpose either payments under this Act or funds from local sources necessary to provide free public education to other children).

Any payment which such agency would otherwise be entitled to receive under section 3 for the next fiscal year (except where the determination under the preceding sentence has been made with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965) shall be reduced by the amount of the payment under this subsection for the preceding fiscal year. The determination under clause (B) shall be made by the Commissioner after considering the current expenditures per child in providing free public education in those school districts in the State which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, are generally comparable to the school district of the local educational agency for which the computation is being made."

(h) Section 9 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The membership of schools shall be determined in accordance with State law or, in the absence of State law governing such a determination, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner; except that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where the local educational agency of the school district in which any child resides makes or contracts to make a tuition payment for the free public education of such child in a school situated in another school district, for purposes of this Act the membership of such child shall be held and considered—

"(A) if the two local educational agencies concerned so agree, and if such agreement is approved by the Commissioner, as membership of a school of the local educational agency receiving such tuition payment;

"(B) in the absence of any such approved agreement, as membership of a school of the local educational agency so making or contracting to make such tuition payment.

In any determination of membership of schools, children who are not provided free public education (as defined in paragraph (4)) shall not be counted."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1965.

Congressman Minshall Report of the 2d Session of 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 88th Congress is nearing adjournment after more than 9 months in session.

The House of Representatives passed nearly 400 public bills out of the more than 3,000 introduced. It also approved more than 100 Senate bills. Of this number more than 300 will have been signed into law by the President by the time Congress adjourns.

During my 10 years in Congress I have answered literally thousands of rollcalls and my attendance record on votes has been better than 91 percent. However, bare statistics do not accurately represent the long hours spent by each of us in committee work alone. It is in committee that the major portion of actual legislating is done. There the bills are painstakingly studied, analyzed, discussed, often amended. Those measures favorably reported by a committee are again studied and debated when they reach the floor of the House, but the spadework is accomplished in committee.

My own Appropriations Committee assignments include a massive amount of detail and work. As a member of two of the most important subcommittees in the entire Congress—the Department of Defense appropriations and foreign operations appropriations—I spend many long hours in locked-door sessions with our Nation's highest civilian and military officials. I have access to top-secret information pertaining to our defense posture and planning. These two subcommittees have a great responsibility in taking initial action on budget requests submitted by the executive branch. My Defense Subcommittee scrutinizes military expenditures, which account for more than one-half of the entire Federal outlay. My Foreign Operations Subcommittee makes the dollar appropriation on economic and military assistance to foreign nations.

I have an intense interest in both of my committee assignments, and I feel that fulfilling them is one of my important services as a Representative in Congress.

Although there are occasional sharp differences of opinion among members of the subcommittees, I can report to you that every member works diligently in what he believes to be the best interests of his country.

My report on the second session of the 88th Congress follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Unanimous support was given by the whole House for the Defense Appropriation, $46.7 billion for fiscal year 1965, a figure the Senate basically agreed to. It represented a reduction of nearly half a billion from the previous fiscal year, and a reduction of $718 million less than Pentagon requests. In addition to this amount, nearly $1.57 billion was appropriated for military construction.

Chief dispute in the House over the Defense measure centered around the Pentagon's too-heavy reliance upon cost-effectiveness studies, failure to develop major new weapons, and political censorship of testimony given before my Defense Subcommittee.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A spirited attempt to cut the foreign aid bill by $247.8 million was waged by the chairman of my Foreign Operations Subcommittee, allied with most of the minority members of the group. This economy move was defeated on the floor of the House by a mere 10 votes in a 198 to 208 rollcall. The House approved a total of $3.7 billion for the entire aid program. The Senate authorized nearly the same amount and their appropriation bill awaits final action as this is written. A rider attached to the Senate

foreign aid authorization delayed action somewhat on reapportionment of State legislatures, as ordered by the Supreme Court.

International Development Agency: Public and congressional reaction to the seemingly endless flow of American dollars overseas was reflected by the House when it rejected funds for IDA late in February, later reconsidered and passed the necessary legislation by a narrow margin in May.

Laos Commission: House floor debate was heated over authorization of payment of the U.S. contribution of $683,000 for 1964 to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Dispute was over the Commission's failure to prevent funneling of Communist troops and supplies through Laos to Vietnam. Payment was approved in a 268 to 89 rollcall vote.

Vietnam resolution: Following the Bay of Tonkin clash in early August, the Congress approved a resolution in support of the President's action in the crisis and reaffirming the United States determination to assist any member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which asks for aid in defense of its freedom.

United National Charter: As the Soviet Union remained intransigent in its refusal to pay certain of its financial obligations to the U.N., the House unanimously approved a resolution expressing its sense that the President should direct our permanent delegate to the U.N. to continue efforts toward securing payment of assessments, and that if such arrears are not paid article 19 of the U.N. Charter should be invoked penalizing nonpayment by revoking the right to vote in the Assembly.

The Panama Canal may soon reach the point where it will not be able to meet the demand of increased size and number of vessels. Congress authorized a study to determine a site for construction of a new and larger sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

DEBTS AND TAXES

For the sixth time since January 1961, the House voted to increase the national debt ceiling, this time from a "temporary" $315 billion ceiling to a "temporary" $324 billion limitation. On an average, there has been an increase of about $8 billion a year each year since 1961.

An omnibus tax bill, provided for $11.5 billion reduction in rates, lowering individual and corporate taxes, but repealing the 4 percent dividend credit, and tightening allowable deductions for certain State and local taxes, casualty losses, sick pay, and certain oil and gas income. Too low withholding on payrolls may leave many unhappy taxpayers with money due Internal Revenue next April.

An attempt to repeal wartime-imposed excise taxes on jewelry, fur, luggage, handbags, and toilet preparations was defeated by a scant 22 votes in the House, and continued for another year.

Social security benefits were increased by 5 percent across-the-board by the House, with limited benefits extended to some 600,000 formerly ineligible persons. Self-employed physicians were added to compulsory coverage, firemen were included on a voluntary basis. Increased payroll tax rates for employers and employees will be 3.8 percent each starting January 1, 1965, spiraling upward to 4.8 percent each by 1971. Increased self-employed tax rate will be 5.7 percent as of January 1, 1965, reaching 7.2 percent in 1971. House and Senate conferees are presently meeting to resolve differences. The controversial "medicare" amendment is likely to be shelved until next Congress.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Mass Transportation Act: The $375 million mass transportation act was given congressional approval for the purpose of making Federal grants and loans to States and communities to acquire, construct and improve land, rolling stock and terminal facilities for mass transportation systems owned or leased by a public transportation authority. Of the $375 million authorized, $75 million is to be appropriated in 1965, the balance in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Federal pay raise: Proposed increases in the salaries of Members of Congress caused many of us who have always supported pay raises for Federal employees to vote against this bill as a protest against raising our own salaries at a time of heavy national deficit spending. The $10,000 increase for Members was defeated in early 1964, but a majority of the House voted for the bill the second time it was considered, when it limited the congressional raise to $7,500. Although I strongly felt that the average 4.3-percent raise for Federal workers and 5.6-percent raise for postal employees carried in the bill was justified, I voted against the congressional pay raise, feeling that any increase would be inappropriate for Congress at this time.

Another military pay raise totaling $207.5 million monthly was voted into effect during this past year.

Civil Rights Act: As enacted into law, voting rights are afforded stronger protection; public school desegregation will be accelerated, discrimination will be eliminated from all programs receiving Federal assistance. Most controversy and debate centered around the public accommodations provision, which outlaws discrimination in hotels, motels, restaurants, lunch counters, movie houses, theaters, and stadiums, or by any establishment which offers its services to patrons of the covered establishment, such as a barbershop located in a hotel; and the Equal Employment Commission, whose task will be to prevent discrimination in hiring, promoting, firing, apprenticing, or job assignment.

A National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, composed of 14 members, was authorized to report legislative recommendations to Congress by January 1, 1966.

Wilderness bill: After many years' delay in Congress, the wilderness bill finally received congressional approval. The legislation places 9.1 million acres of Federal land already classified as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe" land, under a permanent protective wilderness system. The Secretary of Agriculture is assigned to review 5.4 million acres of primitive national forest areas and the Secretary of the Interior some 22.1 million roadless park areas and 24.4 million wildlife refuges and game ranges and to recommend their inclusion or exclusion from the wilderness system. Congress would be required to act before such recommendations would become effective.

Economic Opportunity Act: Better known as the antipoverty bill this new law revives a number of work programs from the 1930's and launches several new ones. The 3-year program, authorizing specific appropriations of just under $1 billion, provides for 10 separate programs under the supervision of the Director of the new Office of Economic Opportunity. The act provides for a Job Corps training youth in conservation camps and in urban and rural residential training centers, a work-training program for youth on the community level, community action programs involving Federal aid and direction to civic groups and other private organizations, a Domestic Peace Corps to be known as VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and a number of programs for rural areas.

Appalachia bill: The Senate passed a bill to provide public works and economic development programs, as well as the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of this whole region. The House bill awaits floor action in the near future.

Fish and wildlife protection from the use of insecticides and pesticides was furthered in legislation passed by Congress as the result of Rachel Carson's bestseller, "Silent Spring."

National Defense Education Act: The 1958 measure is to be extended for another 3 years and college student loan funds increased from $135 million to $195 million for fiscal 1968. The bill also includes the 50-percent loan forgiveness to student teachers in private institutions as well as public ones. The House will take action on the conference report prepared by conferees from both Houses late this week.

Housing and health: The Housing Act authorizes $1.2 billion for urban renewal, 37,500 low-cost public housing units, loans to elderly citizens and farmers, and some relaxation of FHA conditions and requirements for home mortgages.

The Hill-Burton Act for construction and modernization of hospitals was extended for 5 years and authorized $1.3 billion on a 50–50 State-Federal matching basis.

Other bills authorized a total of nearly $360 million to provide aid to education of nurses and other professional personnel in the health field.

Highways: $1.1 billion annually for 1966 and 1967 was earmarked for the Federal contribution to our national road system. It should be of interest to know that in the past 2 years 33 Federal-aid highway projects were authorized for Cuyahoga County, having an estimated total cost of $95 million. This covers improvements to a combined length of 17.9 miles and the construction of 31 bridges in the greater Cleveland area.

Veterans: Several bills were passed in both sessions to liberalize the veterans'

pension laws. Of most interest this session is the House passed bill to increase non-service-connected pensions for veterans and their widows, and to revise upward limits of permissible income without loss of pension. This measure is on the Senate Calendar awaiting action.

PUBLIC WORKS

Over $3.5 million will go into survey work, construction, and operation and maintenance of Cleveland harbor and river facilities in 1965.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will spend $709,000 on the Lake Erie portion of a comprehensive study of the Great Lakes to find a solution to the problem of pollution of lake waters.

It is an honor to represent the nearly half a million residents of the 23d district, one of the most highly informed and articulate congressional districts in the entire Nation. I take particular pride in the fact that these citizens have awarded me their confidence and support during the decade I have served them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

My Cleveland and Washington offices are always ready to provide counsel or assistance for constitutents who are involved in the increasingly complex problems of Federal Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 4: 2: *Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.*

Almighty God, as we go forth into the hours of this day, may we put to good account all the talents and capacities for service with which we have been endowed and entrusted.

We humbly acknowledge that we are frequently content to merely do our bit and follow the way of least resistance.

Grant that we may be inspired with a lofty sense of mission and give the very best of mind and heart to discharge, faithfully and well, our duties and responsibilities.

In seeking to please and find favor with our fellow men, may we never betray or surrender our most assured convictions and cherished principles.

May we seek to win and possess the peace of the joyous victor, whose conscience gives him the glorious prospect that he belongs to that blessed company of the faithful, who have no vain regrets and no shattered ruins to lament over.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of the bill H.R. 6593.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2249. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

APPROVAL OF PUBLIC WORKS PLANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State, watershed, executive communication No., committee approval:

Colorado, Home Supply, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Georgia, Beaverdam Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Georgia, South Fork of Little River, 2428, September 24, 1964.

North Carolina, Crabtree Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Oklahoma, Four-Mile Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

South Carolina, Three and Twenty Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Idaho, Montpelier Creek, 2539, September 24, 1964.

Oregon, Sutherlin Creek, 2539, September 24, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, M.C.,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

The HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to see if we might clarify the legislative situation here in the House of Representatives for the balance of this week and for next week, if we are to be here next week.

Before I make the inquiry I think it should be said for the record that on this side of the aisle, as I am sure is the case on the other side of the aisle, many of us have had no doubt but what this session of Congress would have been adjourned before this time. We have made commitments to be home in our districts where we have a right to be and, as a matter of fact, where we have an obligation to be, because we are now in an election year.

Candidates seeking reelection from the House feel this obligation to be in their districts and they have a responsibility to meet the commitments they made in all good faith. Having gone this long and, may I say, Mr. Speaker, far beyond any reasonable time in my opinion that we should have gone, certainly there is great concern on my side of the aisle as I am sure there is on the other side, as to just what the timetable is.

When Republicans were in charge of the 80th Congress we adjourned the 2d session June 20.

When Republicans were again in charge of the 83d Congress we adjourned the 2d session August 20.

Both of these Congresses were highly productive in the best interests of the country. We did the job that needed to be done with dispatch.

Now, with a Democratic administration and a Congress that is controlled by an overwhelming Democrat majority, we find a situation in which this body cannot seem to legislate and, for some strange reason beyond my comprehension, does not know how to quit and go home.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader may I advise that the hope that he expressed that we can complete the business of the session is felt, I think, pretty generally.

Mr. Speaker, all Members would like to go home. Most Members have to campaign. Most Members, like myself, are canceling speaking engagements daily. I canceled three of mine this morning.

But, of course, the obligation to be in our districts is also qualified, I think, by the obligation to complete the necessary business pending before the House and the Congress.

The gentleman knows full well that neither the authorization act nor the appropriation act for foreign aid has been signed into law. The gentleman also knows that both of those acts were passed by the House of Representatives by the end of the last fiscal year. I believe the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act was passed in the House about the first day of this fiscal year. The authorization bill had been previously passed. We hope to dispose of those matters expeditiously.

Also, the gentleman knows that the House has passed all of its appropriation bills in due time this year. And, he knows further that the social security bill is still in conference. The gentle-