SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1965

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

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

Our Father, God, with our burdened lives tense and strained in a world so agitated and divided, we would seek the peace which is the gift of Thy grace to all those who, with true purpose of heart, turn unto Thee.

In the midst of a new week, with human problems pressing for solution, we humbly bow at this wayside shrine, praying that to Thy servants here in the high functions of government there may be given open ears, that they may hear voices calling to high endeavors; open minds, ready to receive and welcome new light and truth as they are revealed to them; open eyes, quick to discover Thine indwelling in all the wondrous world Thou hast made; open hands, ready to share, holding all good things in trust for Thee and Thine other children.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, and of Friday, January 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 45)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance:

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today—

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task.

And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years. Four hundred thousand new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide:

Facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges.

Major new resources for vocational training.

More loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education.

Enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us:

To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most.

To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students.

To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers.

To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared:

> Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. Preschool program.

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons have narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special head start program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational centers and services—recommended below—will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. Elementary and secondary schools.

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts.

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance.

Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling.

Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Nearly half the youths rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs.

Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th-grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided:

On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States.

Through payments made to States for distribution to school districts.

With the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas.

On the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts.

For the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials.

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said:

> All that mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books.

Yet our school libraries are limping along.

Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books.

Many schools have an average of less than one-half book per child.

To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services.

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the new math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as—

Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art.

Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children.

Special assistance after regular school hours.

Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters.

A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents.

A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices.

A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional education laboratories.

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to—

Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects.

Train educational research personnel.

Provide grants for research, development of new curriculums, dissemination

of information, and implementation of educational innovations.

Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading and examinations. After testing, they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curriculums and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies.

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to—

Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership.

Formulate long-range plans.

Expand educational research and development.

Improve local and State information about education.

Identify emerging educational problems.

Provide for the training of State and local education personnel.

Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with ongoing and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. Higher education.

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes—

An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages.

An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families.

To help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs.

To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities.

To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Scholarships.

I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist:

Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs.

Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans:

I recommend—

That the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education.

First. The existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second. Many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. AID TO SMALLER COLLEGES

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system; Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as:

A program of faculty exchanges.

Special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields.

A national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges.

The development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities. They must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY EXTENSION PROGRAM

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges, American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning; research and development in pressing educational problems; economic and job market studies; continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership; and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. SPECIAL MANPOWER NEEDS

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend—

Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services.

Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared:

> The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free man acknowledges. It is the only security that free man desires.

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and the economic report, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak to the extent of 1 or 2 minutes in excess of the limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the message on education which President Johnson sent to the Congress this morning. It is, I believe, a milestone in its comprehensive and enlightened approach to providing full educational opportunity for every American.

As President Johnson says: "In the life of this Nation, education is a continuing challenge." And in this message he has pinpointed these challenges and suggested specific programs to meet them. The four major tasks which he sees facing the Nation are:

> To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most.
>
> To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students.
>
> To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers.
>
> To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

To accomplish these tasks the President proposes, with regard to primary and secondary education, a broad variety of new programs. They include a major program of assistance to public and secondary schools serving children of low-income families, Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and student use, a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services, and Federal grants to State educational agencies for the improvement of the methods and programs.

To strengthen our system of higher education and make it available to all qualified Americans, the President recommends, in addition to the continuation of existing programs, a system of college scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates, expansion of the work study opportunity and low-interest loan programs, aid to our less-developed struggling small colleges, legislation for the purchase of books to strengthen college teaching, and a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on the problems of the community.

Mr. President, education, the best education that every American can absorb, is a key not only to the welfare and happiness of the individual, but to the strength and well-being of the Nation. President Johnson has done much in this message to suggest how full educational opportunity can be achieved. I am confident that the Congress will give his proposals the most careful consideration and do its part with equal vision and enlightenment.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the comments of the majority leader in regard to the President's great message related to education that has come to the Congress today. As I assured the President this morning in a discussion on his message, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I shall proceed promptly to set hearings on the bill that will be introduced later today. It is a bill which, with the permission of the majority leader, will remain at the desk for 3 days to provide an opportunity for other Senators who may wish to cosponsor it to do so. I plan to start hearings on the bill within the next 2 weeks, because I believe it is of the utmost importance that we proceed with dispatch, but thoroughly in making our record upon the President's great message on education as incorporated in this great piece of proposed legislation.

I hail the farsighted vision of the President in thus showing us how we in the Congress can bring to bear, in concentrated form, the resources of the Federal Government to improve the quality of education we afford the boys and girls who are most in need of it. As I told the President this morning, and I now make the statement publicly, I highly commend and congratulate the President for his great statesmanship in this major area of education as well as in other fields.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the remarks which he has made. As always, it will be his subcommittee to which the bill will be referred. He has shown great skill, managerial ability, and great knowledge, and I am very happy that he has decided to hold hearings within the next 2 weeks. We look for early action on the measure.

STRENGTHENED TIES BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, events during the past several years have served to strengthen the ties that bind Mexico and the United States. They have brought about a basic and mutual understanding which has served to dim the differences of the past and to light a very bright future for Mexican-American relations. At this point, it can be said that these relations are at an unprecedented height of mutual tolerance, mutual understanding, and mutual respect.

In the past year alone our countries have sought to solve two monumental problems which, unsolved, might have opened a chasm between us. These solutions came about because each party dealt with the other with maturity, restraint, and respect. I am referring, of course, to the approval of the El Chamizal Treaty and the serious negotiations now in process seeking a solution of the water salinity problem of the Colorado River.

Mr. President, on the 1st of December it was my pleasure to visit Mexico once again in the company of the official U.S. delegation to the inauguration of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz. This "Ceremony for the Transmission of Executive Power" was an extraordinarily impressive event. Particularly noteworthy was the grouped presence of the five former Presidents of Mexico. Each of these men, in his turn, had given much of himself to help fulfill the promises of the Mexican Revolution. The special contribution of the outgoing President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, was noted in the inaugural speech of Diaz Ordaz, who said:

A fruitful period of Mexican history ends. President Lopez Mateos increased our spiritual and physical patrimony: he enlarged our country in all orders; he took Mexico to the world, with its ideas and hopes of universal brotherhood; he was concerned for the fate of all Mexicans, within the concert of the great family formed by mankind. Today I receive from his hands the spotless flag of Mexico.

Mr. President, we sometimes overlook the fact that Mexico is now the largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world. It is fulfilling a role of leadership in the development and progress of the Western Hemisphere. There is every reason to expect that the progress of the last decade will be consolidated and that even greater achievements will be recorded under President Diaz Ordaz. He is eminently qualified by experience, dedication, and temperament to take up the burdens which Lopez Mateos carried so well. His dedication to the ideas of democracy, eloquently expressed in the Charter of Punta del Este, is emphasized in his magnificent inaugural address. They are words of great significance not only to Mexico but to this Nation, the hemisphere, and the world as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presidential address previously referred to be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

Honorable Members of the Congress of the Union, in a fervent civic demonstration which the people of Mexico turned into a national feast, the vote of the citizens entrusted in my hands the banner of their hopes. I receive it with the cleanest of purposes to defend and serve it.

The trust of my people is great, and much will it demand from me; I am conscious of the enormous responsibility I now assume, but I accept it with optimism born of my faith in the destinies of Mexico.

The mission to accomplish excludes delays as well as improvisations. It is a task whose width and depth requires the continuous effort not of one man nor of a group of men, but of all society for several generations, that combining and succeeding themselves, will be inspired, as they have been in the course of our history by a sole passion: the welfare of our country.

We have an ideology that, through the foresight of our forefathers, is alive today and, through the persevering action of our people, is continually enriched in the face of new realities and the most complex problems.

Each Chief Executive in his term makes an effort in the permanent task of reaching the highest goals and sets the foundations to carry on in the next stage.

Our democratic system has man as its starting point, not as a simple number of pure abstraction, but rather as a subject of rights, as a person whose attributes of dignity and freedom we consider fundamental; these attributes guarantee the sacred solidity of the family which in turn, forms and tightens the links of what must be unbreakable social solidarity. Man, family, country, humanity, are essential and inseparable concepts.

We have noted with optimism the first results of the recent electoral reform. I believe that the representatives of the majority as well as those of the minorities, products of a new right, measure their responsibilities to the nation; responsibility as great for one as for the other: Mexico demands and deserves the serene and conscientious presentation of its problems, their weighty analysis, and the honest exposition of ideas.

We have faith in that by doing this within the roads marked by law, improves our democracy and helps us to preserve all that which through the efforts of many years we have achieved.

The political and economical stability that we enjoy are not a gift. They are the result of a dynamic society that modifies the inconvenient situations and creates, instead, all those that, based on reality are demanded by our ideals.

To assure stability implies to continue economic, political, and social transformation, without fear of reforms and not forgetting reality; but always within one path: the path set forth by the fundamental Constitution of Mexico, and which is our constitution.

From the time we were first born to our independent life we have fought to have a constitution to fit the ideals of our people; through many struggles we have perfected our constitutional laws and we must now dedicate our best efforts to uphold and safeguard our fundamental charter.

To preserve economic stability and political tranquillity is even more difficult than to have conquered them. It is true that the weight of responsibility falls mainly on government, but no Mexican can consider himself alien to it, because these are an invaluable treasure that all of us, absolutely all of us, must guard.

Mankind has had a very long experience, and yet it seems to disregard a double lesson: violence does not help to solve problems, but rather to enlarge and aggravate them; no matter how acute they are, a solution can always be found in peace, with the invincible weapons of law.

Power belongs to the people. Government authority is based on popular will which, in turn, is a product of the freedom of the people. Therefore the obligation to maintain—in all their scope—the freedoms and guarantees consecrated in our legal system.

Freedom and authority do not exclude each other. It is not easy to reconcile them, but neither is it impossible: the responsible exercise of one and the other, within the limits of the law, insures them reciprocally.

They who, with deliberate perversity, demand their rights so as to violate the rights of others, who invoke the Constitution only to tread on the Constitution; who pretend to take refuge in freedom only to end all freedoms, take note here and now, that we well know these two indivisible and inseparable obligations of government, that complement and uphold each other: to avoid that, in the name of freedom it be intended to do away with order, and to impede that, in the name of order, it be intended to destroy freedom or diminish the rights of citizens.

Our unity is born from the full exercise of our freedoms, and from our unity stems what we have achieved and what we must yet accomplish.

What has been won through long years of efforts can be lost, if we do not care for it with daily determination. And if it should ever be threatened, we as Mexicans must think of all that which draws us together and compare it with the little that may separate us.

Let us repeat, that for the good of the country, we must abandon the passions that divide us, and only retain the one that unites us: our passion for Mexico. This shall be our best weapon to continue being a united nation that progresses in freedom, social justice, and human solidarity.

Because of it, we seek national unity as an unbreakable rule of government. But national unity is not uniformity of thought nor unanimity of conduct, but rather it is something that results from the preservation of unique personalities, the rich mixture of all thoughts, even from extreme shades, within a free debate of ideas, that turns into one concept of what the country means, in one conjunction of all the efforts to preserve the independence of the nation, the freedom, dignity and progress of Mexicans, the progress in economical development to create riches that may be shared in equity by all, in accordance with the unchangeable principles of social justice.

I conceive Mexico as a febrile grouping of men devoted to work, but above that zeal and effort, I conceive Mexico as a creative emotion. Nothing consolidates so strongly the sentiment of country as the enjoyment of freedom and the possession of social justice, which are inseparable; because liberty without social justice is a gross and hollow formula, and social justice without liberty is the privation of the most fruitful stimulus to living.

Without the respect of law and juridical certainty, no progress is solid. Strengthening the Federal judiciary power and heightening its efficiency will deserve our utmost attention.

Federal justice, by solving individual conflicts and by checking abuses of power or in repairing them, fulfills a decisive function for the orderly life of the Nation.

The national armed forces come from the people and are devoted to serving the people. They are an image of Mexico, guardians of its sovereignty and institutions, irreplaceable auxiliaries in the fulfillment of civilian tasks, for the benefit of the people from whence they came. To better their economic, social, and technical conditions will be a permanent preoccupation of this administration.

I publicly and solemnly express my trust in that the Mexican soldier will continue to honor the sacred mission the country has deposited in him. As for me, I assure them that I will live up to the honor of being their Commander in Chief.

To govern in Mexico is, in a good measure, to conquer physical limitations. To retain the water that avaricious nature gave us sparingly in most of our territory; to control it in other zones where it ruins and destroys; to overcome an abrupt orography that makes material and spiritual communications between Mexicans difficult; to find land susceptible to cultivation and to bear fruit; to banish sickness engendered by a hostile climate; to change the geography of complete zones to make them habitable; to reclaim the desert for production; to defend our lands from erosion that attacks us without mercy. Many and great are the physical limitations we have had to overcome and must continue to conquer.

This situation establishes economic development as a fundamental task. There is no inexorable design superior to our wills that assures us or denies us its possibilities: to obtain it depends on our efforts, on doing what we must do.

We live times that demand caution and decision. We are on the threshold of a development that sustains itself, since it generates development. This is the difficult stage of transition, in which we have to suffer, at the same time, the problems of underdevelopment as well as those of the beginning of development. To reach the next stage we must coordinate action, complete and integrate accomplishments, and initiate others in order to reach new goals.

The road of the Mexican Revolution takes us to our objective of economic development and this origin clearly establishes the ends that we pursue and the means to which we have recourse.

We seek economic development to fully utilize our natural resources, to provide productive and remunerative occupation to the growing population of Mexico, to raise the living standards of the great majorities of the Nation, to strengthen our independence and increase our capacity for international cooperation.

The basic problem of Mexico is the lack of capital as related to the utilization of its natural and human resources. To occupy our demographic growth productively and remuneratively and to eliminate unemployment, it is imperative that the Nation create approximately 400,000 new jobs per year. To attain this, we must create capital and be able to allocate it.

It is urgent that we expand the necessary consumption of the majority and reduce the unnecessary consumption of the minority.

Mexico must not create its capital by sacrificing fair wages nor by reducing the consumption of those in the lower income bracket. It would be unjust if the most needy were to support the full weight of our development.

To economically strengthen the majorities also creates capital, for there is no greater stimulus to economic growth than an ever-growing market. Without a market there is no production. And without purchasing power in the masses, there is no market. We reiterate that no business can prosper if surrounded by poverty.

The economic growth reached until now is the result of policies which were initiated in Mexico more than three decades ago: investment in infrastructure: irrigation, electrification, communications, nationalization of basic natural resources; the creation of fundamental industries and social reform in the labor area, as well as, and above all, in the agrarian area.

Direct foreign investment can play an important role to accelerate economic progress, and is welcome as long as it respects our laws, operates in a manner which complements our national effort, and helps in the attainment of the social objectives which guide our nation.

To consolidate and continue this growth we will be guided by the principle of balanced development. We must maintain a balance between farm and industrial production; between the exploitation and conservation of our natural resources; between the development of the different regions of the country, the different types of industry, the different economic and social investments, their effect, productivity, and recuperation; a balance, in short, between the creation of capital and its proper distribution.

We can no longer put off the fight against economic and social regional differences: To that end, we will carry forward full planning by regions, we will continue vigorous investment in infrastructure, we will erect poles of economic development in poverty-stricken zones, and will bring to reality the multiple activities which the full integration of the Indian communities in our national society may require. By attacking regional inequality we shall stop the exodus of the farm worker to urban areas and avoid unemployment. The reallocation of population, when this is inevitable, shall be carried out in a thoroughly planned and organized manner.

The indestructible solidarity in the common destiny is such that in this age no Mexican is alien to the fate of another Mexican, no matter how distant they may be. Either the benefits of progress are available to all, or there is no real progress.

Our general goal, based on numerous specific goals, is that the rate of annual growth shall not be less than 6 percent and the increase in annual per capita income be the highest possible.

Economic planning must begin with public financing. The three sectors which constitute the mixed economy of Mexico: public, private, and social, must operate coordinately and in a complementary manner avoiding conflict and interference.

I must repeat, once again, that public investment neither competes with private investment nor does it intend to supplant it. It substitutes it in basic resources, expressly reserved by the Constitution, or when private initiative does not want or cannot or does not know how to participate in fields in which the country needs investment. There is a vast field in Mexico for both types of investment and we still need more and better private initiative, and more and better public initiative.

Nothing needs unity as much as government, because government can be defined as unity of purpose.

More than in the creation of new governmental agencies I put my trust in unity of action and of thought, in the coordination between the diverse organs in order to serve the people more efficiently within our system of government.

We will counteract any tendency toward raising the cost of living, trying to avoid irritating and negative deflationary measures.

The preservation of monetary stability within our traditional free exchange, expanding at the same time our economic activity, requires a delicate financial policy which, without departing from a balanced budget and maintaining a circulation of currency in accordance with the production of goods and services and their exchange, may broaden the credit allotted to production and reduce that which is channeled to speculation. The selective orientation of credit applied simultaneously with vigor and flexibility, plays a decisive role in this respect.

Only for productive and self-liquidating investments, shall we use foreign credit, adhering strictly and at the same time to our capacity to pay.

It is up to our farm production to meet the growing demand for food. If the supply of food does not augment in the proportion required by the increase in the per capita income, this would be canceled by the rise in prices. Furthermore, farm production must supply raw material to industry and contribute to finance national economic progress.

We will stimulate the yield of our soil, we shall promote export of our products and we shall defend to the utmost their international price.

The greatest possible amount of financial resources shall be channeled to the rural sector, and we will encourage the participation of private banking.

The natural resources of Mexico sustain our economic development. The exploitation of the nonrenewable must be carried out in the benefit of the nation by creating with them riches and permanent sources of employment. The rational exploitation of the nonrenewable helps to create important industries and insures the supply of raw materials for the future.

A poorly exploited forest means dilapidation of resources and breaks down an important defense against erosion. A rational forest policy is in order * * * one that will neither result in sterile conservation nor in merciless exploitation.

Six million Mexicans, half of the working force of the nation, toil in the fields. For their benefit and that of the country we will carry agrarian reform to its ultimate conclusion: we will accelerate the distribution of land until that which is available is exhausted; all simulations, concealment and whatever other forms of violations of the law, will disappear, for outside of or against the law one can only live for a relatively short period of time, but never indefinitely; we will also be systematically against preversion in distribution, such as the concentration of land grants to farmworkers or the illegal subletting; we will insure the peaceful enjoyment of communal lands by the people and we shall provide ample guarantees to the authentic small property owners.

The agrarian problem is not only physical, but fundamentally human: population grows faster than the land that we can put at the disposal of the farmworkers. To complement this we must face the urgency of giving employment to the people who come to the cities because they no longer earn a living in the fields. We will not fool the farm laborer. Those to whom it is impossible to

grant lands shall honestly and quickly be told so.

Granting of land is not enough to solve the agrarian problem: we know that the implements available in the majority of the "ejidos" are inadequate, that they not only require credit for sowing, but also to form, if only gradually, the necessary equipment to obtain better fields, as well as the acquisition of the knowledge that will make them better citizens and better farmers.

As far as possible, we will take to the fields the economic elements and the necessary technical and scientific efforts. The main thing is to make the land produce more and to accelerate the process of industrialization of its products.

The fields have contributed without reserve and in a basic manner to industrial development; today, industry must contribute to resolve the problems of the fields.

These questions are intimately related to the economic and social growth of the nation.

To conquer them we will meet new problems with courage and will not fear the solutions which some of them are urgently demanding.

Mexico, through it agrarian reform, foresaw, by many years, the international recommendations which today qualify it as a previous requirement for economic development.

Agrarian reform is on the march and it will continue forward until it is integral.

Speeding up of our economy warrants a decisive policy of public works. We must continue small, medium, and large irrigation projects; we must complete our national communications network with new highways and roads to transport food and encourage trade; we must complete the rehabilitation of our railways; we must adapt and build ports which are close to important commercial zones, we must improve our own highway transportation system and consolidate our national merchant marine.

Without basically balanced and integrated industries our industrial progress will be precarious. We will contribute toward realization of its expansion plans by coordinating private initiative with that of the state.

As refers to basic state industry, primarily with regard to oil and electricity, we will stimulate expansion that will anticipate demand and foster other economic development. Integration of the petrochemical industry will permit us, within a short time, to have a diversified chemical industry. Basic petrochemistry constitutes a national industry.

The industrial movement of Mexico must be at the service of Mexico, but this is not so when it enriches a few but impoverishes many through persistent low productivity, through poor localization, through low wages and through exorbitant profits or high prices.

We will try to avoid industrial deformations which translate themselves into increasing pressures which affect prices, aggravating natural inflationary tendencies.

An adequate highway and transportation system will provide the smoother flow which is required by the interchange of commerce and transportation of people. In like manner, it is the basis of the promotion of foreign commerce and for obtaining new levels of national and international tourism.

In international tourism we not only see an important source of foreign currencies, but also a means of bringing our peoples closer together in order to attain a better understanding among men; the type of understanding which is so urgently needed in the world in which we live.

Work should enhance the dignity of the individual and not depress it. We shall fight against necessity which reduces freedom. No Mexican should become so strong, and let us reiterate this, that he may oppress another—nor so weak that he may see himself oppressed by his equal.

The right of association in a union and the right to strike constitute inviolable guarantees. The conscience which the labor movement has derived from its own strength reaffirms the rights of a union when they are exercised in a responsible manner toward aims of revindication, improvement and solidarity, which have been assigned by law.

A sense of security in one's work, adequate wages, social security, profit sharing, all are instruments whose purpose it is to raise consistently the standard of living for the worker.

The extension of social security, the improvement of fringe benefits and the inclusion of others, shall be the permanent objective of the Government. We intend that social welfare reach the largest possible number of Mexicans. We must coordinate the work of the different organisms of social security and branches of public health in order to avoid duplicity of effort and investment. Hospitals, clinics, sanatoriums, and dispensaries must cover the country as sole and interwoven network of services that will convert into a practical possibility the right of the Mexican to combat disease with the help of science.

We will take particular care in extending preventative medicine, the basis of which is environmental health. Demographic growth and industrialization present a deficit with regard to housing which has not been met despite governmental zeal. The necessities are great and force us to avoid dispersion and disorder. We will systematize the work of the different organisms which are directly or indirectly concerned with the policy of popular housing seeking not only to build new units, but also to condition and improve those which do not fill the minimum requirements.

We will establish a plan of social credit for the construction and improvement of popular housing. We have the support of the construction industry, the organs of social security, and private as well as national banking.

The construction industry must modernize itself from its foundations, with a tendency toward reducing costs.

The direction of our education is founded in history and moves toward the future. Mere teaching is not education. Education is teaching with ethical, historical, and social content. It does not end in the schoolroom; for there, only the basis is set to develop in harmony all of the faculties of the human beings and to install in him, at the same time, the love of country and the conscience of international solidarity based on independence and justice.

Equal opportunities for all Mexicans, in accordance with their vocation and aptitude is the supreme goal of our social development and this requires an educational system that will relentlessly attack ignorance, starting with illiteracy.

Elementary, medium, and higher education nourish each other and it is not possible to advance in one if we hold back in another. Their vigorization, by elevating and extending them harmoniously, is the unavoidable duty of all Mexicans.

The centers of higher culture, universities, normal, polytechnic and technological schools will receive constant support.

Our people demand even greater learning of greater education. Our educational needs have no boundaries; and our efforts must be in accordance with those unlimited necessities.

Therefore, the budgets for education will show increase in a sustained manner to provide the tools, from free text books, to higher education and investigation, limited only by the possibilities of the country and the necessary equilibrium between the investment for economic development and intellectual investment.

We concede special importance to the educational forces that operate outside the school in a direct and tenacious manner, creating opinions, preferential systems, and styles of conduct. We will try to utilize them adequately by means of coordinating the resources which science and modern techniques placed at the service of human culture. As important as the scholastic work is that of cultural diffusion.

We do not exclude private participation in educational endeavors; it can and must be augmented when it is adjusted to our constitutional concepts and national programs, and concurs with a sense of service and not one of profit only.

The resources which industry may devote to technological research, to professional formation and to the training of laborers will contribute to national prosperity and development of industry itself.

Education channeled toward productive work is vital to modern Mexico. We must rapidly prepare all our personnel, from the high-ranking scientist to the semiqualified laborer that Mexico demands. The need for hand labor of a higher level grows faster than the number of qualified laborers. We will connect educational planning with employment policy in an effort to balance supply and demand of qualified and semiqualified labor forces.

I ask for unanimous cooperation and, particularly, from those who participate in the gigantic task of national education, so that we may increase our intellectual investment as well as its benefits. Our people have such an urgency for education that it must be considered as a crime against the country if there is any educational decline derived from the lack of discipline, negligence, discord, loss or waste of resources, energy or time.

The colossal job that it is, national education cannot wait nor be delayed one hour, not even one moment which rightly should be devoted to it; no pretext is valid before the people to interfere with or reduce the efficiency of educational work which requires love, emotion, and constant dedication.

The outstanding fact in international affairs is that the postwar period is over. The world is on the threshold of a new historic era whose characteristics cannot yet be precisely defined; but we can venture that they will be different from those of the immediate past.

Naturally, the spectacular conquest of man in the infinitely great, such as outer space, and in the amazing minuteness of the atom, gives the impression that the borderline between the possible and the impossible has been erased. It now seems that everything is possible, or will be very shortly. This is perhaps one of the reasons which explain the impatience of those who for centuries suffered and waited and that is bringing them much closer together than any of the ideologies which were willed to us by the 19th century.

The mere fact that we live in these fascinating moments of human history signifies an immense responsibility, greater still if one occupies a position of command.

My voice is that of a typical Mexican, like many other Mexicans; however, the vote fully expressed by my people makes me the voice of Mexico. I wish that the message carried by that voice be one of optimism and harmony; but I want it to carry also my appeal to all peoples, and very specially to those whose greater power invests them with greater responsibilities so that they may use that power in a joint struggle or at least use it in a parallel manner, against the enemies or mankind: poverty, ignorance, sickness, insecurity, injustice, bellicose fanaticism, all of which are sterile remnants of a world which has already ceased to exist. Why is it that if man has achieved such spectacular victories in technology and in science, how

can one conceive that he cannot advance in that which is political, economical, or social.

The most elevated idealism as well as the most elementary commonsense inspires one to defend peace because today peace is a requisite for the survival of man. To want peace is to fight against the conditions that make war possible. We are partisans of disarmament starting with denuclearization. We hold that peace can only be guaranteed in the measure in which objective conditions are created which will make all peoples join in its consolidation.

We must repeat that peace is not only the absence of war, but effective cooperation between nations to face the ancestral problems which have afflicted man in all latitudes. Only by means of a great conjunction of efforts can we firmly establish the basis for a true peace, which even then, shall require bold and permanent efforts to maintain it in its true sense.

Mexican international policy is determined by essential principles, and not by whims or arbitrary attitudes of men, for we are perishable. It is the product of our struggling history and a result of our unrelinquishable experience. It nourishes on old ideals and is implemented in accordance to principles of permanent validity. In a world such as that of our times, of fast changes, our international policy is, and must also continue to be, an instrument to serve the integral development of the community.

Mexico projects itself, in the panorama of our era as a nation that confirms, each day with greater vigor, its independence. It is, nevertheless, an independence which is conscious that no country, rich or poor, big or small, weak or powerful, can live isolated. This conviction, together with the cordial and open spirit of the Mexican, leads us to offer and desire the friendship with all the peoples of the world, understanding as friendship that sentiment that begins by respecting the integrity and dignity of the friend, that insists in understanding him, in order to serve him better. It is the noblest bond that can unite men.

Our ambition is that the individual may decide his own destiny in society, and that each community, based on that right, freely reach its own destiny.

Nonintervention and the right of self-determination are principles that we have maintained invariably for more than a century.

We were born in an era of anticolonialism and in the past we suffered invasions, aggressions, and interventions. Therefore, it is the essence of our nationality to condemn any preeminence of one country over another, no matter where it comes from or the form or shape it takes.

Reason and right tell us that among men, as among peoples, there is no conflict that cannot be solved by peaceful means. We feel we have a special responsibility to fight for this principle in inter-American relations.

When the mighty bows before justice, his attitude does not diminish or debase him, rather it honors and ennobles him; as for the weak, law has always been his best shield.

In moments in which the world shortens its distance, but enlarges its problems, national and international solidarity must be made stronger and tighter.

We are firmly convinced that peace and international cooperation need efficient operation and vigorization of the general and specialized international organs, such as the United Nations and the regional inter-American agencies. We will not deny them our support.

When Mexico proposes a policy of independence for itself, we are thinking of the full independence of all nations, so from their participation, voluntarily agreed to be nations equal and free, authentic international solidarity will be born.

We have developed, and continue to develop, thanks mainly to our own efforts, although we recognize the cooperation that we have honorably received. We believe we have good reason to state that in vast regions of the world, and of course some in our own hemisphere, there are countries that need foreign aid much more than others, and have a right to receive it through procedures respectful of their dignity, sovereignty, and way of being.

If in the domestic sphere it was possible to check many injustices through systems such as social security, minimum wages, and guaranteed prices, there is no reason why in the international sphere, and specifically in the regulation of trade and financial cooperation, a moral conscience of justice, human solidarity would also be a healthy foresight. We cannot avoid the growth of the distance between the well-being of the few, in the face of the poverty of the many, if only these latter are willing to work toward that end. We know that, fundamentally, not even well-being or happiness comes to anyone from the outside.

We will continue to make efforts so that specially in the vital orbit of foreign trade, cooperation will turn into formulas that combine equity and efficiency.

Mexico desires peace for all the world; it wants the friendship of all peoples, but obviously stronger and warmer, with the nations that constitute the hemispheric community.

To our immediate neighbors, north and south, we reiterate the decided will to make our relations with them an example of a cordial and constructive way of living together.

The Punta del Este Charter gave the solemnity of a hemispheric obligation to goals that for a long time guided the efforts of the Mexican people, in the noblest of their struggles.

It leaves to each country the responsibility of planning and guiding its progress; but makes social justice a condition of it, and adopts cooperation as a supplementary instrument, although indispensable, in the noble, long and difficult task of raising the standard of living that is so disheartenigly low in many rural areas of the Americas.

It is unfair to Mexico to be pointed at as wishful of turning into the leader of Latin America. We do not seek this nor do we desire it. Within the Latin American community Mexico could go, according to circumstances, ahead or behind, or in a middle position, in some aspects of our life; but it aspires only to be just another member in the group that joins its efforts for the common improvement.

What Mexico wholeheartedly wishes is to be a brother to its brothers of Latin America.

Congressmen, Senators, Justices of the Supreme Court: In our past, there is a long historical process to guard and to cherish, and a dreamed-of tomorrow to be fulfilled.

History, to be real history, must tend to close disputes that belong to the past and not revive old rancors; for history to be noble, it must be an efficient instrument of present harmony on which to base a fruitful effort, capable of creating a better future.

The use of the best of our past should be the premise and prize of the tasks that the country demands. Our continued path gives us, with the insurgents, an unwavering will for independence; with the Reform, an imperishable will for freedom; with the revolution, a nonvariant will for social justice.

Overcoming apparent contradictions, we must link permanently these three wills in order to fulfill the destinies of Mexico.

The souls of our illustrious dead watch over us in our struggle; they have never abandoned us; but under their guidance, the Mexicans, all of us, must make efforts, each day, not only in the free exercise of our rights, but also in the strict fulfillment of our duties.

The Mexican woman is with us in this undertaking. Her decorum, delicateness, her exceptional qualities, have given dignity and nobility to political activities. Her tenderness, that traditionally she kept only for her home, is projected now toward the vast limits of the country.

New generations emerge to national life. The young receive, every day, opportunities to become better prepared; they are therefore each day more indebted to the nation, obliged to fight for a great cause, a just and pure cause: the cause of Mexico. In the joint efforts, we can count on Mexican youth, with their constantly renewed vigor for the struggles, full of generosity and gallantry that the country may require; confident that they will always know how to defend the noble banners of peace, equality, security, and justice.

A fruitful period of Mexican history ends. President Lopez Mateos increased our spiritual and physical patrimony: he enlarged our country in all orders; he took Mexico to the world, with its ideas and hopes of universal brotherhood; he was concerned for the fate of all Mexicans, within the concert of the great family formed by mankind. Today I receive from his hands the spotless flag of Mexico.

Power, simply as power, lacks attraction. What is more, it leads to a lessening of the person that intends to use it in such a sterile manner, and in a moral breakdown of the people unfortunate enough to suffer him.

Power is responsibility, the gravest, the most relentless of all responsibilities; it implies total dedication, the most absolute surrender of oneself.

I called for the vote of the Mexican people knowing that electoral victory would entail that responsibility to my people, the most sacred responsibility of my entire life, determined to fulfill it to the utmost limit of my strength.

A man, however, even if inflamed with the most fervent passion for his country, and invested with the highest republican representation, needs the assistance of all his compatriots to give direction and true range to his country. The mandatary, that is, he who responds to the mandate of the community, receives with the free expression of the will of the people, the strength that supports his action, and never the other way around. The mandatary, as I see it, must be a servant: he who serves, he who watches over, he who guards, he who caters to the common well-being. The great Morelos wished to be called "Servant of the people," when he was offered the title of generalissimo.

Those who have accepted to share the tasks of the executive power know with me that we are Mexicans equal to the rest and we are not different from our compatriots except in that we have greater responsibilities and a greater obligation to serve, because that is precisely what we are: servants of the people. And we must be so without arrogance, without disappointments, with loyalty, with efficiency, with honesty as a standard and not as a merit, and expecting, as our only real compensation, the satisfaction of having done our duty.

As for me, I put my seal on this great obligation: all interests which are genuinely Mexican shall be sacred to me. I shall watch so that nothing or no one will diminish them. And by genuinely Mexican I understand that which has the warmth of Mexico, that which places the supreme interest of Mexico above any other interest, that which moves man, woman and child to passionately love Mexico.

From the very heart of the Mexican people I come and to them I must return; they gave inspiration and sense to my life; they are my only comfort and my only strength;

they have given me great and undeserved honors, and in my hands they have confidently deposited their hope. I give myself fully to the task of understanding, obeying and serving my people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to pay my respects to the work that has been done by the Senator from Montana in improving our relationships with the Republic of Mexico—not that the Republic of Mexico was not friendly to the United States to begin with. But the work that has been done by the Senator from Montana, and also by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has added materially to the mutual esteem which now prevails between the two countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont. The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has had much to do with bringing about a better understanding and a better respect between our two nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to take a moment to express deep appreciation to the Senator from Montana for the able leadership that he provided as the head of our delegation to Mexico at the time of the inauguration, recently, of the new President of Mexico. Over the years, the Senator from Montana has been one of the very best friends that Mexico has had in the U.S. Senate. In carrying out that service, he has also performed a great service for the people of the United States in helping to strengthen United States-Mexican relations.

I share the high opinion of the new President of Mexico, expressed by the Senator from Montana. One need only read the inaugural address, which the Senator from Montana has just placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to obtain adequate support of my high appraisal of the new President of Mexico.

Next month, the month of February, we shall again have our annual Inter-Parliamentary Conference between representatives of the Congress of the United States and the Congress of Mexico. It will be held this year in Mexico. A good many of the problems that exist between the two countries, problems referred to by the Senator from Montana and also referred to in the briefing this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, will be taken up at that Conference. As the Senator from Montana and all other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations know, these annual conferences at the parliamentary level have undoubtedly produced good results in strengthening relationships between Mexico and the United States. Our water problems, our salinization problems, our border problems, and even some of our migratory labor problems have been helped very much in the reaching of a better solution as a result of parliamentarians getting together.

I commend my leader for the great work that he has done in strengthening relations between the peoples of these two great Republics.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Public Law 86–1, the Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee, vice the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of December, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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 for the Forest Service for "Forest protection and utilization" for the fiscal year 1965 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF ADMIRALTY CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE GOLD STAR LAPEL BUTTONS FOR NEXT OF KIN OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PAYMENT OF INCENTIVE PAY FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN DUTIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 147, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN TELEPHONE FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF SPECIAL ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1964, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF (CORPUS CHRISTI OFFSHORE WARNING AREA)

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON QUALITY OF WATER, COLORADO RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report on quality of water, Colorado River Basin, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR INTERFERENCE WITH DEFENSE SECURITY SYSTEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPT. TED M. RICHARDSON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that department, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEWIS H. NELSON III

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERENCE J. O'DONNELL, THOMAS P. WILCOX, AND CLIFFORD M. SPRINGBERG

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON APPROVAL OF PETITIONS TO ACCORD FIRST PREFERENCE STATUS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on approval of petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES, CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries, Civil Service Retirement System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28—STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the Congress found in said act that "In the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources"; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation, causing untold damage to public and private property; and

Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property exceeded $100 million; and

Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods has caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

Whereas much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas it appears timely for the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to renew the request for action in this regard previously made by Joint Resolution 5 of the 1962 legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

2. The secretary of state shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

ROBERT M. FALERY,
Acting Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile;

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Laos;

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Rumania;

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Liberia; and

Antonio Certosimo, of Arizona, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 364. A bill for the relief of Pericles Ioanis Zombolas;

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Storino;

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Maria Papakonstantinou; and

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Kiriakos Delalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 368. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Philip R. Codd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 370. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nations' elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Zofia Walasek and her daughter, Barbara Walasek;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra;

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta;

S. 374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez); and

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 376. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of certain bread; and

S. 377. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the Trust Funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 378. A bill for the relief of Luka Pecarina;

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Mitar Damjanovic; and

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Vukota Vukadinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Roy O. Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 382. A bill for the relief of Canelos Roditis;

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Ejnar Christen Pedersen;

S. 384. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Van Vures;

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali Ziarati Hameli;

S. 386. A bill for the relief of Lena Woo Djeu and Vung-Shung Djeu (also known as Victor Djeu);

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Kuntic and Ivan Kuntic;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chong Hyok Un; and

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Teresa Marangon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 390. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 391. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Dr. Salwan Baban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Lim Wey Nan John (or John Wey Nan Lim), and Maude Lim (or Lim Wang Maude Luella); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Alexa Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 395. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal financial assistance for establishing and maintaining State programs of voluntary health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 396. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; and

S. 397. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 398. A bill to authorize extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increase the limit on annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20,000,000; and

S. 399. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 400. A bill to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 401. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant relief concerning an oil and gas lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain persons who were employed by the L. L. Constantin Electronics Corporation;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Gizella Bruder; and

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas, Vera Nahas, Albert Gabriel Nahas, and Frederika-Maria Nahas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 406. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on polyethylene imine; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 407. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 408. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Jakob Blagaich (also known as Jakov Blagaic);

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Regidor Nava Aguirre (also known as Felipe Capulong);

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Vito Portuese and his sisters, Maria Portuese and Maddalena Portuese;

S. 413. A bill for the relief of Felipa Quintero Sanchez;

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Ruiz Coronado (also known as Francisco Ojeba); and

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Roberto Biteranta Mejorada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); and

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Laura Poblete Carbonell;

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Duk Koh; and

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 421. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; and

S. 422. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 423. A bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 424. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in the State of Utah to the Cerebral Palsy Center for Multiple Handicapped, Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 425. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduce the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 426. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 427. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico); and

S. 428. A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda water range); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Khachik H. Tatian;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; and

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Behjat Bakshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 432. A bill to establish the office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Juan Pablo Castano Zapata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 435. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 436. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 437. A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 438. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or

antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Samy Antoun Kassab, Geliana Antoun Kassab, Bader Antoun Kassab, Julet Antoun Kassab, and Adel Antoun Kassab;

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez;

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Amir H. Mehregan;

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Carleen Coen;

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Resan Rokad;

S. 444. A bill for the relief of Christina Zielinski (formerly Krystyna, Widz);

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scardina, his wife, Maria, and their children, Salvatore and Antonia;

S. 446. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife, Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen;

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Romeo D. Brion;

S. 448. A bill for the relief of Modesta Ogoy;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 450. A bill for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Dev Kumar Mojunder;

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Stakich; and

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Lee Hyang Na; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kum Soon Kim; and

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 457. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 458. A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces in the southeast Asia theater of operations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 459. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BAYH (for himsif and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 460. A bill authorizing construction of a deep-draft harbor by the State of Indiana on the shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Waterway, and assumption by the Federal Government of an appropriate part of the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 461. A bill to provide that the 12th day of October in each year, known as Columbus Day, shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Moise Negrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Simo Miskin; and

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Milorad Segrt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gertrudes Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 466. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 467. A bill authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 468. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A HISTORY OF THE PIMA INDIANS AND THE SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 22

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT CERTAIN CENSUSES OF THE TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO AND TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 23

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document excerpts from the decennial census of 1860 for Arizona County in the Territory of New Mexico, excerpts from the decennial Federal census of 1870 for the Territory of Arizona, together with excerpts from the Special Territorial Census of 1864 taken in Arizona under the authority of the Act of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 448).

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO MIGRATORY LABOR BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. RES. 24

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,105 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ARMING OF AMERICAN SERVICEMEN FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 25) expressing the sense of the Senate as to the arming of American servicemen fighting in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 26) to provide a code of ethics for Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

STRIP MINE RECLAMATION STUDY BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleagues, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

Strip and surface mining operations in many sections of our country, in recent years, have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep-shaft and other mining methods. While one might justifiably say this progress has been beneficial to our economy as a whole, nevertheless, we must face the fact that it also, in a majority of instances, has destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars. Plainly stating it, Mr. President, in many areas the land has been robbed of its resources and abandoned to the wrath of the elements. Time alone will not heal these wounds.

There are large areas in Ohio and other States where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened.

Mr. President, during my administration as Governor of Ohio, after many unsuccessful attempts, there was finally enacted a strip mine reclamation law requiring strip mine operators to restore the usefulness of the land by a degree of leveling of the spoil banks and planting of them in grasses and trees. While the law has been helpful in land restoration, I have always felt that it should have required more strict conservation measures. Faced with almost insurmountable opposition, it was the best that I could get.

While some other States have had some strip mining regulation laws enacted in recent years, there remain throughout the country thousands upon thousands of acres of pre-law spoil banks, which can, it is my belief, be converted to some useful purpose with a little help.

Strip and surface mining operations are no longer confined to the once-limited areas. These operations are spreading daily in many of the mineral producing States. With the cooperation of the several States and the Department of the Interior, as my bill provides, a very beneficial land use study would be made in order that the Congress could determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation.

During the 88th Congress, an identical bill received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 368) to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 368

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—

(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;

(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

(3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;

(4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;

(5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;

(6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;

(7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and

(8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A BILL TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY FIRE COMPANIES TO BE CLASSIFIED IN NONPROFIT CATEGORY OF POSTAL LAWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit volunteer fire companies to be classified in the nonprofit category of the postal laws.

At the present time religious, educational, philanthropic, labor, veterans, and fraternal organizations are able to use the nonprofit rate, which is approximately one-fourth the cost of the first-class rate.

Since the volunteer fire companies of this country render such an extremely valuable service to their communities, and since they operate almost exclusively on contributions received from public-spirited citizens, they certainly deserve to be permitted to send mail at the nonprofit rate.

These volunteer companies, I know from experience in Delaware, often use the mails both to report on company activities and to solicit funds.

A saving in their mailing costs would mean that this money could be put to use in providing better volunteer fire service to their communities.

I would like to thank my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, as well as Senator JOHNSTON, Senator BREWSTER, and Senator SCOTT for cosponsoring the bill with me. An identical bill I introduced during the last session was passed by the Senate on August 6, 1964.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 390) to permit voluntary fire companies to be classified in the nonprofit category of the postal laws was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators AIKEN, COTTON, MORTON, PROUTY, and SCOTT, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to assist States in improving the health care of individuals 65 years and over of low and moderate income by enabling them to obtain protection against the expenses of health services.

This is a subject of concern to all of us and one to which we in the Congress shall be devoting our attention in the months ahead. Soon 20 million Americans will be 65 years of age or older. Rising medical costs, reduced incomes, and the increased medical services which older people require combine to create a situation in which many of our aged

citizens cannot afford to pay for the help they need.

The number of Americans participating in private health plans is rising steadily and this is a trend which is commendable. The passage of the Kerr-Mills Act by Congress in 1960 was also a step forward. Directed toward helping the medically indigent, programs under the act are in operation in 40 States and 4 other jurisdictions and have been authorized in 3 additional States. Massachusetts, I am pleased to say, was among the first to implement Kerr-Mills and has a program which is considered an excellent one. Other States are adjusting their programs so that they will meet the needs of their people more adequately. At least 15 have liberalized eligibility requirements since implementing Kerr-Mills, and a like number have increased program benefits. But there is evidence that, to date at least, the Kerr-Mills Act has not proved sufficient to meet the need which exists.

There has been criticism that the act as implemented in some States imposes burdensome means test requirements, and excludes certain individuals who need assistance in meeting their medical costs. In my opinion this criticism is generally justified.

We have medical aid for the aged today. What we want to do is to improve its quality, to extend the number of people eligible to receive assistance, and to soften the sometimes onerous requirements which must be met before eligibility is established. At the same time, I personally believe a program that is voluntary and administered locally as far as possible is wiser and in the end more helpful than one administered and controlled from Washington. I believe, too, that ability to pay as well as age should influence eligibility, and I lean to the view that financing the program from general revenue is more equitable than levying a payroll tax or adding its cost to social security. Obviously the method of financing determines on which group in our society the burden of the cost will fall. Unlike the graduated income tax—general revenue approach—which taxes persons according to their ability to pay, the payroll tax which has been proposed by some would require a person earning $5,200 a year to pay as much as a person earning $52,000 annually. We want to make sure that in any changes in the law we are helping our aged and not handicapping all of our fellow citizens.

There are, of course, many approaches to the goal which we all seek: meeting the health care needs of our older citizens and meeting them with dignity and in an equitable manner. A number of suggestions have already been advanced. My colleagues and I offer this proposal for the consideration of Congress. We do so in the belief that its main features are desirable ingredients of a national health care for the aged program. We recognize that the problem is a complicated one which defies simple solutions, and we join with many others in the search for the most helpful and wise approach. Further careful analysis of our bill may lead to refinements of some of its provisions. I note, for example, that within the past year advocates of the payroll tax approach have decided to authorize an association of private insurance carriers to sell policies covering health costs not included under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws. This and other recent changes represent an improvement in that method.

We offer the bill as a serious effort to meet the problem which exists. Briefly stated, the major features of the bill are as follows:

First. It is a voluntary program financed with general revenues and not one based on compulsory social security financing.

Second. It involves Federal-State matching and State administration.

Third. It builds upon Kerr-Mills rather than replaces it, since one requirement of State participation in this program is that it have a Kerr-Mills program in effect.

Fourth. It extends benefits to individuals who are not eligible for assistance under Kerr-Mills, and also provides an alternative to Kerr-Mills enrollees.

Fifth. It offers a choice of three actuarily equivalent plans so that participants can select the one which best meets their specific needs.

Sixth. It includes a private insurance policy option.

Seventh. It involves contributions by individual enrollees based on their income.

Eighth. It avoids the undesirable features of a means test, yet by establishing an income limitation on eligibility it excludes individuals fully able to meet their own medical costs.

Participation in this program would be open to individuals of 65 years of age or over who are not recipients of old age assistance or other Federal public assistance programs, excluding Kerr-Mills enrollees. The income limitation for single people is $3,000 and for married couples a combined income of $6,000 is permitted. Individuals would be required to pay an enrollment fee which would vary with income. The minimum enrollment fee would be $10 annually and would apply to individuals receiving $1,000 or less in income. For persons with income in excess of $1,000, the fee would be as follows:

Income of individual	*Amount of enrollment fee*
More than $1,000 but not more than $1,500	$10 plus 2½ percent of income in excess of $1,000.
More than $1,500 but not more than $2,000	$22.50 plus 3½ percent of income in excess of $1,500.
More than $2,000 but not more than $2,500	$40 plus 7 percent of income in excess of $2,000.
More than $2,500 but not more than $3,000	$75 plus 9 percent of income in excess of $2,500.

Under the terms of this bill three options are available to individuals:

First. A preventive diagnostic, short-term program which would provide as a minimum:

(a) Twenty-one days of inpatient hospital services which include physician, nursing, and intern services as well as laboratory and X-ray services, ambulatory services, drugs, and appliances related to care and treatment.

(b) Sixty-three days of skilled nursing home care. State plan can provide more. However, the number of days for which participants will have the costs of inpatient hospital services paid shall be reduced by 1 for each 3 days he receives skilled nursing home care.

(c) Surgical services provided in a hospital.

(d) Physicians' services for 12 days outside a hospital.

(e) One hundred dollars of ambulatory, diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services rendered outside a hospital or nursing home.

The State may include additional health services if it wishes to do so.

Second. A long-term major illness program which would provide as a minimum:

(a) One hundred and twenty days of inpatient hospital services.

(b) Skilled nursing home care.

(c) Prescribed drugs.

(d) Diagnostic laboratory services—including X-ray—not exceeding $200.

(e) Outpatient hospital services.

(f) Physicians' services including surgery.

Under this option, the State may also include additional health services if it so desires.

Payment would be made for not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of above costs in excess of $50 during an enrollment year.

Third. Private insurance policy program: Instead of enrolling in the short-term or long-term program, an individual may elect to receive a certificate to be used in assisting him to defray the premium costs of a qualified private health insurance policy of which he is a beneficiary. The total payment cannot exceed an amount equal to the amount of the actuarial value of the short-term and long-term programs minus the enrollment fee persons would pay under either short-term or long-term programs. Such private health insurance policy would have to provide health benefits having an actuarial value at least equal to that of the benefits provided by either the short-term or long-term program.

Federal participation in State program costs would consist of grants of 50 percent of State administrative costs and from 60 to 80 percent of other costs—exclusive of enrollment fee receipts—depending on a State's per capita income, up to a maximum Federal contribution of $150 per enrollee.

A single State agency would be designated to administer the program. If it desires to do so, a State could utilize, through agreements or contracts with voluntary private organizations, the services of such organizations in the

administration of one or more health benefits programs under the State plan.

An Advisory Council on Health Care Benefits for the Aged would be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Secretary on matters relating to general policies and administration. It would consist of 12 members appointed by the Secretary for 4-year terms—4 from among representatives of various State or local government agencies concerned with the provision of health care or insurance against the costs thereof, 4 from among nongovernmental persons concerned with the provision of such care or with such insurance, and 4 persons from the general public to represent consumers of health care—and 2 ex officio members, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Social Security.

Cost: Based on an estimated 80 percent participation of the 13.8 million persons eligible for the first year of the program, Robert J. Myers, chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, estimated that the cost to the Federal Government would be $1,315 million. States would contribute another $710 million while the amount received from enrollment fees would be approximately $285 million.

In my State of Massachusetts there are nearly a half million individuals 65 or over who would be eligible for this program. If 80 percent of these participated, 360,000 persons would be enrolled.

Mr. Myers estimated that it would cost Massachusetts $29.8 million for the program with another $44.6 million as the Federal contribution. Enrollment fees could be expected to raise another $11.8 million, bringing the total cost in Massachusetts to about $86.2 million.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, my colleagues and I offer this proposal for consideration because we believe it represents a sound approach to the important problem of assisting our older citizens to obtain the health care they need. We hope that it will be considered carefully.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 395) to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal financial assistance for establishing and maintaining State programs of voluntary health insurance for the aged, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AUTHORITY UNDER AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT TO RENDER ASSISTANCE TO STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain areas and ask that it remain at the desk for 7 days to allow any Senators who desire to do so to cosponsor it. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire, and the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 400) to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship, introduced by Mr. MCINTYRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"To assist in the economic readjustment of, and to provide new employment opportunities in, certain areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship, the Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States in which he determines that a natural disaster, or the loss, removal, or closing of a major source of employment (including the closing of military installations), has caused, or is about to cause, an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment or underemployment of such magnitude that the area can reasonably be expected to become eligible for designation under the other provisions of this subsection, or under subsection (b), within two years unless the authority conferred by this paragraph is exercised."

Mr. McINTYRE. The bill is designed to help remedy a situation which has existed for a number of years and which has dramatically revealed itself in the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense relating to the closing down of military installations throughout the country.

In brief, the bill provides that area redevelopment assistance shall be available to those areas of the Nation which, although they do not presently meet the requirements for such assistance, can reasonably be expected to meet the requirements within 2 years as the result of a recent, or a pending, removal of a major source of employment.

This situation could follow the closing down of a major military installation, the departure of a privately owned industry, or a natural disaster which resulted in severe underemployment.

Enactment of this bill would provide a permanent standby authority for the Department of Commerce to extend immediate aid in situations such as the phasing out of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, the closing of the Studebaker plant in South Bend, or the Alaskan earthquakes. Available aid, of course, would be in the form of regular ARA grants and loans, 4-percent SBA loans, and increased funds for urban planning and urban renewal grants, among others.

FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the past two Congresses I have introduced proposed legislation authorizing a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of a possible Federal flood insurance program. In both cases the proposed legislation was endorsed by the administration and passed by the Senate but not enacted into law.

Yet each year the need for such a study has become more urgent. My interest in this problem resulted from the 1962 storms which ravaged the coast of New Jersey and other northeastern States. Now, as we have seen, even more tragic floods have devastated our western coastal States in the closing days of 1964.

It is imperative that we delay no longer in seeking a solution to the crushing economic burdens and hardships suffered by the victims of such disasters. I am therefore introducing this essential measure again, as my first bill of the 89th Congress, and I am pleased that Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, COOPER, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH have joined as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table through the close of business on January 19 to give other interested Senators the opportunity for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk until January 19, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 408) to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. For many generations, the Federal Government has accepted the responsibility for action in cases of floods and other disasters. This has sometimes taken the form of relief for the victims, and in other cases has involved financial assistance for the construction of flood control works. But the sad fact is that despite such assistance we have not attacked the basic problem. We have been swatting flies instead of draining the swamp.

As soon as there is a flood disaster, there is a scramble to have the location declared a disaster area so that inexpensive Federal loans can be made available to permit businessmen to reestablish themselves. But neither the language of the Small Business Administration Act nor the amount of money available under it is liberal enough to permit the average farmer or homeowner to obtain relief. What is needed is some way for the victims of flood disaster to obtain protection at a reasonable rate which would forestall economic disaster.

Mr. President, hearings on this legislation in the past have clearly developed the fact that the cost of flood insurance for crops, buildings, beaches, and other property is beyond the reach of almost everyone. In the case of insurance policies for coastal areas, for example, generally only wind damage is covered. Even if it has been possible to obtain the always extremely expensive flood coverage,

there is considerable dispute over whether the damage was caused by floodwaters or wind.

The problem was vividly described in a Wall Street Journal article of December 29, 1964, on the recent tragic floods on our west coast. It reports that the spokesman for a northern California lumber company which may suffer up to $10 million in damage stated his company has "absolutely zero" insurance, and that this is also the case with all lumber operations in the Eel River Canyon where the cost of insurance is prohibitive precisely because of the flood danger. The article further reports that the damages resulting from the terrible floods in Oregon and California are nearing $1 billion.

Flood losses, moreover, affect not only individuals directly involved but all the taxpayers of flooded communities, for often a great deal of publicly owned land is inundated.

In Asbury Park, N.J., for example, the taxpayers faced $1,500,000 in damage to the estimated $15 million of public beachfront properties maintained by the city as a result of the northeast coastal storms of March 1962. Federal aid available to provide essential shore protective works was only a little over $250,000. Municipal taxpayers can no longer afford to carry this burden without some assistance. The State of New Jersey clearly recognized the magnitude of the problem, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the text of a joint resolution adopted by the State legislature on December 29, 1964, urging Congress to implement the Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this bill, in brief, would direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator to undertake a study of alternative programs to help provide financial assistance to victims of flood disasters. The study would be conducted in close cooperation with appropriate Federal departments, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Geological Survey, and the Weather Bureau. A report would be made to Congress which would include information on the feasibility of each program studied, estimates of costs to both the Federal Government and to property owners and the legal authority for State financial participation. The study would be submitted within 9 months from the enactment of the act or the appropriation of funds, whichever is greater.

As I have mentioned, the bill has always had the full support of the HHFA, the Small Business Administration, and the Budget Bureau, and in 1962 President Kennedy issued a statement endorsing it. It has also received the endorsement of the Council of State Governments, which for many years has been keenly interested in flood plain zoning and flood insurance.

Mr. President, we have already delayed too long in attacking this problem. We must not wait to express our concern until the floods come again to destroy homes and livelihoods. I urge early action on this measure to seek ways to permanently solve the problems.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the Congress found in said act that "In the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources"; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation causing untold damage to public and private property; and

Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property exceeded $100 million; and

Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods has caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

Whereas, much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced, or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas it appears timely for the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to renew the request for action in this regard previously made by Joint Resolution 5 of the 1962 legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

2. The secretary of state shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately

BILLS TO INCREASE ANNUITY PAYMENTS TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the American people in recent years have become increasingly aware of the desirability of attracting topflight people to Government service. One means to be used toward this end is sufficient salaries. Another is the promise of adequate retirement benefits.

Therefore I send to the desk two bills intended to raise retirement annuities to a more adequate level.

Mr. President, in addition to their importance in attracting the best qualified persons to Government service, adequate annuity payments are of course demanded by considerations of social justice. Consider the following facts:

Records of the Social Security Administration show that there are 23,000 annuitants who retired prior to 1948, when salaries were less than half what they are today and when the maximum annuity was only half of a person's pay.

The 164,000 persons who retired between 1948 and 1956 are receiving considerably smaller annuities than the 265,000 who retired after 1956.

As of 1963, out of 453,000 civil service employee annuitants, 124,000 were receiving less than $100 per month and 289,000 were drawing less than $200 per month.

Here is the most shocking part: Out of a total of 190,000 civil service survivor annuitants—widows—we were paying less than $100 per month to 153,000 in 1963.

The cost of living has increased 15 percent since 1955.

The only increase in civil service annuities during this period was limited to 5 percent. Civil service annuitants have fallen behind by 10 percent in their battle with inflation.

To end this situation I propose a 10-percent increase in each annuity up to $2,400 per year. This is not a large increase; it does not do full justice to the needs of the retired Federal employees. However, it is a constructive step that should be enacted at a very early date.

Also I propose that retirees electing a reduced annuity in order to provide an annuity for a surviving spouse not have their annuity reduced by the present 2½ percent of the first $3,600, but that they continue to pay for the provision of survivors annuities by a 10-percent reduction of any annuity over $3,600.

The second of the two bills which I am introducing deals with the fact that former employees who retired before 1956 still have annuity reductions up to 25 percent to provide survivor benefits for their spouses, while more recent retirees have much smaller deductions. To correct some of the inequities in the survivor annuities program, I propose to recompute all annuities of those retiring before October 11, 1962, to give the retirees the advantage of the more recent formula, and to bring up all survivor annuities to 55 percent of the annuity of the retiree.

Mr. President, I urge early consideration of these two bills which would go far toward increasing the quality of the Civil Service at the same time that they represent an act of social justice toward those directly affected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee

on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 421. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; and

S. 422. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement.

CONSTRUCTION OF A DAM AND RESERVOIR ON MILL CREEK, GRAND COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of a dam and reservoir at Mill Creek, in Grand County, Utah.

Mr. President, nothing holds greater promise for the future of the people of Utah than the full development of their slender water resources. Although the water outlook in my State of Utah is much better this year than it has been recently, we are still facing a water shortage.

The people of Grand County, Utah, are particularly anxious to adopt feasible means of conserving for beneficial use every drop of water which falls in their arid section of the State. Too much of this precious water is now being lost. Even in good water years, streams flood in the springtime, and during cloudbursts, destroy farms and homes, only to run completely dry by midsummer and fall.

At my request, the U.S. Corps of Engineers began a study, sometime ago, of Mill and Pack Creeks, in Grand County, which in the cloudburst season have been flooding into the basements and homes of some of the newer areas of the town of Moab, and destroying considerable property in this important county seat. In May of 1963, a public hearing was held in the courthouse there, and was attended by about 140 people, including representatives of the town of Moab, of Grand County, of agencies of the State of Utah, of Federal agencies, and a representative of General Frye, South Pacific division engineer, together with members of the district engineer's staff and the district engineer.

This hearing brought out very forcibly the interest of the people of the area in the construction in the Mill and Pack Creek Valleys of a multiple-purpose dam which would control floods, make water available for domestic and irrigation uses, and establish a recreation area around the dam. The people also indicated their desire for channel improvements on both Mill and Pack Creeks, within the city of Moab.

The engineers study is estimated to cost $225,000, and $115,000 has been allocated through fiscal year 1965. I realize that it will take some time to evaluate the studies already made, and to undertake the further investigations which will be necessary before it can be determined whether such a plan is economically justified. At the present rate of allocation it will be another 2 years before the study will be completed, but I am convinced that the Mill Creek and Pack Creek Valley has a potential of far greater water resource development than has yet been planned, and I want to do everything possible to move forward a multiple-purpose project. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill to authorize such a project, to be constructed by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, with appropriations of the necessary sums to be provided to carry the project out.

Comprehensive and coherent development of the area's water resources now, under a plan which is sound, and will, therefore, avoid costly modifications later on, is most important to the people of this rugged and beautiful section of Utah. Tourism is a growing industry. My Canyonlands National Park bill has now become law and Moab and Grand Counties are on the brink of a great economic development. This is the time to be preparing the area to cope with that future growth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 425) authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, three bills which I am introducing at the request of the Department of the Air Force. Each of these measures provides for the restriction of certain specified areas of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coasts of Florida and Texas for Defense Department and National Aeronautics and Space Administration purposes.

Approval by Congress of such restriction is required by Public Law 85–337.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of each of these bills and a letter of explanation concerning each signed by Secretary Zuckert appear in the body of the RECORD at this point so that interested persons may be informed of the proposed restriction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and letters of explanation relating to each will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 426. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the Outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343) for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of 10 years with an option to renew the restriction for an additional period of 5 years with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the restriction made by this subsection may be terminated, as to any or all of the area described in section 2 of this Act, at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of Interior.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of any restriction under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing.

(c) The right to enter the areas described in section 2 of this Act and to use them for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340), except that such authority shall be exercised only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

(e) Nothing contained in this Act shall impair or affect the application of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 10854 of November 27, 1959, in the airspace overlying the area described in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described as follows:

Beginning at a point latitude 29 degrees 25 minutes 18 seconds north, longitude 81 degrees 02 minutes 30 seconds west; thence on a curved line following an arc with a radius of 35 nautical miles from a center point located at latitude 28 degrees 53 minutes 00 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 47 minutes 30 seconds west, east and south to a point at latitude 29 degrees 08 minutes 48 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds west; thence on a straight line to a point at latitude 28 degrees 43 minutes 30 seconds north, longitude 70 degrees 57 minutes 18 seconds west; thence on a curved line following an arc with a radius of 35 nautical miles from the Cape Kennedy Lighthouse at latitude 28 degrees 27 minutes 36 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 32 minutes 37 seconds west; to the intersection of an arc having a 35 nautical mile radius from a point near Cape Canaveral harbor entrance located at latitude 28 degrees 25 minutes 00 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 35 minutes 18 seconds west; thence southwesterly along a line following the last described arc to a point at latitude 27 degrees 51 minutes 42 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 23 minutes 18 seconds west; thence northward along the line 3 nautical miles from mean low water (MLW), for a meander distance of approximately 104.27 nautical miles to the point of beginning, being latitude 29 degrees 25 minutes 18 seconds north, longitude 81 degrees 02 minutes 30 seconds west, containing approximately 2,630,000 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the eastern test range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–337, and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain lands, described in the attached draft, of the Outer Continental Shelf adjacent to the State of Florida in the vicinity of Cape Kennedy, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein. A letter of intent to continue the restriction of the utilization of the land and water areas has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

The installation involved is the eastern test range consisting of a land and water area of approximately 2,630,000 acres used by the Air Force for missile and space research and development. The utilization of areas by various agencies of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will prohibit exploitation of mineral resources.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved is currently in use by the Departments of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. There will be no change in Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

S. 427. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico):

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343) for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of five years with an option to renew the restriction for a period not exceeding five years upon the request of the Secretary of Defense and after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the restriction made by this subsection may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of any restriction under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing..

(c) The right to enter the areas described in section 2 of this Act to use them for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, grant mineral leases pursuant to the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343) and subject to such other terms and conditions as they shall agree upon within the area described by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described as follows:

Beginning at a point 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds west; thence southeast to 28 degrees 56 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 31 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 27 degrees 52 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 02 minutes 00 seconds west; thence meandering south southeast along the three marine league line to 27 degrees 15 minutes 00 seconds north, 82 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds west; thence south southeast to 26 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 82 degrees 17 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 25 degrees 45 minutes 15 seconds north, 82 degrees 07 minutes 00 seconds west; thence west to 25 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 27 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southwest to the 100 fathom curve being 25 degrees 13 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 19 minutes 15 seconds west; thence meandering along the said curve northerly, northeasterly, northerly, and northwesterly to 29 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds north, 86 degrees 48 minutes 00 seconds west; thence north to the three marine league line being 30 degrees 12 minutes 40 seconds north, 86 degrees 48 minutes 00 seconds west; thence meandering along said line of three marine leagues easterly, southeasterly, easterly, and northeasterly to 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 27 minutes 00 seconds west; thence east to point of beginning being 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds west, containing 24,328,601 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes." The areas involved constitute the gulf test range, Gulf of Mexico.

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain submerged lands, described in the attached draft, of the Outer Continental Shelf off the gulf coast of the State of Florida, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein.

The installation involved is a portion of the gulf test range constituting of approximately 24,328,601 acres of submerged land which is used by the Air Force and Navy in the testing and development of weapons systems and in the training of personnel.

The Air Force Systems Command and the Strategic Air Command conduct launching, scoring and impacting of missiles, space probes, and other weapons systems on the gulf test range. Air Defense and National Guard units deploy from all parts of the United States to Tyndall Air Force Base to use this overwater range for weapons delivery training and testing. The Tactical Air Command also fires ordnance on this range to maintain air crew proficiency in the operation of weapons systems.

Established air space warning areas W–151, W–470, W–168 and W–174, provide the necessary air space control to conduct testing and training on a safe and economical basis.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved is currently in use by the Department of the Air Force and there will be no change in the Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

S. 428. A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range):

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343), at the request of the Department of the Air Force, for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of three years with an option to renew the restriction for an additional period of three years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior. The restriction made by this subsection may be terminated, as to any or all of the area described in section 2 of this Act, at any time by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) This Act does not prohibit applications, under laws and regulations then existing, for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of the restriction made by this Act.

(c) The right to enter the area restricted by this Act and to use it for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) This Act does not limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340), except that the authority may be exercise within the area restricted by this Act only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is embraced in an area described as follows:

Beginning at a point 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds west; thence east to 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 14 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 27 degrees 22 minutes 00 seconds north, 93 degrees 26 minutes 00 seconds west; thence southwesterly to 26 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds north, 95 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds west; thence north northeasterly to point of beginning, being 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds west, containing 3,874,291 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda water range)."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain submerged land, described in the attached draft of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein. A letter of intent to restrict the utilization of the submerged land area has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

The installation involved is the Matagorda water range consisting of 3,874,291 acres of airspace, water, and submerged land which is used by Strategic Air Command B–58, B–52 and B–47 combat air crews for operational readiness inspections and day-to-day aerial gunnery training. Air crews from numerous bombardment wings located in the South Central United States require this range on a full-time basis in the support of live firing training and testing to maintain combat proficiency.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved replaces the old Matagorda water range and there will be no change in Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the office of Deputy President to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President.

The Senate showed its concern about the problem of succession at the last session when it approved the proposal for a constitutional amendment to deal with the question of succession and disability. I supported the amendment and am a cosponsor of the resolution introduced by Senator BAYH this year dealing with the same problem.

However, as we know, the method of amending the Constitution is often a slow process. Even if both Houses of Congress were to approve the amendment, there is no certitude it would be approved by the States or, if they do approve, it might take several years before the required three-fourths of the States would act favorably. Of course, no President has attained office under any of the succession laws enacted by Congress, but even if the possibility is remote, we should act now to provide a better procedure by statute.

The office of Vice President, has been vacant on 16 occasions in our national history—8 times because the Vice President succeeded to the Presidency, 7 times through the death of the Vice President, and once following resignation of the Vice President. The Constitution authorizes Congress to provide for succession by statute. The presidential succession laws enacted by Congress in 1791, 1886, and 1947 have been adequate to protect the national interest. But the responsibilities of the President have increased greatly in recent years, and so has the need for the official next in line of succession to be experienced and well-informed about the duties he may be called up to assume.

The bill I am introducing would create a new office of Deputy President. This office would be filled only in the event that the office of Vice President is vacant. Nomination to the position would be made by the President within 30 days following the vacancy in the office of Vice President and confirmation by the Senate would be required. The bill also designates the Deputy President as first in line of succession to the Presidency in event of the death or disability of the President. The President would make his nomination from among the highest Federal officers—the members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the Congress—and the Governors of the States.

In effect, my proposal returns to the succession policy in effect from 1886 to 1947. During this period the Secretary of State, a Presidential appointee confirmed by the Senate under constitutional procedures, was next in line. Under my proposal the Deputy President would be first in line of succession, to be followed by the Secretary of State and other Cabinet officers.

The President has need of a Vice President, or equivalent officer such as the Deputy President provided under this bill, to assist him in the performance of his duties. The Nation should have the assurance that the Vice President, or other officer, has acquired daily familiarity with the operations and policies of the office to which he may succeed and with the executive personnel with whom he must work.

A major advantage of creating a new office of Deputy President is that the choice of a Deputy President would be made only when the office of Vice President was vacant, and it would be with the understanding that the Deputy President would have the right of succession. A weakness of our previous succession laws has been that the designated official often attained his position for reasons and considerations quite apart from the possibility of succession.

Another weakness has been that the designated officials under previous legislation have had other responsibilities which require their full attention. The official next in line should be able to give full-time assistance to the President and be able to acquire the practical experience of the responsibilities of the Presidency. Neither the Speaker of the House, as under the present law, nor the Secretary of State, as once provided, can as adequately fulfill this twofold responsibility. They hold important positions in their own right, and their offices necessarily take their full time. On the other hand, their responsibilities are specialized and do not provide the broad range of experience which the officer next in line of succession needs at this time in our national history.

Finally, the proposal would guarantee leadership by the political party which won the previous election. In 8 of the past 18 years, the Speaker of the House has been a member of a different party from the President. In event of a double vacancy, a complete change of administration would have followed. The succession law should respect the mandate of the people, who vote not only for a man but also, in a broad way, for his party and its program. The elevation of a leader of another party in midterm is undesirable in principle and could have most unfortunate practical effects.

We are all, of course, most hopeful that the succession law will never be needed. Yet history requires us to be objective and to use prudent judgment to provide procedures that, in event it must be, will best provide an experienced successor. Enactment of the bill I am introducing will not prejudice action on a constitutional amendment; rather, it provides a means by which the succession law can be improved now and also in the event that a constitutional amendment is not approved or its approval takes the full 7 years following submission by Congress, as provided in the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 432) to establish the office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN LANDER, WYO.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator McGEE and myself, I send to the desk a bill for proper reference that will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo.

The Forest Service in the middle 1930's acquired two city lots on which were built a warehouse and a garage.

During the last 5 years, the town has grown and now the business district surrounds these two city lots. Consequently, they have appreciated in value.

Because of the increased activities of the Forest Service, this land and its facilities are not adequate, nor does it appear feasible for them to attempt to remodel the buildings. The Forest Service must expand if it is going to properly carry out its functions in the mountainous areas which fall in the jurisdiction of the Lander office. The Forest Service wants to acquire land outside of the city, which would give them room to house and store their equipment. This piece of legislation would permit the Forest Service to sell the presently occupied land at fair market value and use the benefits from the sale for acquiring new land and building new structures.

I am hopeful that the committee to which this bill is referred will act on this at its earliest possible convenience.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 433) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. McGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

UPPER PRIEST LAKE IN IDAHO PROPOSED AS ADDITION TO KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Upper Priest Lake in the Panhandle of northern Idaho is a gemlike body of water in a setting encircled with evergreen forests and rugged mountains. It is less than 4 miles long and three-fourths of a mile wide, and located near the Washington State and Canadian borders. Its beauty is unmarred by commercial development of any kind. Trout dimple the lake surface and deer and moose come down to drink at a shoreline dotted with sandy beaches. And the only marks of man are two well-concealed campgrounds and an emergency fireguard station.

No road or trail penetrates this wilderness locale, and the only approach is by the Thoroughfare River, a slowly meandering stream deep enough for outboard motorboats and wide enough to permit one boat to pass another. The Thoroughfare connects Upper Priest Lake with Priest Lake proper. Thus Upper Priest remains in its natural state—a bit of God's handiwork unspoiled by man.

But, Mr. President, unless we can act, and act soon, commercial development will invade this idyllic setting. The west side of the lake is part of the Kaniksu National Forest, and the east side owned by the State of Idaho, with the exception of three separate and privately owned parcels. The owners of a 140-acre parcel have planned to subdivide it for cabin sites.

More than 4 years ago the Idaho wildlife federation set out to prevent this type of commercial development. Last year, when it appeared the development was a certainty, a national semiscientific organization, Nature Conservancy, came to the rescue with a loan to the owners to buy an extra year's time in which to save the lake. During this period the owners have agreed to negotiate with public agencies for the disposition of their land.

Last August I introduced a bill designed to add the threatened areas to the Kaniksu National Forest, where they would be protected and preserved for the use of the public. The Department of Agriculture subsequently issued a favorable report on the bill, and in October, at my request, field hearings were conducted at Priest Lake by the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and with my colleague [Mr. JORDAN], and the Congressman from Idaho's First District [Mr. WHITE], and myself attending. Nearly all of the witnesses were greatly in favor of saving Upper Priest. The printed field hearing report should soon be available, clearing the way for early action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, at a fair market value, the 417 acres involved in the three parcels of land which I have mentioned, and to include them within the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest. This year, my colleague, Senator LEN JORDAN, joins with me as a cosponsor of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to promote protection and conservation of the outstanding scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho and lands adjacent thereto for public use and enjoyment, the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are hereby extended to include those of the lands hereinafter described which are not now within such boundaries. In order that they may be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire the following lands at their fair market value:

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter;

section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter);

section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter;

section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter); lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are needed to carry out the purposes of this Act.

REMOVAL OF DISCRIMINATORY NATIONAL ORIGINS QUOTA SYSTEM FROM IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the discriminatory national origins quota system from U.S. immigration laws.

Our present laws, based upon the national origins of our population in 1920, say in effect that persons from Italy, Greece, and Poland, for example, are less welcome than persons from other parts of Europe. They mock the immortal words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, "Give me your tired, your poor," by adding the qualification "if they come from certain countries only and are not too tired and too poor."

I am unalterably opposed to this repugnant philosophy. There is no room in our free society for this degrading concept of subjecting human beings to the indignity of being judged on the basis of their place of birth or racial ancestry rather than on their merits and qualifications.

Indeed, it does not even conform to the intent of the Congress. Under present law, 156,700 quota immigrants may enter the United States each year. But because some countries are not using their full quotas, 60,000 numbers are wasted each year, while numerous Americans are waiting for their relatives to obtain permission to join them.

My legislation will eliminate once and for all this stain on our national ideals and honor. It conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I urge its early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 436) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELEASING OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the disposal of 150,000 short tons of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period.

There exists at present a critical shortage of zinc on the American and world markets, a shortage which promises to become even worse in the days ahead.

In this country, the shortage is creating serious problems and hardships for many industries. In my own State of Connecticut there are more than 25 companies, many of them substantial in size, altogether employing many thousands of workers, which must have zinc for various diecasting and galvanizing processes and for the production of bronze and brass.

These firms are located in Bridgeport, Bristol, Groton, Hartford, New Britain, Waterbury, and a number of other cities and towns throughout the State.

Many of these firms have contacted me regarding the difficulties they face in obtaining zinc. Because of the drastic curtailment of operations and the layoffs caused by the shortage, they have been unanimous in urging congressional action to provide effective emergency relief.

The domestic and world shortage can be met only by release of metal from our national stockpile, since there is no other readily available supply of zinc in the free world.

Even though 75,000 tons of zinc were released last year, this limited amount

obviously was not enough to alleviate the persistent shortage.

The national economy continues to expand, the demand for zinc will undoubtedly continue to grow and the shortage will continue to worsen unless Congress takes prompt action.

In accordance with the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials from both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Federal Government now holds over 1½ million short tons of zinc in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

The irony of the situation is that in 1960 the stockpile objective for zinc was reduced to zero from the 1958 figure of 178,000 short tons.

Think of that for a moment. Our stockpile objective is zero and the Government still holds over 1½ million short tons of zinc.

Thus while there is a growing industrial shortage of this metal, the Government has a very large supply which has been declared nonessential.

The measure I am introducing today would authorize release of 150,000 tons of zinc for disposal on the domestic market. By providing a waiver of the 6-month waiting period that is ordinarily required, it would make the metal immediately available to producers and consumers.

Official estimates of the amount of zinc needed to ease the present shortage range as high as 200,000 tons.

The Department of the Interior has urged release of 150,000 tons. This proposal has been endorsed by the Office of Emergency Planning, general overseer of the Government stockpile materials, and by the General Services Administration, which would be responsible for the actual disposal of such material.

Industry representatives have met a number of times with Government officials to discuss all aspects of the shortage and possible courses of corrective action, and they, too, support strongly Government sale of stockpiled zinc.

As soon as Congress approves this bill, and I hope and expect it will be approved early this year, GSA would continue these consultations with both zinc consumers and producers in working out the terms and conditions for its sale on the open market.

The present supply is so short and the demand is so great that there is no danger that the sale of 150,000 short tons would depress the price of zinc or in any other way disrupt the regular operation of the zinc market.

At the same time enactment of this legislation would bring in substantial returns to the Federal Government as a result of the sale of metal now held in the stockpiles.

Actually this bill is part of a two-pronged effort on my part to help Connecticut industry. Copper is also in very short supply and I have joined with our distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and a number of other colleagues in sponsoring a proposal to make 100,000 tons of copper available to private industry on a repayable loan basis.

The critical shortages of both zinc and copper have caused grave problems, and it would serve the best interests of industry, the Government, and the national economy for Congress to take remedial action immediately.

Thus I urge prompt and favorable consideration of my bill to provide relief for the many businesses which continue to suffer from this acute shortage of zinc and of the bill to release copper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 437) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ILLEGAL TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to control the illegal traffic in stimulant and depressant drugs. This measure is a refined version of legislation which members of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and I have toiled upon for 44 months.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be left at the desk until January 16, so that other Senators who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 438) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that there is a widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs producing psychotoxic effects moving in or otherwise affecting interstate commerce; that the use of such drugs, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, may cause a wide variety of acute and chronic changes in psychological functioning, social behavior, or personality, such as difficulties in judgment and coordination, disorderly thinking, disturbances in mood, bizarre and abnormal perceptual experiences and more severe behavior disturbances such as attempted suicide and antisocial activities; that this illicit traffic results in extensive sale and distribution of such drugs to juveniles and youths, as well as adults, not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner; that the use of such drugs by juveniles, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, may lead them to perform acts of delinquency and crime and to experiment with narcotic drugs, which experimentation may result in narcotic addiction; that the use of such drugs, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, often endangers safety on the highway and otherwise has become a threat to the public health and safety, making additional regulations of such drugs necessary regardless of the intrastate or interstate origin of such drugs; that in order to make regulation and protection of interstate commerce in such drugs effective, regulation of intrastate commerce is also necessary because, among other things, such drugs, when held for illicit sale, often do not bear labeling showing their place of origin and because in the form in which they are so held or in which they are consumed a determination of their place of origin is often extremely difficult or impossible; and that the regulation of interstate commerce without the regulation of intrastate commerce in such drugs, as provided in this Act, would discriminate against and depress interstate commerce in such drugs.

CONTROL OF CERTAIN DRUGS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(v) The term 'controlled drug' means—

"(1) any drug which contains any quantity of (A) barbituric acid or any of the salts of barbituric acid; or (B) any derivative of barbituric acid which has been designated by the Secretary under section 502(d) as habit forming;

"(2) any drug which contains any quantity of (A) amphetamine or any of its optical isomers; (B) any salt of amphetamine or any salt of an optical isomer of amphetamine; or (C) any substance which the Secretary, after investigation, has found to be, and by regulation designated as, habit forming because of its stimulant effect of the central nervous system; or

"(3) any drug which contains any quantity of a substance which the Secretary, after investigation, finds as, and by regulation designates as (A) affecting or altering to a substantive extent, consciousness, the ability to think, critical judgment, motivation, mood, psychomotor coordination, or sensory perception, and (B) (i) to be substantially involved in drug abuse ('drug abuse' being deemed to exist when drugs are used for their psychotoxic effects alone and not as therapeutic media prescribed in the course of medical treatment or when they are obtained through illicit channels); or (ii) to have a substantial potential for such abuse by reason of the similarity of its effect to that of a drug already subject to this paragraph (v); except that the Secretary shall not designate under this subparagraph, or under clause (C) of subparagraph (2), any substance that is now included, or is hereafter included, within the classifications stated in section 4731, and marihuana as defined in section 4761, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 4731, 4761)."

(b) Chapter V of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

CONTROLLED DRUGS

"SEC. 511. (a) No person shall manufacture, compound, or process any controlled drug, except that this prohibition shall not apply to the following persons whose activi-

ties in connection with such drug are solely as specified in this subsection:

"(1) Manufacturers, compounders, and processors who have listed their names and places of business with the Secretary and who are regularly engaged or seek to be engaged, and are otherwise qualified, in preparing pharmaceutical chemicals or prescription drugs for distribution through branch outlets, through wholesale druggists, or by direct shipment, (A) to pharmacies or to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, or physicians, for dispensing by registered pharmacists upon prescriptions, or for use by or under the supervision of practitioners licensed by law to administer such drugs in the course of their professional practice, or (B) to laboratories or research or educational institutions for their use in research, teaching, or chemical analysis.

"(2) Wholesale druggists who maintain establishments in conformance with local laws and are regularly engaged in supplying prescription drugs (A) to pharmacies, or to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, or physicians, for dispensing by registered pharmacists upon prescriptions, or for use by or under the supervision of practitioners licensed by law to administer such drugs in the course of their professional practice, or (B) to laboratories or research or educational institutions for their use in research, teaching, or clinical analysis.

"(3) Pharmacies, hospitals, clinics, and public health agencies, which maintain establishments in conformance with any applicable local laws regulating the practice of pharmacy and medicine and which are regularly engaged in dispensing prescription drugs upon prescriptions of practitioners licensed to administer such drugs for patients under the care of such practitioners in the course of their professional practice.

"(4) Practitioners licensed by law to prescribe or administer such controlled drugs, while acting in the course of their professional practice.

"(5) Persons who use such controlled drugs in research, teaching, or chemical analysis and not for sale.

"(6) Officers and employees of the United States, a State government, or a political subdivision of a State, while acting in the course of their official duties.

"(7) An employee of any person described in paragraph (1) through paragraph (5), and a nurse or other medical technician under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs, while such employee, nurse, or medical technician is acting in the course of his employment or occupation and not on his own account.

"(b) No person, other than—

"(1) a person described in subsection (a), while such person is acting in the ordinary and authorized course of his business, profession, occupation, or employment, or

"(2) a carrier or warehouseman, or an employee thereof, who, while acting in the usual course of his business or of his employment, delivers any such controlled drug to a person authorized by subsection (a) to manufacture, compound, or process such drug, shall sell, deliver, or otherwise dispose of any controlled drug to any other person.

"(c) No person, other than a person described in subsection (a) or subsection (b)(2), shall possess any controlled drug otherwise than (1) for the personal use of himself or of a member of his household or (2) for administration to an animal owned by him or a member of his household.

"(d)(1) Every person engaged in manufacturing, compounding, processing, selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug shall, upon the effective date of this section, prepare a complete and accurate record of all stocks of such drug on hand and shall keep such record for three years. On and after the effective date of this section, every such person manufacturing, compounding, or processing any controlled drug shall prepare and keep, for not less than three years, a complete and accurate record of the kind and quantity of such drug manufactured, compounded, or processed and the date of such manufacture, compounding, or processing; and every such person selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug shall prepare or obtain, and keep for not less than three years, a complete and accurate record of the kind and quantity of each such drug received, sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, the name and address of the person from whom it was received and to whom it was sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, and the date of such transaction.

"(2) Every person required by paragraph (1) of this subsection to prepare or obtain, and keep, records, and any carrier maintaining records with respect to any shipment containing any controlled drug, and every person in charge, or having custody, of such records, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records. For the purposes of verification of such records and of enforcement of this section, officers or employees designated by the Secretary are authorized, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle in which any controlled drug is held (or they have reason to believe that it is), manufactured, compounded, processed, sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, and to inspect, within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished material, containers, and labeling therein, and all things therein (including records, files, papers, processes, controls, and facilities) bearing on violation of this section or section 301(q); and to inventory any stock of such drug therein, and obtain samples of such drug. If a sample is thus obtained, the officer or employee making the inspection shall, upon completion of the inspection and before leaving the premises, give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the sample obtained.

"(3) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not apply to a licensed practitioner described in subsection (a)(4) with respect to any controlled drug received, prepared, processed, administered, or dispensed by him in the course of his professional practice.

"(e) The Secretary may by regulation exempt any controlled drug from the application of all or part of this section when he finds that regulation of its manufacture, compounding, processing, possession, and disposition, as provided in this section or in such part thereof, is not necessary for the protection of the public health."

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. Section 301 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(q)(1) The manufacture, compounding, or processing of a drug in violation of section 511(a); (2) the sale, delivery, or other disposition of a drug in violation of section 511(b); (3) the possession of a drug in violation of section 511(c); (4) the failure to prepare or obtain, or the failure to keep, a complete and accurate record with respect to any drug as required by section 511(d); (5) the refusal to permit access to or copying of any record as required by section 511(d); or (6) the refusal to permit entry or inspection as authorized by section 511(d)."

GROUNDS AND JURISDICTION FOR JUDICIAL SEIZURE AND CONDEMNATION

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 304(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before ": *Provided, however,*" the following: ", and any such drug which is a controlled drug within the meaning of section 201(v) and which has been manufactured, compounded, processed, sold, delivered, disposed of, or is possessed, in violation of section 511, or with respect to which there is a failure to prepare, obtain, or keep any record required by such section, shall be liable to be proceeded against at any time on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found".

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 303(a) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 333(a)) is amended by inserting after the final word "fine" and before the period the following: ": *Provided, however,* That any person who, having attained his eighteenth birthday, violates section 301(q)(2) by selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug (as defined in section 201(v)) to a person who has not attained his eighteenth birthday shall, if there be no previous conviction of such person under this section which has become final, be subject to imprisonment for not more than two years, or a fine of not more than $2,000, or both such imprisonment and fine, and for the second or any subsequent conviction for such a violation shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than six years, or a fine of not more than $15,000, or both such imprisonment and fine".

(b) Section 303(b) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 333(b)) is amended by inserting after the word "shall" the following: "(except in the case of an offense which is subject to the provisions of the proviso to subsection (a) relating to second or subsequent offenses)".

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 701(e)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting "201(v)," immediately before "401".

AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS TO CARRY FIREARMS

SEC. 8. Section 702 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 372) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Officers or employees of the Department designated by the Secretary to conduct examinations, investigations, or inspections under section 511 of this Act may, when authorized by the Secretary, carry firearms."

APPLICATION OF STATE LAW

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the manufacture, compounding, processing, possession, sale, delivery, or other disposal of any drug in any State in contravention of the laws of such State.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the seventh calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted; except that the Secretary shall permit manufacturers, compounders, and processors referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 511 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by this Act, to list their names and places of business with the Secretary prior to such effective date, and except that the definitions of terms in subsection (v) of section 201, as added by this Act, and the provisions of section 9 shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in our investigations we found that during the past 6 years the illegal use of the 5 billion pills which are annually sold illegally

in this country was causing grave damage to our young people.

We further found that, beyond question, the reason for this situation is the lack of adequate Federal controls over the distribution of these drugs.

The bill I am introducing today will provide these controls by requiring that:

First. Manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines be required to register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second. Manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of such drugs be required to keep records of the quantities of such drugs they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors.

Third. Adequate authority be given to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles, and other facilities relevant to the proper investigation of the disposal of drugs.

Fourth. Possession of these drugs be illegal, except if the drugs are for one's own use or for the use of a member of his family.

In emphasizing the seriousness of illegal trafficking in these drugs, I have made the bill call for severe penalties for those found selling to children and teenagers.

Mr. President, last August, in its wisdom and concern for the welfare of the youth of our Nation, the Senate passed an earlier version of this bill to help control and regulate the flagrant abuse of certain dangerous stimulant and depressant drugs that are today manufactured, distributed, and sold throughout the 50 States almost as if they contained qualities no more harmful than popcorn.

Because the proposal was not considered by the other body before the 88th Congress adjourned, I rise to introduce it again, early in this session so that, hopefully, the bill can be enacted into law by the end of this year.

I think it is regrettable that we have hesitated this long with our legislative deliberations in this area, since with every passing month the dangerous drug trade gains a more solid base in our society and becomes more difficult to eradicate.

Last November, it was confirmed by the Food and Drug Administration that organized criminal rings are moving into the bootlegging of sleeping pills and pep pills because of the profits that allow 1,000 pills costing $1 to be sold for $30 wholesale and then retailed at 10 to 25 cents apiece or as much as $250 profit. The attractiveness of such a return to our criminal underworld is obvious.

The dangerous drug trade is a relatively new development as compared with the traffic in hard narcotics, the traditional stronghold and source of income for the criminal underworld. But time is of the essence if we are to have effective means for thwarting the big-time criminals from moving in and taking over this new field. Today, all to often, Federal officers must stand helplessly by because they have no law, because they cannot identify the source of the drugs they confiscate, and because no records are required to show by whom the drugs are produced, how they are obtained, and how they are sold.

The dangerous drug traffic is new in terms of the segments of the population it affects and in its impact on the rate and location of crime and delinquency in this country.

The peddling of hard narcotics was once confined to high delinquency and slum areas of our cities. But dangerous drug use has invaded suburban areas and is now contributing to lawlessness among youth in middle-class residential districts. Such a report was released last October by the head of the police narcotics unit in Chicago who tells us that the present users of these drugs are often young people in the so-called white collar class who have no previous criminal records. Here again, time is running out on us. If we are to stop a new wave of delinquency from a new source, Congress must act quickly. This is a development we can ill afford in view of the already formidable delinquency problem facing us at the present.

In addition to these urgent reasons for quick enactment of a law in this area, I want to remind the Senate of the facts which were disclosed in our committee's previous investigations of the drug trade. They are:

Over 50 percent of the 10 billion amphetamine and barbiturate pills which are produced in this country annually eventually end up in the illicit traffic.

Increasing misuse of these drugs by teenagers and young adults has resulted in actions which eventually lead to the misuse of the hard-core narcotics such as heroin.

Misuse of these drugs has resulted in violent, antisocial, and criminal behavior.

Youngsters with no prior records of delinquency from the so-called better families in the suburbs, are included among those who frequently misuse these drugs and commit crime.

Law enforcement arrest figures reflect the increasing seriousness of this problem.

Large quantities of these drugs have been transshipped to Mexico for illegal reentry into the United States.

The lack of effective Federal regulation of the interstate traffic in these drugs substantially contributes to the seriousness of the problem.

In view of the subcommittee's findings, I believe that no prudent person would contest the need for remedial legislation. However, after almost 4 years of urging the Congress to act, I again appear to present this much-needed bill.

Opponents of my efforts, all from the drug industry, have indicated that the problem is one which should rest with State and local authorities and they have so testified. I find this view to be totally unacceptable because the very crux of the problem lies in the interstate traffic in these drugs.

Drug industry representatives have testified that drug production figures could be sought voluntarily from the manufacturers and compounders of drugs and thus, there would be no need for the recordkeeping provision of my bill.

I need only point to the testimony of Commissioner George P. Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration in order to dispel this contention. He testified in August of 1964 before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that such voluntary cooperation had been sought by the Food and Drug Administration. It has been unsuccessful to date due to the fact that two of the largest manufacturers of these drugs refused to cooperate. And, I might add, they are well within their rights in so doing under the present law. In addition, the records of other firms were not adequate or were incomplete.

Another complaint of the drug industry is that the provisions of my bill are discriminatory and would be overly burdensome on the pharmaceutical profession.

I do not believe that this is true. It is a fact that 78 percent of the convictions achieved by the Food and Drug Administration concern pharmacists, pharmacies, or pharmaceutical employees. Thus, to relieve that profession of responsibility under my bill would, in effect, contribute to the defeat of its intended purpose. I do not mean to malign or in any way discredit members of the pharmaceutical profession who, by and large, would not traffic illegally in these drugs. I do not believe, however, that we can ignore facts which have a direct bearing on the problem with which we are concerned.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that these fears on the part of the drug industry came to the surface in the waning days of the 88th Congress.

The years of the development of this bill by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee were years of close cooperation with the drug industry. Their facilities and research were at our disposal. The subcommittee and the industry mutually benefitted from the experience. One drug company, becoming more and more aware of the abuse of the dangerous drugs, established a drug identification laboratory and made its services available to the police and other authorities. A commendable effort.

Thus, when S. 2628 went to public hearings last summer before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it had the full support of the harassed and already overworked law-enforcement agencies of the country, police officials who are faced with large increases in ever more serious crimes triggered by the abuse of these drugs.

It had the almost unanimous support of the 100 drug experts who framed the report and recommendations of the White House Conference on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. President Kennedy had asked specifically that this bill be made law. And, importantly, after years of cooperative research on the threat that the abuse of these drugs pose to public safety, the legislation, S. 2628, had the broad support of the drug industry.

I outlined all of this last summer as one of the first witnesses to appear before the Senate Labor Committee in hearings on this bill. Later in those hearings, I detected an uneasiness in

the trade. As it became more apparent to me that the bill would clear the Senate, as it did shortly thereafter without objection, I found that the biggest ingredient in the drug industry's support for the legislation was lipservice.

Even before the matter was approved in the Senate, criticisms of the measure, all of them emanating from the pharmaceutical industry, began appearing in the trade press. The camaraderie of years of investigating a problem, which all concerned agree imposes a serious threat to communities across the Nation, was suddenly dropped by the drug industry.

Here are just two examples: In the August 18, 1964, Drug Trade News, a bylined article by Robert Barr announced that "Some drug interests are known to be trying to kill the bill in the House [of Representatives] Committee."

In the September 1, 1964, issue of the same journal, under the byline of Richard Wightman, a lengthy story was announced under a headline which said: "Industry Fights To Delay Action on RX Files Bill." The article began:

> Retail and manufacturing sections of the pharmaceutical industry are pressing hard this week to delay House action on the controversial psychotoxic drug bill (S. 2628).

The story then went on to explain, among other things, that the bill, just recently passed unanimously by the Senate, was unacceptable to the National Association of Retail Druggists and also to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

I can only observe once again that the chief ingredient in the years of apparent support and cooperation given by the industry was lipservice, possibly compounded with a dash of the gambler's instinct that the bill would not be passed in the legislative rush of an election year. I think that the resentment of the American public will present the drug industry with a much more effective compound in this Congress. They will support only effective legislation and will not hold for the lightweight, intramural arguments that, thus far, have withheld the drug industry's support for the measure at the expense of the public health and safety.

And it is at the expense of the public.

Let me quote from reports that reached the subcommittee while the 88th Congress dallied:

> AUGUST 1964.—Baltimore police broke a major pill ring when they arrested a woman who had sold 200,000 pills to undercover officers over a 7-month period.
>
> AUGUST 1964.—The city of Yonkers, N.Y., in Westchester County, was shocked when police revealed that of the 900 local teenage users of these drugs, the highest concentration was in the fashionable upper middle class northwest section of the city.
>
> OCTOBER 1964.—Chicago police indicate that the traffic in these drugs to teenagers is getting out of hand and that youngsters from white-collar families who have had no previous records of delinquency are often found to be users.
>
> NOVEMBER 1964.—The Food and Drug Administration indicated that organized criminal rings have taken up bootlegging sleeping pills and pep pills in a very substantial way.

And what of the overall problem as it exists in some of our major addiction centers.

The attorney general of California told my staff that dangerous drug arrests in California had increased 75 percent from 1960 to 1963.

The Illinois Division of Narcotic Control reported a 100-percent increase in dangerous drug cases from 1960 to the present.

Chicago alone reported that 1964 cases increased by 65 percent over 1963.

Baltimore reported a 60 percent increase for 1964 over 1963.

The New York City Police Department prepared a special report for me on dangerous drug arrests and drug seizures for the first 11 months of 1964, compared to a similar period in 1963. The results of that report are startling:

Barbiturate arrests increased 131 percent; seizures, 28.2 percent.

Amphetamine arrests increased 23.9 percent; seizures, 393 percent.

The New York police further identified the latest troublemaker in that city, a powerful amphetamine drug popular with heroin addicts, called Desoxyn. Seizures of this drug increased 237 percent last year.

Mr. President, these facts need no further elaboration. As far back as July 15, 1964, President Johnson issued a statement calling for a higher priority on government efforts against narcotics and drug abuse. President Johnson's directive followed the lines of the first 25 recommendations of his Commission's report on narcotic and drug abuse.

I would like to quote recommendation 13 from that report:

> The Commission recommends that all nonnarcotic drugs capable of producing serious psychotoxic effects when abused be brought under strict control by Federal statute.

The report states further:

> On January 28, 1963, Senator THOMAS J. DODD submitted to the Senate a bill (S. 553) to provide close Federal regulation of the manufacture, sale, and distribution of certain dangerous drugs, notably the barbiturates and amphetamines.
>
> A similar bill (H.R. 6848) was submitted to the House of Representatives by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY.

The report concluded:

> The Commission favors the plan of regulation proposed by the Dodd-Delaney bill.

As recently as January 6, 1965, in President Johnson's health message to the Congress, he said:

> I recommend legislation to bring the production and distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs under more effective control.

Mr. President, since May 23, 1961, when I first introduced this bill, it has been subjected to the scrutiny of the President's Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse; the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Treasury; Justice; and State; the law enforcement agencies in New York City and the State of California, where this problem is greatest; the Association of Juvenile Court Judges, the International Juvenile Police Officers Association, and the distinguished representatives of a number of religious faiths. All of these groups have approved of or endorsed this bill over the past 3½ years. Thousands of parents have written to me urging passage of the bill.

Mr. Walter A. Munns, president of the largest producer of stimulant drugs in the United States, Smith Kline & French Laboratories, wrote to me on September 9, 1964, and endorsed this legislation.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce today is the culmination of many years of hearings by different committees in both the House and the Senate. It is the culmination of more than 3 years of work by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

This is a bill which tightens acknowledged inadequacies in the law, inadequacies which are permitting a wave of narcotic addiction to go unchecked in this country.

It is a good piece of legislation and one that has the approval of just about everyone familiar with the dangerous drug problem. I would like to urge my colleagues in the Senate and especially those on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to give top priority to this much-needed bill.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL BENEFITS TO SERVICEMEN ON DUTY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, throughout our Nation's modern history the American citizenry has extended special benefits to those servicemen who are called to duty and who face combat conditions. This is a time-honored tradition and one which Americans have proudly respected.

It seems to me only right and appropriate that this tradition be extended to encompass the present conflict in southeast Asia. There can be little doubt that Americans in the Vietnam area are facing combat conditions.

There has been in past months a general reluctance by some strategists to regard Vietnam as a combat zone, but I think we can no longer flout reality.

And so I rise. Not to offer the elusive panacea of peace in Asia—would that I, or anyone else, could offer that. But, I do arise to urge this Senate to extend to American servicemen in today's battle zone the recognition and the subsequent opportunities and benefits which this Nation has afforded for service in the far too frequent combat zones of the past.

I propose three pieces of legislation designed to recognize reality and to deal with it as an honorable American citizenry should.

I propose:

First. A Vietnam GI bill.

Second. Extension of normal combat-zone tax benefits to our men in southeast Asia.

Third. A declaration by this Senate that Americans fighting there must be provided the best available weapons, equipment and aircraft.

VIETNAM GI BILL

It is my belief that veterans whose military service approximates that of wartime are entitled to educational benefits like those extended in the Korean

and World War II GI bills. My Vietnam GI bill will extend 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service not to exceed 36 months of schooling. The aid would be in the form of a monthly cash allowance to the veteran enabling him to select his own school, correspondence course, or technical training program.

The Vietnam GI bill also provides home and farm loan assistance with a loan fee included to offset all losses.

Six months of active service would be necessary to qualify for benefits. In addition, widows would be eligible for the loan benefits, and children of combat dead would be eligible for the educational benefits.

I ask permission that a more detailed explanation of the Vietnam GI bill be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

VIETNAM TAX BENEFITS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the second bill I offer would designate the southeast Asian area as a combat zone under the Internal Revenue Code. This will extend to men and women, serving the cause of freedom there, the tax benefits already prescribed in the law for combat zone service.

This means enlisted men would pay no income tax on their salaries, and officers would receive a $200 per month tax exemption.

VIETNAM EQUIPMENT RESOLUTION

I believe that my proposed resolution on Vietnam and Laos speaks for itself. I quote it:

S. RES. 25

Whereas American military servicemen are fighting and dying in the Republic of Vietnam; and

Whereas these Americans and their comrades-in-arms from the Republic of Vietnam are fighting to preserve freedom and liberty from the treachery and brutality of Communist aggressors; and

Whereas the United States does not regard its soldier sons as mere mercenaries fighting only for pay, but as dedicated and courageous protectors of liberty who are committed to battle to preserve and defend principles which Americans hold to be of utmost importance; and

Whereas American servicemen go into battle knowing that they will not be betrayed in trust or in support by their Government or their fellow citizens for whom they offer their lives if need be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That American servicemen fighting in the Republic of Vietnam, or at any other place, be provided promptly and in adequate numbers with the most effective weapons, equipment and aircraft available in American military inventories.

Mr. President, I ask that the three measures I have introduced—the Vietnam GI bill, the Vietnam tax benefits measure, and the Vietnam equipment resolution—may be held at the desk for 1 week so that other Senators may become cosponsors of any or all of the measures, if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas that they be held at the desk for 1 week will be granted.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TOWER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 458. A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces in the southeast Asia theater of operations.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 459. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) expressing the sense of the Senate as to the arming of American servicemen fighting in Vietnam, submitted by Mr. TOWER, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXHIBIT 1

DIGEST OF VIETNAM GI BILL OFFERED BY SENATOR TOWER

This bill provides readjustment assistance for veterans of the southeast Asian theater who perform active duty between January 1, 1961, and the termination date of the draft law (now July 1, 1967). Discharge other than dishonorable is required. The President delimits the southeast Asian theater periodically. Readjustment assistance authorized is similar to that afforded in the Korean GI bill.

Educational and vocational training assistance: Eligibility is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty or discharge for service-connected disability. Education or training period cannot exceed 36 months and is calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of active duty. During the educational period the monthly allowance is as follows: For full-time college training—no dependents, $110; one dependent, $135; more than one dependent, $160. Lesser benefits are prescribed for proportionately less study. Veteran must begin education within 3 years after discharge or enactment of bill, whichever is later, and must complete education within 8 years after discharge or enactment. No allowance is paid for study before January 1, 1965. All education and training end 10 years after the draft law is terminated, with limited exceptions for career enlisted men. Children of combat dead are eligible for these educational benefits.

Loan assistance: Eligibility for guarantee and direct loans is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty, or discharge for service-connected disability. Widow of veteran who died of service-connected disability also eligible. Loans are for purpose of purchasing (a) homes, including farm homes, and (b) farmlands, livestock, and so forth, to be used by veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Loans are subject to guarantee fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of loan amount, to be used to cover losses on loans. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans. Interest rates and maturities of loans controlled by laws applicable to World War II and Korean veterans, now and in the future. (Under Public Law 86–73, maximum interest rate is 5¼ percent per annum.) Termination date of guarantee and direct loan program is 10 years after end of induction period except for loans on which VA commitments have been issued before such date.

AUTHORIZATION OF DEEPWATER HARBOR ON LAKE MICHIGAN, IN NORTHERN INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize a deepwater harbor on Lake Michigan, in northern Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 460) authorizing construction of a deep-draft harbor by the State of Indiana on the shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Waterway, and assumption by the Federal Government of an appropriate part of the cost of construction thereof, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the passage of this measure, which is similar to one cosponsored by my senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and me in the last session, and with whom I have joined in its introduction at this session, will, I hope, after it has made the journey through both Houses, mark the consummation of a dream which has been held by many citizens of Indiana since the beginning of statehood.

There has been a strong, sincere effort on the part of my senior colleague and me, as well as of other members of the committee—the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and also the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reach a compromise between the two seemingly irreconcilable points; namely, the interest, on one side, to have a deepwater harbor, and the interest, on the other hand, to preserve the natural resources in that area, the dunes area.

With the help of the Senators whom I have mentioned, a bill was introduced in the Senate during the last week to create, almost within sight of the port area, a Dunes National Lakeshore Park, which would provide, first, for the development of two great resources, deepwater transportation and rapidly growing economic industrial opportunities in this area; and second, the preservation of natural resources and provision for recreational opportunities for workers and business people who are coming into the area in rapidly growing numbers.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAYH

I have introduced today a bill to authorize the State of Indiana to construct a deep-draft harbor on Lake Michigan and assumption by the Federal Government of its appropriate share of the cost of the construction.

Leaders of the State of Indiana have dreamed of operating a public harbor on Lake Michigan almost since statehood. With the authorization provided by this bill, our dream can become reality in the near future.

I know that my colleagues are aware of the controversy that surrounded the Indiana port construction for a number of years. During that period, the harbor stood as the symbol of the industrialization of a section of Indiana's Lake Michigan shoreline. Conservationists opposed this industrialization and sought to preserve all of the remaining Indiana shoreline.

This controversy is behind us. It has been resolved by development of a plan which will provide more than 11,000 acres for conservation and recreation purposes and still provide an extensive area for industrial expansion. I am a sponsor again this year of a bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and it is my hope that it will be passed again by the Senate so that action can be taken in the House of Representatives.

The State of Indiana must move rapidly to develop a deep-water harbor on Lake Michigan. Industrial users of the facility are already operating in the area and are in need of waterborne transportation.

The need to begin construction within the next year requires that the State assume the responsibility for construction, as other States have done from time to time, with the Federal Government maintaining its responsibility for the cost of the Federal portions of the navigation structure. The corps has estimated these costs to be in excess of $25 million.

Gov. Roger Branigin of Indiana has announced plans to ask the Indiana Legislature for an advance of $25.5 million so that harbor construction can move forward. It is expected that these funds will be appropriated and be available on July 1. The State timetable provides for planning and design of the facilities to be accomplished by the end of 1965 so that construction can begin in the spring of 1966. The Corps of Engineers has been fully advised of the action by the State and it agrees that State construction will be required to meet the completion date dictated by need for the facility.

Indiana has been patient. Indiana has worked hard to secure the benefits of the Federal harbor improvements program. Now that parties are in agreement with the compromise developed by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, let us now proceed to authorize this important harbor facility.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBER 12, AS A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to designate Columbus Day, October 12, as a national legal holiday.

Columbus Day marks the sailing of a courageous man and three now famous little ships into Western waters on one of the world's most historic ventures.

It is in effect the point where the story of America begins, and it certainly is appropriate and right that we give proper recognition to this date.

There is significant State and National precedent for this legislation.

October 12 is celebrated in all but 13 States and the District of Columbia.

It is officially observed in 30 States as Columbus Day and in 7 other States under varying appropriate designations.

In addition, under title 36, section 146, of the United States Code, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation "designating October 12 of each year as Columbus Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies expressive of the public sentiment befitting the anniversary of the discovery of America."

In the 88th Congress I was one of the cosponsors of a bill to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. Because of a special appeal I made, in cooperation with a number of colleagues, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, hearings were held and the bill passed the Senate last August.

Unfortunately, the House took no action on the measure before adjournment and it died with the end of the 88th Congress.

This same bill was reintroduced last week, with the identical bill number (S. 108) and I have again cosponsored it.

But I thought it would be appropriate for me to introduce my own bill since I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation establishing national holidays and celebrations, and since my proposal is drafted differently.

My bill makes specific reference to the statute I have cited making Columbus Day a ceremonial day. Then it adds to this statute by giving Columbus Day legal stature similar to that enjoyed by Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Labor Day, Veterans Day and the other national legal holidays.

In introducing this alternative approach, I pledge that I will make committee consideration and approval by the Senate one of my first objectives this year.

If we can get this bill through the Senate at an early date, the House will have ample time to consider and approve similar legislation and we will not run the risk of having our efforts come to naught as they did the end of last year.

Many millions of persons throughout the United States observe Columbus Day, paying homage to this historic figure and to the men who accompanied him across the sea, and paying tribute to the many fine Americans of Italian origin or descent who have played such an important part in the growth of this great Nation.

It is only fitting that this year we start to honor October 12 as a national legal holiday and I urge favorable consideration of this Columbus Day proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 461) to provide that the 12th day of October in each year, known as Columbus Day, shall be a national holiday, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF PORT ORFORD, OREG., HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.

This bill is a companion to the bill which has been introduced today in the House of Representatives by my colleague, Congressman ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District. We of the Oregon congressional delegation are particularly proud to sponsor this project, because it is one which has not heretofore received Federal assistance by way of construction of harbor improvements.

The people of the Port Orford area are to be commended for the fact that over a period of almost 30 years they have endeavored to develop harbor facilities on their own initiative. The work they undertook without Federal assistance reflects expenditures of more than $425,000. A community which has sought to help itself in such a convincing manner deserves every tangible encouragement the Federal Government can render.

After a careful study, the Corps of Engineers recommended the project as a feasible and necessary harbor improvement. It has a very impressive 1.9-to-1 cost-benefit ratio. A fully developed harbor is essential to the economic development of the Port Orford area; and if this excellent deepwater harbor is to serve adequately the community and the commerce of our Nation, it must be protected from winter storms by the 550-foot extension of the breakwater which is proposed under this authorization bill.

The authorization calls for a Federal expenditure of $696,000; and in the opinion of the sponsors of the Port Orford Harbor authorization bills, this development would constitute a wise investment of Federal funds and a great asset to the Nation.

We urge prompt and favorable action in committee and in the Senate on this outstanding harbor project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 467) authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg., introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., certain lands originally donated to the United States for use in connection with the operation of a veterans hospital. This bill is identical to a bill which was introduced today on the House side by Congressman ROBERT DUNCAN, of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

In 1932, the city of Roseburg donated to the United States approximately 413.7 acres of land near Roseburg lying north

of the South Umpqua River. At the same time, the State of Oregon donated another tract of 40 acres of land lying immediately south of the river. Subsequently, the Veterans' Administration constructed a veterans hospital on the donated land.

The city of Roseburg desires to obtain reconveyance of a certain 47-acre tract of the land originally donated to the United States in order that the area may be converted to a major recreation facility as a portion of Roseburg's Stewart Park.

When this bill was introduced in the last Congress, the Veterans' Administrator supplied a report, suggesting the inclusion of certain conditions and limitations. These are set forth in section 2 of the bill which is being introduced today.

The gratuitous conveyance, which would be authorized under this bill, does not violate the so-called Morse formula. The formula does not apply in those cases wherein the bill is designed to bring about a reconveyance of land donated to the Federal Government by the beneficiary named in the bill. One of the first cases in which this principle was announced involved a conveyance of land to the city of Roseburg. The subject was discussed in some detail in the Senate and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 7, page 9323.

In view of the meritorious nature of the proposed conveyance, it is my hope that the committee to which the bill is referred will schedule prompt hearings and take early action on the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 468) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMISSION TO REEXAMINE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for appropriate reference, legislation to establish a commission to reexamine the effectiveness of our Federal agricultural laws and programs. This measure takes the form of legislation which I previously introduced in the 87th Congress as S.J. Res. 238 and in the 88th Congress as S.J. Res. 152 in order to permit a new and much needed fresh look at our present agricultural programs and objectives. On November 12, 1963, during the 88th Congress, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] introduced S. 2299, a bill to establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy, and on January 16, 1964, the senior Senator from Minnesota, now our Vice President-elect, introduced similar legislation, which measures were referred to the Agriculture Committee.

During Senate debate on H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill, on March 2–4, 1964, Senator HUMPHREY and I each introduced amendments to the pending bill which would have authorized the establishment of such a commission. Assurances were given at the time my amendment (No. 452) was withdrawn, that hearings would be held by the Agriculture Committee on the proposals offered by the above-mentioned Senators. I am hopeful that hearings on the establishment of a commission to examine our Federal agricultural policies may be possible in the new Congress.

The need for reappraising the effectiveness of our agricultural programs, with the objective of improving them, is very much upon us. The commission sought to be established by this legislation is of the Hoover type consisting of 12 members, 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House, with not more than 6 members to be of the same political party. Six members would be picked from nongovernmental fields. This Commission would provide basic machinery for the conduct of an important study. The legislative recommendations to be provided by it will, it is hoped, provide a valuable basis for confronting still unsolved basic agricultural problems.

The Commission would reexamine existing agricultural legislation and consider the desirability of improvement and/or elimination of existing programs and consider: First, the effectiveness of price support and production limitations; including acreage allotments, and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for certain commodities; second, the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities; third, suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future; fourth, methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with export opportunities for such commodities; fifth, the effective use of surplus commodities in support of our foreign policies; sixth, problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States; seventh, the national requirements for stockpiling agricultural commodities, and eighth, the need for consolidating the activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with other Federal agencies on the development of rural resources. The Commission would also give particular attention to the formation of programs to ease the economic adjustment of farmers who wish to move into other occupations. Assistance in such cases might take the form of retraining programs, relocation allowances, and aid in obtaining alternative employment opportunities.

The recent disclosure of the tremendous wheat needs of the Soviet Union has pointed up the failures of the monolithic, centrally controlled Soviet farm management program. In the light of these Soviet failures, we must not forget the motivating forces of our own agricultural system. We must continue to place emphasis on the blessings of bountiful productivity, the free competitive forces of the market, on private enterprise, on the profit motive, and on individual productive efficiency.

I do not believe that the Department of Agriculture, involved as it is in carrying out the agricultural policy of the administration and the day-to-day administration of the existing agricultural laws, would be able to devote the needed deliberation and objectivity to this study of overall effectiveness of our agricultural programs. I am hopeful that the Department would profitably lend its expertise to such an effort and in a major way would contribute to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks, a text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. TOWER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 20

Whereas agricultural production in the United States has achieved levels of both quantity and quality unprecedented in world history; and

Whereas today some two billion people of the world are inadequately fed and many millions already benefit greatly from the surplus agricultural production of the United States; and

Whereas it is vital to the interest of the United States and to the world that our present agricultural productive level be maintained and that our productive potential be increased in order to meet the current and future needs of the United States and the world; and

Whereas the people of the United States engaged in the production of food and fiber comprise a vital segment of this Nation's economic productive force and its social structure; and

Whereas the welfare of that important segment of our population is critical to the welfare of the country in general; and

Whereas the attainment of an effective balance between the agricultural production of the United States and domestic and foreign consumption of such production is and has been the goal of Federal agricultural programs throughout our history and must continue to be so in the future; and

Whereas Federal programs formulated for achieving that goal have had little success when compared to the marked increase in agricultural production; and

Whereas such agricultural programs have been responsible for an increasingly intolerable burden on the people of the United States in both taxes and higher prices, have been responsible for placing many buyers, sellers, and users of agricultural commodities in this country at a competitive disadvantage in world trade, and have failed in assuring an adequate standard of living to many medium- and small-scale agricultural producers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the effective utilization of the agricultural produc-

tion of the United States so that (1) the markets for United States agricultural commodities, insofar as possible, will be competitive in the markets for such commodities in the world, (2) the present and future requirements for such agricultural commodities in the United States and the world can be fully met, (3) the interests of taxpayers and consumers may be fairly safeguarded, and (4) the producers of agricultural commodities in the United States will receive a return on their investment and labor commensurate with their contribution to the national welfare. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote programs recognizing the necessity for consumers in this country to be assured an adequate supply of agricultural commodities of the best possible quality and at the lowest possible prices. It is, therefore, the purpose of this joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs in order to achieve the policies stated above.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL LAWS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. In order to achieve the purpose set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representtaives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding $22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall make a comprehensive study and investigation of all Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs to achieve the aims set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution. In carrying out such study and investigation the Commission shall consider such matters relating to agriculture as it deems necessary or appropriate, but shall specifically consider, with regard to the various agricultural commodities produced in the various regions of the United States, (1) effectiveness of price support and production controls, including acreage allotments and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for such commodities, (2) the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities, (3) suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future, (4) methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with the export opportunities for such commodities, (5) the effective utilization of surplus commodities in support of our foreign policies, (6) the problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States, (7) the national requirements for stockpiling of agricultural commodities, and (8) the need for consolidating the activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with other Federal agencies on the development of rural resources.

The Commission shall also give particular attention to the formulation of programs to facilitate the economic adjustment of agricultural producers who decide to transfer to other occupations. Such programs may include, but shall not be limited to, retraining programs, relocation allowances, assistance in obtaining alternative employment opportunities, early retirement, and provision for minimum compensation for land, dwellings, and equipment which such producers no longer want or need.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1966, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a)(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) OFFICIAL DATA.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution requiring the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct, established last year, to prepare and submit to the Senate a code of ethics for Senators and legislative employees. In the meantime, my resolution would provide for an interim code based on disclosure of financial interest until a permanent code of ethics can be adopted by the Senate. The resolution also authorizes the Select Committee to render advisory opinions on questions of ethics when requested to do so by Senators or officers and employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 26

SECTION 1. (a) One of the most vital concerns of a free and representative government is the maintenance of moral and ethical standards for their representatives which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. The people are entitled to expect from their elected representatives in the Federal Government and the employees of the legislative branch a standard above that of the marketplace, for these public servants are entrusted with the welfare of the Nation. Yet these standards must be practical and should be fairly representative of the people who elect their representatives. Some conflicts of interest are clearly wrong and should be proscribed by sanctions in the criminal law; however, many are composed of such diverse circumstances, events, and intangible and indirect concerns that only the individual conscience can serve

as a practical guide. But there are many possibilities of conflict in that shadowland of conduct for which guidance would be useful and healthy, but for which the criminal law is neither suited nor suitable. Therefore, the Senate finds that a Code of Ethics is desirable for the guidance and protection of its Members and the officers and employees of the Senate, by establishing the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

(b) It is also the purpose of this resolution to provide for a thorough study and investigation to determine necessary and desirable changes in existing conflicts of interest statutes applying to Members of the Senate and to officers and employees of the Senate, and to develop a comprehensive code of ethics for the guidance of such Members, officers, and employees, by which the purposes of this resolution may be more fully assured in the conduct of the public business in the Senate.

DUTIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct (referred to hereinafter as the "Select Committee") to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the policy objectives set forth in section 1 of this resolution can further be assured. In the conduct of such study and investigation the Select Committee shall, among other things, determine to what extent existing conflict of interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened, and it shall recommend a comprehensive Senate Code of Ethics, in the formulation of which it shall have considered the following subjects:

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate;

(2) Disclosure by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealing by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate in their official capacities with matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust; and

(6) Other matters concerning official propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members of the Senate and to officers or employees of the Senate.

(b) The Select Committee shall report to the Senate the result of its investigations together with such recommendations for the establishment of a Senate Code of Ethics as it may deem advisable. Such report shall be submitted no later than one year after the effective date of this resolution.

INTERIM CODE OF ETHICS

SEC. 3. Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964 (relating to the establishment of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of guidance for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate during the period during which the Select Committee is considering the provisions of an appropriate Senate Code of Ethics, the Senate hereby adopts the following standards as a guide to such Members, officers, and employees:

"(a) No Member of the Senate, or officer or employee of the Senate, 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 the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust.

"(b) In addition to the general rule set forth in paragraph (a), the following standards are applied to certain specified transactions:

"(1) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties.

"(2) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority.

"(3) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties or use such information for other than official purposes.

"(4) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.

"(5) A Member of the Senate, or an officer or employee of the Senate, should not by his conduct give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party.

"(6) A Member of the Senate, or an officer or employee of the Senate, should endeavor to pursue a course of conduct which will not give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

"(7) Any Member of the Senate, and any officer or employee of the Senate having a financial interest, direct or indirect, which has a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General. As used herein, the term 'regulatory agency' shall include such agencies as shall be designated by the Comptroller General, which list shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

"(8) Any Member of the Senate who has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure should declare the nature and extent of such pecuniary interest before casting any vote with respect thereto upon the floor of the Senate or in any committee or subcommittee of the Senate.

"(9) Any officer or employee of the Senate who has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure, before engaging in the rendition of any service with respect to that measure for or on behalf of any Member of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, should declare to such Member, committee, or subcommittee the nature and extent of such pecuniary interest.

"(10) No Member of the Senate, and no officer or employee of the Senate, should solicit or accept any substantial loan or gift from any other person who has or may have any substantial direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure upon which such Member has or may have occasion to cast his vote as a Member of the Senate, or with respect to which such officer or employee has or may have occasion to render any service as an officer or employee of the Senate."

ADVISORY OPINIONS

SEC. 4. Section 2(a) of Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "and" in line 9, page 3;

(2) striking out the period in line 12, page 3, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) inserting, between lines 12 and 13, page 3, the following new paragraph:

"(5) render advisory opinions upon questions of ethics arising under the rules of the Senate or any code of ethics of the Senate when so requested by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate.".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 5. As used in this resolution, the term "officer or employee of the Senate" shall have the meaning given thereto by section 5 of the Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am also introducing a separate bill requiring that any communication between a Senator or a member of his staff and a regulatory agency in adjudicatory proceedings be made a part of the public record of those proceedings. This bill would amend the Administrative Procedure Act.

Companion legislation governing Members and employees of the House of Representatives is also being introduced today in the other body by Representative OGDEN R. REID. The Reid bill would establish a select House committee to parallel the Senate committee already in being.

The public interest requires a clearly defined, enforceable code of ethics for Senators and their staffs to support public confidence in the Senate, confidence shaken by the disclosures made in the Robert Baker hearings.

In similar legislation which with my former colleague I introduced in the last Congress, a Joint Committee on Ethics would have been established and the proposed code of ethics would have been applicable to Members of both Houses of Congress and to the more than 25,000 employees of the legislative branch. Since the Senate in the last session establish a select Senate committee to consider matters of ethics solely as they pertain to the Senate, the subject of the bill I am introducing today is limited to Members and employees of the Senate, to make effective use of a committee already in existence.

My proposal would set basic standards for the conduct of Senators and their staffs, taking into consideration the necessary differences between the responsibilities and financial requirements of members of the executive branch and Members of Congress. I feel it is completely incongruous for Senate committees rigorously to question executive appointees on their financial affairs when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements. We cannot continue to function on this double standard of ethics—one standard for the executive branch and another for the legislative branch.

The bill I introduce today would go a long way toward eliminating this double standard as far as the Senate is concerned. If enacted it would immediately establish an interim code of ethics pending the adoption of a permanent code. One provision of this interim code would require a Senator, officer, or employee of the Senate to disclose financial interests of $5,000 or more in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. Another provision would require Senators to disclose any pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of legislation before voting on it.

Other prohibitions would limit outside employment, ban the disclosure or use of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties for other than official purposes, prohibit using official influence to gain special privileges or exemptions. In the years 1963 and 1964 I have made disclosures on the Senate floor of my own financial position in accordance with the proposed interim code.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 466) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 20, to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 2 which deals with the question of apportionment. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had fully intended to join us. He is in complete accord with the purposes we have in mind and the objectives which are sought to be attained. However, he believes that perhaps some modification in terminology might be necessary, from his standpoint, at least. Accordingly, he will probably introduce a joint resolution dealing with the same subject matter, seeking the same objective.

I now ask that Senate Joint Resolution 2 be taken from the desk and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has stated exactly the three points which I feel must be covered by the constitutional amendment in order to give the people in each State the right to have one house apportioned not on the basis of population. They are: First, that the Supreme Court shall retain jurisdiction of the one-person one-vote basis for the house which is not the subject of the people's action under that constitutional amendment; second, that compliance with the amendment—the way in which a house is to be apportioned not on the basis of population—also be subject to the review of the Supreme Court; and third, that the people have continued control so that having apportioned one house not on the basis of population, they might make changes in their determination, or even reverse their determination without having a built-in permanent constitutional amendment to that effect.

In that way, the people will have the same power that they had when they established the Senate of the United States in the Constitution. I am confident that we can work this out.

I believe that Senator DIRKSEN's purposes are precisely the same as mine. I hope to be in complete accord with Senator DIRKSEN and the cosponsors of his amendment.

In due course, I shall introduce a resolution to that effect. I compliment my leader on taking this kind of leadership, which is, in my judgment, taking a moderate course, in the middle of the road, in respect to this very critical matter to the American people.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be added to the growing list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which deals with the double-barreled problem of vacancies occuring in the office of Vice President and of Presidential disability.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPALACHIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3, popularly known as the Appalachia bill, remain at the desk for cosponsors through Friday, January 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I ask unanimous consent that S. 252, his bill to end Senate confirmation of postmasters, remain at the desk until Monday, January 18, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO WATER RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on January 6 I introduced three bills, S. 22, S. 23, and S. 24. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added as a cosponsor of these bills at the next printing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6 TO REMAIN AT THE DESK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 6 be kept at the desk until the close of business on Friday, January 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, ETC.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 6, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 1. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes: Mr. KENNEDY of New York and Mr. MONRONEY.

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commission, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research: Mr. BIBLE and Mr. TOWER.

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes: Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes: Mr. BIBLE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. Moss, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 288. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents: Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress: Mr. FANNIN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Venezuela; and Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ecuador.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 12, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and the Economic Report.

APPROVED STATEMENTS ISSUED BY SENATE AND HOUSE MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 11, the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, which has been operating as a joint group throughout the 87th and 88th Congresses, and which continues into the 89th Congress, approved statements issued by the two minority leaders.

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

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

When defeat comes to a major political party in this country invariably there are outcries for revolutionary changes in party structure, party leadership, and party policies. The Republican defeat of 1964 has produced these manifestations of uncertainty, unrest, and uneasiness. Many suggestions, both formal and informal, for action pour from numerous sources.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, are fully cognizant of the situation. There is no doubt in our minds that action is indicated and we are taking it. In our conversations since the November defeat we have discussed among ourselves and with other recognized party leaders, numerous paths that might be followed. Always, certain basic facts have emerged:

First, that the only elected Republican officials of the Federal Establishment are the 32 Republican Members of the U.S. Senate and the 140 Members of the House of Representatives. Obviously and beyond dispute, they will guide Republican Party policy at the national level, in the absence of a Republican President and Vice President, by the record they write in the Congress. It is their responsibility.

Second, that an additional repository of advice and counsel on party policy exists in former Presidents and nominees for President, in our present elected Governors, in the members of the Republican National Committee and the State chairmen of our several States, and, of course, in active Republican advocates at all other levels of the party structure. Their wisdom must be channeled into party policy formulation.

In the conviction that the Republican Party for a century has been and is an essential element in this Nation's forward progress, and with the firm belief that all Republicans must join the effort, we, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, have on this day initiated a proposed mechanism to achieve a broad consensus on vital objectives for our country and our party. It is an honor to introduce my colleague, the new Republican leader of the House, JERRY FORD, to provide the details of the proposal.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

We propose to give the Republican Party a unified leadership. As a chart we are making public will show, we are inviting the five living Republican nominees for President—one of whom, Dwight D. Eisenhower, served two terms in that office—and representatives of the Republican Governors Association to join with us in the establishment of a Republican Coordinating Committee to continuously examine party policy and party operations.

We have asked the presiding officer of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the Republican National Chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, to serve as presiding and administrative officer of the new Republican Coordinating Committee, and through the Republican National Committee to provide such staff assistance and funds as may be necessary. As Mr. Burch, himself, suggested, we regard this role an implicit responsibility for him or whoever may occupy his office in the future.

It will be the function of the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the 11 members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the five living Republican nominees for President, and five representatives of the Republican Governors Association to facilitate the broadest party representation and the establishment of task forces for the study and examination of major national problems and issues. The recruiting sources for these task forces, which would report to the joint leadership, are clearly delineated on the organization chart which we are making public.

For the joint leadership, I have been asked to add these two pertinent points: First, the Republican National Chairman has been requested to immediately invite the other participants to join us in forming the Republican Coordinating Committee. Second, we are convinced that the Republican Party is not only a great force in the American way of life, but it is the only living political instrument which can make the American dream a reality, not a mere collection of words and promises. Our only goal is results and we intend to achieve them.

INTERVIEWS OF SENATOR CHURCH CONCERNING VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, the Senate appointed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Senator CHURCH has made an excellent statement with regard to what our policy should be in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with a number of editorials from the New York Times of December 28, 1964, the Evening Star of Washington, December 30, 1964, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 30, 1964, the Salt Lake Tribune of December 31, 1964, the Idaho Statesman of December 18, 1964, and the New Britain Herald of December 28, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Ramparts magazine, January–February 1965]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

I think that if there is a basic fault with our Asian policy, it might well be our failure to confine it to the practical limits of our power. We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. Afterward, the Pacific was a very broad moat protecting the United States against hostile encroachment. Had we established, as our westernmost rampart, the island chain which rims the Asian continent, and had we made it clear that we were prepared to meet—with our own military force—any hostile penetration of the Pacific, we would have established a boundary line fully within our military power to maintain. The United States is essentially a naval and aerial power, and there is no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific. The elephant cannot drive the whale from the sea nor the eagle from the sky. But it is also true that neither the whale nor the eagle can drive the elephant from his jungle. I think our failure to establish such an island rampart, conforming to the character of our military power, has been a fundamental cause for some of the difficulties that now face us in Asia.

Question. Senator CHURCH, you would restrict American intervention to the defense of this string of islands. Is that correct?

Answer. That might have been our posture, but it has not been.

Question. If you are going to limit the line like that, how can you justify our presence in Korea, which is on the mainland?

Answer. I think that we were right, in the first instance, to intervene in Korea. An invasion by North Korea had occurred, and we undertook, in the name of the United Nations, to defend the independence of South Korea against that invasion. Many other countries joined us, at least in a token way, to uphold the U.N. shield against an aggression of this kind. Our mistake was not in undertaking the defense of South Korea, but in having remained there afterward longer than required. Today, for example, there still are 55,000 American troops on the 38th parallel. From all appearances, they are permanently entrenched as though the 38th parallel had become an American boundary, and this, despite the fact that the South Korean Army has been equipped as a modern military force, nearly twice as large as the North Korean Army which faces it. There is no military necessity for so large a continued American presence along the 38th parallel, and I think that we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea.

Question. There are some who argue that even though the North Korean forces are much smaller, there is the vast army of Red China just across the Yalu River. From that point of view, wouldn't it seem advisable to keep American troops in there?

Answer. If we were to accept that premise, then it would follow that American troops must remain permanently on the 38th parallel so long as Red China endures. I think that this is a faulty argument. It may lead China, North Korea, and other Asian countries to conclude that we are, in fact, interested in maintaining some kind of permanent foothold on the Asian mainland. Remember, we have a large and mobile military force on Okinawa, within easy striking distance of Korea, should another invasion ever occur. Moreover, we could, if necessary, leave a single regimental combat team, rather than two full divisions, on the line in Korea, which would be a sufficient "trigger force" to guarantee our renewed participa-

tion in the defense of South Korea, if the need were ever to arise again. But, no matter how one looks at it, there is no military requirement for keeping a whole American army there indefinitely, in view of the present strength and capacity of the South Korean Army to defend their boundary line.

Question. If there is no military need for the 55,000 troops, is there a possibility that there is a political need?

Answer. The only political reason for maintaining so large an American army there would be to assist in buoying up the weak South Korean economy. But this is, in itself, an admission of the failure of American policy in Korea. Twelve years after the end of the war, South Korea is still a garrison state, incapable of self-support, and each year it is necessary for the United States to give South Korea close to half a billion dollars in rations. We can't continue indefinitely to finance the South Korean nation and yet, we seem unable to find an alternative to this dole.

Question. Senator CHURCH, returning to the matter of the island string, what about our being in Formosa? Is this compatible with traditional American policy in Asia?

Answer. Of course, we are not in Formosa with a whole American army as we are in Korea. I think we were correct in giving formal assurances to Formosa that we will defend her against Communist attack. Our commitment extends not only to the island of Formosa, but the Pescadores as well. I would view these islands as a part of the ocean rampart I previously mentioned, and well within the American military capacity to defend. Our 7th Fleet is, indeed, the shield for Formosa. My only criticism of American policy in Formosa is that we have helped to finance the maintenance of an army for Chiang Kai-shek, which is twice too big for the needs of the island's defenses and not a tenth big enough to retake the mainland. So the policy has been unduly costly for us, and at the same time, may well be giving China cause to suspect that we are preparing Chiang Kai-shek to act as a spearhead for an invasion of the mainland. I do not regard this as our objective, but it may seem so to the Government of Red China.

Question. It might seem, from the two instances of South Korea and Formosa, that we are trying to preserve an American grip upon Asia. Do you think Asians so view the situation?

Answer. It disturbs me that we may well be creating such an impression even though this is not, in fact, our objective. We fully understand the importance of credibility when it comes to our military forces. We take great precautions to make certain that our nuclear deterrent is a credible one in order to avoid a nuclear war through enemy miscalculation. But we seem to give precious little attention to making our diplomatic objectives credible. I think we have, to some degree, committed this error both in South Korea and Formosa.

Question. The dilemmas we seem to have vis-a-vis South Korea and Formosa appear to find their ultimate expression in the situation in South Vietnam. Wouldn't you agree, Senator?

Answer. Yes, I think that's so. And here again, it is a fact that we are in South Vietnam only because the Communists refuse to let the Saigon government alone. If they were to call off the insurrection against that government and leave South Vietnam and her neighbors alone, we'd be only too willing to withdraw our forces from that region of the world. Nevertheless, it may not seem this way to many Asians. I remember spending some months in India during the Second World War. I had the opportunity to talk to Indian intellectuals and revolutionaries. They made a sharp distinction between me, as an American, and my English friends. They understood that the United States had been the first colony to achieve its independence from George III. They had read our Declaration of Independence; they could quote passages from Thomas Paine, from Thomas Jefferson and from Abraham Lincoln. But once I left their company and went out onto the great flatlands of India itself, and encountered ordinary Indian people, it was apparent from the way they treated all Americans, that they made no distinction between us and the British. We were all white men. To them, we all represented Western imperialism. I'm afraid that in South Vietnam today, there are a great many of the indigenous peoples who make little distinction between our American uniforms and the old French uniforms, and therefore, we are once again faced with the problem of making our position in Vietnam credible to the Asian people with whom we must deal.

Question. Then that raises probably the most fundamental question of all. Should we have gone into South Vietnam in the first place?

Answer. Looking back upon it, I would say that Mr. Dulles was mistaken when he persuaded President Eisenhower that we ought to intervene in South Vietnam after the French defeat. After all, the French had fought for years with an army of some 400,000 men in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina, and that proud army was defeated by ragged guerrilla forces which could not be overcome. Nevertheless, we did make that decision and we now have to live with it.

Question. Thus far, the Saigon government has not been able to win the war. Do you think that the war can ever be won?

Answer. I really don't know. I think that we have to continue to honor our commitments to the Saigon government to make sure that it has all of the weapons, the equipment, food, and financial assistance needed to carry on the war. We have given such help in massive quantity, and I think that we must continue to do so.

But in the end, the capacity of Saigon to win the war will depend on the cohesiveness of public support that can be achieved. Some political stability will be essential. The people themselves must have the will to continue the fight. For nearly 20 years now, fighting has been going on in this unhappy region of the world. The people are weary of war. If the spirit to fight on is preserved, we can provide the material aid necessary, and the war eventually can be won. To do this, I think South Vietnam must be sealed off from supplies from the north, both over the jungle trails and from the sea. But in the last analysis, victory or defeat will depend upon the South Vietnamese people themselves. The thing we must remember is that there is no way for us to win their war for them. It is a guerrilla war, at root an indigenous revolution against the existing government, the kind of war where it's exceedingly difficult to tell the enemy from the people. It can only be won by the people themselves.

Question. When you say seal off supplies to the Vietcong from North Vietnam and from the sea, are you implying that the South Vietnamese have sufficient military capability to do this?

Answer. I think that it's possible for them to accomplish this militarily, particularly if we can bring about a joint military effort in Laos which will interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. It's possible, also, that we can find a role for the United Nations to play in maintaining the integrity of the boundaries in this area.

Question. Isn't it true that a lot of the warfare is being waged by captured American arms, with the result that the insurrectionists are already rather self-sufficient?

Answer. Yes. It isn't well enough understood that the war in the south cannot be won in the north, even though it would be helpful to cut off the supply lines which continue to give aid and comfort to the Vietcong. Basically, the Vietcong consists of South Vietnamese; the bulk of their weaponry is captured, and they have the capability of maintaining their attacks, independent of North Vietnam. Therefore, it's folly to think that, by extending the war northward, there is a way out for us. All one needs to do is to look at the map to see that this is the way in, not out, and that the war can be more easily won, not by taking on the whole North Vietnamese army, but by confining it to the 25,000 hard-core Vietcong that are involved in the south. If they cannot be put down by the Saigon government, with all of the aid and assistance we are giving it, then our predicament will only be worsened by extending the war northward and increasing the enemy force many times.

Moreover, let us remember that, within the past 2 years, China invaded India. Also, it was Red China that came down from the north when she felt herself threatened by approaching American troops in Korea. Thus, there is little basis for us to assume that China might not respond in like fashion to Vietnam, if the war were to be extended northward. Then, we would have the whole of the Chinese army to contend with as well, and we would be faced with a tragic trail of casualties in this region of the world, out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States.

Question. Assuming that South Vietnam could be insulated and assuming further that we kept pouring in more and more supplies, what should be the policy of the United States if this effort failed nonetheless, and the war in South Vietnam could not be won?

Answer. I would hope that we could then find the maturity to accept that fact. France did so, both here and in Algeria. Algeria, incidentally, meant a great deal more to the economy of France than Vietnam does to ours. Besides, Algeria was for many years considered a part of France where more than a million Frenchmen lived. When, in the end, the French Government found that there was no way to put down the insurrection against it, that the will for independence in Algeria was irresistible, the statesmanship of De Gaulle made it possible for the French to recognize the inevitable and to make a peaceful settlement in Algeria. This involved a French withdrawal.

Now, South Vietnam has never been, nor do we want it to be, an American possession. It is alien to the United States in almost every way, and it is as remote from the United States as any country in the world. If, despite all of its material advantages, the Saigon government can't prevail, because it simply lacks the indigenous support of the people of the country, then I would hope that we would recognize that it is not our country and never has been. The war is there for them to win or to lose. If it is lost and there is no way left to win it, we should accept that fact.

Question. And by that, do you mean that we should withdraw our support?

Answer. I think in that event, withdrawal would be forced upon us, for the Vietnamese themselves would form some kind of government which would invite us out. I hope it never comes to that, but we must be prepared for that possibility.

Question. Wouldn't it be possible, even before that time, for the United States to make certain diplomatic moves to support the French proposals advocating neutrality for all of southeast Asia? Wouldn't that bring about a resolution of the problem, particularly as it wouldn't require withdrawal in the face of defeat?

Answer. Neutrality for all of southeast Asia, for the whole of that great peninsula, is a proper objective, providing that it is not a

camouflage for a Communist takeover. If we were able to sustain the Saigon government sufficiently long to permit it to win its war, or if we were to stabilize the situation in this region in such a way that it would be possible to go with some trump cards to the conference table, then I think we might reach an international agreement, declaring this whole region to be neutral, and requiring the withdrawal of all foreign troops. We could guarantee the integrity of that agreement with our own military power. If it were violated by invasion from China or any other country, we could commit ourselves, along with the other nations joined in the international accord, to the maintenance of its integrity.

Question. That would only guarantee territorial integrity from external aggression. How would that help in terms of internal insurrection?

Answer. The only answer to Communist subversion, burrowing from within a country, is to be found within that country itself. If its government is a decent one and enjoys general popular support, the internal Communist problem can be successfully dealt with. Malaya is a good example. There, a few years ago, Communists undertook the same kind of guerrilla war against the Malayan Government as South Vietnam is plagued with today. The same tactics were used. The same dedicated, hard-core revolutionaries were at work and, too, there was a very large Chinese population in Singapore which might have given shelter and support to the Communist activity. Yet, Malaya was able to deal with this problem, to isolate the Communist guerrillas from the rest of the population, and to stamp out the insurrection. Malaya had the kind of government that enjoyed the confidence and support of the people. The thing for us to remember is that, unless the people themselves are willing to rally behind their government, unless they regard a Communist insurrection as a menace to their own well-being, there is no way that American forces can intervene to save the day. If we move in and take over in an effort to thwart the impending success of a Communist insurrection, the Asian peoples involved will forget entirely our good motivation, and will come at once to regard the war as one between a white Western force on the one hand, and indigenous Asian forces on the other. And there is no way for us to win such a war on the Asian continent. We have to recognize that the period of Western occupation and control in Asia is gone. It is now Asia for the Asians. Nothing would be more futile than to permit ourselves to be sucked into a war which would pit Western forces against Asian forces, for even if we were able, by brute musclepower, to take a large chunk of Asian territory, we could not stay there long. Our only harvest would be implacable hostility on all sides and the tides of history would, in the end, wash over us. No lasting victory could be achieved.

Question. Everything you say seems to fit the situation in South Vietnam at the time that we are talking. We have had, in the last year or two, any number of regimes in South Vietnam, plus a war that seems to be hopelessly bogged down. Is it because of the failure of the Saigon government, or I should say governments, to fulfill the needs of the people?

Answer. I think that the Government in South Vietnam has been incompetent, to say the least. It must be viewed for what it is, a military despotism. Communist North Vietnam is also such a despotism, but this hardly gives the people of South Vietnam a clear-cut choice between free government and tyranny. Nor should we think of this war in terms of preserving a free economic system against the imposition of a Socialist system, for the fact is that both the Governments are committed to socialism.

Question. Taking into consideration everything that you've said so far about our policy toward Asia, don't we face a rather difficult future now that China is a nuclear power?

Answer. Yes. The situation will become increasingly difficult once China has a nuclear arsenal. Of course, the recent detonation of a nuclear device is significant in terms of prospects, but the ultimate significance will be realized, say, about 10 years from now when the Chinese will probably have an effective nuclear arm. This would change the power balance in Asia immensely, and China might well seek to use her newfound power to establish a hegemony over southeast Asia, where China has traditionally enjoyed a sphere of influence. I would hope, by then, that we will have drawn our lines in strict conformity with our vital interests, so that we never find ourselves faced in southeast Asia with the dilemma that confronted Khrushchev in Cuba, when he was compelled to withdraw under highly humiliating circumstances, simply because his gamble was not worth the candle. When it comes to nuclear confrontation, countries must make their stand conform to their mortal interests. The stakes must be absolute, for the consequences are too terrible to permit the frivolous commitment of nuclear weapons.

Question. In other words, once China has atomic capability, any South Vietnam situation would be almost certain to end with the humiliation of having to withdraw or face a nuclear threat from virtually next door. Is that what you are implying, Senator?

Answer. Yes. Unless we look ahead and undertake now to revise our policy in Asia, we could face such a debacle some time in the future.

Question. Assuming that China will have a nuclear capability in the foreseeable future, does this automatically imply that China is going to take over all of Asia?

Answer. I wouldn't think so. Chinese divisions decisively defeated the Indian troops defending India 2 years ago, but China recognized that the conquest of India would not only strain her own resources to the limit, but would also result in greater problems for her than solutions, and, therefore, elected—having shown her capabilities—to withdraw her forces once more. In the event that China establishes her own nuclear arsenal, it is much more likely that she will seek to create a sphere of influence in southeast Asia, similar to the one the old Chinese emperors once enjoyed, which would leave other countries like Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos somewhat independent, even though these countries may become Communist in name. The important thing to remember is that there is now an unraveling within the Communist world. It isn't all one great Red dominion as it appears on the maps. Today, even those who would regard it this way concede that there are at least two Romes, and Moscow and Peiping grow increasingly hostile. Moreover, in Eastern Europe we see the satellite countries asserting their independence in more and more obvious ways, striving with some success to loosen the Russian grip upon them. The point is, that the same unraveling process is likely to occur in Asia as is now occurring in Europe, and that these satellite countries will become increasingly independent of domination from either Peiping or Moscow. Thus it will become more and more possible for us to establish our separate relationships with them, as we are even now doing in the case of both Poland and Yugoslavia.

One final question: vis-a-vis South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam, we seem to be in a position that can best be described as involvement. If the world situation changes or the war, for example, in South Vietnam cannot be won, how can we prepare ourselves as a nation, psychologically and politically, for a change from involvement to disengagement?

Answer. It's especially hard for a free, popular government to change course. We have a tendency to oversell our policy with respect to any given country in such a way that public opinion hardens behind it, and then it becomes very difficult to change course. I think we have to find the statesmanship to do this. It's possible that we have swung on the pendulum of public opinion, from the extreme of isolationism 30 years ago, when the prevailing opinion in this country was that it didn't matter to us what happened abroad, to the opposite extreme where we regard it as an American responsibility to maintain the governments of all those countries that are now nominally non-Communist. This, in a sense, is an imperial attitude, even though we seek no possessions, and even though we are not attempting to impose American rule upon any of these countries. However, unless we come to accept the fact that it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere, our policy is doomed to failure. Here again, the requirement for statesmanship is very high, but if we strive to inform the American people of the upheaval and ferment of our times, and if we give them all the facts, I think the American people will be prepared to support a flexible foreign policy, better tailored to serve the real interest of the United States in a changing world.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 28, 1964]

A FRESH VOICE ON VIETNAM

Senator FRANK CHURCH, in his interview with the liberal Catholic magazine, Ramparts, has said publicly what many U.S. officials are saying privately about Vietnam. Mr. CHURCH argues that the United States should never have got in in the first place and, while there is no immediate way out, the ground should be laid for ultimate extrication.

The tough line Washington is taking in regard to the military purge of the South Vietnamese National Council would indicate a belief that General Khanh's position is not strong as he has made it out to be. His defiance of a few days ago has now been tempered by a warm Christmas message to the U.S. forces expressing "grateful appreciation" for what the Americans are doing.

This represents no assurance, however, that General Khanh will yield to American demands. The political crisis in Saigon gives many signs of being beyond repair. It can be papered over or it can be held down forcibly by the military, but so long as the Buddhists refuse to cooperate and oppose both the war against the Vietcong and American aid to wage it, no solution to the Vietnamese crisis can offer much real hope.

Senator CHURCH deserves to be heard, not only because he is a thoughtful voice but because he has been right in the past on Vietnam. In the autumn of 1963, when Secretary McNamara and General Taylor were giving out optimistic reports on the Diem regime, Mr. CHURCH was publicly skeptical and critical. He now argues that "neutrality for all of southeast Asia is a proper objective, providing that it is not a camouflage for a Communist takeover." Senator MANSFIELD, the Democratic majority leader, has taken a similar line; but his colleague, Senator MONRONEY, returns from an Asian tour convinced that neutrality would be a mistake.

The proviso of keeping the Communists out is all important. The basic objective of the United States in southeast Asia is what was called "containment" in 1954. The American aim was to stop the Communists from taking over all Vietnam, and that is still our objective. A true neutrality would serve that purpose, but it is unrealistic to think that weak nations on the fringe of Communist China can preserve a Swiss-type of neutrality. A Yugoslav-type, perhaps, but then the defi-

nition of neutrality would have to be stretched.

As Senator CHURCH points out in his Rampart interview, a number of Democratic Congressmen are dissatisfied with the present policies toward southeast Asia. The dilemma is that no one has an alternate course to suggest that does not involve the enormous risks of an expanded war or an abandonment of all our commitments in the area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 30, 1964]

SENATOR CHURCH CALLS FOR CAUTION

(By Max Freedman)

Senator FRANK CHURCH, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, deserves the highest praise for speaking so frankly, in his interview with Ramparts magazine, about the situation in Vietnam.

He has not ignored the hazards and humiliations that now face the United States; but he has not advocated the abandonment of South Vietnam to Communist domination as an easy way for the U.S. Government to escape from its growing difficulties.

He is ready to support military aid to South Vietnam while its rulers and people are willing to fight for their freedom. The test of this willingness is to be provided not by the wishes of Washington but by the actions of Saigon.

One of the great misfortunes of the United States entanglement with Vietnam has been the lack of clarity in defining long-term purposes. Perhaps CHURCH is right in blaming the late John Foster Dulles for making Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia so important to U.S. security. But CHURCH surely will agree, on reflection, that the blame cannot be carried by Dulles alone. The Dulles initiative took place as long ago as 1954. The U.S. absorption with the affairs of Vietnam has continued steadily.

Our military, economic, and emotional commitment seemed to grow more intense as our failure to control events became more evident. President Kennedy did not reduce former President Dwight Eisenhower's commitment, he increased it; and President Johnson is under growing pressure to increase that commitment still further.

During all these years there has been no critical protest in Congress, except by a few notable Senators, at this enlargement of U.S. risks and responsibilities. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara discouraged open debate. They preferred to testify before secret congressional committees. As the war continued to go badly, there was a growing reluctance to challenge U.S. policy in Congress. Responsible Members wished to do nothing that would endanger U.S. security or weaken the fighting resolve of the hard-pressed Vietnamese Government.

But CHURCH is not alone in thinking that continued silence imposes greater risks on the United States than a responsible challenge that will force this country, at a calamitously late hour, to answer some hard questions about its purposes in southeast Asia.

In his interview, CHURCH has discussed some of the first principles of U.S. policy that should have been fully examined years ago. In essence, he has asked two basic questions. Has the United States made the best use of its limited resources in the Pacific? And has the United States assumed more responsibility in southeast Asia than can be justified by its own national interest? Not everyone will agree with CHURCH's answers, but there will be wide agreement with his contention that the present policy cannot be continued without the gravest risks for this country. He is even more opposed to launching a war on North Vietnam.

CHURCH will no doubt take the first opportunity in the new session of Congress to amplify his proposal for giving the United Nations special duties for protecting a neutralized southeast Asia. He recognizes, what President Charles de Gaulle, of France, has failed to admit, that these neutral borders would soon fall under Communist control unless they were placed under some kind of supervision and protection. This means that outside countries would have to assume economic and military duties in southeast Asia, under the guidance of the United Nations, to prevent a Communist attack and to assure the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia that their national independence would remain intact.

This theme, and similar proposals, will be taken up by CHURCH and other Democratic Senators in the new Congress. They do not want to embarrass the Johnson administration. They want to save the country from mistakes and perils in Asia that can yet be avoided. The somber misfortunes in Vietnam assure that their criticisms and suggestions will be more favorably considered by the public now than in the past.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Dec. 30, 1964]

A SENATOR ON VIETNAM

Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, made perceptive comments on U.S. policy in South Vietnam in an interview published in Ramparts magazine. He is one of a small group of Democratic Senators who have shown growing uneasiness over the course of events in Saigon, and there is a belief in Washington that a major discussion of foreign policy may be in the making.

Senator CHURCH believes the United States must continue to honor its commitments; he does not advocate an immediate end of U.S. economic and military support for the floundering Vietnamese Government. He thinks the United States should not have picked up the burden of the defeated French in Indochina in 1954, but he recognizes that the problem is not to deplore the past but to decide what to do about the present and future.

The Senator, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, advocates neutralization for southeast Asia as a fair objective of U.S. policy, and he hopes that the United Nations can be brought into the picture as a guarantor of national boundaries. He also hopes the United States will never be forced to withdraw, but he thinks "we must be prepared for that possibility."

Anyone who reads the dispatches from Saigon must share that feeling. The Communist rebels now are reported to control three-fourths of South Vietnam and half the people; there have been six upheavals in the Saigon government in the last 14 months. If the South Vietnamese are to have any bargaining power in a move for a new Geneva conference or some sort of U.N. intervention there is no time to lose—if, indeed, there is any time left. A U.N. presence would be desirable, but since Red China, not a U.N. member, would have to participate in guarantees, there are many complications.

Senator CHURCH is right when he says we must find the statesmanship to change our course, and must accept the fact that "it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere." We have failed to distinguish the difference between our vital national interests and our emotional commitments. A constructive debate in this field might serve the Nation well.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Dec. 31, 1964]

ANOTHER POSSIBILITY IN VIETNAM POLICY

Amid the uneasiness and the welter of suggestions as to U.S. policy in the long, drawn out war in South Vietnam, one of the newest voices is that of Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, who is becoming somewhat of a foreign policy figure in the Senate.

In a recent magazine article, Senator CHURCH recommends the neutralization of all southeast Asia and suggests that a role be found for the United Nations as a guarantor of national boundaries in that area.

Along with several other prominent members of the majority party, Senator CHURCH is showing the restiveness that many Americans feel about the Government policy in Asia generally and in South Vietnam in particular.

SOME FAVOR WITHDRAWAL

Senators ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, have favored withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam now while Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader, has indicated support for the neutralization of South Vietnam only.

Another Democratic Senator, GEORGE D. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, has proposed a 14-nation conference to seek a political settlement.

It is clear that the new Congress convening next month will stage a major foreign policy debate and that possibly the heaviest opposition to the administration's policies may well come from Democrats.

Senator CHURCH's recommendations deserve careful study. If the kaleidoscopic changes of the government in South Vietnam continue at the pace they have in recent months and if the most powerful figures, militarily speaking, such as Gen. Nguyen Khanh, continue to mutter about U.S. interference while demanding astronomical aid for a war which is far from won (and, it seems from all dispatches, pursued desultorily by the Vietnamese), then it may not be a bad idea to throw the whole matter into the hands of the Security Council of the United Nations.

ASSEMBLY'S VIEW

The U.N. General Assembly would, of course, view the Vietnam struggle as a "colonial adventure" by the United States, thanks mainly to the new and excessively touchy nations of Africa and Asia.

But, the Security Council could take up the matter and possibly work out a solution which, while it may not satisfy all conditions of both sides in the dispute, could at least bring the whole southeast Asian question into the world forum, relieving this country of the odor as well as the actuality of dictating to the unstable politicians in Vietnam.

One problem in the U.N. Security Council, of course, would be the veto power of the Soviet Union. However, it is not impossible that, due to the rift with the Red Chinese, the Russians would refrain from vetoing U.N. action in Vietnam.

FOLLY TO ESCALATE

In his magazine article, Senator CHURCH declared that it would be folly to escalate the present military operations into North Vietnam because such an expansion of the fighting would inevitably bring Communist China into the war.

This is probably true for Peiping is much more aggressively doctrinaire than Moscow and assumes the mask of protector against white colonialism all over the world with an unction which only deceives those who wish to be deceived.

Yet the complete and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces and aid from South Vietnam would be a massive loss of "face" in the Asian world (although what "face" is left is certainly bruised and bloody).

So, the Senator from Idaho may have an acceptable solution for the Vietnam dilemma which President Johnson and his advisers would do well to examine closely.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Dec. 18, 1964]

CHURCH VIEWS THE FAR EAST

In the current Catholic laymen's magazine, Ramparts, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, gives an interview, stating: "I think that if there is a basic fault with our Asian policy, it might well be our failure to confine it to the practical limits of our power."

The Senator, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, looks back and pinpoints mistakes: "We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. Afterward, the Pacific was a very broad moat protecting the United States against hostile encroachment. Had we established, as our westernmost rampart, the island chain which rims the Asian Continent, and had we made it clear that we were prepared to meet—with our own military force—any hostile penetration of the Pacific, we would have established a boundary line fully within our military power to maintain."

That lengthy sentence sets the theme for a present-day critique of our policies in the Far East. Senator CHURCH finds the United States still a major naval and aerial power with no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific.

"The elephant cannot drive the whale from the sea nor the eagle from the sky," CHURCH philosophizes with his usual eloquence. "But it is also true that neither the whale nor the eagle can drive the elephant from his jungle."

The Senator "might" restrict American intervention to the defense of this string of Pacific islands. How does that theory fit in with our presence in South Korea?

He answers that the United States was correct in intervening in Korea, but erred in remaining there long after "our presence was no longer required." He finds no military necessity for so large (55,000 American troops) a continued presence along the 38th parallel and "I think we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea."

The Idahoan would retain an American regiment in South Korea. He believes the present South Korean Army could defend alone their boundary line.

Senator CHURCH views the island of Formosa and the Pescadores as being part of the ocean rampart he has delineated.

As to South Vietnam, he thinks that possibly former Secretary of State Dulles was mistaken in persuading President Eisenhower to intervene after the French defeat. The Senator notes that France had an army of some 400,000 men fighting in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina.

The Senator declares the United States must continue to honor her commitments to the Saigon government, to make sure it has all the weapons, equipment, food, and financial assistance necessary to carry on the war. He is concerned about a lack of political stability, a certain amount which will be necessary for the South Vietnamese to pursue their Communist invaders.

"To do this," CHURCH said, "I think South Vietnam must be sealed off from supplies from the north, both over the jungle trails and from the sea. But in the last analysis, victory or defeat depend upon the South Vietnamese people themselves."

The Senator is critical of the South Vietnam Government, recalls its incompetency and views it as a military despotism. "Communist North Vietnam is also such a despotism, but this hardly gives the people of South Vietnam a clearcut choice between free government and tyranny."

In other matters, Senator CHURCH considers the Far Eastern situation more complex with Red China on the way toward becoming a potential nuclear power. But he is not forecasting that Red China will take over all Asia. He cited the Chinese invasion of India and the decisive defeat which the Indian army suffered. "But China recognized that the conquest of India would only strain her own resources to the limit."

The Senator is correct when he acknowledges no sure way for resolving the Far East conflicts. His remarks in Ramparts were scholarly and thought provoking. There is no easy way out. The United States must stand by its commitments and continue to work for the cause of freedom.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, Dec. 28, 1964]

DISINVOLVEMENT

A popular, young Senate Democrat who is widely respected in both political parties had some things to say in a just-published magazine interview which ought to set a lot of Americans to thinking.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, writing in the Ramparts magazine, a Catholic layman's publication, expresses the view that the United States ought to be setting its sights on getting out of southeast Asia. He doesn't think that we, as a nation, ever should have been in there in the first place.

What makes the Senator's view worthy of more than passing comment is that it is a position widely talked about privately in Washington, seldom publicly.

His view is not simply a throwback to isolationism. It is, rather, a carefully conceived attitude which calls for gradual reduction of all foreign involvements throughout Asia, and as a substitute therefore, guaranteed maintenance of national boundaries through the United Nations.

In Vietnam, in particular, Senator CHURCH feels that continuation of the present course of guerrilla involvement is folly, leading nowhere. He believes that escalation of the war would likewise be futile, leading to dangerous possibilities. The United States, he feels, ought to be making plans for gradual elimination of its troops from South Vietnam.

Likewise, he feels that continued maintenance of the Korean truce line by American troops is a situation which could go on as long as China is under a Communist government.

The important part of his thesis is that he would not simply have the United States withdraw and create a power vacuum. Rather, the United Nations would become the guarantor of peace in that far-off continent.

The American people would not be unhappy to learn of some alternative to the Vietnam situation which does not call for expansion of the war or abandonment of our commitments to the people of Asia.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Dec. 21, 1964]

ANOTHER SETBACK IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Another military putsch, the latest in a long series, has brought new upheaval to the Government of South Vietnam, illustrating again the dilemma that faces American policymakers in Asia. American troops are in South Vietnam to support the Government in a civil war with the Communist-backed Vietcong rebels, but there is no real government to support.

In its latest show of force, the military junta which rules South Vietnam dissolved the National Council, the country's legislature, and set about arresting many of its members. The civilian premier, Tran Van Huong, seems not to have been deposed, and the chief of state, Phan Kac Suu, was evidently still in power Saturday night. This doesn't mean a great deal, however, since it is clear that the military chiefs could depose either of them whenever they wished. The situation does not encourage confidence in the ability of the Government to secure the country against rebellion, and so long as the Government remains helpless there is little the United States can do to help it save itself.

South Vietnam has been without an effective government since the French were forced to pull out. At no time have the South Vietnamese people felt a national identity with the Government, and so it has been a simple matter for the Communists to stir up trouble in the villages. Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, discussed the problem in an interview published in this newspaper yesterday. "The only answer to Communist subversion, burrowing from within," CHURCH said, "is to be found within that country itself. If its Government is a decent one and enjoys general popular support, the internal Communist problem can be successfully dealt with * * *. The thing for us to remember is that, unless the people themselves are willing to rally behind their Government, unless they regard a Communist insurrection as a menace to their own well-being, there is no way that American forces can intervene to save the day."

This is why CHURCH, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and some others in and out of Congress now consider American policy in Vietnam fruitless. We are caught in a civil war on the side of a government which is barely functioning and we find ourselves unable to avoid taking sides in a religious conflict between Buddhists and Catholics. What is worse, as Senator CHURCH pointed out, we are white people fighting against Asians in Asia, and in the eyes of many Asians simply carrying on where the French left off. And our position there deteriorates with each new demonstration of the Government's incapacity to govern.

DEDICATION OF ARKANSANS TO THE ARKANSAS RAZORBACK FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the people of Arkansas are warm, friendly, and lighthearted about most matters, but on one question we are deadly serious. Where the Arkansas Razorbacks football team is concerned, Arkansans have a dedication not unlike that of the most fervent true believer.

As the only non-Texas team in the Southwest Conference, we have the formidable prospect each fall of playing seven Texas football teams; and as everyone knows, Texas football players, like most things from that State, come pretty big.

In less prosperous times when Arkansas teams had all they could do to stay in the league, Arkansas fans displayed the dogged devotion which many believed to be the peculiar possession of New York Mets followers. However, like all things in Arkansas, the Razorbacks in recent years have steadily risen the ladder of success. This year this devotion was repaid. We reached the top. Last week the Razorbacks, who won 10 in a row in the regular season and defeated Nebraska in the Cotton Bowl, were announced as the winner of the Grantland Rice Award as the No. 1 team in the country.

All of Arkansas is very proud of the team which was not as ponderous as its opponents and did not have any superstars in the lineup but which played each game as a team and with steady improvement. Much of the credit for the team's success must go to the student

body of the university and to the people of the State who have given the Razorbacks solid support. But to Coach Broyles must go much of the credit for having given the essential training and having created the spirit in both the players and the public.

Having played a little football at Arkansas some 40 years ago, I can truthfully say this year's team is one of the best ever, possibly the best—at least since my last year on the squad.

To my colleagues from Texas I cannot offer much hope for the future. All reports indicate that our freshman team is better than ever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from last night's Washington Star about the selection of the Arkansas Razorbacks to receive the Grantland Rice Award be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AWARD COMPLETES ARKANSAS DREAM—IRISH SECOND IN RICE VOTE

HONOLULU.—"I'm prouder than I've ever been in my life," said Coach Frank Broyles Wednesday on learning that his unbeaten, untied Arkansas Razorbacks will receive the Grantland Rice Award.

The memorial to the late sports-writing great goes to the team rated No. 1 in the United States by a five-man committee representing the Football Writers Association of America.

"This is something I know the people of Arkansas have dreamed about for a long time," he said. "I know that this has to be the proudest moment in the athletic history of Arkansas—for the players, the university, and our fans.

"They all rank No. 1," Broyles said.

Arkansas, the Southwest Conference champion, defeated Nebraska, 10 to 7, in the Cotton Bowl game for an 11 to 0 record. Arkansas was the only major college football team without a loss.

SECOND IN ASSOCIATED PRESS POLL

The Razorbacks finished second in the final Associated Press football poll, which was released before the bowl games. Alabama, No. 1 in the last poll, lost in the Orange Bowl to Texas, which was defending national champion and No. 1 when it lost by a point to Arkansas.

The Razorbacks received four first-place votes and one for third. Notre Dame was runner-up with five second-place votes. Texas had one first-place vote and one third-place vote for four points and Michigan received three third-place votes for three.

Alabama received no votes for first, second, or third place.

The five-man committee was composed of Si Burick, Dayton News; Fred Russell, Nashville Banner; Blackie Sherrod, Dallas Times-Herald; Steve Weller, Buffalo Evening News, and Paul Zimmerman, Los Angeles Times.

HULA BOWL COACH

Broyles is here to coach the South squad in the Hula Bowl game, which has been won every year by the North.

"The award is a great reward for this Razorback team," he said. "The players dedicated themselves to this end after our victory over Texas.

"It required hard work, tremendous leadership and unselfishness," Broyles said. "They improved steadily each week and climaxed the season with a championship drive in the Cotton Bowl against an outstanding Nebraska team.

"We received the greatest support of any team in America from our students and fans throughout the State," he said. "I think it's wonderful for our squad and the State. We had such great effort all year long. I'm as excited as everybody in Arkansas is."

CAN THE STATE LIVE ON CRUMBS?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, State governments face what is probably the worst fiscal crisis in their history.

Most State legislatures meet in odd-numbered years. Before 1963 had ended, no less than 35 State legislatures had passed tax increases, estimated to raise annual collections by $1 billion.

The revenue sources in many instances are in direct conflict with Federal taxation.

In 5 years—1958–63—State and local tax rates rose twice as fast as Federal taxes.

State and local taxation is now increasing twice as fast as income.

Since World War II Federal debt has gone up only 20 percent—State and local debt has gone up six times or 600 percent.

John Anderson, former Governor of Kansas, and past chairman of the Governors' conference, has written a very outstanding article on the problems of Federal and State taxation. This article appeared in the January 9 issue of the Saturday Review. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF PROSPERITY: CAN THE STATE LIVE ON CRUMBS? WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WASHINGTON CUTS INTO THE PIE OF LOCAL REVENUE?

(By John Anderson)

The choices which Americans must make over the next 2 or 3 years concerning the critical question of Federal-State fiscal relations will greatly affect the future nature of the Federal system. The best way to begin a consideration of Federal and State fiscal relations is to sort out the salient facts about Federal, State, and local governmental revenues and expenditures. Some of these facts are startling and all of them have serious implications for the future. (By "serious" I do not necessarily mean "discouraging.") But first, some facts and figures:

1. Amazing as it may sound to some, Federal expenditure needs are leveling off while at the same time State and local expenditures are continuing to skyrocket.

2. By 1970 or thereabouts, barring drastic changes in the international situation, annual State and local expenditures will have passed total Federal expenditures, including those for defense and foreign aid. In the fiscal year 1963 Federal expenditures for civilian government totaled about $30 billion, in comparison to State and local outlays of $64 billion. I would guess that by 1971 State and local expenditures will have reached $120 billion compared with a Federal budget of $110 to $115 billion by that time.

3. State and local government employment is rising steeply. These governments now have about 7,500,000 employees, compared with 2,500,000 Federal employees.

4. During the past decade State and local outlays grew more than 8 percent annually, or double the growth rate of the national income.

5. During the past decade State and local governments have had to increase tax rates repeatedly. At the Federal level there have been two large tax cuts, in 1954 and 1964, with talk of more good things to come.

6. State and local debt increased by 170 percent from 1952 to 1962, with over $80 billion outstanding at the end of the period.

7. The most costly functions at the State and local level have been and will continue to be those of education, roads, health, and welfare.

8. Taxes by all governments took about 25 percent of the gross national product in 1952, and the same proportion a decade later. However, the share taken by the State and local government continues to rise and the Federal share continues to decline.

9. In round figures, the State-local tax take is made up of 45 percent property taxes; 12 percent income taxes (most of which are only mildly graduated, if at all); 15 percent general sales taxes; 13 percent gasoline and motor vehicle taxes; and 15 percent miscellaneous, such as cigarette, liquor, and inheritance taxes.

	Percent
Property tax	45
Income tax	12
General sales tax	15
Gasoline and motor vehicles tax	13
Miscellaneous	15

10. Federal grants-in-aid continue to grow apace in both magnitude and variety. This aid tripled between the years 1952 and 1962. It now stands at $11 billion. The last Congress alone added between 10 and 30 new grant programs, depending on what one calls a separate program category.

11. The rate of tax mortality among State and local political leaders is very high. A Governor or mayor must raise taxes in order to meet his increasing responsibilities—but he is often voted out of office for doing so. Were he to choose to cut services rather than to raise taxes, he would also be likely to get kicked out—so he usually tries to raise taxes at the beginning rather than the middle of his term. Also, we are told continually that any further increases in State and local taxes will drive industry out of the State or discourage new industry from coming in. In other words, political and economic pressures at the State and local levels are against tax increases.

12. We are told that Federal revenues are likely to outstrip expenditure needs over the next few years, with a budgetary surplus the likely result unless new domestic spending programs are undertaken by the Federal Government or unless the Federal debt is reduced.

These 12 basic facts generally tell where we have been, where we are now, and where we are tending in Federal-State fiscal relations. The essence of what they tell us is this:

The responsibilities for nonmilitary public services in government over the next few years are going to fall largely on State and local levels of governments. However, State and local revenue systems are much less responsive to economic growth than is the Federal revenue system. Consequently, State and local expediture needs are going to outstrip revenues at current rates, while it appears that at the Federal-level revenue at current rates is going to outstrip expenditure needs. The big question before us is: Which of several alternate courses should be taken?

An obvious possibility is to utilize judiciously any Federal budgetary surpluses for reductions in the debt or reductions in tax rates, according to the economic outlook at the time. It may be the result of an outdated Puritan ethic even to consider the reduction of debt. But I think we would all agree that, in years of full employment and firm or rising prices, an application of Federal surpluses to debt retirement would not be unduly deflationary.

On the other hand, to confine the use of Federal surpluses solely to Federal tax reductions or to debt retirements is objected to on two grounds. First, it does nothing in a direct sense to ease the pinch on State and local governments. Second, if Federal tax rates are steadily reduced and State and local taxes continue to increase, the result will be increased burdens upon property and consumption taxes, and lessened burdens on income taxes.

A second possibility is to utilize Federal surpluses for the initiation of some new and large Federal grant-in-aid programs in areas having a strong element of national interest. Some of the obvious fields would be education, highways, and mental health. It is not difficult to dredge up several other fields of State and local activity in which Federal financial assistance would be welcome.

However, this approach meets with some strong objections. In the first place, Federal aid in these new fields would inevitably be accompanied by Federal controls. Our existing Federal aid programs are accompanied by controls. New ones would be, too. In the second place, at Federal, State, and local levels we are approaching the limits of manageability in the variety and complexity of Federal grant programs. We can add new ones, but getting rid of old ones is practically impossible.

As the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has observed there is nothing so permanent as a temporary grant-in-aid. Many thoughtful people are coming to the conclusion that there must be simpler and better ways of making future Federal funds available to the States.

A third possibility is to initiate the concept of an unconditional Federal grant to the States—often referred to as a "block grant." The difficulty with this approach in the past has been that its advocates have coupled it with simultaneous elimination of present Federal grants. In addition to other arguments against such an approach, it is not feasible from a political standpoint. It would be hard enough to get Congress to agree with the concept of an unconditional grant; it would be impossible to get it to carry on a corollary fight with all of the interest groups that are involved in the existing program grants.

In our new situation of projected Federal surpluses, however, the possibility is advanced of initiating a block grant to the States to be used for virtually any purpose except highways and with no matching or other strings attached, leaving undisturbed the existing pattern of Federal grants in the various program areas. This approach has the advantage of administrative simplicity and a transfer of Federal funds to the States without accompanying controls. Furthermore, to the extent desired, the distribution of such a grant could be keyed to the fiscal capacity of the various States so that any desired degree of equalization between low- and high-income States could be accomplished. This general approach seems to be the one most favored by the administration.

The principal argument against this approach is the alleged lack of political feasibility. Specifically, how could one persuade Congress to turn loose billions of dollars of Federal funds each year, without any specifications as to their use by the recipient States?

Another argument is advanced against this type of approach—namely, that local governments, as well as State governments, should receive unconditional Federal grants and that the sharing of these funds between State and local governments should not be left to the discretion of the individual State. However, as a Governor, I cannot subscribe to this argument.

In the first place, the local governments are subdivisions of the State and operate under the provisions of State constitutions and statutes. Secondly, the division of responsibilities and, consequently, fiscal burdens between State and local governments varies from State to State. Thirdly, no yardstick exists by which Federal funds could be distributed directly to localities on anything other than a per capita basis, because we have no measures by which to compare fiscal capacities of local government on a nationwide basis. Finally, the reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of one man, one vote, may relieve some of the fears that the Federal funds would be disproportionately divided.

A fourth possibility, would be to ease the State-local tax bind by means of a credit against the Federal personal income tax for State and local taxes paid. Such a credit would necessarily be less than 100 percent but would cover all State and local taxes. This would leave it up to each State and local government to determine the most equitable taxation method to be employed in meeting the massive increases in State and local expenditures, but at the same time would make it possible for a designated portion of such tax increases to be borne indirectly by the Federal Government. This would make tax raising more politically feasible at the State and local levels. It would also meet the argument of local governments that they should not have to depend on the State for a distribution of Federal aid. It is also one of the most politically feasible of all the approaches from the standpoint of the Congressman or Senator because it combines a Federal tax reduction with automatic help to State and local governments.

This approach, however, is open to the objection that it would be regressive in nature and would not benefit the people who pay State and local taxes—particularly sales taxes—but whose incomes are not sufficiently high to place them in a Federal tax bracket. This argument could be partially met by having the credit apply in a decreasing scale as one moves up in the tax brackets.

A fifth alternative would be to rebate a percentage of Federal income taxes to the State of collection. This has been proposed at various times in Congress. It would be a tax sharing rather than a tax credit arrangement. It would be simple to administer and would leave State and local governments free to chart their future policies on taxes and expenditures. However, it is objected to on the ground that existing fiscal disparities among the States could not be recognized in the rebate arrangement. New York and California, for example, being relatively high-income States with many citizens paying taxes in the higher Federal brackets, would get back a much larger per capita share than would low-income States.

I have attempted to describe briefly the present Federal-State fiscal situation, the major trends, and some alternate proposals for improving the balance in the fiscal relationships between our various levels of government. Up to this point, I have tried to be completely objective in stating the problem and in presenting the arguments for and against the various solutions that have been suggested.

At this point I would like to give you my own views on the most desirable path to be pursued.

Unlike some, I do not view the Federal tax system as ideal, either from the standpoint of equity or from the standpoint of maximum encouragement to economic growth. The corporate income tax rate is still at a high level. I am confident that further reductions in the corporate income tax would, for the most part, find their way into new investment in plant and equipment. Investment in new plant by private enterprise is an ideal stimulant to growth.

Next, I should explain the absence from the list of the five foregoing alternatives of a proposal that has been viewed fondly by many Governors over the years—that of exchanging some Federal tax sources for some existing Federal grants-in-aid. While I would like to see something of this sort accomplished, I and all of my fellow Governors know that it is neither equitable nor feasible. It was tried a few years ago during the Eisenhower administration when it was proposed that the Federal telephone tax be repealed and this tax source turned over to the States, while at the same time a group of grants-in-aid equal to the amount of Federal telephone tax be discontinued—leaving it to the States to pick up the responsibility for the functions formerly aided.

This plan collapsed when it became apparent that the transfer of the tax source would aid the wealthy States most and the poor States least, while the cessation of the grants would hurt the wealthy States least and the poor States most. Governors and Congressmen alike lost little time in turning their backs on that one.

I think that, whatever steps are taken to provide increased Federal aid to the States, the implication should not be left that the State and local governments can relax and stop trying to improve their respective revenue systems. The States are not trying to duck their responsibility; they recognize that much remains to be accomplished in strengthening the structure of State government and improving their tax systems, particularly with regard to the local property tax.

Now, let's get to the heart of the matter. Which of the five possibilities would be best for the States and best for the Nation, and what are the political feasibilities?

It is always an easy answer to say that the best Government is that which is closest to the people. It is also easy to say, and it always sounds good, that Federal bureaucracy will be our downfall and that our strength lies in a strong free enterprise system.

These statements may be true, but what virtue they have lies in their generality.

It seems to me we must rely on a combination of programs in the fiscal fields—active in strengthing the State and local governments, yet utilizing, when needed, the combined strength of financial resources of the entire Nation.

If we reach the point of Federal tax surplus, we should not only consider tax reductions, but also apply some of the surplus to debt reduction.

I favor a rebate or tax-sharing program, the objections notwithstanding. It seems to me that such a tax-sharing program could be effective in strengthening the State governments and thwarting the ever-increasing trend toward centralized control. Such tax sharing should not preclude continued use of grant-in-aid programs. While I favor tax-sharing over grant-in-aid programs, because of the extensive controls attached to some of the latter, I think it extremely likely that the Federal Government will favor a block grant plan so as to give States with lower gross State products relatively larger amounts of money, probably in combination with tax cuts and added grant programs.

There should be few strings attached except the requirement for a well-developed State spending plan. Performance should be measured, perhaps annually.

Every State will have to put more energy, talent, and money into planning, because the Federal money will likely go to education, environment control, perhaps urban and rural renewal. These will be fields of endeavor for both State and local governments. They will therefore require exceptional planning activities.

A Federal tax return program might be a major catalyst. Long overdue, it is needed to initiate regional thinking and action on public problems. Despite the practical difficulties in arranging useful cooperation

among present groups across political boundaries, regional solutions are clearly mandatory, with the likelihood that political obstacles will be readily overcome when sizable rebate funds are the incentive.

The Midwestern Governors' Association is currently working toward effective regional cooperation in the fields of equalization in Federal defense spending, in research and development, and in the interstate cooperation for utilization of graduate and professional school facilities in the colleges and universities by means of reciprocal contracts. Mental health programs and penal programs are also being explored for regional cooperative effects.

These trends point in one direction—the need for more management-trained and professional staff people in State and local government. Finding these people, integrating them into State governments, and paying for their services will be a major problem, and State governments must then compete with private industry, universities, Federal Government, and other institutions for the same people. The market will remain tight for another 7 to 10 years, because of the population-age distribution. States may want to consider contracting out some of their problems to skilled groups throughout the country.

Perhaps the Federal Government can be prevailed upon to distribute back to the States some of the talented people it now employs, along with money. This might have a considerable beneficial effect on the "brain drain" that is now such a major issue among many States. It could also mean that States like Kansas might celebrate the return of expatriates who have left Kansas to work in the Federal establishment because of the lack of challenging, adequately reimbursed opportunities at home.

All these points are supported by the increasing regard and responsibility with which the voting public views Government solutions to public problems. More professionals in State government should further enhance in the public mind the stature and status of government employment.

There is, of course, no easy solution, no pat formula. I hope my remarks may be interpreted as being related to a great opportunity to realize the federalist idea of solving the local problems at the local level, and utilizing the combined resources of all the people in solving the interstate problems for the common good.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING AND THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on health care for the aging, the American Medical Association has come forward allegedly with a solution.

First, I welcome the fact that at last the association recognizes that a problem does exist.

However, the solution which is proposed, that the Government pay the difference between the cost of private insurance and what the individual can afford to pay, is a bad one; first, because it is again a means test for the individual; and second, because the dignity of the individual requires that he shall know he will be covered. The difficulty with the AMA proposal is that the individual does not know that he will be covered until such time as he has established his indigency. Finally, the AMA continually wishes to rely upon the Kerr-Mills Act, which has been shown to be too expensive and that too few States are willing to go into it with the amount of coverage that the aged need to be adequately covered.

In addition, it has the defect of not assuring care to an individual before such time as he actually becomes sick.

Dependence upon insurance without the underlying benefit of a bill such as the one which was passed by the Senate last year—which I am now cosponsoring—giving hospitalization is ineffective because insurance is, today, even under the 65-plus plans, much too expensive. We must have the Anderson-Gore-Javits bill, and I hope Congress will make it the first order of business.

One of the objectives of the health care for the aging program under social security which I have sponsored is to assure the independence and dignity of the retired person. It achieves this objective by seeking to prevent the individual from becoming dependent on public relief because of increasing health care costs in the declining years of his life.

The AMA program clearly is not a solution. In the 5 years that medicare proposals have been before the Congress this approach has been thoroughly thrashed out and rejected. By its nature, the Kerr-Mills program cannot help older citizens until dependency actually occurs; the Anderson-Gore-Javits bill, which includes the Republican sponsored private carrier insurance program, provides health care coverage at a cost which is manageable by the overwhelming majority of individuals and prevents dependency caused by extended illness.

No matter how we may modify Kerr-Mills, it still remains a public assistance program for the indigent. It is a very costly program in which the State and Federal Governments share the expense. In New York State, for example, the average monthly cost per person is over $300, and the only way in which a State can reduce this expenditure is by limiting the benefits it provides. This has in fact happened in some States which could not afford a broad medicare program for its indigent citizens even under the generous Federal cost-sharing formula. And some States have never entered the program at all even though it has been in existence since 1960.

There are some of the reasons why in my opinion Kerr-Mills, which is a necessary program for the indigent elderly, cannot become a workable program for the health care problems of the millions of aging Americans who are not now indigent.

The proposal to subsidize health insurance policies on a graduated income basis has also been carefully explored in the past and found wanting. Apart from the important fact that it would be excessively costly, extremely cumbersome to administer and would lead to escalation of rates, this part of the AMA proposal assumes that private health insurance alone can do the job of covering health care at reasonable cost. The facts show that this is not the case. Even the statewide nonprofit 65-plus plans, now in effect in New York, Connecticut, California, Texas, and many other States—which are among the best private plans available—even these plans are now beyond the reach of most older persons, and their costs and premiums are continuing to rise.

These plans call for a substantial deductible and for at least 20 percent coinsurance—all of which adds up to much more than the retired citizen can afford. For a couple, the premium rate alone is over $450 a year, and the States which pioneered in this plan have had to increase premium rates by almost 20 percent because membership was limited and hospital costs high.

In one State less than 10 percent of the eligible persons enrolled, and of these a majority took only one part of the program because of its high cost. Premiums for commercial insurance plans for benefits comparable to the nonprofit 65-plus plans run considerably higher.

The inescapable conclusion is that only an approach on a nationwide scale, such as the Anderson-Gore-Javits bipartisan approach, can achieve the broad objectives of a health care program which is adequate, available at genuinely low cost and which safeguards the independence and dignity of the older citizens. It is the program which best meets the recommendations of the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, which was organized at my suggestion in 1962 and which has the potential of best meeting an urgent social need.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TENTATIVE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed the tentative holiday schedule, and I should like to announce that the following plans have been made accordingly:

Inauguration Day is Wednesday, January 20. From the conclusion of business on Friday, January 15, the Senate will go over until Tuesday, January 19, and then meet on Wednesday, January 20, when the Senate must meet.

Lincoln's birthday is on Friday, February 12. From the conclusion of business on Thursday, February 11, until noon, Wednesday, February 17, the Senate will not be in session. There will be a pro forma meeting at noon on Monday, February 15.

Easter, which falls on Sunday, April 18, the Senate will not be in session from the conclusion of business Thursday, April 15, until noon on Wednesday, April 21. Tentatively, a pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Monday, April 19.

Memorial Day falls on Sunday, May 30. The Senate will not be in session from the conclusion of business on Thursday, May 27, until noon on Tuesday, June 1. A pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Friday, May 28, probably. That will be tentative.

July 4 falls on a Sunday. The Senate will not be in session for the transaction of business from the conclusion of business on Thursday, July 1, until noon on Tuesday, July 6. A pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Friday, July 2.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is apparent from this list that February 22, Washington's Birthday, is not included. Of course, it is traditional that the Senate be in session on that day for the purpose of listening to Washington's Farewell Address.

I make that comment because I am quite sure that the majority leader had that in mind at the time the list was prepared.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had forgotten that. I am glad that the distinguished minority leader reminded me. That is correct.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the January 10 issue of the Washington Sunday Star there was published an excellent article entitled "Questions Still Abound as Senate Wrestles With Baker Case."

Mr. John Barron and Mr. Paul Hope have put a tremendous amount of research in, and deserve a lot of credit for, developing this story, in which they point up many of the questions still remaining unanswered in the Baker case.

The Senate must not overlook the fact that this investigation involves charges concerning its own operations and there must be no compromise short of full and complete disclosure.

The integrity of the Senate is at stake.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, as published in the January 10 issue of the Washington Sunday Star, be printed in the RECORD, and I urge every Member of the Senate read it.

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

QUESTIONS STILL ABOUND AS SENATE WRESTLES WITH BAKER CASE

(By Paul Hope and John Barron)

"I think we have demeaned ourselves long enough over one fallen angel and I think it is about time to stop."

So spoke Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican minority leader, when the Senate was agonizing over the Bobby Baker scandals last July.

The Democratic majority eagerly agreed, as the investigation of its former secretary was causing increasing political embarrassment in an election year. Amid furious oratory, the Senate hopefully laid the Baker case to rest.

But the obsequies were premature. And the new 89th Congress finds itself tormented by an old problem: Is it more dangerous to proceed with the investigation or more dangerous to abandon it again?

The dilemma confronting the Senators is simply this:

If investigators are ordered to plunge ahead in an earnest attempt to answer the multitude of questions which have been left unanswered or half answered, there is no telling whose toes will be stepped on.

But if the Senate arranges still another premature funeral, there is no assurance that the Baker scandals will not again be resurrected in even more distressing form. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who forced the Senate to begin the investigation in the first place, and who twice forced his colleagues to resume it when they had dropped it, has warned that he intends to keep digging no matter what the rest of the Senate does.

Few congressional investigations have had the potential of the Baker case for revealing influence peddling and other gross improprieties at the top levels of Government.

But after 15 months of investigation, the Senate is not much further along toward solving the real issues of the Baker affair than it was when the inquiry was authorized in October 1963.

The investigation has been a stop-and-go affair that has raised more serious questions than it has answered. And the Senate has done next to nothing in the way of remedial action.

The questions still pending go to the very heart of the legislative process and involve the integrity of Congress. They concern such explosive matters as improper pressure in the handling of legislation, payoffs and questionable political contributions, and the patronizing of call girls by highly placed persons. Here are a number of these questions and some of the information which raises them:

QUESTION 1

What was the source of Baker's cash? Why was it given to him? What, if anything, did he do to earn it? Why did he elect to transact so much of his business in cash, anyway?

There has been testimony that large sums of cash flowed through Baker's Capitol Hill office and that at times he kept stacks of $100 bills on his Government desk.

Baker, who claimed in financial statements that his net worth increased from $11,000 to $2.1 million in 7 years, deposited at least $106,000 in cash in his personal bank account between 1959 and November 1, 1963. His top Government salary during that time was $19,600.

QUESTION 2

Why were lobbyists so eager to do business with Baker? Did he ever attempt to influence legislation or policy decisions in their behalf?

As secretary to the majority, Baker advised Senators of pending legislation and of the attitude of the Democratic leadership toward it.

Rules Committee records show that while in his Senate job he habitually and intimately associated with lobbyists or self-styled Washington representatives paid to promote certain legislation and governmental decisions.

He was in business deals with Fred B. Black, Jr., who at the time was Washington representative for North American Aviation Corp., a large defense contractor. He also was in business or closely associated with persons representing electronics plants having or seeking Government contracts.

Two days after the Senate enacted a bill beneficial to ocean freight forwarders, a representative of that group paid Baker $5,000.

After a California group received a bank charter, Baker cashed a $5,000 check at the Senate disbursing office made out to a lobbyist engaged to help secure the charter.

QUESTION 3

Did Baker play any role in the passage of sugar legislation?

This is an area the Rules Committee has never touched, despite the fact that Baker was associated with people interested in legislation granting sugar import quotas for foreign countries.

Some sugar lobbyists reportedly maintained season suites at the Carousel, Baker's plush motel at Ocean City, Md. It also is reported that after the passage of the 1962 bill revising quotas for sugar suppliers, the sugar interests held a party at the Carousel.

Baker once delivered to a congressional committee a questionnaire filled out by I. Irving Davidson, a Washington representative of Ecuador sugar interests. No one asked why Davidson gave Baker the questionnaire to deliver to the committee.

Baker prevailed upon John D. Lane, a representative for Peruvian sugar interests, to buy some stock for him in Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. of Milwaukee. Baker's ownership of stock in MGIC, a firm which received a favorable tax ruling from the Government, was acquired through the help of several people with interests on Capitol Hill. Lane also is an attorney for Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., from which Baker bought his house.

QUESTION 4

Why was the Murchison financial empire of Texas so interested in Baker?

Names of persons associated with the Murchisons run all through the Rules Committee record of Baker's activities.

Thomas D. Webb, Washington representative for Murchison, was involved in business deals with Baker.

Robert F. Thompson, executive vice president of Tecon Corp., a Murchison heavy construction outfit that does most of its $75 to $90 million a year business under Government contract, was involved in stock deals with Baker. Thompson either put up the money or arranged the financing for the deals.

Thompson once offered to buy the Carousel from Baker when the motel was in bad financial condition. And Thompson once gave Baker a star sapphire ring.

Baker was involved in a meat deal with Webb and others that gave him a two-way cut on the operations of a meat-processing company owned by the Murchisons in Haiti.

Davidson, the sugar representative, played at least a minor role in obtaining a buyer for the Haitian meat on which Baker was getting a commission. In a foreign agent's report filed with the Justice Department, Davidson listed Tecon Corp. as one of his clients.

Baker once accompanied Clint Murchison, Jr., to see Gov. Pat Brown of California about a race track.

Webb and Bedford Wynne, an official of the Dallas Cowboys football team, another Murchison enterprise, were described as organizers, along with Baker and others, of the Pasantic Corp., a Washington development firm which foundered after the Baker scandal broke.

QUESTION 5

What was Baker's role in the handling of campaign funds, and in the conduct of campaigns themselves?

While a Senate employee, Baker also served for 5 years as secretary and 2 years as treasurer of the Senate Democratic campaign fund and political contributions passed through his hands.

The Rules Committee has a statement from a former vice president of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., who said his superiors in 1960 pressured him into donating $1,200 to a Lyndon Johnson campaign fund. He said he was told he could recover the contribution by falsifying his expense accounts. He also said Baker picked up the contribution.

The former vice president quoted an I.T. & T. official as saying that such contributions were paying off big in Washington.

Another source has told the committee that contributions were also made to the Republican vice-presidential campaign that year.

Jay McDonnell, former assistant to Baker on Capitol Hill, has told reporters that Baker's office resembled a political headquar-

ters during the 1960 presidential primary campaign in West Virginia. McDonnell also told reporters that campaign literature was stacked in or around Baker's office. He said he understood it was for distribution in West Virginia during the contest between Hubert Humphrey and the late President John F. Kennedy.

N. Joe Rahall, a Beckley, W. Va., businessman who lent Baker $10,000 in 1962, confirmed to a reporter last spring that Baker was indeed working on the scene in West Virginia for Humphrey and that he "touched base two or three times" in Beckley during the campaign.

McDonnell claimed Baker's real interest in the Humphrey campaign was to try to slow down the Kennedy drive and put Johnson in a better spot for the nomination.

Johnson, then majority leader, also was trying for the presidential nomination that year. After Johnson became the vice-presidential nominee, Baker was heavily involved in the operation of Johnson's campaign.

Baker had McDonnell fired because they disagreed on the way things should be run in the Democratic secretary's office.

The Rules Committee has refused to call McDonnell to testify even though he was closely associated with Baker, and even though he was one of a long list of witnesses requested by Republican members of the committee.

The committee repeatedly has refused to examine the issue of campaign funds, contending that it is irrelevant to its job in the Baker case. However, the Baker case aside, the Rules Committee does have general jurisdiction over campaign activities and even has a standing subcommittee assigned to the subject.

Committee Democrats justified their refusal to go into the I.T. & T. matter with the comment that there was no indication that Baker was any more than a messenger in picking up the contributions.

QUESTION 6

Was there any relationship between a free flight to a fundraising dinner and the certification of an airline for Government contracts?

While Baker was majority secretary, Riddle Airlines of Florida flew lobbyists, congressional staff members and Baker's secretary, Carole Tyler, to Las Vegas free of charge. The occasion was a fundraising dinner for Senator HOWARD CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada, who is a member of the committee investigating Baker.

Later, Columnist Jack Anderson, who is a director of the airline, had a bill presented to Baker for the flight. The bill never was paid. Anderson subsequently said that it was submitted to Baker by mistake and that someone else really arranged the flight from Washington.

Riddle, a cargo carrier, had been having trouble for 3 years keeping its authorization for Government contracts. Recertification for further Government business was authorized in May 1963, a month after the Las Vegas flight.

QUESTION 7

Were party girls employed to influence legislation, Government decisions, or business deals?

When the Rules Committee last July submitted what it thought would be its final report, the majority members told the Senate:

"The committee reports it found no more than a mere scintilla of evidence that Baker or any other officer or employee of the Senate had used call girls or other immoral women for promoting their outside business and financial activities, and that no evidence other than rumors was produced."

But last February—months before the foregoing statement was drafted—a Puerto Rican businessman, Paul Aguirre, informed committee investigations that Baker once brought two beautiful women to a rendezvous in New Orleans. One of them was the German party girl, Ellen Rometsch.

At the time, Baker was contemplating a business deal with Aguirre. Last spring, Aguirre made a $60,000 loan to Baker, who was having difficulty borrowing money elsewhere.

When the committee abandoned the inquiry last July, it did not disclose this evidence.

In secret session last month, insurance agent Don B. Reynolds, the controversial witness who long was an intimate of Baker, testified in detail about party girls. He described episodes allegedly involving immoral women and at least four Senators or former Senators. One of the Senators he named is a member of the Rules Committee.

Reynolds, a key witness in the inquiry, was a longtime friend of Baker and operates a Silver Spring, Md., insurance company that lists Baker as vice president.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, has suggested on the House floor that the Rules Committee might learn much of importance from Joseph A. Fabianich who, according to the FBI, ran a call girl operation in Washington. Fabianich is reported to have boasted he could "blow the lid off this town" with disclosures related to the Baker case.

After being convicted of white slavery in December 1961, he was imprisoned in the District jail until last February when he was transferred to Leavenworth Penitentiary in Kansas. Penal officials here described the transfer as routine, adding that Fabianich was not a wholesome influence upon other criminals.

The Republican minority report submitted to the Senate last July included a statement by Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, who charged:

"Party girls and entertaining were part of the business promotion apparatus. The facts are available if we pursue it. Individuals were induced to enter into certain business arrangements as part of that promotion. Girls were solicited on Government telephone lines, taken to the place, entertained the prospective customer, and it is part and parcel of the transaction."

Mrs. Rometsch, the wife of a West German sergeant stationed here, was hustled out of the country in 1963 after authorities learned of her relations with men highly placed in Washington.

Democratic members of the committee last month voted not to investigate the affairs of Mrs. Rometsch, contending that her activities were not within the scope of the inquiry. They insisted that the committee has "no legal right to probe into the private conduct of individuals."

The vote did not exclude the possibility that the committee might scrutinize the behavior of other women, but all indications are that the majority still regards the party-girl subject as a forbidden one.

QUESTION 8

Were illegal abortions arranged through an office in the U.S. Capitol?

In testimony released last January, Don Reynolds swore that he once referred a girl seeking an abortion to Baker's office on the Hill. He said that the girl subsequently obtained the abortion. Since receiving this testimony, the committee in all of its public sessions and in all of its public reports completely has ignored the question of abortions.

QUESTION 9

Just what was the relationship between a key Senate employee and organized gambling?

Baker was a partner with Las Vegas gambler Edward Levinson in the Serv-U Corp., a vending machine company that obtained lucrative concessions from defense contractors. At least one other gambler and a close friend of Levinson also were among the original stockholders.

Part of stock in District of Columbia National Bank in Baker's name actually was owned by Levinson.

Baker tried to get gambling concessions in the Caribbean for Nevada gamblers.

He once set up an appointment for Levinson, Clifford Jones, and Jacob Kozloff with John Gates, chairman of Intercontinental Hotel Corp., a subsidiary of Pan American Airways, which operates some casinos in the Caribbean.

Gates said Baker described the three as his clients and friends. Levinson operates the Freemont Hotel in Las Vegas. Jones, a former Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, and Kozloff, have gambling interests in the Caribbean.

Levinson was a stockholder, along with Baker and others, in a new savings and loan association in Honolulu. He also was in a deal with Baker and Black involving the purchase of stock in a State bank in Oklahoma. Black arranged through the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, to buy the stock.

When Baker refused to testify before the Rules Committee, his attorney claimed that telephone conversations between Baker and Levinson had been recorded by Government agencies.

QUESTION 10

Why did Baker have such a close relationship with the savings and loan industry? And why did Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., a company with close ties to the savings and loan business, favor him?

In 1959, Baker was permitted to make an insider's purchase of $28,750 of MGIC stock. The stock later soared in value and by February 1963 Baker listed his holdings in MGIC as totaling 15,130 shares worth nearly $700,000.

MGIC insures mortgage loans, many of which are made by savings and loan associations. Several of the top officials of MGIC formerly were officers of savings and loan associations or had close ties with the industry.

MGIC, with the help of Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, obtained a tax ruling from the Government which was essential to its growth.

Among documents in the Rules Committee record is a letter from MGIC President Max Karl asking Baker to help a John Grogan get "appointed to the advisory council which is set up under the bill referred to in his letter." When Karl testified, nobody asked him who Grogan was nor what the reference to an advisory council and the bill was all about.

During the hearings, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, urged that the committee ascertain whether Senators or Congressmen, other than BYRNES, had profited through investments in MGIC.

"I believe we have that information, Senator," said Committee Counsel Lennox P. McLendon.

If the committee does have such information, it has never made it public.

Baker spoke to the Savings and Loan League's convention in San Francisco in 1958. In 1960 Reynolds gave Baker a $1,000 check which he said was to cover Baker's expenses to a savings and loan convention in Miami. Baker received a $500 honorarium from the league for speaking at the convention.

Baker reportedly hosted a reception for Senators and their staffs in the old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol in 1962 when savings and loan legislation was under consideration, and the reception reportedly was paid for by the savings and loan industry.

Baker financed the Carousel Motel through a Baltimore savings and loan firm. Attached to the loan was a note from Baker stating the date on which the Baltimore firm could

open a new branch—a branch that once had been turned down by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Glen Troop, lobbyist for the savings and loan industry, was a close friend of Baker and joined him in organizing the Quorum Club.

Baker once borrowed $10,000 from the District of Columbia National Bank and documents filed with the Rules Committee indicate it was for a person who was organizing a savings and loan association in Prince Georges County, Md.

QUESTION 11

Has any influence been used by Capitol Hill officials in the chartering of national banks?

Baker was allotted 1,500 shares of the original stock offering of District of Columbia National Bank, an offering that was oversubscribed. Several others on Capitol Hill also were among the subscribers, including Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, second ranking Democrat on the Senate Banking Committee, and five members of the Alabama House delegation. The wife of Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, was listed as a stockholder.

Baker's reference on his subscription application was Max Kampelman, an organizer of the bank and a former aid to Senator HUMPHREY.

Baker was allowed to make several loans from D.C. National, including one for $125,000 to buy a home in fashionable Spring Valley. The loan was not secured by a mortgage but was bought through an arrangement under which an officer of the bank was listed as trustee for the property. Baker signed a promissory note for the $125,000.

A California group hired a friend of Baker, Wayne Bromley, to help push for a national bank charter. After the charter was granted, Bromley was paid $5,000. The check for the $5,000 was delivered to Bromley through Baker and the check, bearing both Bromley's and Baker's endorsements, was cashed at the Senate Disbursing Office.

Representative JACK BROOKS, Democrat, of Texas, is a major stockholder in a new national bank at Silsbee, Tex. The Brooks bank obtained a charter after another group who wanted to open a bank in Silsbee was turned down.

Former Representative Oliver Bolton, Republican, of Ohio, sought an investigation of bank chartering last year by the House Banking Committee but nothing came of it. The Senate Rules Committee has shown no disposition to venture into this area.

QUESTION 12

What were Baker's connections with labor?

Testimony has shown that a Florida business venture in which Baker was involved was financed with a Teamster Union loan.

A former Teamster official, sentenced 4 years ago on a conspiracy charge and once described as a "scoundrel" by Senate Rackets Committee Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, was hired by Baker's Serv-U Corp. as a labor consultant.

A Boilermakers' Union official bought MGIC stock through Baker for $2,300 and a year later sold it to Baker for $4,600 although it was worth more than $30,000 when transferred to Baker. About the same time the Federal Housing Administration was approving a $2.5 million loan for an old folks' home sponsored by the Boilermakers' Union, a loan that has been defaulted on because the home has never had an occupant.

QUESTION 13

Why did William N. McLeod, Jr., while clerk of the House District Committee, accept $1,500 from Reynolds? Why did McLeod ask District officials if Reynolds could write the insurance on District of Columbia Stadium? Why did Reynolds buy a Cadillac for Representative JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House District Committee, a purchase for which MCMILLAN later reimbursed Reynolds?

Reynolds said he gave the $1,500 to McLeod for helping get the District of Columbia Stadium bill through Congress and for other favors over the years. McLeod called the payment a gift, one of the nicest he had ever received.

Reynolds explained the Cadillac transaction as a friendly gesture on his part for MCMILLAN whom he has known for many years. At the time the Cadillac was bought in 1961, when Reynolds was trying to get the stadium insurance business, MCMILLAN explained in a press release that he had Reynolds buy the car for him so no one would think he had taken advantage of his official position to obtain a discount. The matter has never been explored further.

QUESTION 14

Did Baker play any role in the awarding of a contract for the construction of the District of Columbia Stadium?

The Reynolds insurance firm, in which Baker had an interest, was allowed to handle the $73,000 performance bond which had to be obtained by the contractor, McCloskey & Co. of Philadelphia.

Matthew McCloskey, then head of the firm, said he gave Reynolds the business because Baker asked him to. There was discussion with McCloskey about the bond in Baker's Capitol Hill office even before bids were taken on the project.

Reynolds claims there was a $35,000 kickback in connection with the bond. He said the McCloskey firm overpaid the bond cost and that $10,000 went to him as "bagman" and $25,000 went to Baker to use in the 1960 presidential campaign. At the time, McCloskey was treasurer for the National Democratic Committee.

McCloskey heatedly denied Reynolds' kickback charge. He said the extra $35,000 was for other insurance Reynolds was to provide but never did.

He said his company actually paid twice for the extra insurance coverage Reynolds was supposed to provide, once to the company that regularly handled the McCloskey firm's insurance and once to Reynolds. He said this was a "goof" that was never discovered until the issue was raised in the Baker inquiry.

QUESTION 15

What was Baker's relationship with the D.C. Transit System?

D.C. Transit supplied the buses that carried Washingtonians to the opening of Baker's Carousel motel. Baker never paid for the service.

Webb, the Murchison representative who has been so close to Baker, is a director of the D.C. Transit System.

In September 1963, shortly before the Baker investigation began, Baker showed up as a member of a group calling itself the District of Columbia Committee for Balanced Transportation. One of the vice chairmen of the committee was Morris Fox, vice president of D.C. Transit.

One of the first acts of the committee was to sponsor a $100-a-plate dinner honoring O. Roy Chalk, president of D.C. Transit. A letter sent out by the committee chairman said, in part:

"I am certain that you will want to join with other community and national leaders in giving testimony to his (Chalk's) many accomplishments for the area's mass transportation system. Tickets for the affair are $100 each. The proceeds * * * will be used to help effect the completion of the already approved District of Columbia freeway and bridge system. We have made reservations in your name for two tickets to the dinner."

The letter foresaw a long and expensive struggle ahead to effect the completion of our freeway and bridge system and then to integrate it with a practical mass transit system.

Chalk has opposed any mass transit system for Washington unless the D.C. Transit Co. has a major role in its operation.

To understand why the 15 questions set forth above are still unanswered one must consider three important facets of the Baker case—Bobby Baker's tremendously important role in the Senate when he worked there; the Johnson administration's deep interest in the case, and the reluctant and often inept handling of the investigation from the day it started.

THE SENATE

Bobby Baker is literally a product of the Senate, where he spent much of his boyhood and most of his adult life.

The son of the Pickens, S.C., postmaster, Baker came to Washington at 14 to work in the Senate as a page. Senators were his mentors, and whatever he became, it was partly through the influence of the men who make up what they like to call the world's greatest deliberative body.

One of the Senators he was closest to was the late Senator Kerr, the Oklahoma oilman whose business and legislative interests often overlapped.

Baker saw how important influence is in government. And he saw the junketing, the partying and the other extracurricular activities that often accompany the legislative process. He became more than a servant of the Senate; he became an important functionary in its operations. Senators confided in him and often sought his guidance.

In 1957, 2 years after he became secretary to the Democratic majority, President Johnson, then majority leader, praised Baker unstintingly in a speech on the floor of the Senate.

"He is a man who truly serves his country and I consider him one of my most trusted, most loyal and most competent friends," Johnson said. Johnson said that Baker, then only 28 years old, had "gone farther in life than many others of far greater years and it is my personal opinion that he is just getting started."

Later, Johnson was to describe his ubiquitous young protege as "my strong right arm, the last man I see at night, the first one I see in the morning, and to call him as valuable as any man in the Senate."

In 1961, when Baker received an honorary degree from American University, he won bipartisan accolades on the Senate floor. Republican Leader DIRKSEN observed "the efficiency with which he labors" and "the knowledgeable way in which he serves the Senate and the country. Of all the persons I could name, I could name no other who so richly deserves this honor."

Now, the boy wonder of the Senate—the angel, as Senator DIRKSEN called him—has fallen. But as several Senators have said, it is not the fallen angel who is on trial but the Senate.

Although the resolution authorizing the inquiry was not restricted to Baker, there has been practically no effort to find out if there are other Bakers on Capitol Hill.

There has been little effort to establish whether individual Senators have had business dealings with Baker, or whether any of the many outside business interests of Senators result in conflicts with their official duties.

The committee chairman, B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, has said the committee "is not investigating Senators."

It has been disclosed that Baker was involved with at least one Senator, GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, in a business venture.

THE ULTIMATE QUESTION

So far as the Senate is concerned, the ultimate issue in the Baker case is what it is going to do about policing its own morals and ethics. Up to now, it has shown little taste for doing anything in this direction.

It has debated long and bitterly the suggestion that it require Members and employees to disclose financial holdings and sources of income.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a member of the Rules Committee, said during a debate last July:

"The real question before the Senate is whether the Senate should require disclosure by its Members and its officers and employees, whether the Senate should prohibit the kind of 'moonlighting' that got Bobby Baker and the whole Senate into trouble, whether the Senate should require that certain activities by Members of the Senate or by officers or employees should be prohibited because they are not in the public interest, and whether Senators, when called upon by one of their committees, shall be required to testify, unless they state in writing they know nothing of the subject matter under investigation. I suggest there is nothing radical, nothing new, nothing extraordinary about these proposals."

It was during this debate that DIRKSEN, a consistent opponent of disclosure proposals, made the comment that the Senate had demeaned itself long enough over one fallen angel.

A disclosure resolution proposed by CLARK was voted down, 62 to 25. The only member of the Rules Committee whose support CLARK could enlist was Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Another disclosure resolution authored by Senator WILLIAMS was voted down the same day, 59 to 27. This time there were three members of the Rules Committee supporting it—CLARK, SCOTT, and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky.

The Senate turned down even milder reforms recommended by the Rules Committee itself.

TOOK ONE STEP

It did, however, approve a resolution proposed by Senator COOPER to create a permanent select committee of three Democrats and three Republicans to police the behavior of its members. But the committee has never been appointed, and when Senator WILLIAMS forced a reopening of the inquiry later, the Senate turned it back to the Rules Committee rather than the select committee.

Two days after COOPER's resolution was passed, the Senate had some additional thoughts on the matter. It accepted a proposal by DIRKSEN that a grand commission of 19 members be appointed by the President to make a study of the general problem of ethics throughout Government.

But DIRKSEN never got around to putting it into the form of a resolution which the Senate and House could formally act on. So it has produced precisely nothing.

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD of Montana said last week he hoped to have the committee authorized by the Cooper resolution appointed in a week or so. He said, however, that he didn't think it would become involved in the Baker investigation.

Rules Committee Chairman JORDAN told the Senate, though, that he thought the new committee should take over the Baker case if the Senate wants to pursue it further. It has been no secret that JORDAN and some other Democrats on the committee are sorry they ever got into the case which has brought them so much criticism.

THE WHITE HOUSE

As the Baker inquiry has limped along, it has touched not only the Senate and other governmental units but also the White House. The administration has been stung by the conduct of the man who once was described by Lyndon Johnson as his strong right arm. It came even closer when Walter Jenkins, Johnson's longtime administrative assistant, was brought into the case.

There can be little doubt that the influence of the White House significantly affected the progress or lack of progress of the investigation.

The first indication that names of White House personnel would be involved came in a private interview investigators had in late November 1963 with Don Reynolds.

When newsmen learned that Reynolds had sworn he supplied a free stereo set to President Johnson, then Senate majority leader, and was pressured by Jenkins to buy advertising time on the Johnson television station in Austin, Tex., calls went out to newspapers from people close to the White House trying to suppress or alter stories that were being prepared for publication.

There was direct intervention with the Star by Attorney Abe Fortas after the Star asked the White House for comment about the stereo set. Fortas, one of Johnson's closest unofficial advisers, was Baker's attorney until he withdrew from the case after Johnson became President. The story was nevertheless published.

REYNOLDS ATTACKED

About the same time, officials at the top levels of the executive branch told some Washington newsmen covering the Baker case that Reynolds' background was such that he was not a reliable witness.

In at least one case, reporters were shown a report said to be based on material about Reynolds in confidential Air Force and State Department personnel files. The files themselves were not produced.

But a confidential Air Force memorandum based on the Air Force and State Department files was used by Washington columnist Drew Pearson in articles questioning Reynolds' reliability. Republicans on the Rules Committee accused the White House of deliberately leaking confidential records to Pearson to discredit Reynolds. Pearson and the White House denied such a leak.

In a statement to the Senate last July, Senator CURTIS said he received an anonymous phone call in which a person who said he worked at the Pentagon claimed people who were blocking the Bobby Baker investigation were going through the private confidential files of Don Reynolds in order to smear him.

WILLIAMS COMMENTS

At the same Senate session, Senator WILLIAMS SAID:

"I am not unmindful of the fact that the nationally known columnist to whom this was leaked and who tried to discredit this witness had a stepson (Tyler Abell) who was appointed Assistant Postmaster General under President Johnson. His stepson's wife is (social) secretary to the wife of the President * * * and his partner (Jack Anderson) is a director of Riddle Airlines, which is involved in one of Mr. Baker's payoffs."

WILLIAMS said that Reynolds, who had written an insurance policy on Johnson's life, "was considered honorable enough that Senator Lyndon Johnson and Mr. Robert Baker each accepted a stereo set from him." Johnson has said he thought the stereo was a gift from Baker.

Much of the Pearson information came from a report allegedly prepared for the Secretary of the Air Force by Benjamin W. Fridge, the Air Force's special assistant for manpower, personnel and Reserve forces.

An Air Force spokesman refused to comment on the report or to say why the Air Force has a special interest in the Baker case that would require the preparation of the Fridge memorandum about Reynolds' background.

THE INVESTIGATION

The conduct of the Baker investigation has been marked by bickering between Republicans and Democrats on the committee, sketchy questioning and puzzling changes in direction.

Republicans on the committee have consistently claimed that witnesses have been treated unequally. They contend the handling of Jenkins is an illustration.

Republicans wanted Jenkins called to testify about Reynolds' claim that he pressured Reynolds into buying advertising time on the Johnson television station.

But the committee handled it another way. Committee Counsel L. P. McLendon and Chief Investigator W. Ellis Meehan went to the Executive Office Building next to the White House to interview Jenkins. McLendon and Ellis prepared a memorandum of the interview which was then shown to Jenkins and which Jenkins certified to be correct.

In the memorandum, McLendon and Ellis wrote that Jenkins denied having "any knowledge of any arrangements by which Reynolds purchased time on the TV station." McLendon went to pains to point out later that Jenkins didn't deny knowing that Reynolds purchased time on the station.

Reynolds claimed committee investigators harassed and tried to intimidate him. In a statement filed with the committee, here's how Reynolds described a session he had with McLendon and Ellis:

"When he [Meehan] asked me who discussed the purchase of television advertising space with me and I stated that Walter Jenkins and Walter Jenkins alone had, he, the interrogator, thereupon threw a book on the floor and in a boisterous manner informed me that I did not discuss this with Walter Jenkins, that I had discussed it with Bobby Baker.

"At this point I became somewhat reluctant to discuss openly anything further, knowing that his attitude was more toward defending certain people than toward ascertaining the real facts of the case. At two subsequent appearances before the Rules Committee I soon learned that the majority of that committee was more interested in discrediting me as a person and as a witness than it was in developing the actual facts of the case."

M'LENDON'S COMMENT

McLendon's feeling about Reynolds is summed up in a draft he wrote of the committee's report to the Senate. He said:

"The committee can only conclude that Reynolds, being of at least a questionable character himself, glories in the role of a character assassin with little respect for the truth and even less respect for the time honored rules of fair play and common decency."

This language was changed by the Democratic majority to read: "It appears rather obvious that Mr. Reynolds in his effort to enjoy the limelight of this investigation was not reluctant to draw on his imagination and to add to his store of knowledge as time passed."

Reynolds, a former Air Force officer and a former State Department consular officer, has admitted in published interviews that he is no saint. His testimony and a résumé of his Government services records which have been entered in the minutes of the Rules Committee, but which have not yet been made public, bear out Reynolds' own assertion.

But Senator WILLIAMS once told the Senate that without Reynolds' cooperation "we could never have exposed the Bobby Baker case." He added:

"I do not mind saying that I have greater respect for him, even though what he did was wrong, than I have for those who try to discredit him and try to cover up for Mr. Baker."

In its report to the Senate, the committee majority defended its refusal to call Jenkins with this comment: "In reality, the evidence of Jenkins as given or as he might testify

in person has no significant importance insofar as the committee's legislative function is concerned."

That was last July when Jenkins was a top aid in the White House. Last month, after Jenkins had been arrested on a morals charge and had resigned his White House post, the Democrats on the committee changed their minds and agreed with the Republicans to call Jenkins to testify.

Asked why the committee now thinks it appropriate to question Jenkins when it insisted last year that there was no point in summoning him, Jordan last week said: "That's a good question."

He added, "Some of them wanted to call him and it was all right with me."

JORDAN ASTONISHED

No one has been more astonished at the Baker revelations than Chairman JORDAN, the easygoing 68-year-old Sunday school teacher from Saxapahaw, N.C., who said that on his first day in the Senate he sat where Bobby Baker told him and stayed there until Baker told him he could leave.

JORDAN said in the early stages of the inquiry that he could see no significant political implications in the Baker case.

A picture of Baker which once hung on the wall in JORDAN'S office was removed after the investigation began.

JORDAN'S chief role has been to swear in witnesses and read them a statement of the committee's function. It was JORDAN who recommended the 74-year-old McLendon as the head of the investigative staff, a recommendation that was approved unanimously. Republicans on the committee have had some second thoughts about the appointment and Senator CURTIS has suggested that McLendon turn in his resignation.

During a heated exchange last month after McLendon accused Senator WILLIAMS of lying, CURTIS accused McLendon of unfair treatment of witnesses and of frustrating the Republicans' attempt to dig further into the case.

Another Democratic member is CARL HAYDEN, who at 87 is the oldest man in the Senate. HAYDEN, of Arizona, has never asked a question of a witness.

Democratic Senator CANNON, for whose dinner the Riddle Airlines flight was chartered, has shown little interest in the inquiry.

The same is true of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia. His biggest contribution, at least in the public phases of the inquiry, was a hostile interrogation of one of the anti-Baker witnesses, Ralph Hill, in the early stages of the investigation.

Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, has been one of the most conscientious of the Democrats about attending hearings. He has not asked many questions either but he was the only one who could get much of a response from Baker when Baker invoked the fifth amendment more than 100 times rather than answer questions.

PELL asked Baker whether he thought it would be a good idea to change the system of selecting and handling page boys. Baker suggested it might be a good idea to use orphans from the District of Columbia.

After the last round of hearings, PELL indicated to a reporter that he had developed a new interest in the investigation.

Senator CLARK has found himself in a painful position. He has been a leading advocate of reform in the Senate but because of the partisan nature of the case has gone along with the rest of the Democrats in most of the votes on the conduct of the investigation.

REPUBLICANS FIGHT

The Republicans have been more aggressive, no doubt inspired in large part by the political capital to be gained. Without their pressure—and without the help of Senator WILLIAMS—the inquiry would have been dead long ago.

Senator CURTIS, an experienced investigator from the McClellan committee, has pursued witnesses relentlessly. But when it came to a vote on the disclosure resolution on the floor of the Senate, CURTIS was with most of his Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee and with his Republican leader, DIRKSEN.

Senator SCOTT also has been a vigorous questioner. But when the kickback charges were being heard against McCloskey, a big wheel in Pennsylvania, SCOTT was in Tasmania. CLARK also found it convenient to absent himself when his constituent McCloskey testified.

Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, has been so tied up with other things, such as the Warren Commission's investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, that he hasn't been able to devote much time to the Baker investigation. But he has told reporters privately that recent revelations have opened his eyes about the Baker case. He has been a vigorous advocate of extending the investigation into new areas.

Dozens of witnesses requested by the Republicans have been turned down by the Democrats on the committee. Some of those turned down last spring, including McCloskey, on grounds their testimony would be merely cumulative and repetitive were called in the latest round of public hearings. Somehow, their testimony, like that of Jenkins, became pertinent in the interval.

WILLIAMS WATCHES

Always in the background as the Senate considers the Baker dilemma is Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, by all standards the Hill's most feared sleuth.

Because of his role in the case, WILLIAMS has been ostracized by the White House, called a liar, and been made the target of insulting innuendo by some of his colleagues. But nothing has halted his pursuit of Baker and Baker's confederates.

When he declared himself through with the Rules Committee last month, he warned that he would be watching the progress of the investigation with great interest.

Few who know him doubt that he now is trying to assemble the material for more bombs to drop on the Senate floor should the investigators, whoever they turn out to be, do less than he thinks they should.

Although President Johnson made a last-minute, personal appeal for his defeat, WILLIAMS was reelected to the Senate last November.

Recently, he was asked how long he thinks the Baker case will continue. "I have 6 more years," he answered.

CONSERVATION OF DIMINISHING WILDERNESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 88th Congress passed the wilderness bill—the most significant and far-reaching step ever taken along the road to conservation of our diminishing wilderness. I am very proud to have had a part in helping pass this tremendously important legislation.

In debate on the measure, many supporters of the bill spoke of its objectives in clear and unmistakable terms, writing a record which revealed their determination to preserve for posterity great natural scenic and recreational areas of the Nation.

It remained, however, for Frances Zaunmiller, a correspondent of the Grangeville (Idaho) Idaho County Free Press, in writing about Idaho's famed primitive area, to express the very essence of what wilderness means to mankind.

It is a place—

She wrote—

where trees grow that were not planted, and a man can walk and he is not trespassing. * * * And the man takes that part of the stillness, that has soaked into his being, with him, even out of the mountains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent column printed in the RECORD.

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

(By Frances Zaunmiller)

CAMPBELL'S FERRY.—Back in the days when the United States was a rich nation, there were men, both in and out of Washington, who did not have a cataract in their mind's eye. They could see the time coming when a tree would not be a tree, but would be "board feet" for the saw or pulp mill.

They saw in the future when a creek would not be a place to cool tired feet, nor would a river be only for men to play with fishing gear. No, they saw the time when these United States would be so poor, that creeks and rivers would only be recognized as water power, and could not be used for playthings.

Those men were not blind, nor were they stupid. They knew that the souls of men need the stillness of forested mountains and canyons. So, after long deliberation and due process of law, the primitive area of Idaho came into being.

It is a place where trees grow that were not planted, and a man can walk and he is not trespassing.

He can spend a day or a week or as long as he wants, soaking into his being the stillness of the mountains, that brings healing peace to man.

He sees the creeks running free and clear, with fish in quiet pools. While he sits on the trunk of a fallen tree and eats his lunch, he looks at all that is around him, and his mind is not closed to understanding, but listens to the voice of the stillness that is the mountains. And he listens to the story of how the half-rotten tree trunk he is using for both chair and table came to be there, at the edge of the clearing.

No, the trees are not planted in the primitive area, yet they grow, as the tiny little one, so small you'd think something would step on it and it would be crushed.

But it has a toughness not dreamed of in nursery rows, and it will grow, each year lighting its candles to the spring. Until the time when the tree, too, will be a monarch of the mountains, tall and straight with slender strength, asking only for its top in the sun while the rich brown dirt covers its feet.

And it still grows, offering shelter from sun and storm to both two- and four-legged people, and to the ones that fly and wear feathers.

The tree only grows, and asks nothing—'til a summer storm comes over the ridges from the high peaks and crags. Then it bows its head and prays, even as you and I:

"Let not the thunder notice me and call my name, for then the lightning will find my place and use my length as a path for its journey to its marriage with earth.

"Let not the wind twist my branches, for should they break and fall to earth, the nest that they shelter will be broken.

"Let not the wind and rain come together—else the dirt will be washed from my roots and the wind will bend my body, and I will fall to earth, no longer a tree.

"Let me pass safely through this storm, as through those in the past, so that I might give shade and shelter as I have done in the past."

And the man sitting on the trunk of a fallen tree, sees the nest of a grouse in the

tangled branches. He hears the squeak of a mouse that has built its home in the dry needles. And a chipmunk comes from somewhere and tells him the local gossip.

And the man takes that part of the stillness, that has soaked into his being, with him, even out of the mountains.

No, it was not a wasteful United States that set aside the primitive area of yesterday and today and tomorrow. Even as the belly needs meat and bread, so does the soul of man need a quiet place, apart from cities and people, where he can reach an understanding with his inner being.

It is for this that they made it the primitive area. A gift to you and to your son who is not yet born, to play in and keep for all time, yours.

NATURAL DISASTER INSURANCE: AN IMMEDIATE NEED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is with considerable pleasure that I join the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in cosponsoring his proposal for a study of methods of providing financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters. I trust that the Senate will act promptly upon it. The fact that it has once before, on November 8, 1963, received the approval of the Senate should speed its progress through committee and floor consideration.

The need for a comprehensive natural disaster insurance program aiding the private sector of the economy has often been expressed, most recently in Senator JACKSON'S proposal in the last session for earthquake insurance. At the hearings held in connection with his bill, we were all reminded that there is already on the statute books a Federal flood insurance program, 42 Stat. 2401–2421. However, this program has never been funded because of the failure of Congress to appropriate the necessary money. This failure has, in turn, been caused by a lack of sufficient actuarial data for determining the amount which would be needed to fund its provisions. Senator WILLIAMS' bill will enable the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make a recommendation to the Congress concerning the amount of money necessary to establish the Federal flood insurance program.

The number of private homes destroyed or suffering major injury in natural disasters in this country in the last year can be seen from the following table. The materials tabulated here have been obtained from the American Red Cross and represent, except in the case of the recent west coast floods, their final figures for the various disasters:

Disaster	Homes destroyed	Homes suffering major damage
Ohio Valley floods, March 1964	181	1,870
Alaska earthquake, March 1964	494	452
Pacific coast tidal wave, related to Alaska quake	55	21
Wichita Falls, Tex., tornado, April 1964	205	85
Southeast Michigan tornado, May 1964	132	70
Montana and Idaho floods, June 1964	135	260
Eastern Nebraska floods, June 1964	6	441
Hurricane Cleo, west coast of Florida, August 1964	106	1,393
Hurricane Dora, west coast of Florida, September 1964	93	728
Hurricane Hilda, Louisiana, October 1964	169	2,622
West coast floods, December-January 1964:		
Idaho	2	50
Washington	10	42
Oregon	574	1,499
California	977	1,273
Total	1,564	2,864
Grand total	3,140	10,806

In view of the disastrous Alaska earthquake of last spring, the ever-present possibility of other quakes around the Pacific basin and the certainty in the years ahead of other natural disasters throughout the Nation, I feel that both Senator WILLIAMS' proposal and the Federal Flood Insurance Act should be amended to cover earthquake and, perhaps, other natural disasters. At the appropriate time, I shall introduce amendments to accomplish this result.

In the meantime, I shall be watching with continuing interest the progress of the legislation which I cosponsor at this time.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Sunday night, January 10, a distinguished New Jersey team departed from Kennedy International Airport in New York City bound for Brazil. They arrived Monday morning in Rio de Janeiro for briefings by the American Embassy and AID officials and will leave today for the State of Alagoas in northeast Brazil.

This program development team represents the New Jersey Partners of the Alliance Committee which was organized by the citizens of my State in order to participate in a new program designed to match private sector groups and organizations in the United States with similar groups in Latin America. The objective of the partners concept is to help those in Latin rural and slum areas who are striving to help themselves attain a better life. It is that part of the Alliance for Progress that seeks to utilize the full energies of the peoples of the Americas toward hemispheric development.

The New Jersey team consists of Dr. Jesse B. Aronson, director, local health services, division of the New Jersey Department of Health; Mr. Everett C. Curry, president, New Jersey Education Association; Mr. Louis J. Fontanelli, engineer, retired, Fibro Corp.; Mr. Charles C. Phillips, district governor, Rotary International; Mr. Frank A. Saraci, director, plant industry division, New Jersey Department of Agriculture.

The experts will visit small projects undertaken by Brazilians in the State of Alagoas. They will seek to formulate a program whereby the private sector organizations and groups in New Jersey can join in a partnership action to help complete these projects. It may be a gasoline generator for a night literacy class, a blackboard or pencils and paper for a rural school, tools or equipment for agricultural projects involving irrigation or the provision of funds for the purchase of drugs and medicines for mobile health units or health centers. It is the kind of help that recognizes the efforts being made by many Latin Americans to help themselves.

I was personally pleased to participate in the initial organizational meeting of the New Jersey Partners in Newark last September 30. Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the partners of the Alliance programs, in the Agency for International Development, attended and outlined the work and accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere and explained the partners of the Alliance program that is now actively functioning in 19 States. He also indicated that another 10 States are in advanced stages of organization. This meeting, then, was the first step of the New Jersey participation in a citizen's "alliance" with Latin America. Subsequently, a nominating committee, headed by Mr. Albert A. Acken, executive vice president, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, was named by the planning group to select experts from various fields to constitute the team. Many people have donated much time and energy to get the program off to a good start. It has been a bipartisan effort in which a number of members of the New Jersey congressional delegation have participated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release which explains the project in greater detail in regard to the departure of the New Jersey team. I am sure they will accredit themselves well on this mission for the people of New Jersey.

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

FIVE-MAN TEAM OF NEW JERSEYITES TO SET UP ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PARTNERSHIP WITH CITIZENS OF BRAZILIAN STATE OF ALAGOAS

NEWARK, N.J.—A mutual self-help partnership between citizens of New Jersey and of the Brazilian State of Alagoas is being established under the Alliance for Progress program of the Agency for International Development.

Five prominent New Jerseyites—a doctor, an engineer, an agriculturalist, a businessman, and an educator—departed by air to Brazil Sunday evening (January 10) for a 2-week visit to that northeastern Brazilian State. They will meet with local citizen groups and set up a nongovernmental program to assist Alagoans with specific problems eminating from self-help projects aimed at securing a better life for themselves and future generations.

The delegation of New Jerseyites is headed by Charles C. Phillips, of Neptune, president of Edgar Phillips & Son, Inc., and a district governor of Rotary International, who is also serving as temporary chairman of the sponsoring organization—New Jersey Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Other members of the delegation are: Dr. Jesse B. Aronson, director, division of local health services, New Jersey Department of Health, who is a resident of Trenton; Everett C. Curry, president of the New Jersey Education Association and a resident of Atlantic Highlands; Louis J. Fontenelli, an engineer recently retired from the Fibro Corp. (a division of the

Drackett Co.), Clark, and a resident of Garwood; Frank A. Soraci, director of the division of plant industry, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, Trenton, a resident of Titusville.

The delegation received a special AID briefing in Newark Sunday afternoon from Wade B. Fleetwood, a representative of the Washington office of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Later they transferred by helicopter from Newark to Kennedy International Airport for departure to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, aboard a 9 p.m. Pan American Airways flight. Following additional briefing at the U.S. Embassy in Rio, the group will fly on to Macieo, the capital of Alagoas, to familiarize themselves with that state's basic human needs and to establish the citizen contacts through which the program will subsequently function.

During their stay in Macieo, the group will meet with the Governor of Alagoas, Gen. Luiz Cavalcante, and will present him with an official letter of greetings from New Jersey's Gov. Richard J. Hughes, as well as a New Jersey State flag.

New Jersey's participation in the "partners" program was initiated through efforts of Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., along with Congressmen PETER W. RODINO, JR. and PETER FRELINGHUYSEN. At the group's initial meeting, held in Newark some weeks ago, Senator CASE related how the program has received enthusiastic bipartisan support in the Congress because of its unusual effectiveness and its modest cost.

The partners program, Phillips explained, is now functioning in 19 States. It provides a channel through which community organizations—business, professional, educational, labor unions, service groups, State or city institutions, or even private citizens in the United States can work directly with the people of a Central or South American nation or state, encouraging their efforts to improve their own way of life. It supplements cooperative assistance between the governments and public and private institutions within the two nations involved. Most of the individual partners projects, he said, will be of a modest nature—a portable electric generator for a rural school so that night literacy classes can be conducted for adults; a pump or pipeline to complete a local irrigation project; typewriters or foot-powered sewing machines to help children in an orphanage develop employable skills; operating room supplies for a small hospital, etc.

"Because such projects directly benefit the people, we are told they have as much, if not more, impact in our struggle against Communist anti-Americanism than do the large undertakings that are conducted at the intergovernmental or interinstitutional level. They provide tangible evidence of the average U.S. citizen's genuine interest in the welfare of our Central and South American neighbors," Phillips said.

"Financial support for projects of this kind can be generated directly by citizen organizations in New Jersey," Phillips continued. "While our New Jersey Partners organization is so new that it does not as yet have permanent officers, the underlying membership already includes representatives of the major service clubs, organized labor, and statewide business groups so that we have a sound basis for implementing our program and meeting some of the small but important human needs of the people of Alagoas."

Phillips emphasized that the program is not one of charity. The projects to be undertaken by New Jersey participants will be solely to supplement self-help projects initiated by the citizens of Alagoas. He also pointed out that the partnership is not a one-way program, citing the experience of one Western State which has already received important agricultural help from its South American "partner."

Present at the briefing in Newark Sunday were several members of the New Jersey Partners temporary steering group including Russell Armstrong, of Alpine, a district governor of Rotary International; Bertram J. Bertolamy, of Garwood, international counselor for Lions International, and John L. Wetten, of Caldwell, New Jersey district governor of Kiwanis International. Albert H. Acken, executive vice president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and Arthur M. Cox, Jr., the chamber's public relations director, remained with the five-man New Jersey team until their international flight departure. Acken, who resides in Orange, is serving as chairman of the group's nominating committee, and Cox, a resident of Maplewood, is acting as temporary secretary.

The New Jersey team is expected to return to Newark on Sunday, January 24, and shortly thereafter will present a report to the organization's entire membership.

AN APPRAISAL OF FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year a constituent, Richard Hansen, of Joplin, Mont., sent me a paper he prepared in defense of agricultural subsidies. "The Distorted Image" is an excellent analysis of the subsidy issue as it affects the farm economy, both from the practical aspect and the public relations aspect of the issue.

In the not too distant future, Congress will again be faced with a review of our farm policies. With this thought in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have the Hansen article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

THE DISTORTED IMAGE

(By Richard E. Hansen, Jr.)

In a speech not long ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman presented a chilling prospect for the millions of Americans engaged in the business of farming. With the Nation's farms growing fewer in number and larger in size each year, he warned, the balance of power is also shifting.

"In the future," he said, "legislation dealing with all agricultural matters will become more and more dependent upon the votes of those who represent urban States and areas other than agricultural for passage."

With the heavy burden of responsibility these legislators already have to their constituents in regard to the complexities of modern-day urban problems, it seems doubtful that many will be either willing, or able, to devote the time and attention necessary to fully understand or intelligently act upon the needs of the suburban population.

Of real concern to many farmers in this image-conscious age, is the distorted view which many urban residents have of those who make their living by farming, or, to use more recent terminology—agribusiness. A barrage of criticisms, half-truths, and innuendoes has for years been leveled periodically against the farming industry. This bombardment—largely undeserved, has with the exception of a few isolated cases, remained mostly unanswered—resulting in one of the most lop-sided examples of public relations ever experienced by any group in this country.

Probably the most flagrant area of distortion and misinformation lies in the yearly appropriation which Congress makes to the Agriculture Department.

A great many of those responsible for keeping the public informed, frequently leave the impression that this figure—representing billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, is simply divided up and handed out equally to all of the Nation's farmers to subsidize them for not growing anything at all on their acres.

In all fairness, it must be said that some of the blame for the failure to fully inform its citizens as to the expenditure of these tax dollars originates from within the circles of Government itself.

The result of these implications has been to implant firmly in the minds of a majority of the Nation's urban citizens that nowadays the farmer's main harvest field is the U.S. Treasury. It has been suggested that 90 percent of the country's nonfarm population, if asked for a synonym for the word subsidy, would unhesitatingly answer "farming."

The ironical fact is, that while lashing out at farm subsidies, many publishers choose to ignore the fact that they themselves are being heavily subsidized by this same Government. A number of these publishers have testified before congressional committees that, without this aid, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for them to continue in business.

Perhaps then, this would be a good time to take a brief look at Federal aid in general, and a longer look at farm support in particular, in an attempt to see just how Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public fares, and what they are getting in return for some of this golden harvest which many intimate is being handed out so lavishly to the Nation's farmers.

U.S. Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota, in a special report on subsidies to the House Agricultural Subcommittee, stated, "The subsidy is as ancient as time. It has an honorable purpose and tradition. The subsidy is indispensable in this day of increasing population, with the world shrunken in size by rockets and travel at speeds faster than sound."

In his report, Representative Marshall points out the fact that the oldest recorded subsidy is the gift to Adam and Eve of the Garden of Eden. Since then, history is studded with examples of subvention in one form or another. Kings and kingdoms were dependent upon subsidies. The original colonists of our country were aided by the gift of the land which formed the original colonies, as well as in other ways.

In fact, the whole history of the growth and development of this country is one of subsidization, from the formation of our Navy and merchant fleets, to our railroads and industries. The early-day pioneers were subsidized in their westward migration by the Homestead Act of 1862. This same year, education in the Nation was assisted by the Land-Grant College Act, whereby free land was donated by the Government for the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts.

A limited study of the history of subsidies, made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, shows that the first direct subsidy of record which was paid by our Federal Government, was when Congress authorized the Postmaster General to award payments for carrying mail in 1845.

Since we intend to take up the matter of Government aid to farmers at a later point, it is interesting to note here that postal deficits from mail subsidies during the 10-year period, 1946 to 1956, have cost the taxpayer more than the entire losses from the agriculture price support program from its inception in 1933, to date.

It should be pointed out also, that while it is not a direct money grant, the tariff system, enacted in 1789, is considered to be our most monumental example of the subsidy. In fact, the entire principle of subsidy was established by this legislative act of our first Congress. Today, tariff revenues to the Gov-

ernment alone are running at something like three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. In addition to this, industry, business, agriculture, and other groups reap uncalculable millions in benefits from this system.

One can only speculate on how far the storied U.P. Trail would stretch today were it not for the support of the Government. One estimation of the total amount of Federal aid given to encourage railroad construction puts the figure at nearly $1.3 million. Much of this has been in the form of land grants, consisting of some 183 million acres during the last half of the past century alone. This figure is considerably more than the total acreage planted to corn, wheat, cotton, and soybeans last year.

Although subsidies are normally thought of as a direct payment of money, this is not always the case. It is doubtful if any person in this country does not benefit in some way—either directly or indirectly, from Government help. Each time a person uses one of the Nation's highways, for example, or mails a letter or receives a publication by mail, travels by rail, sea or air, or attends a public school, he is in effect profiting from our Federal subsidy system.

Not only do our own people benefit from our Federal subsidies, but in one way or another—either through our foreign aid program, miiltary aid, direct grants of money, or technical assistance—a large part of the world's population also feels the effects of our subsidization.

During the fiscal year 1959–60, a period of especially vitriolic attacks against Federal aid to farmers, out of the $82 billion Government budget, aids and special services—according to the Budget Bureau's own analysis—accounted for $1.5 billion, or about one-fifth of the total budget. Of this sum, nearly $1.5 billion went to business for such items as postal service operations losses, maritime operating and other assistance to the shipping industry, as well as air navigation aids.

Labor received almost three-quarters of a billion, largely for unemployment benefits, while about $5 billion went to veterans for pensions, medical care, education, and other costs. Our foreign economic and military aid programs accounted for slightly over $3.7 billion during this same period.

Additional grants included $2.3 billion for assistance to the needy, aged, blind and disabled, aids to Indians, etc. Funds for stockpiling metals for defense and other purposes also accounted for a share. Homeowners and tenants profited through such direct Federal aid programs as Housing and Home Finance Agency, slum clearance, and urban renewal.

Not included in this figure are such indirect aids as fast tax writeoffs for defense-related industries, depletion allowances for oil and mining companies and many others. Hardly a segment of our economy failed to profit in some manner or share in some way in the billions ladled out by the Government to assist private enterprise, needy or deserving citizens, or for general economic pump priming.

The amount which was budgeted to agriculture at that time was $6,450 million. If, as is frequently intimated, this amount was divided up among the Nation's farmers, there should then be some 4 million multimillionaires living on farms in this country. Since this is obviously not the case, just where did this money go? Who benefited from it if not the farmers of the Nation?

The answer is, practically everybody in this country shared in a part of it, as well as millions of persons in foreign lands. If you bought meat—either wholesale or retail—drank milk, used any lumber, or if your child participated in the school lunch or school milk programs, or if you enjoyed a vacation in one of the national forests, then you were receiving benefits from some of the funds allocated to the Department of Agriculture.

A breakdown of Agriculture Department expenditures for that year reveals about 45 percent of this $6.450 billion, or a total of $2.874 billion, was expended upon programs having multiple benefits, and not directly chargeable to the farmer.

Of this total, the largest share—$1.396 billion, was used for programs having foreign relations and defense aspects, including donations and gifts of food overseas under Public Law 480. Another $510 million went to REA and FHA in the form of loans which are repayable with interest. School lunch programs, food distribution and school milk accounted for another $323 million of these funds. Such items as meat inspection, research, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, and forest and public land management used an additional $645 million.

It is perhaps worthy of mention also, that of this total budget figure, approximately 11 percent was siphoned off in the form of administrative expenses, for such things as personal services, salaries, travel, supplies, etc. These expenses include the costs of preparing, printing and distributing many of the speeches given by Department officials, and it may interest some taxpayers to know that a random sampling of these speeches show their cost to average out at about $246.58 each.

While every citizen of our country, as well as those in other parts of the world shared equally in the benefits of these programs, the amounts expended to obtain them are often a part of the total figure which critics use in their blasts at farm subsidies.

And the remaining 3½ billion? Is this the amount which was handed out to the Nation's farmers?

Handouts—no. Subsidies, yes—to some extent—received by a great many farmers and ranchers. However, much of this was received in the form of loans—secured and subject to interest payments. Department of Agriculture figures show that in regard to programs predominantly for the benefit of farmers, the greatest amount, $2.955 billion went for Commodity Credit Corporation price support, supply and related programs, National Wool Act, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas. Conservation programs, acreage reserve, conservation reserve, and Sugar Act programs accounted for the balance.

Since Government price support programs for such commodities as wheat often bear the brunt of attacks by farm critics, it should be pointed out that any money farmers receive from price support comes in the form of a loan. This loan is subject to repayment within a definite time period, either in cash with interest, or through forfeiture of the collateral commodities.

These loans—in the words of Department officials themselves—constitute neither payments nor losses. Commodities acquired by the Government through loan forfeiture or purchase, have a definite value which, when recovered through sale or other means, substantially reduces the net cost to the taxpayer.

Further, during the year in question, a very large percentage of these loans were repaid in cash by farmers, along with interest payments which amounted to approximately $14 million alone.

Many farmers use these loans simply to postpone selling until more favorable market conditions prevail, or, to defray income for tax purposes over into the following year. It might be argued that these commodity loans represent subsidies to the farmer to the same degree that Government loans to those engaged in any private business or industry, or to the veteran buying a home can be considered a grant.

Touching briefly upon the payments farmers receive for carrying out projects relating to conservation type activities, a simile might be drawn between conservation programs and the depletion allowances operators of oil wells and mines are granted. Theoretically, recognition is made that these operators are depleting wealth of their property by production. Being an exhaustible natural wealth, it is further theorized that these persons are entitled to Federal aid, which in this case is received in the form of tax relief.

Conservation payments to farmers might be termed as soil depletion, or fertility depletion allowances, since this farmer is also depleting natural wealth in producing from the soil. In this case though, the farmer must take the initiative and usually bear a part of the cost of restoring this natural wealth himself before the Government chips in with a percentage.

Perhaps though, the area which is of most concern to the nonfarm taxpayer is that of the much publicized payments which farmers receive for not producing anything on part of their acreage. This concern is shared by a great many farmers as well, since in a considerable amount of cases, these payments are not nearly equal to the amounts which would have been realized had the farmer been allowed to use this acreage for productive purposes.

Under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to determine each year the total number of acres in this country upon which can be grown crops which are currently considered as being in surplus. Out of this total, each grower of a given commodity is allocated a certain percentage of his total acreage which he is allowed to use in producing these specified products.

His remaining acreage can be utilized to raise crops which are not in surplus, or, can be allowed to remain idle, in which case the Government compensates the farmer to some extent for his loss of income from these acres by some form of payment.

Unfortunately, particularly in the case of many dryland wheat farms, there is no alternate crops which can be profitably grown on these remaining acres. Their only recourse in most instances, is to allow this land to lie idle and accept payments to partially offset their losses, while at the same time, striving for increased yields from the land which is in production to try and make up the difference.

When one compares the per acre income potential of most average-to-good farmland when used for production, against the Government payment per acre for not producing on this land, it becomes readily apparent that such of the land taken out of production under soil bank and similar programs was hardly worth farming in the first place.

It should be established here, that farming represents one of the principle remaining outposts of the rugged individualist. Farmers have long cherished the freedom and independence which were basic to their way of life.

Some proof of this is offered in the tenacity with which many continue to cling to their farms, in spite of the fact that roughly 55 percent of all farm-operator families are classed as being among the lowest income fifth of all families in the United States. The shackles imposed upon their way of life by Government restrictions are galling indeed to the majority of these individuals.

Still, no group is more aware of the problems which exist in connection with their industry. Recognition is generally, albeit reluctantly, granted by farmers that there is need for some sort of controls, particularly in the face of present day surplus production of many commodities. This is a situation which, paradoxically, they have brought

about themselves largely through their own progressiveness.

Few others in this country have been more quickly responsive to technological advancements during the past two decades than farmers. As a result, we are the best fed, best clothed people of any nation on earth. At the same time, the farmers share of increases in food prices during this period have been so slight as to be almost negligible.

Wheat growers, like many other farm commodity groups, have been more than willing to assume their share of the responsibility for doing something about their problems.

Nearly every Western and Midwestern State where wheat and other cereal grains are grown now has a large scale, farmer organized and supported, program of education, sales promotion, marketing, and research. In most cases, this program is financed entirely by the growers themselves through a system of voluntary per-bushel assessments on the grain they produce.

Much of the efforts of these groups is directed at expanding existing markets in foreign countries, as well as creating new markets for their products. Continuing research is also being carried out toward finding new uses for these products, improving present grain varieties, and searching for new and improved varieties.

As was pointed out, farmers—while perhaps not as vociferous as other groups in the Nation—are among the sharpest critics of Government interference in the business of farming. At the same time, they are fully cognizant of the folly of divorcing theirs—or any other single industry in this country—entirely from all Federal control; i.e., aid and support.

To do so, would place them in a position of competing against their own tax dollars, since nearly all of the goods and services they are required to buy are in some way, shape or form, Government subsidized.

Speaking before the House some time ago, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, said, "Our Government provides the minimum wage and collective bargaining powers to protect our labor forces, and our industry is favored by many laws that soften the impacts of harsh and unrestrained competition."

There are today, he pointed out, more single units of enterprise in agriculture, more individual capitalists, than all other industry and business combined.

"This Nation," he said, "will not permit more than one-half of its free enterprise units to struggle constantly on the edge of insolvency."

Farming is not only one of our oldest forms of free enterprise in this country, it is also our basic industry. Farmers are among the Nation's largest users of steel, paint, chemicals, rubber, and automotive products.

If the farmer—as typified by the family-type operation—is allowed to wither on the economic vine, then the considerable segment of our business, industry, and labor community which exists to serve him will certainly shrivel accordingly.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE COAST GUARD IN WAR AND IN PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has written a most interesting and illuminating article regarding the Coast Guard's many contributions to our country, both in war and in peace.

As one who served in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II, and as a member of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, I am especially pleased to have an opportunity to bring this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues.

Admiral Roland points to the 174-year-old history of our Coast Guard, its long record in defending and safeguarding principles we cherish, and, particularly, its use of new technologies directed toward increasing the effectiveness of its services. These include experiments with thermoelectric nuclear generators in navigational aids, and new offshore light structures to designate more accurately safe channels for passage near land. One such structure has recently been put into operation at Brenton Reef, off my home city of Newport, R.I.

Admiral Roland also explains that during the last 10 years the Coast Guard has rescued almost 32,000 persons, and has saved property valued at over $15 billion. This is, indeed, an outstanding record of achievement.

To maintain and build on such a record requires vigilant and resourceful leadership. The Coast Guard is fortunate to have a Commandant possessed of these qualities.

I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Roland's article, entitled "The U.S. Coast Guard: Helping Hand and Armed Force," which was published in the December issue of the Officer magazine, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE U.S. COAST GUARD: HELPING HAND AND ARMED FORCE

(By Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard)

The U.S. Coast Guard is an armed service with an important difference: While other Armed Forces operate in the Defense Department, the Coast Guard is a Treasury Department agency in peacetime.

In time of war or on direction of the President, it operates under the Navy. But in war or peace it always remains a military service, never losing its Coast Guard identity. This is a point often missed by many persons otherwise well informed on military matters.

Aside from its unusual position in the Defense Establishment, the Coast Guard is also unique in that it has a traditional and well-defined peacetime mission to promote maritime safety and marine law enforcement. Its dual character as an armed force and marine safety agency gives it a personality distinct from that of the other services.

In view of the Coast Guard's complexity, it's not surprising that a large segment of the American public does not have a clear concept of the part played by this 174-year-old service in our national life. Perhaps a look at the Coast Guard would help to dispel some of the confusion.

FAR BEYOND U.S. WATERS

First, let's take up the size and geographic scope of the Coast Guard. Compared to the other services, the Coast Guard is small with a total military strength of about 32,000 men. It has few large units, and many isolated in remote parts of the world. Instead of hugging the coast, as its name implies, the Coast Guard is scattered around the globe—from the Mediterranean in the east to Japan and the Philippines in the west—from the Arctic to the Equator, and at times the Antarctic. Obviously, the Coast Guard's functions range far beyond the coastal waters of the United States.

The great bulk of the Coast Guard's duties in peacetime are concerned with the safety of life and property on the high seas and waters under Federal jurisdiction.

Generally, its activities in maritime safety may be divided into two classes: Those intended to reduce the occurrence of accidents or other distress at sea, and those activities aimed at alleviating distress once it exists. While search and rescue often makes the headlines, the less spectacular preventive activities are no less important, and in many ways predominate in our day-to-day work. They underlie many of our operations, especially those involving merchant marine safety, aids to navigation, and recreational boating safety. More and more we are coming to realize that the key to increased safety at sea may well lie in the preventive approach to marine safety.

Relatively few persons are aware of the Coast Guard's merchant marine safety program which includes administration and enforcement of laws and regulations governing the safety and efficiency of the U.S. merchant marine. Broadly stated, this embraces the development of safety standards for the design, construction, equipping, and operation of merchant ships; inspection of merchant vessels and their gear during building and periodically thereafter to insure their conformity with prescribed standards. It also extends to the setting of personnel standards, and the issuance of licenses and certificates to merchant marine personnel. Another function is the control and supervision of the loading and transportation by merchant vessels of explosives and other hazardous cargoes. When, despite these safeguards, casualties occur, the Coast Guard investigates and takes corrective action in whatever area it may be needed.

THE FIRST NUCLEAR SHIP

In recent years, the Coast Guard's long experience in setting the criteria for marine safety was employed in the construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the *Savannah*.

As part of its continuing effort to make the sea safer for those who sail it, the Coast Guard maintains a vast network of more than 2,000 aids to navigation, including a worldwide network of loran stations. These aids are located along our coasts, in the Great Lakes and navigable rivers, in our island possessions, and as required for defense purposes, at oversea locations. Improvements to waterways and other changing circumstances create new or different requirements for aids. In the last several years, many secondary lights have been converted to automatic operation, oil and gas burning lights and buoys have been converted to electric power, and other changes made to provide better service at lower cost.

In this connection, the Coast Guard has been experimenting with a thermoelectric nuclear generator installed in a lighted buoy in Chesapeake Bay. This generator, one of a series developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, is similar in principle to the atomic generators now used in the Transit navigational satellites and in automatic weather stations in the Arctic and Antarctic. Strontium 90, a byproduct of nuclear reactors, provides the best source for this generator. Recently, the Coast Guard placed in operation its first atomic powered lighthouse in Chesapeake Bay.

A further advance in navigational aids is the offshore light structure which is being used at points where the depth of water permits. Eventually, many of the Coast Guard's colorful lightships will be supplanted by these offshore structures. One of them is now functioning in Buzzards Bay at the southern approach to the Cape Cod Canal. A second is in operation at Brenton Reef off Newport, R.I., and a third is about to go into commission replacing the Frying Pan Shoals lightship off Cape Fear, N.C.

DARING RESCUES AT SEA

With increasing thousands of Americans taking to the waterways, recreational boating safety has become another major area of interest for the Coast Guard. In recognition of this upsurge of interest in pleasure boating, the Coast Guard has established a Recreational Boating Safety Division at its headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Primarily, the Coast Guard seeks to encourage adherence to safe boating practices through education. Assisting in this effort is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, a voluntary, nonmilitary organization of boatowners, functioning under the administration of the Commandant. Among other things, this organization exists for the purpose of assisting the Coast Guard to promote efficiency in the operation of motorboats and to foster a wider knowledge of laws, rules, and regulations governing motorboat operations. Auxiliarists conduct courtesy boating examinations and provide courses in safe boating which are open to the public.

Nearly everyone is familiar with daring rescues at sea carried out by the Coast Guard. No matter how far we may advance in preventive safety, we can never altogether eliminate the many hazards of the sea. There will always be need for the Coast Guard's search and rescue work.

One of the most important developments in this vital field was the inauguration of the Atlantic merchant vessel reporting program (Amver) in 1958. Under this program, vessels report their courses and speeds periodically to the Coast Guard in New York. These data are processed by an electric computer and provide the most current information for Coast Guard rescue coordination centers. Hundreds of vessels of foreign and U.S. registry have taken part in the program and next year, coverage will be extended to include the North Pacific Ocean.

SAVES FIVE TIMES COST

In carrying out its search and rescue function, the Coast Guard, over a period of the last 10 years rescued 31,888 persons in peril and saved property valued at more than $15 billion. This figure represents more than 5 times the total appropriation for the service during the same period of time, a remarkable record for a service of less than 32,000 men.

In the past, oceanography has been a relatively obscure science. Today, it is rapidly becoming one of our most important activities, with enormous implications both for peace and war. Reflecting a growing national interest in oceanography, the Coast Guard is intensifying its efforts in this field. Its involvement in this vital area started in 1867, shortly after the purchase of Alaska from the Imperial Russian Government.

In that year the cutter *Lincoln* was dispatched on the first official exploration of Alaskan waters. Since then the Coast Guard has been moving steadily forward in the marine sciences. Through oceanic studies carried out by its International Ice Patrol, Alaskan Patrol, and its ocean weather ships in both the Atlantic and Pacific, the Coast Guard is contributing significantly to the national oceanographic effort.

The Coast Guard, however, is a military organization and does have military functions to perform along with its many peacetime tasks. It is in this connection that the Coast Guard Reserve plays a major part and we rely to a great extent upon our reservists to prepare for and be ready to carry out the Coast Guard's wartime missions.

ENTER COAST GUARD RESERVE

Prior to the outbreak of World War II we had no Organized Reserve and our entire strength numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. The Coast Guard found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible due to our ever-increasing duties. As a result, the Coast Guard Reserve was born.

With the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939, Coast Guard ships, planes, and stations were ordered to carry out extensive patrols to insure that merchant ships in our waters did not violate the neutrality proclaimed by President Roosevelt. The next summer the Coast Guard began its port security operations under the revised Espionage Act of 1917 and the newly enacted Dangerous Cargo Act.

On November 1, 1941, the Coast Guard was ordered to operate as part of the Navy. The next month Pearl Harbor was bombed and we were in the war. As in World War I, a big part of the Coast Guard's task was antisubmarine warfare. Coast Guard cruising cutters and convoy escorts helped win the battle of the Atlantic as they destroyed 11 U-boats. At the same time, more than 4,000 survivors of torpedoings and other enemy action were rescued from the Atlantic and Mediterranean by Coast Guardsmen.

But there were losses too. The cutter *Hamilton* went down while in tow after she had been torpedoed off Iceland. The *Acacia* was sunk in the Caribbean; *Escanaba, Leopold, Muskeget,* and *Natsek* in the Atlantic; *Serpens* in the Pacific. Only two of the crew survived *Escanaba*—no one, on board *Muskeget, Serpens,* or *Natsek*. More than 90 percent of those who went down with these vessels were members of the newly established Reserve component of the Coast Guard.

RESERVISTS ON THE BEACHES

Many more reservists manned landing craft that hit the invasion beaches with assault troops at Guadalcanal, Anzio, Tarawa, Attu, North Africa, Salerno, Makin, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Normandy, southern France, Luzon, Guam, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa—the Coast Guard made all those stops and a lot in between.

At its peak strength the service had 802 vessels (over 65 feet) of its own, and in addition manned 351 Navy and 288 Army craft. Shore stations increased from 1,096 to 1,774 and by June of 1945 total personnel reached 172,000. There were only 10,000 more men ashore than at sea, as many of the shore billets were taken over by temporary reservists and 10,000 women reservists who became known as Spars.

At the conclusion of the war approximately 150,000 of our total personnel were reservists who had entered the Coast Guard for wartime duty. Many of this number formed the nucleus for the establishment of our regular peacetime Reserve and are still serving with Reserve components. Others have completed their 20 years and are now retired under the Reserve Retirement Act which the Reserve Officers Association was so instrumental in having enacted.

Today, we have approximately 150 Reserve port security training units with more than 11,000 men attending regular weekly drills. Many of these reservists are also qualified for assignment to floating units should conditions dictate.

Other Organized Reserve training units are of a support nature, providing additional trained personnel for vessel augmentation and activation, search and rescue, aviation, electronics, coastal forces, and mobilization detachments. During the past 12 months 3,565 members of these organized units received 2 weeks' active duty for training (ACDUTRA) at our Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Va.; another 1,600 at Alameda, Calif., while many more received their 2 weeks' training in their particular specialty at regular Coast Guard units and installations or at Coast Guard or other service schools. The Reserve Officers Association with its precept for a strong, well-trained Reserve can take pride in the fact that its contribution to this program was, and continues to be, a most substantial one.

Currently, we are training approximately 17,000 reservists in Organized Reserve training units. This is the maximum number our present budget of $20.7 million will support. Additional personnel are needed to meet our mobilization requirements. There are other important needs with respect to facilities and equipment.

However, I can state with a great deal of conviction that from my experience and association with the Reserve and its members, the Coast Guard Reserve will, within the limitations of its operating budget, be both ready and reliable.

I have found that its members, whatever their individual backgrounds, reflect one thing in common—devotion, pride, and a feeling of national responsibility.

Without this loyalty and devotion my work and the Coast Guard's mission could not succeed.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION MESSAGE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever there was a capital investment that we as citizens of the United States should make, it is investment in the education of our children. I congratulate the President on his program, and I will support it as hard as I can. My objective is to have every youngster in America receive as much education as he is capable of absorbing and wants, and not to have financial consideration play any role in his securing such an education.

I like the President's approach, too, in that its thrust is directed at our children because only if children want to go to college and are adequately prepared for college can they take advantage of such education. I think all too often at the Federal level we have been putting the cart before the horse, in thinking in terms of advanced education, when we should also be thinking in terms of providing earlier in students' lives more opportunity, or in terms of solving problems such as the one we face when far too many of our youngsters become second generation or even third generation school dropouts.

Education is for far more than economic reasons. But sound reasoning also must include consideration of the fact that persons with an eighth-grade education or less earn $176,000 in the course of a lifetime; high school graduates earn $273,000; and college graduates earn $453,000.

This has an impact on our Nation's economy.

THE USE OF LOOKOUT GALLERIES FOR PREVENTION OF MAIL THEFT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently there seems to have developed a controversy over the advisability of the so-called lookout galleries built into post offices, for observation of mail work rooms by postal inspectors.

Quite contrary to my aversion to any police procedures of the "big brother is watching you" variety, I express my support of the use of these lookout devices for the prevention and detection of theft from the U.S. mails. Our postal system represents one of this country's major lifelines for communication and commerce, and we must use all reasonable measures to keep it open and to keep it worthy of our confidence.

I believe that a good description of the need for the lookout galleries is contained in an article written by Miriam Ottenberg, and published in the January 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

I ask that the 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:

POST OFFICE PROMISES FIGHT FOR GALLERIES

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The Postal Inspection Service rates the lookout galleries in post offices such an "indispensable tool" to prevent looting of the mail that a determined fight will be waged against any effort to eliminate them.

The observation galleries built into the larger post offices are being eyed on both sides of the Capitol.

On the House side, several Members introduced bills to eliminate the lookout posts, held a press conference and announced they would call for an investigation at this session. On the Senate side, the Senate Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee has asked the Post Office Department for information about the galleries.

The congressional attacks on post office surveillance, however, came before Postmaster General John A. Gronouski closed the observation posts in post office men's rooms last month.

The Postmaster General said he thought the washroom lookout stations were an "unfortunate invasion of privacy" but he stressed at the time that he did not consider that observation galleries elsewhere in post offices violated anyone's rights.

Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague concurred with the Postmaster General on banning washroom lookouts although thieves have used the plumbing to destroy such evidence as money wrappers and envelopes.

For the rest of the post offices, where galleries permit a view of the mail workroom, Chief Montague insists that the lookouts benefit postal employees as well as the mailing public. Without the lookouts, he is convinced, the mail will be much less safe than it is today.

He is determined to keep the lookout galleries and considers that calling them peepholes is strictly "smear tactics."

AID TO WORKERS

He said the lookouts are useful where a businessman complains that he's not getting valuable mail. In about 100 cases last year, Chief Montague reported, the business firms' own employees were rifling the mail.

If it hadn't been for the lookouts, he said, suspicion would have fallen on postal employees. The way it works now, he explained, the lookout galleries enable inspectors to clear postal workers of any suspicion and enlist their help in solving the theft.

He stressed the incalculable value in terms of money and merchandise going through the mail—from diamonds in New York to the suburban bank-by-mail deposits. The overall value has been placed at trillions of dollars.

Postal inspectors, he said, only move into the lookout galleries when a complaint is received that mail is not reaching its destination. Supervisors on the mail floor cannot spot thefts when their backs are turned but inspectors in the gallery can narrow down exactly where the theft is occurring and exactly who is responsible.

GALLERIES CALLED DETERRENT

"Instead of rounding up all the employees on one side of the room and saying we want to talk to you," Chief Montague argued, "we can go to the right man and know he has the evidence in his pocket. We think it is to the advantage of all honest employees that we can prevent them from being under suspicion."

He stressed that the lookout galleries are a deterrent since the employees know of their existence and the vast majority of postal employees are honest. Over the past 5 years, however, close to 3,000 employees have been caught stealing from the mails.

The legislators who attacked the lookout galleries said they were old-fashioned snooping devices and should be replaced by more modern methods of detection. Chief Montague said he's still looking for another method that works.

Closed circuit television had been suggested but experiments showed it didn't have the quality needed for this work. He said he had been advised that Canada invested a considerable amount to install television at the main post office in Peterborough, Ontario, but was tearing it out and installing lookout galleries.

SBA DECENTRALIZATION ACTION REPRESENTS COMING OF AGE FOR ITS ALASKA AND PUERTO RICO PROGRAMS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yesterday it was announced that the Small Business Administration will undertake a major decentralization of its headquarters' functions, by transferring its operations, programing, and decisionmaking from Washington, D.C., to its field offices.

In the course of this change, the facilities at Anchorage, Alaska, and those at 47 other branch offices will be elevated to the status of regional offices.

This reorganization is in accord with the progressive conduct of the Small Business Administration by its present Administrator, Eugene P. Foley. With all that the SBA does for the Nation's 4½ million small businesses, it is somewhat surprising that this remarkable agency operates at a net cost to the taxpayer of only $8 million a year, with 80 percent of its $35 million budget of 1963 offset by fees and interest from its loans and programs.

The decentralization, in addition to saving an estimated $1 million a year in handling charges, will place decisionmaking closer to the people and to their particular geographic problems.

The advantage of this to Alaska is illustrated by the earthquake which struck on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, covering an area containing 60 percent of Alaska's population, and producing over 55 percent of the State's revenue.

The SBA responded vigorously, through its disaster loan program. Additional staff was mobilized to conduct more than 3,000 interviews and inquiries of victims; and Administrator Foley visited Alaska, to coordinate the overall effort. By the end of 1964, the SBA had processed 1,388 applications for business and home loans, of which 1,217, in the amount of $61,753,394, have already been approved. Furthermore, at year's end the agency had actually disbursed checks totaling $48,210,060, covering 1,175 of the approved applications. The effect of such prompt and substantial support to individuals and businesses can readily be imagined.

Since its inception, the SBA has meant much to Alaska's economy. Through September 1964, aside from earthquake assistance, 476 business loans, totaling $25,732,000, had been approved. In addition, 999 prime contracts, totaling over $55 million, have been awarded under the SBA set-aside program for small businesses in Alaska.

A similar regional situation was brought to my attention when a special subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings last April, in Puerto Rico, on the tax treatment of American companies with Puerto Rican affiliates and the participation by small business in the economic progress of Operation Bootstrap.

The Small Business Office of Puerto Rico, an island of 4.2 million population, consistently ranks among the top half dozen offices in the Nation in loan activity, and has done an outstanding job in servicing the local small business community and helping to foster its growth.

As a consequence, in May 1964, I recommended to the SBA that its office in San Juan be upgraded to a regional office, so that loan authority could be increased, decisions speeded, and programing and operations be closer to the local language and culture.

It is gratifying to note that last week's action puts this recommendation into effect.

I understand that the goal of this decentralization is, beginning on February 1, to delegate full operational authority to the SBA's eight area offices, for redelegation to the regional offices, such as those at Anchorage and San Juan. Accordingly, as soon as the regional offices attain their full experience and capacity, they will be able to take any loan action pursuant to the Small Business Act that the Washington office formerly could have performed.

For both of these offices, whose areas of service are not contiguous with the rest of continental United States, this grant of authority represents a highly desirable coming of age under the Nation's small business program. Thus, I heartily commend the SBA and Mr. Foley for this action.

FRANK P. BRIGGS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I rise to join in the tribute to Frank P. Briggs, who is retiring as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

More than most men could ever hope to do, Frank Briggs has managed to confuse his vocation and his avocations. He worked all his life at the wise use of natural resources, while supporting himself with such avocations as successful newspaperman, potent political leader, and beef farmer.

His conservation interest began with hunting, as such awareness has begun with so many of us; but it branched on and out to the realization that earth and air and water are the basis of all life. Yet he never lost interest in hunting the quail of Macon County, Mo.; and he flushed them before his bird dogs last November, although he was just recovering from a major operation. However, he did modestly admit that he could no longer qualify as America's greatest wing shot.

But for all his reputation as a hunter, he was always the resource manager who adopted the principle of harvestable surpluses. As Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, and in his earlier State conservation work, he demanded research and regulations based upon the

idea that hunters would harvest only the excess, the annual increase in wildlife production that could not be carried into the next year. This was his guide in duck-hunting controversies, in waterfowl management, and in dealing with the endangered species of wildlife, for which he demanded full protection.

He brought to the Assistant Secretaryship of the Department of the Interior a great background. He had been a newspaperman in Oklahoma and in Missouri; he had been for 30 years the publisher and the active editor of the Macon (Mo.) Chronicle-Herald; for 14 years he served, most actively, on the four-man, bipartisan Missouri Conservation Commission that controls fish, game, and forests on a model basis. Prior to that contribution, he had served his native commonwealth as State senator; and, by gubernatorial appointment, he completed the U.S. Senate term of Harry Truman when Mr. Truman was elected Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Briggs' service on his State's conservation commission was a unique preparation for his Assistant Secretaryship, for he made policy decisions on fishing and hatcheries; on the game species of his native land, ranging from mourning doves to deer; and on the forestry and land-use practices in an area of 45 million acres. In his capacity of commissioner, he traveled to national and international meetings, met the great men of conservation, and became one of those great men.

When he came to Washington, as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, he brought with him a knowledge of the political demands within a democracy, a realization of the need for State-Federal cooperation, an understanding of the delicate relations between State wildlife departments and the Federal bureau in game management, and an understanding of public information needs.

This was not enough, perhaps, to enable him to succeed. But he had something more—what Aldo Leopold called "the ecological conscience," the recognition that all things have a right to living space, a place in the scheme of things. This, with his other qualities, made him a great leader in the wildlife field. When Frank Briggs now goes back to Macon, Mo., and to the daily newspaper which for so many years has been that small town's public conscience, he will carry with him the knowledge that although he has served his country in several capacities, his country has given him a single title: "Conservationist."

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF KEENE, N.H., REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the contribution of the Manpower Development and Training Act to our economic growth and development cannot be overemphasized. Training and education programs, established under this act, to prepare unskilled workers to meet the changing demands of today's labor market form an integral part of our struggle to reduce unemployment.

Typical of the gains in creating new job opportunities, new jobs, and saving old jobs are the accomplishments of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation, of Keene, N.H. Current estimates are that 300 to 400 new jobs or job opportunities are being created in this community of 18,000.

Not only have these programs resulted in the training of adults, but they have also stimulated cooperative efforts between local schools and industry to provide vocational training for young people.

Mr. President, I heartily commend the farsighted efforts of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation to upgrade the skills of existing manpower, as well as to equip high school students with the skills necessary for entering industry. With the thought that it will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the comprehensive report on the activities for the past 18 months of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KEENE REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL FOUNDATION COMPREHENSIVE ACTIVITY REPORT FOR YEAR AND ONE-HALF ENDED DECEMBER 1964

Most people think of the work of the industrial foundation as primarily devoted to seeking out new industry and persuading it to move into our area. Actually the work of the Keene Foundation, as with most other local foundations, is primarily directed to the assistance of local existing industry and to concern over the local industrial and economic climate.

To get things in the proper perspective same background information is needed.

In the United States, in 1 year, 300 to 500 industries move or open a branch. There are 15,000 organizations, such as our own foundation, seeking these 300 to 500 prospects. The organizations range in size from those like our own, with one part-time employee, to those employing as many as 50 to 60. Taking an average of three employees to each organization, there would be about 45,000 people competing with us for new industrial plants.

Industries are attracted to an area primarily because of an adequate supply of manpower with needed skills; secondly by a fair and equitable tax situation. Housing, recreation, climate and educational facilities are less important factors.

Tax advantages are less of a factor now than they were some years ago. Then, enticements were being offered by some areas, such as no real estate taxes for 10 years or a building put up with State or municipal funds to be sold to the occupant at less than true value at a later date. Today, most communities recognize that an industry attracted by a free ride is not a great asset and would be all too ready to move elsewhere when initial advantages expire.

New Hampshire and Keene are competitive in taxes, and we seek no one who wants a free ride. At the same time we do have the means to build a plant and to lease or sell it on favorable terms comparable to any other State. However, the new industry must expect to shoulder its fair share of the cost of local services through its tax payments.

Keene does not have a large supply of labor. An industry considering a new community normally seeks a ratio of about five interviews to one hiring. We have only 450 unemployed in the area, most of whom are unskilled. In addition many lack other qualities which any employer would seek. While this relatively low unemployment reflects a healthy local economy, it also makes it difficult to attract new industry.

A shortage of low-rent housing is part of the reason we are short of labor. Keene has no low-rent housing projects financed by Federal funds or otherwise. Until we have such housing, immigration of labor cannot be expected in any significant quantity. Without a larger supply of labor, more rapid economic growth cannot be expected.

In general, the following five factors characterize the present Keene industrial picture:

1. Keene's industry is tremendously diversified. The total loss of our largest employer or group of employers in one field would affect only 15 percent of our labor force.
2. Our industry is healthy and progressive.
3. Our industry, generally speaking, needs to expand and wishes to do so.
4. We have no pool of trained manpower.
5. We have insufficient housing for trained personnel from other areas, if they were recruited.

All these factors dictate major emphasis on assisting in the health and growth of existing industry.

Over the past year and a half much of the activity of the foundation has been devoted to establishing training and education courses for our unskilled people. With great help and cooperation from our local State employment office, as well as the employment office in Concord and the State education department, Keene has obtained a relatively large share of the funds available in our State for adult education and training. In addition, cooperation of local industry and our local school systems has been of vital importance.

Specifically, what has been accomplished?

Funded and in operation are two machine operator's courses at Keene High School and two machine operator's courses at Monadnock Regional High School.

These courses are designed to fill a forecasted need by our local machine tool industry of some 200 new jobs in the next 2 years. They will all be completed by July 1, 1965, and will graduate 60 to 80 machine operators, trained to industry requirements in courses edited and approved by local industrial men. Actually the first instructors in the course are foremen at two local plants.

Funded and in operation are two clerk-typist courses at Keene High School and two stenographic-secretarial course at Monadnock Regional High School.

These courses are also to be completed by July 1, 1965, and will graduate 50 to 70 women capable of entering local offices, especially the home office of one of our larger industries: insurance.

The expansion planned by National Grange Mutual Insurance Co. and the normal attrition in their work force, due to marriages and so forth, call for about 50 women per year to enter this industry for the next 2 to 3 years.

The foregoing programs have been established under the Manpower Development and Training Act, utilizing Federal funds. They have placed in our two high schools industrial-type and modern office equipment worth close to $100,000. This equipment is available to the schools for their own vocational courses during school hours. It does, however, remain the property of the Federal Government.

Under the same act, the foundation has worked with the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, to obtain on the job training programs.

Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc. now has in operation a course given in the plant by MPB instructors to teach the new skills required in the manufacture and assembly of the Redeye Missile. Forty-five people are being trained, most of whom are not now

employed; others will be upgraded from other jobs within the plant, but in either case 45 new jobs are being opened up.

Troy Mills now has in operation a similar program to train 20 people in the new skills of running a plastic film casting range. This range is replacing 12 blanket looms and brings this mill into a new market of artificial leather and similar products.

American Optical Co. has awaiting approval a program to train for the new function of this Keene plant. It has now been assigned the building of machines required by the entire parent company. Machine shop skills and new assembly skills will be taught by American Optical's own men. About 75 new jobs are involved.

Roberts-Hart, Inc., has awaiting approval a program to train 16 new stitchers for 24 weeks under expert instructors. This course will enable Roberts-Hart to substantially increase production to meet larger sales of newly designed shoes.

In addition to education and training, the foundation has been of help in getting the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Building into partial operation. One-half of the plant is now in use and employs 20 to 30 woodworkers.

The Foundation also helped in the sale of the Abbott Co., to a new concern, Abbott Industries. This sale prevented the complete liquidation of the plant, and it will soon be back in operation, employing 40 to 50 woodworkers. It will be expanded by the inclusion within the plant of the Harry Skinner & Son wood dimension plant formerly located in North Swanzey.

We assisted in the establishment of a nutrient blending plant in North Walpole. This new $100,000 plant will employ 10. Thus new job opportunities have been created for: 60 to 80 machine operators; 50 to 70 female office personnel. Thus new jobs have been created for: 45 at MPB, 20 at Troy Mills, 75 at American Optical, 16 at Roberts-Hart, 10 at North Walpole, 20 to 30 at Lane Bucket in the PPG building. Thus jobs were saved for 40 to 50 at Abbott Industries.

In total, 336 to 396 new jobs, new job opportunities or jobs saved were involved in the foundation's activity in recent months.

We should fully appreciate the tremendous importance to a community like ours of the Manpower Development and Training Act. During the past year the Federal Government allocated $1 million to New Hampshire for education and training programs, with no State funds required. Under the act, State participation will be required in the next 2 years. It will be asked to provide one-third of the total cost next year and two-thirds the following year. It is of great importance that we do all we can here in Keene to point out what has been accomplished under the act and to urge adoption by the State of its share in this absolutely vital program for the next 2 years.

In addition to training adults under programs already described, utilization of the act has placed in our two high schools equipment which will train our vocational students on industrial-type machinery or modern office machines and make them ready to enter industry at graduation. It has stimulated thinking about the great value of good vocational courses in the schools, has stimulated cooperation between educators and industrialists and has brought them together working for vocational courses which will graduate young people ready to take a responsible place in the community.

The foundation is assisting in planning a cooperative program by education and industry under which pupils may attend school in the morning and then go to work in a local plant or office in the afternoon. All of this is to be planned and scheduled as a complete vocational program which will train the pupils in the particular skill needed by a particular industry. In addition to earning a minimum wage while working at the plant or office, upon his graduation a job will be waiting for the student for which he has been specifically prepared.

This program is only in the planning stage but, properly set up and scheduled, can be of inestimable value to our economy as well as to scores of young people in the area. It should give the vocational program the prestige and dignity it deserves. The effect on school dropouts can only be surmised, but it should help tremendously to keep young people in school and earning a small income at the same time.

Visible evidence of confidence in Keene by our industrial community is demonstrated by expansions at Kingsbury Machine Tool Co., Markem Machine Co., and Marlboro Manufacturing Co.; by activity in the Pittsburgh Building and at Abbott Industries. If we are correct in saying that 300 to 400 new jobs or job opportunities are being created, this should mean $1 million to $1,500,000 of additional payroll coming into the community in the next 12 to 18 months.

What of the future? Given conditions as they exist, with a shortage of skills and a shortage of housing to attract skilled manpower, our attention must be focused on continued training and education. Every possible means must be utilized to upgrade skills of our existing manpower, to graduate high school students with skills to enter industry and to educate technicians and engineers at the college level. The remarkable growth of industry around Boston has been fostered by its great educational complex. We must emulate this in a smaller way using our high schools and the new liberalized program of the Keene State College.

HATS OFF TO THE CITY OF MADISON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in November, the Secretary of Defense made a decision to close 95 military installations.

As expected, the decision brought on a flow of stormy protests from communities affected, but not from the city of Madison, which suffered the shutdown of the Truax Air Force Base, in Madison—a $25 million a year loss to this city of 150,000 people.

I quote from a resolution adopted on November 24 by the Common Council of the City of Madison:

Although our economy may suffer temporarily, we recognize the overall good to the country, and therefore commend the Department of Defense for its decision.

Here is an inspiring example of statesmanship.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF CITY OF MADISON, WIS.

By Mayor Henry E. Reynolds, Council President James O. Pfefferle, and all other members of the common council, as follows: John P. Connell, Leo J. Cooper, Harrison L. Garner, James C. Gill, James P. Goulette, Robert L. Guerin, Lyle O. Johnson, Richard D. Kopp, James A. Marks, Lawrence J. McCormick, William S. McCullough, Robert C. McMurray, George R. Olp, George H. Reger, Robert L. Reynolds, Jr., Harold E. Rohr, Pete Schmidt, Donald H. Smith, William Bradford Smith, Thomas J. Stavrum, Ellsworth J. Swenson.

"Whereas Truax Air Force Base has been located in the city of Madison for nearly a quarter of a century; and

"Whereas during this period of time, the Madison area has derived considerable financial benefit from the location of Truax Air Force Base in this city; and

"Whereas the city of Madison and its citizens have been justly proud of the location of the base at this city, have been pleased to have many Air Force families living within the city, and have derived considerable prestige from the fact that Truax Air Force Base was a part of our city; and

"Whereas many persons who performed military duties at Truax Air Force Base have since returned to our city to make it their permanent home; and

"Whereas many of these Air Force veterans are now numbered among our most distinguished and useful citizens; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense has announced that Truax Air Force Base will be deactivated during 1698: Now, therefore, be it and it hereby is

"*Resolved*, That the city clerk by a copy of this resolution, inform the commanding officer of Truax Air Force Base and the Secretary of Defense that in spite of this loss to our community, the common council wishes it to be known that:

"1. We will miss all of the military and civilian personnel and their dependents who will be leaving this area in the near future, and we will welcome their return in the future, either as civilians or as military personnel;

"2. Although our economy may suffer temporarily, we recognize the overall good to the country and therefore commend the Department of Defense for its decision; and

"3. If at any time in the future military services desire to return to our area, we will be pleased to have them serve here and be a part of our community.

"4. We will always regard Truax Field as a living memorial to Lt. Thomas LeRoy Truax, of Madison, and to all who have died in the service of their country."

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Madison, Wis., at a meeting held on the 24th day of November 1964.

ELDON L. HOEL,
City Clerk.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SEASHORE AT ASSATEAGUE ISLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the past few days, I have attempted to apprise my fellow Senators and the rest of the American people of the need for a national seashore at Assateague Island. Last Wednesday, I introduced proposed legislation which would create such a seashore. Ten of my colleagues joined me at that time, and I am pleased to say that four more have subsequently added their names as cosponsors of this bill.

Late last week, I brought to the attention of the Senate several editorials which pointed out the need for quick action on the bill. At this time I ask unanimous consent that two more editorials—one from the Balitimore News-American of January 8, and one broadcast by Washington radio station WWDC—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News-American, Jan. 8, 1965]

ASSATEAGUE A NATIONAL PARK

At long last, the outlook for prompt congressional action to establish Assateague Island as a national seashore park is bright.

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER and Representative CARLTON R. SICKLES have intro-

duced companion bills to bring this about, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has called on the Senate and House committees which will handle them to give them "the highest priority."

The Brewster-Sickles bills would permit the setting aside of 600 acres on the island for overnight tourist facilities. This represents a compromise. The original Interior Department plan made no provision for such facilities, but they were included in the plan last year to enlist the support of Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, who represents the Eastern Shore where Assateague is located.

Private lot-owners will, of course, be compensated under the government plan.

As Secretary Udall points out, the time to act is now. If the Maryland Court of Appeals sustains a lower court decision which overturned a State refusal to allow private interests to build on Assateague, it will be difficult to forestall private development which would greatly complicate the situation.

The controversy over the future of Assateague has simmered for over a dozen years now. During that time, the people of Maryland could have been enjoying the facilities of a park on the island. We hope the Secretary is justified in his optimism, and that the delays are finally at an end.

[From WWDC, Washington, D.C.]

THE PUSH FOR ASSATEAGUE

To all of us who have pushed the national seashore plan proposed for Maryland's Assateague Island, these recent words by President Johnson offer hope: "We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any period in our history."

We trust the President's words indicate the White House will side with the Interior Department, the Maryland congressional delegation, the Governor of Maryland, and millions of ordinary people living in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. The prevailing view of all of these officials and citizens is that—properly developed—Assateague could become an invaluable recreational resource within reach of 33 million Americans.

In fact, the only opposition to the idea continues to come from the Worcester County Commissioners. They insist that most of the island develop as privately owner seaside cottages with the inevitable honky-tonks, souvenir stands, and similar resort-type blight that has already gobbled up most of the vanishing shoreline. They apparently have no faith at all in the economic bononza that millions of annual visitors to a great national seashore park would bring to the adjacent areas of Worcester County.

No one likes to brush aside the wishes of a local minority. But in this case there is clearly a need for a broader view than the county officials seem able to take.

THE HARTKE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL AND THE PRESIDENT'S GUIDELINES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today we have received President Johnson's recommendations entitled "Toward Full Educational Opportunity." For some time, I have concentrated my attention on the great enterprise of education, whose scope from kindergarten to graduate and postgraduate levels is so all-encompassing. At this time, I shall comment briefly on the part dealing with the needs for college students.

I point out to the Members of the Senate the close parallel or identity between the concern the President has expressed and the program in the college assistance bill, S. 5, which I introduced last Wednesday.

That bill is still on the desk, and will be open to cosponsors until the close of business on Friday. At the present moment, 24 Members of the Senate have expressed their desire to join me in sponsoring this measure.

Let me call attention, Mr. President, to the portion of the President's message labeled "A," in the "higher education" section, dealing with "assistance to students," since this is the area of S. 5.

Title I of my bill deals with the first area of the message. The student grants or scholarships, which title I of my bill proposes, will amount to $75 million annually. This is clearly in the neighborhood of the sum to which President Johnson referred when he spoke of helping in this way up to 140,000 students in the first year.

My bill calls for an expansion of the work-study program, under the Office of Education, as the message recommends. In fact, the existing program under the poverty effort is couched in terms for the most part identical in language to that which appeared in my bill, S. 2490, last year, and which is retained in S. 5. An authorization of $250 million a year for this purpose would aid, it is estimated, 330,000 students annually. Assistance would go to students who need help, even though they come from middle-income, rather than lower income, families.

The federally guaranteed loan program embodied in title II of my bill is also supported by the message of President Johnson. Embodied in it is a provision which the President specifically endorsed—"that a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government."

Specifically, under the Hartke bill, this part of the interest load paid by the Federal Government would be 2 percent, making possible a likely effective rate of 4 percent to the student. The need for this kind of self-help for private loans to the student himself, at a low cost, with repayment out of later earnings, is vast. Under the Hartke bill, provision is made for $700 million of private credit, guaranteed by the Federal Government, and with aid to the student on the interest burden. This will open doors to scores of thousands who have been waiting for just such effective aid to be undertaken, with the burden for repayment on their own individual responsibility.

The package principle involved both in the Hartke bill and in the recommendations of the President's message has been endorsed by leading educators and their associations. This appears clearly from the hearing record developed last year in connection with the consideration of S. 2490. Acceptance of these principles is reflected further in the approval by the Education Subcommittee of such legislation last year, and the recommendation to the Senate by the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I note a further point on which the President's view corresponds to my own. It is at the point where he stated unequivocally that the kind of measures he recommends, and which I have already introduced, comprises—"a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

This was my contention on the day when I first introduced S. 2490. It is still my contention.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased to note that in this entire section President Johnson agrees with the approach of the Hartke bill. Based on the experience of last year's hearings, Senate bill 5 deserves the full support it is finding, which I hope will be further extended to it. I hope and trust that this bill will receive early enactment.

NOMINATION OF JOHN CARVER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I had the great privilege of presenting to the chairman and the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs my strong support for the nomination of John Carver to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. Because of my high regard for John Carver, I should like to read that statement at this time and I crave the indulgence of my colleagues as I do so.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to submit this statement in support of the nomination of John Carver to serve as Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. In my opinion, Mr. Carver is eminently qualified for this position and it is my pleasure to cite two outstanding achievements which demonstrate that he has the ability to serve well in this new assignment.

The members of this committee, especially Senators ANDERSON and BIBLE, will remember that in 1961, I suggested a totally new approach to rangeland conservation. I urged a program of direct investments where surveys showed a need both to reduce grazing and to treat a deteriorated watershed. I urged a program of comprehensive watershed development for our rangeland.

This led to four pilot projects in Oregon, New Mexico, Nevada, and Idaho.

These have produced outstanding conservation results and in the process have stabilized—yes, increased—grazing use.

John Carver played a large and constructive role in the implementation of this program.

On Columbus Day, 1962, a hurricane swept the Pacific Northwest, blowing down billions of board feet of timber in the State of Oregon, as well as in the State of Washington. As the chairman knows, John Carver responded at once. He acted as a catalyst to unite public and private efforts in what became a most successful endeavor to salvage for economic use the greatest amount of timber to have been destroyed by an act of nature. The prompt action that John Carver spearheaded averted the destruction of billions of additional board feet of standing timber by insects and disease.

John Carver, as Assistant Secretary of Interior, has done an outstanding job in

the public interest for conservation. I am delighted that the President has submitted his name for the post of Under Secretary, and I urge his prompt confirmation, both by this committee and by the Senate.

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

STATUS OF AGRICULTURE IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL PICTURE OF THIS NATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in President Johnson's address to the joint session of Congress on January 4, he made this statement:

> Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most.

This statement has been widely interpreted as a recommendation for the reduction or elimination of Government services to farmers including crop price support programs.

While I do not believe that the President contemplates drastic action in this direction, I readily agree that some farm programs have been costly in terms of value received and are in need of review and revision.

I cannot, however, let the all too prevalent impression that the American farmer is wallowing in a wealth of Government handouts—or that American agriculture is expendable in terms of international trade and investment go unchallenged.

Just yesterday, I read this statement in a weekly magazine:

> Aid for small farmers: The President is annoyed by the fact that 80 percent of the Government's commodity assistance funds (total: $2.3 billion last year) goes to 1 million farmers who earn more than $9,500 annually, while some 2.5 million poorer farmers must share the remaining 20 percent. Agriculture Department officials are working on a detailed plan to meet the President's specifications.

This is only one instance in which the public is misled as to the income of farmers.

The $9,500 referred to is not income to the farmer, but receipts from farm sales from which must be deducted costs of supplies, interest, taxes, insurance, selling charges, transportation, and other costs.

Imagine a manufacturer having gross sales of $9,500 a year and regarding that amount as his income.

Yet the public is supposed to believe that the gross sales from a farm are clearly income to the farmer.

As for farmers with gross sales of less than $9,500 per year, they are certainly not wallowing in prosperity.

For the information of those who may have gained a false impression of the status of agriculture in the economic, social, and political picture of this Nation, I am now going to present certain facts for the record, hoping that some of our people, especially the people of the large urban areas of America, may find time to read them.

How important is agriculture to the welfare of the United States?

To what extent does it contribute to our military and economic security?

The figures I shall give you have all been furnished to me by U.S. Government agencies.

What percentage of the people now gainfully employed are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture?

Let us start off with the 6.5 million workers on the land itself.

Then, we must add 6 million more workers who produce the supplies and equipment which farmers use.

Dependency on the farm does not end with the harvesting of the crop, however, for 10 million more people are engaged in transporting, storing, processing, handling, and selling the products of agriculture.

Add these categories together and we find that 3 out of every 10 persons employed in private industry look to the farm for their income.

What do farmers require that keep so many nonfarm people employed?

Let me give just a few examples.

Farmers last year spent well over $3 billion for new tractors, motor vehicles, and other equipment, or more than three times as much as the entire iron and steel industry spent for new equipment and new plants.

Farmers spent over $3.3 billion for maintenance of equipment and fuel and lubricants with which to run it.

Let those who would trade off agriculture in return for petroleum markets abroad stop and realize that the best market in the world for petroleum products is the American farm.

The American farmer uses billions of dollars worth of fertilizer, lime, spray material, rubber tires, and hundreds of other items, the production of which keeps 6 million workers employed.

Except for agriculture, the transportation systems of America would deteriorate and decay.

Some of our more profitable rail lines would find themselves in the red were it not for the business of hauling supplies to the farm and crops from the farm to consuming centers, processing plants, and shipping ports.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of farm commodities supplying last year—fiscal 1964—one-fifth of the world's agricultural exports.

This business required financing, inland transportation, storage, and ocean transportation for 55 million long tons—enough to fill 1½ million freight cars or 5,500 cargo ships.

Processing and packing plants for meats, poultry, milk, grain products, and fruits and vegetables alone employ well over a million nonfarm employees.

What about the investment on the farms?

The total value of agricultural assets amounts to $226 billion, or two-thirds as much as the value of the current assets of all the corporations of the United States put together—and nearly 2½ times the value of all U.S. investments in the rest of the world.

We had better think twice before we do anything to depreciate the solid investment in American agriculture in favor of more tempting and more precarious oversea lures.

Up to now, I have directed my remarks to the domestic economic importance of agriculture.

It should be clear to everyone who reads, listens, or thinks, that any serious decline in the volume of our agricultural production or the income of our farm people would be the surest way to bring on a national economic depression. It has happened before. It could happen again.

It is not only that farm production is a low-cost source of food and fiber for our own people that should concern us.

It is also the fact that the United States is the principal supplier of food products to the world.

Sixty-three million acres of our 300 million harvested acres produce for export.

This amounts to about the same acreage of cropland that is harvested in the three great farming States of Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas.

Our export of farm products now amounts to nearly $6 billion a year, or nearly one-third of our total export business.

Our agricultural abundance is a powerful force for world peace.

It has helped to prevent hunger and has promoted economic growth in the newly developing countries of the world.

It has encouraged sorely distressed nations to adhere to more democratic principles of government.

As an example of what U.S. food abundance is doing to stabilize governments elsewhere, let me read a news dispatch which came over the wires on January 7 of this year:

> NEW DELHI, INDIA.—India's food crisis came home today with jolting impact for this capital's 3 million residents. The Government announced rationing of sugar, wheat, and rice will begin next month.
>
> The three staple foods for vegetarian Hindus have been in short supply for months. But the capital has been spared the grinding hunger that has sparked food riots elsewhere.
>
> This week, however, retail prices hit new highs, spreading fear of even greater shortages. This kicked off a wave of hoarding.
>
> To halt panic, the Government announced seven special trains speeding toward New Delhi from the west coast of Bombay with wheat imported from the United States. It will be sold in 830 fair-price shops.

What we are doing in India to help stave off inflation, hunger, and possible riots is only one manifestation of the effect of America's crop production bounty.

Now, I would like to comment on this part of the President's statement:

> I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy costs of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most.

I wish to commend the President for his desire to cut the costs of Government and hope that he will apply such good intentions not only to agriculture but to expenditures for other factors of our economy as well.

I am sure that a near miracle can be achieved in that field if the effort is applied with equal vigor to industry—the armed services, space exploration, international operations, and all other governmental operations.

A fine start could be made by reducing some of the seemingly exhorbitant tax deductions allowed certain phases of industry.

Lest we be tempted to use the meat ax on agricultural program costs, however, it would be well to know what we are now spending in the name of farm programs and who would be most affected by a reduction in such programs.

According to the figures which the public sees, the budget expenditures for agriculture amounted to $7,926 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

It is anticipated that this figure may be reduced a billion dollars or more in fiscal year 1965.

These figures are indeed formidable and would give us cause for much concern if accepted at face value.

What the people are not told is that well over half of the costs charged to agriculture are, in fact, spent for the general public rather than the farmer.

Over much of the country, well over half of the work of the Extension Service and the Agricultural Research Service is now directed to the needs of nonfarm people.

Let me give you just a few examples to show how thoroughly the appropriations for agriculture are now being diverted to public use.

I shall use the preliminary figures for fiscal year 1964.

First. Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies amounted to $1,452 million, the cost of which was all charged to agriculture while the proceeds were made available to State Department, Defense Department, and other agencies of Government.

Second. Emergency food relief to friendly people in other nations amounted to $215 million.

Third. Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services for purchase of dairy products amounted to $45 million.

In that connection, a disturbing rumor came to me yesterday, that the administration may possibly recommend elimination of the practice of furnishing of milk to the Armed Forces in present quantities.

This cost to the Department of Agriculture started a few years ago after complaints were received from young men stationed at Fort Dix and at other camps in this country that they could not get milk, and were give a half-pint for breakfast, which they could use on their cereal, or drink it and then eat their cereal dry. Additional supplies of milk were subsequently made available. An arrangement was made whereby the Department of Agriculture was charged half the cost of the milk furnished to the camps, and the armed services supposedly paid the other half of the cost.

I earnestly hope that the rumor that the supply of milk to the armed services is to be restricted is not true.

Fourth. The cost of school programs amounted to $277 million, all of which was charged to agriculture.

Fifth. The cost of the U.S. Forest Service and other conservation programs for the benefit of the public amounted to $512 million.

Finally, I would also point out that when loans are made by Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration, they are charged as an agricultural expense, but when they are repaid with interest, as they are, the receipts, amounting to several hundred million dollars a year, are paid into the U.S. Treasury with no credit given to agriculture.

Rather than bore the Senate with further examples at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables furnished me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture giving a breakdown between the costs of programs which are predominantly for the benefit of agriculture and the costs of programs benefitting the public or those who have little or no direct connection with farming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection?

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Budget expenditures, fiscal years 1964 and 1965 (based on 1965 midyear budget review)

[In millions of dollars]

	1964 [1]	Estimated, 1965
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public:		
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:		
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies	1,452	1,301
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	215	244
Donations of commodities acquired by CCC	345	298
International Wheat Agreement	86	20
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	83	89
Long-term supply contracts	53	183
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under sec. 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	45	41
Total	2,279	2,176
Food distribution programs:		
Commodity purchases under removal of surplus agricultural commodities	236	239
Commodities acquired by CCC	246	179
Pilot food stamp plan	30	51
School lunch program	180	193
Special milk program	97	100
Total	789	762
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment:		
REA loans	330	383
FHA loans	220	219
Total	550	602
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:		
Forest Service	315	321
Agricultural Research Service	197	199
Soil Conservation Service	193	198
Programs, etc.—Continued		
Long-range programs, etc.—Continued		
Extension Service	79	78
Cooperative State Research Service	41	43
Agricultural Marketing Service, marketing services	38	44
Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses	38	44
Other, including FCS, FAS, CEA, FCIC, REA, expenses, and staff offices	89	98
Subtotal	990	1,025
Total	4,608	4,565
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others:		
Agricultural conservation program	217	225
Conservation reserve program	290	200
Cropland conversion program	7	10
Total	514	435
CCC price-support, supply, and related programs:		
CCC price-support, supply, and related programs	1,244	−192
Acreage diversion payments:		
Feed grains	646	876
Wheat	115	34
Price-support payments:		
Feed grains	382	374
Wheat	79	
Cotton equalization payments	63	561
Wheat marketing certificate program		−108
National Wool Act program	73	39
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115	114
Total	2,717	1,698
Sugar Act program	87	88
Total	3,318	2,221
Grand total	7,926	6,786

[1] Subject to revision when final Treasury figures are available.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, according to these figures, it appears that for the fiscal year 1964 the costs of programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income was $3,318 million, while the costs of programs benefiting consumers, businessmen, and the general public was $4,608 million.

For 1965, the estimated expenditures are $2,221 million for farmers and $4,565 million for the others.

An especially flagrant example of how farmers are charged with the cost of expenditures, subsidies or plain handouts for the benefit of others will be found in the so-called wheat-cotton bill enacted in the spring of 1964.

This act was approved by the administration and passed the Congress although opposed by the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and myself.

As a result of the subsidy provided in this act, the price of cotton to the mills for domestic use is now 8.29 cents per pound less than it was a year ago. The result has been: The price to the cotton producer has not increased. The textile mills have made record profits. The taxpayer will pay the bill which will be at the rate of well over $300 million a year.

This expense is not a farm expense in any sense of the word but is plainly a subsidy to the textile mills and their stockholders although it is charged to the farm program.

As for the wheat program provided for in the Wheat-Cotton Act, we have not done so well with that, either.

After the act went into effect, the price of wheat dropped materially and the price of bread went up.

If the President seriously intends to substantially reduce the budget of the Department of Agriculture, he can do so in many ways which will result in these estimated savings:

First. He can promptly eliminate the cotton textile mills subsidy by recommending that we do not extend the cotton mills subsidy—and save $300 million.

Second. He can charge the subsidy to the merchant marine for transporting agricultural commodities to the Department of Commerce where it belongs—this would save $155 million.

Third. He can charge the full cost of dairy products for the military to the armed services, where it belongs—$45 million.

I reiterate, I hope that the rumor the Administration intends to eliminate this milk supply to the boys in the service is not well founded.

Fourth. The President can charge the cost of agricultural commodities used to promote good will and relieve want among friendly and developing nations to the State Department and other agencies of Government, where it belongs—$1,250 million.

Fifth. He can charge the cost of food used in school lunches and donations to needy people to Health, Education, and Welfare—$500 million.

These five items alone will reduce the agricultural appropriations bill by over $2 billion.

I remind Senators—I am not advocating the repeal of all these programs for many of them are very much worth while—and they have contributed materially to the welfare of the people of the United States. I simply wish to point out that they are not programs especially designed to aid the farmer but are programs primarily designed for the public good.

At least another billion dollars could be taken from the agricultural appropriation by putting conservation and flood control practices and consumer research in the proper perspective and crediting the Department of Agriculture with repaid loans and other income now credited to other agencies.

Having made these deductions in items which are clearly for the benefit of the general public or nonfarm people, there will still remain $3 billion or more which no one can deny is appropriated primarily for the benefit of the farmer. Can this amount be reduced? My answer is "Yes."

For 30 years or more Congress has been monkeying with price supports and other farm programs—mostly on a temporary basis. These programs have done much good. There have also been plenty of mistakes made.

We have been and are now using as a criteria for farm prices a parity formula which has been outmoded for at least 15 years.

The nature of farming has been virtually revolutionized during this period. The pushbutton and the computer have taken their place in agriculture.

The number of farmers has been reduced over half in a short period of years. Those who remain are better farmers.

The excuse for much of our farm legislation is that we are plagued with surpluses. Reasonable surpluses are not a plague if they are put to proper use.

The proper use of food supplies is a far more effective means of maintaining good relations with the world than the more costly and dangerous military ventures in which we have been involved.

During recent years we have tried to reduce our commodity supplies by paying farmers to let their land lie idle or diverting cropland to other uses.

I do not say that this program has failed. In some areas it has been quite successful. It has been very costly in proportion to the results achieved.

The whole program of support prices and land use adjustment needs a complete review and should be put upon a more permanent basis—if that is possible.

Price supports should not be wholly abandoned unless we are determined to have an economic crisis in the United States.

Price supports should be at a level which will insure adequate production and a decent income to the farmer but not such as will bring about an imbalance of production between commodities or deter the natural evolutionary changes which would normally take place in agriculture.

The American farmer has grown up. He is a big boy now. He does not want Government to hold his hand or feed him with a teaspoon.

He does ask, however, that he be afforded equal protection with business and commerce and the investment companies.

He does not like the idea of being downgraded or subordinated to the aspirations of others.

He does not like all this talk about agriculture being expendable and being traded off in our dealings with other countries.

He expects the President to see that he does not get the short end of the stick in foreign trade agreements.

If President Lyndon Johnson will make sure that agriculture has equal opportunity and equal protection with other industries, both at home and abroad, he will not only find it possible to reduce farm program costs, but better than that he will get along fine with the farmers.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 89th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

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

THE RADICAL RIGHT IS STILL ON THE RAMPAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, What is an extremist?

Why, that is a guy who keeps his socks up by walking on his hands.

So went some of the banter in the recent campaign. If it had all been so flippant, we could give the country high marks for ready humor. American politics, after all, grew robust around the cracker barrel on many a jibe and belly laugh.

But the real menace of extremism cannot be laughed away. It is, unfortunately, a fever that has not been overcome by the election results.

This is the first of several speeches I plan to give on the subject of the radical right. The substance of my remarks today will appear, in article form, in the edition of Look magazine, which reaches the newsstands tomorrow.

Sensible Americans become most concerned about the threat of radical elements during election campaigns. When an election is over, too many of us tend to take it easy, to assume that the forces of irrationality and vituperation have been vanquished. This is a dangerous assumption. From what I saw in the recent campaign, and what has happened since, I know we have cause for serious concern about the future of freedom in America.

To understand why, we might begin with the frog story that keeps popping up in rightwing literature. Put a frog in cold water and heat the water very slowly. Before the frog catches on, he is cooked. This story is used to illustrate their thesis that, with each Government program, we creep along the road to communism—until suddenly we are there before we know it.

A friend of mine in Idaho tried the slow-boil experiment the other day on one of our frogs. You might, Mr. President, have guessed it, the frog jumped out of the pan. However, Idaho frogs may be smarter than most. I checked with U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists and I learned that in a properly controlled experiment, an ordinary frog's internal system will fail to sound the alarm in time to save him.

The same can happen to our internal political system—through the slowly boiling outrages of extremism. We have already become accustomed to a level of political absurdity that would have seemed, a few years ago, quite impossible.

A distressed schoolteacher writes to warn me that "our defenses are being destroyed and we are rapidly becoming sitting ducks for our enemies." If the Communists are successful in seizing control of the country, she continues, "we will go down together. You, as well as all leaders, will be liquidated. None will be spared unless they are members of the Communist organization."

Mr. President, how do you answer such a letter? Its implication—that this sturdy country of ours is about to be taken over—is preposterous. Yet, this honest, deeply disturbed woman is being trapped into the belief that treason seethes around her.

Hardened adherents to the conspiracy theory of the radical right send a different kind of letter, filled with insult and invective, often neatly typed on fine letterheads, though occasionally scribbled on scraps of paper and smudged with handprints in red ink to signify their suspicion that I, along with most other public officials, am either an unwitting tool, or a conscious agent, in a sinister plot to betray the country.

These people cannot be shrugged off as a "crackpot" fringe; their numbers alone compel us to be concerned, and they spread the virus like Typhoid Marys. In many places, they dominate the letters-to-the-editor columns of the local newspapers. Here is a sample from the Sunday Statesman, in my home city of Boise, Idaho:

> The social studies program [in the high schools] was initiated 30 years ago by American education intelligentsia after the Soviet plan, for the acknowledged purpose of promoting the collectivist society in America.

Another letter brings the startling news:

> The present administration is working hard to undermine our whole defense system to make it much easier for the Communist Party to make more gains overseas and in our own country.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Idaho for the speech he is making on this problem, which is so prevalent now—the working of the rightwing. The reason why I asked the Senator to yield at this point is that last night, quite unexpectedly, I found in my mail an envelope, addressed to me, in which was a magazine called the American Mercury. I was not familiar with this publication. I leafed through it and found that the military editor is one Edwin A. Walker, formerly Maj. Gen. Edwin A. "Ted" Walker, resigned.

The letter referred to by the Senator stated that as a part of the Communist conspiracy the military is being undermined. It reminded me to look at the section in the magazine entitled "The Guard versus National Defense versus the Reserve."

I find here the same sort of writing that the Senator is discussing. The thesis by Edwin A. Walker is that the proposal of Secretary McNamara to merge the Reserve and the Guard is substantially the conspiracy about which he spoke.

I quote:

> Reservists is often too effective and embarrassing to the administration. The Reserve's close association with the Regulars, the full-time military, and its complimenting views and objectives provide a natural bridge between the American citizens and their military forces. This is a bridge of understanding, appreciation and common purpose. It must be destroyed. Secretary of Defense, R. Strange McNamara, is the man to do it. He wants "absolute" control. Politics and political intimidation are the means to "absolute" control. They are the means to destruction of independent thinking and any form of opposition.

Mr. President, this same thesis is played over and over again through all of the thread and fabric of our national life by means of literature of this sort which comes unsolicited into our homes through the mail every day.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. It is a great tragedy that the targets of this scurrilous attack are men of the patriotism and integrity of the Secretary of Defense. Anyone who has followed the record of the Secretary of Defense has been greatly impressed with his efficient administration of the Defense Department. Even those who know our Secretary of Defense, but who have disagreed with decisions he has made would concur in my statement that there is no more devoted, or more loyal public servant in Washington today. But he is not a solitary victim. The targets of the radical right extent to the highest ranking men in Government. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is under the same kind of attack. The President himself is not spared from the vicious insinuation that he is somehow engaged in a nefarious scheme to betray the country he serves.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his esteem of Secretary McNamara. While I might not agree with everything that he does, I recognize that he does it from the highest motive of patriotism in an attempt to build the strongest possible national defense force for this country.

The Senator made reference to the fact that there were other targets of this attack. I quote from an earlier paragraph in the same article, in which the author, Edwin A. Walker, states:

> The signing of the test ban treaty found six notorious, appeasing Senators (one of whom is now Vice President) in Moscow. The decision finalized under a foreign environment with all the assurance that it decreased tensions and increased the opportunities of "peaceful" relations.

It is the same thesis again, that this was all part of the Communist plot of surrender being effected by Members of this body through selecting former Senator Humphrey, who is now Vice-President-elect.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution. I know that in conversations we have had privately since his own reelection in the State of Utah—a reelection, I might say, that reflects great credit upon the good judgment of the people of his State—the Senator has mentioned that he encountered, in larger numbers than he had ever previously experienced, people who would ask him some damning question, and then refuse to permit him to answer it. Their minds were closed, obviously affected by the belief that highly placed members of the Government in both parties were aiding and abetting the enemies of the United States.

These are angry people, but they suffer more from folly than from hatred.

> Folly is a more dangerous enemy to the good than malice—

Deitrich Bonhoeffer, the theologian, said in 1942:

> Malice always contains the seeds of its own destruction, for it always makes men uncomfortable.

This Christian pastor wrote these words from a Nazi prison before foolish men hanged him.

The treachery theme, in assorted versions, inspires a virulent fanaticism that many Americans have not yet learned to deal with. Most of us recognize, and dismiss, the extremists on the racial front, both white and black, who openly flaunt their bigotry. Such inciters may draw a following for a while, but the great bulk of our people, in their abiding decency, will not be taken in.

The same commonsense accounts for the decline of the Communist Party in the United States. Back in 1932, it ran candidates in 39 States, and garnered a total of 102,991 votes. In those desperate depression days the Communists were at work in labor unions and on college campuses. But the reforms of

the thirties, the resurgence of free enterprise and its spreading abundance, robbed the class struggle of its credibility. The unions cleaned shop, the Communist groups faded on campus, and the Communist Party itself was outlawed by Congress.

In view of this collapse of the radical left as a political force within the United States, the precipitous rise of the radical right is all the more curious. Lacking a flesh-and-blood adversary with which to grapple, the right has improvised one, conjuring up a phantom of its own. It takes the vague form of conspiracy, which supposedly involves the top offices of the land. As the monthly bulletin of the John Birch Society trumpeted in 1964, "Washington has been taken over. By which we mean that Communist influences are now in full working control of our Federal Government."

Here, in the Birch Society, is the taproot of the conspiracy doctrine. It was no slip of the tongue when the society's Robert Welch charged Dwight D. Eisenhower with knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy for all his adult life. Mr. Welch listed similar charges against Milton Eisenhower, Allen and John Foster Dulles, Gen. George C. Marshall, and Chief Justice Earl Warren.

The basic thesis, that our leaders are Red-tainted, has to be regularly updated by the radical right. The newest summation appears in "None Dare Call It Treason." During the election campaign, more than 8 million copies went out—1 for every 6 families. Its potential effect is sobering to contemplate, for it could work its poison through our body politic for years to come like the slow, half-life chemistry of radiation. Bruce Felknor, director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a nonpartisan group that studies smear tactics, says that the burden of treason is to "make the Democratic Party appear to be selling out to the Reds, and to make liberal Republicans out as coconspirators with the Democrats in advancing the cause of world communism."

I saw the marks of the conspiracy doctrine in some communities of my own State. For the first time, I found an ugly force trying to disrupt the orderly processes of the election.

Ralph Harding, an able young Democratic Congressman, had criticized the Birch Society on the floor of the House of Representatives. His supporters often told me of threats they received. Drury Brown, Republican editor of the Blackfoot News, backed Harding. One morning, Brown found his car with a red swastika painted on the door, the tires slashed, and sugar in the gas tank. Later, a female voice came over his phone: "Last time it was your car; next time it will be your home."

In Wyoming, Senator GALE MCGEE, an outspoken critic of the radical right found youngsters in Laramie and Cheyenne on a house-to-house canvass distributing mimeographed leaflets. They were instructed to say, "This is an enemy agent. Here are the facts about Communist MCGEE." The Senator's wife, Lorraine, had her husband's campaign cards grabbed from her hands, torn into pieces, thrown at her feet, and then spat upon.

A State director of a charitable foundation, whom I know, came home one night to find "Reds" painted on the mail box in front of his house, "Damn Socialist" daubed on the lawn chairs, the house lights and windows, which were beyond the reach of children, painted bright red. What made him an enemy? A picture of the President of the United States in his window.

In the face of such vehemence, people voted heavily for the moderates. The landslide, some concluded, smothered the radical right.

I do not agree.

> In the past several months the conservative message has received unprecedented exposure—

Says the Reverend Billy James Hargis, who directs what he calls the Christian Crusade, and like other leaders of the rightwing movement, styles himself a conservative. Without doubt, this exposure is paying off, at least for the moment.

The radical right reports rapid growth. Since 1955, its organized membership has been expanding at an average annual rate of 22 percent. The Birch Society, the largest and most influential group, reports that the campaign months from August to October established alltime records in new-member recruitment. The 30 largest organizations raised their annual budgets from $4,906,000 in 1958 to $14,300,000 in 1963. Total spending by all rightwing outfits hit $30 million in 1964, researchers estimate, half again more than both major parties spent in the presidential campaign. The Birch Society will boost its 1965 budget by a whopping 25 percent.

The propaganda network of the radical right forms a giant web. Its 20 largest publications boast a combined circulation in excess of a million. The right also makes its pitch on the public air through 7,000 separate radio broadcasts each week. The case history of one spokesman measures the menace: The Reverend Carl McIntire began his broadcasts in 1958 from a single radio station. He later accused the National Council of Churches—Methodists, Presbyterians, and 29 other denominations—of being "apostate, Communist, and modernist." Today, the avalanche of contributions he solicits from gullible listeners underwrites daily broadcasts on 617 stations.

McIntire is only one of several Big Scare purveyors on radio–TV. Their conspiratorial interpretation of each event, and their endless debasement of loyal leaders, cannot help reaching the credulous in their huge audience. So the seeds of suspicion are sown, and the harvest already is bitter.

Robert B. DePugh, leader of the Minutemen, claims to have recruited more than 25,000 "patriots" into his secret army. In a postelection newsletter, DePugh exudes desperation:

> The hopes of millions of Americans that the Communist tide could be stopped with ballots instead of bullets have turned to dust.

The St. Petersburg, Fla., unit of the Minutemen quickly responded with its own call to arms:

> If you are ever going to buy a gun, buy it now. Form a secret Minutemen team. This is your best guarantee that someone will act promptly to help secure your freedom when the time comes that you unexpectedly turn up missing.

Wild-eyed? Fanatical? Indeed, but only an extreme symptom of the rightwing affliction which, if it keeps on spreading will infect millions more with the fever of fear.

Mr. MOSS. Will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. I was very much interested in the quotation of the Senator from Idaho concerning the Minutemen. I thought perhaps I could add one more quotation from this same little magazine to which I earlier referred. In this magazine there is published an article entitled "The November Mandate, 1964."

Here is the lead paragraph—it is rather short:

> The Communist Party, U.S.A., accepted the November 3 election of Lyndon Baines Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as the greatest mandate the party had ever received. Not Johnson but the Communist Party acquired a 42-million-vote mandate from the U.S. voters. The party only has the justification of immemorial and habitual usage and the historical precedent to reap the harvest.

Mr. CHURCH. It is unbelievable. But the Senator from Utah has extracted a quotation which is typical. The mischief is that this kind of spreading, political extremism in America can only result in the undermining of public confidence in elected officials, and in the institutions of free government itself. That, and that only, constitutes the threat to the life of freedom in America.

Years ago, when Adolf Hitler sought to bring down the Weimar Republic in Germany, he first sought to undermine public confidence in the institutions of popular government and in the men who ran them. This is the basic reason why we must begin to talk back to the radical right in contemporary American politics. All of us who believe in free government know that the men who head up both parties are dedicated and loyal men, worthy of the respect of the people of the United States.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAYH. I should like to compliment the Senator from Idaho for the great amount of research and the diligent effort which he has expended in the preparation of his remarks today. If there is one contribution that has and will be made above any other in the studies and remarks of the Senator from Idaho, and the colloquy between him and the Senator from Utah, it is to stimulate the minds of young Americans to ask questions about some of the documents, books, and articles to which they have access.

During the last campaign, it was my experience—and I am certain it was the same experience of every Senator—to talk about government and the duties of a Senator before many high school and college groups.

In one appearance which I made before a high school group, it was alarming to have a young girl arise and quote from one of the paperback books—which I do not care to dignify by quoting in the RECORD—as if she were quoting from the Gospel.

As Americans, we have a decided responsibility to make decisions based upon fact and not upon fiction, upon truth and not upon prejudice.

I believe that this type of analysis—on which I wish to compliment the Senator once more for his initiative—points out the shortcomings, the barefaced lies, if I may use these words, in a manner which will encourage young Americans not to accept at face value everything which is published. Let them read this type of information if they wish to do so, but then let them examine and cross-examine it and make a determination on the basis of facts.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I could not possibly agree more with what he has said. One of the paperbacked books to which the Senator has referred is entitled "None Dare Call It Treason." At a later date, I propose to speak at some length upon the subject content of this book, because I believe it is necessary for us to repudiate the treachery theme presented in this book in the most direct and effective way possible.

No one, for a moment, would suggest that the American people ought not to have access to anyone's book on any subject. My only point is that we cannot ignore such books any longer. We cannot afford the easy assumption that people are not reading them, or that few are being taken in. Eight million copies of the book, "None Dare Call It Treason," are now on the bookshelves of the Nation.

Some people reading this book have not read many others which deal with political subjects. They are without needed perspective. The book is written in a style which reflects the propaganda genius of a Goebbels. Anyone, without his own references with which to evaluate what he reads in this book, could easily and innocently be taken in. He can be trapped into believing that there really is a conspiracy that goes beyond government, that goes to the press, to our educational institutions, to our labor unions, and to our business foundations, if one were to believe what one reads in "None Dare Call It Treason." This ruling establishment, according to the author, is engaged, wittingly or unwittingly, in an effort to weaken this country and to promote the cause of world communism. We cannot let so infamous a charge go unanswered.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BASS. I do not fear the threat or the growth of these fringe groups and organizations, nor do I fear the propaganda that is being spread by the books to which the Senator has referred—unless the procedure continues, as in recent months, in which these books and organizations were given some dignity by operating under an umbrella provided by one of our major political parties during the past few months.

I believe the failure of the leaders in these areas to denounce the books and the organizations that were supporting this sort of sputum and vile accusations across the country is the thing that has disturbed not only me, but many other people in government today. I hope that the Senator will address himself to that subject during the remarks that he makes today. I commend him for the effort that he has put forth in bringing this situation to the attention of the Senate today.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. Inasmuch as this is the first time he has had an opportunity to speak as a Member of the Senate, I wish to say how pleased I am that he is here, and that the people of Tennessee have chosen him to join with his senior colleague [Mr. GORE] in representing them in this body.

I respond in this way: I intend at a later date to treat with "None Dare Call It Treason"; but I think it fair to say that this book was repudiated by both the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, so neither major political party ever gave the book any official endorsement. It is true, however, that large numbers of copies of this book were funnelled out through some local Republican party headquarters.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BASS. It was distributed through local party organizations in my own State, and it was found on tables and was discussed inside the various headquarters during the recent campaign as being something that was official and a document that was to be believed by intelligent Americans. That is what disturbs me.

Mr. CHURCH. I concur wholeheartedly in the sentiments that the Senator has expressed.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Shortly before the colloquy began, the Senator from Idaho described what he termed a "call to arms" on the part of the St. Petersburg, Fla., unit of the Minutemen. That call was in these words:

> If you are ever going to buy a gun, buy it now! Form a secret Minutemen team. This is your best guarantee that someone will act promptly to help secure your freedom when the times comes that you unexpectedly turn up missing.

I say that this is an invitation to mob rule; it is nothing else. It is completely foreign to the form of government we have, and it must be rejected by all sensible men.

I grieved when the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] mentioned, in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, the American Mercury. I have not seen this magazine for some years. I am aware of its present editorial policy; but I recall its earlier and better days. I was one of the early subscribers to the American Mercury when it was one of the great magazines published in the United States, under the editorship of Henry L. Mencken and George Nathan. It has indeed come upon sorry days now.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comment.

The important question now is: What is to be done about it? First of all, I think, we must undertake to reclaim the precious words of our own heritage. "Freedom," "Christian," "Americanism," are not nameplates to be exploited by charlatans. Nor, for that matter, is the time-honored term, "conservative."

There is plenty of room in this country for the whole spectrum of opinion, from the most progressive to the most reactionary. The sweep of opinion is the essence of a free society. In the Senate, one quickly learns not only to tolerate but to respect, the integrity of another man's point of view. The range of opinion, within each party, extends from a WAYNE MORSE to a HARRY F. BYRD, from a STROM THURMOND to a JACOB JAVITS. But each Senator recognizes the essential loyalty and good faith of his colleagues. All understand that free government rests upon the foundation of mutual confidence, and upon its ruin tyranny is built.

Robert Welch, taking a radically different position, describes democracy as "merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud," and admonishes his followers to understand that "the John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritarian control at all levels." This is neither the language of the true conservative, nor the method of freedom.

Scholars differ on why so many conscientious Americans are being caught up in the Radical Right. It is, clearly, a revolt against the established order by the discontented, motivated by a mixture of reasons; a quest for some higher purpose than is satisfied by the commercial standards of our times; a fear of the new relationships being generated by the burgeoning growth, urbanization, and automation of the country; a resistance to the complexities of modern life, to the bigness of government, to the racial revolution, to a cold war that never ends, to the absence of quick and easy solutions; a frustration over the inability of the United States, in the nuclear age, to swiftly work its will upon the world. These are the conditions of life with which all of us must cope, but they stir many a rebel to go forth in search of a cause.

The rebel may find his cause when asked to join a study group where big things are being "considered"—communism, the Constitution, the need for recapturing traditional values. Do the neighbors care about communism? They seem to care only about bowling, bridge, and barbecues.

So a convert is made. He is taught that the Communists are corrupting the children by creating an allegiance to the

United Nations, which is actually Communist inspired—by Alger Hiss—and operated by U Thant along with some Red generals and judges. Obviously, in order to save the children, the high school textbooks must go.

Now the institutions of the town itself are directly challenged. How will the teachers react, the parents in PTA, the ministers in their pulpits, the editors in their news columns? Will the sensible citizens fight back, or remain uninvolved? I cannot really blame those who choose the easy way out, when so many men in high public office also duck for cover.

For too long, too many politicians have used our national repugnance to communism as a convenient crutch in their races. Little wonder that they now hesitate, though many see the need, to take issue with constituents who regard themselves as superpatriots, waving the compelling banner of anticommunism.

But the local and national community can no longer afford to hesitate. The radical right is not so much the enemy of communism as it is the enemy of freedom. It opposes the only programs that fight the real Communist threat—which festers on the miseries of the people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—and focuses instead on a strawman specter here at home. The resulting fear undermines public confidence in the very institutions of popular government, in the men of Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Presidency itself. When mutual confidence is destroyed, then and then only shall we have cause to fear the loss of freedom in America.

The time has come to affirm that this country of ours is not a Victorian haunted house, its foundations eaten away by Red termites. This country is a great, free land, rich beyond dreaming, powerful beyond belief; a land still striving, in ever larger measure, to reach the goals of equality and personal liberty, toward which we pledged our Nation in the days of its infancy.

The world is not a big Red sea in which this country is being scuttled, but a vast arena of political upheaval, in which the quest for freedom, ever stronger, has overthrown the colonial empires of the past. It is not a tidy world, nor is it a secure one. But it is one for which the United States itself set the revolutionary example.

To put this world, and the Nation, in a proper perspective for the American people—this is the urgent business of statesmanship today. The job cannot be done without first exposing the delusions of the fanatical right. Its propaganda, its frequent resort to outright intimidation and coercion, represent nothing less than totalitarian methods. They must be repudiated by all responsible citizens, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, who will not run at the first cry of "Comsymp."

If our inner strength fails, we may end like the frog, cooked before we know it. Daniel Bell, scholar of mass movements, put the danger wisely:

> Barbarous acts are rarely committed out of the blue. * * * Step by step, a society becomes accustomed to accept, with less and less moral outrage, and with greater and greater indifference to legitimacy, the successive blows. What is uniquely disturbing about the emergence of radical right in the 1960's is the support it has been able to find among traditional community leaders who have themselves become conditioned, through an indiscriminate anticommunism, to judge as respectable a movement which, if successful, can only end the liberties they profess to cherish.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I join my colleagues in commending the senior Senator from Idaho on his courageous and thoughtful speech this afternoon. I had the privilege of reading his article in the current issue of Look magazine, in which he deals with the same subject.

It is my hope that the article will find its way into every home and every classroom in the Nation, because I think it is one of the most searching and most thorough analyses of the dangers of the radical right that has been prepared.

I commend the Senator for the article, as well as for his remarks on the Senate floor.

The Senator from Idaho is a student of American history. He knows as well as any of us that movements of this kind have occurred throughout our history. There are certain similar characteristics in many of these movements and the ways in which they try to appeal for widespread support. For one thing, we find them under superpatriotic banners. We find in such movements flattering appeals made to the Constitution and the flag, leaving the impression that if one is really a 100-percent patriot he ought to give his loyalty and support to these organizations. Yet, as the Senator has said, in a deeper sense, they are really the most subversive groups among us, in the sense that they have lost faith in our political system. They have lost faith in our democratic institutions. They have lost faith in the leadership of both our great political parties. They have lost faith in the capacity of the American people to see and understand the truth without regard to propaganda. They have lost faith in our great churches and in our educational institutions. For all these reasons, they represent an attack on the things that true patriots hold dear.

Again I commend the Senator for calling the attention of the Senate and of the Nation to this very real danger.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator for his fine remarks. I appreciate everything he has had to say.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield now to the Senator from Ohio, whom I am also happy to welcome back into the Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I commend my great colleague from the State of Idaho on the outstanding service he has performed for the benefit of all Americans today in the address he has made in the Senate, and also in the excellent article on the same subject entitled, "Conspirary, U.S.A.," which appears in the January 26 issue of Look magazine. I think it is one of the greatest and most timely articles written by any American in the last decade. I hope it will be universally read in this Nation.

One of the most important issues confronting our Nation today is, of course, the radical, lunatic rightwing extremists. I was faced recently in the course of my campaign for reelection with statements being made that I was soft on communism.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I interrupt the Senator to say that, knowing him as well as I do, I believe I am qualified to state that he is not soft on anything.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Especially not on communism.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. My opposition was misled on one occasion. The distinguished Senator from Arizona, former Senator Goldwater, in a speech last April in California, said that only in Red China do we behold raw communism. Former Senator Goldwater went on to say, "the United States could wind up on the side of the Russians if there is a conflict with China."

Mr. President, one of the hilarious things that occurred in the course of my campaign for reelection was that some of the brainless trust around my opponent gave that quotation to him, and he attributed it to the junior Senator from Ohio, and said that in light of that quotation the junior Senator from Ohio was soft on communism.

Of course I said that Senator Barry Goldwater had made that statement, not STEVE YOUNG. Furthermore, I said I approved the statement as made, that it is a sensible statement, and that it might well come true.

In that connection, only the other day I received a letter written on the letterhead of the American Legion of Ohio by a self-appointed vigilante. In this letter, which was sent to me by the manager of a radio station in Springfield, Ohio, who believed this drivel and who quoted this self-appointed bush league vigilante, it was stated that Antioch College in the State of Ohio was the massive center of communism in the Midwest.

As adverted to by the Senator from Idaho, these extremists berate the Protestant clergy, by talking about Communists among the Protestant clergy. They talk about Communists on the faculties of our colleges and universities. Yet they could not name one Communist and they could not name one Communist sympathizer on the faculty of Antioch College or of any college or university in the State of Ohio or of any college or university in the State of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

They overlook altogether the threat of Communist aggression from abroad, they refer to their neighbors as tools of the enemy, and claim that only they are the purveyors of the real truth.

The Senator adverted to this scurrilous trash "None Dare Call It Treason" which was used in the recent campaign and was part of the bag of tricks of the hysterical mass movement of Fascist-minded, radical extremists. What "Das

Capital" is to the Communists and "Mein Kampf" was to the Nazis, books like "None Dare Call It Treason" are to the American extremists. They all resort to rewriting history to justify a preconceived course of action. They follow the technique of the big lie, the big smear, and the big racial fear.

One great danger, to which the Senator has so thoroughly called the attention of the American people, arises from the fact that millions of well-meaning Americans embrace these programs as valid solutions to deeply complex problems. The tactics of the extremists, the disorders they create, arise when they try to inject into community life their oversimplified approach to bewildering national problems.

It seems to me—and I believe the Senator will agree with me—that, unable to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, a great and loyal American who was a candidate of his party for Vice President of the United States, and who will be remembered for generations to come as not only a great American but also a truly great jurist, his detractors are willing to settle temporarily for the head of a schoolteacher in the Senator's State, or a clergyman in the State of Texas, or a professor in Antioch College in my State of Ohio. Unfortunately, that type of vigilantism is based on contempt of law. The demagogs of the extreme right sell their followers the diagnosis that internal communism is the disease which causes all ills, and then prescribe local vigilante action as the cure.

Speaking of that lunatic, radical right-wing fringe, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as the Senator from Idaho knows, warned:

> Attributing every adversity to communism is not only irrational but contributes to hysteria and fosters groundless fears. The way to fight it is to study it, understand it, and discover what can be done about it. This is neither the time for inaction or vigilante action.

I am reminded that Dr. Robert Hutchins, when he was president of the University of Chicago, was asked by a lady, "Is it really true that you teach Communism in the University of Chicago?" He said, "Yes, and we teach cancer in our medical school, too."

Inasmuch as I have referred to J. Edgar Hoover, let me also mention that he has stated—but we will not hear this from any of the self-appointed, sandlot witch hunters, the super-duper, self-appointed patriots—that the Communist Party in the United States has lost 90 percent of its membership since reaching the peak of its numerical strength some 18 years ago.

The FBI report states that there were 80,000 Communists in the United States in 1944—that was 21 years ago. At that time, the Soviet Red Army was crushing Hitler's supermen and in America we were preparing for the end of the war. J. Edgar Hoover stated that was their high point—in 1944, maybe in 1945. Now he reports that according to the best estimate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the numerical strength of the Communist Party has nosedived and is around 8,000 members.

The Senator from Idaho and I do not know how many of those 8,000 are probably agents of the FBI who are doing their job in connection with the investigation of their activities.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know whether the Senator has made the computation, but, I believe, based upon the latest FBI reports, the figures would indicate that we are considerably purer than Ivory soap.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the sake of uniformity, will the distinguished Senator from Idaho ask unanimous consent to waive the Pastore rule; otherwise the rule of germaneness will apply.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness may be waived.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. As the Senator from Idaho said a moment ago, that figure would show that we are certainly purer than Ivory soap, for it would mean that for every Communist there would be at least 23,000 non-Communists. In other words, the odds in favor of free institutions in this country are approximately 23,000 to 1. Among 80,000 persons attending a Big Ten football game or any other spectacular, statistically there might possibly be 3 or 4 of those 80,000 who are members of the Communist Party or Communist sympathizers. I think that we do not need the John Birch Society or any other lunatic right-wing organization to protect us.

I thank the Senator very much; and again I praise the Senator from Idaho for the great public service that he is rendering today.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much for his remarks.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his masterful discussion on the influence of the radical right in the recent election campaign. Although the election returns showed that rightist influence was several decibels below the noise that they made, we must not believe for one instant that they have been discouraged. Already we are being subjected to new, lavishly financed, broad-based campaigns to scare a greater number of people into supporting rightist philosophy and candidates in the 1966 elections.

Earlier I quoted from the American Mercury magazine that was delivered in the mail yesterday.

The rightwing lost the last election in Utah by a decisive margin. They lost because of the many, many people in Utah, as elsewhere in America, who used knowledge and reason and understanding. But it took Herculean efforts on the part of thousands of these sensible people to turn back at the very gates of the election, the well-mounted rightist campaigns of distortion and fallacy which had been started years ago. And the American electorate suffered through one of the ugliest campaigns of our history.

The Birchers and their allies have been active for some time in my State of Utah. They tried out their muscle several times in hand-to-hand combat with the Utah State Legislature. In 1961 they organized against a bill to provide for community health services. Mrs. Jane Thomas, executive director of the State comprehensive mental health planning program, has related what happened. The community health service bill was endorsed by the State medical society, the community welfare council, and many other professional groups. Its worth was so obvious that everybody thought it was sure to receive favorable legislative consideration.

But a rightist organization called the Utah Citizens Community for Constitutional Mental Health decided there was something subversive about helping the mentally ill, and set out to defeat it. They had the support of W. Cleon Skousen, former chief of police in Salt Lake City, and Reed Benson, then Utah State coordinator, and now a representative for the John Birch Society here in Washington, D.C.

When hearings were set on the bill, representatives of each of the supporting organizations appeared to testify, only to find the hearing room packed with hordes of rightists. Advocates of the bill had to testify from the doorway, under the heckling of the crowd and catcalls of Communist.

The bill got through the legislature, but only after it had been amended to make it a felony punishable by a prison term to give anyone a psychiatric treatment without written consent of the next of kin or a clergyman.

During the past campaign, in which I was a candidate for reelection to the U.S. Senate, I was subjected a number of times to heckling from the closed mind that so often betrays a convert to the radical right.

For example, I would be approached after a speech by a citizen who would snarl: "What are you going to do about Vietnam?"

I would start to summarize the situation in Vietnam as background for my reply to the question, but before I could get out more than a few words, the questioner would throw another snarling question.

Patiently, I would try to continue, only to be interrupted with shouts and fist shaking.

I found I had to give up. The questioner had already made up his mind. He did not want information; he only wanted a chance to insult me.

Again and again during the campaign my billboards and campaign posters were defaced. This was not the usual prank of high-spirited youngsters—a curling mustache or popeyes—it was a systematic defacement with a paint spray gun, and a systematic alteration of the Moss campaign slogan. It seemed to be the product of minds distorted by extremist fears.

The rightwing was very active in the Utah campaign in other ways. A chief

example was the hard drive to distribute campaign paperback books. Thousands of copies of "None Dare Call It Treason" were handed out. Discussions about the book flooded the "Letters to the Editor" columns, and nearly swallowed them up. Businessmen, industrialists, students, educators, members of organized labor, and intelligent citizens from all walks of life—including many Republicans—countered with answers to specific misstatements within the book. The Rocky Mountain Review, a fine weekly newspaper published in Salt Lake City, printed a page-by-page refutation of the statements made. It was a studied effort to correct, by facts, the emotional impact the book was having on people who had no way to get these facts—or who were disregarding them. The flood of letters to the editor grew so large that the Salt Lake Tribune had to declare an end to the discussions in its columns—only to have to reopen them under pressure of numbers. Recently another moratorium was finally declared—and kept.

The reaction of average citizens to the half-truths and scare tactics of the radical right in the past campaign is one of the hopeful signs of the times. Hate and fear and demagogy were discarded in the face of reason and intelligence. This is the proper way—the American way—to deal with campaigns designed only to appeal to the emotions. I believe we must continue to bring the rightist organizations, and their points of view—out into the open where they can be examined and discussed.

As the Senator from Idaho has so well pointed out, "The radical right is still on the rampage." Their activity will continue to grow, not diminish.

What we must do is to see that the moderate view gets more attention. For every John Birch society and every Minuteman group, we need counterorganizations of well-informed and intelligent citizens to expose the tactics of fear and fallacy upon which the haters thrive. For every Dean Manion Forum and Dan Smoot broadcast we need a reasoned and thoughtful presentation of the middle-of-the-road programs and philosophy which the majority of Americans espoused in the last campaign.

We should not wait for the frenzy of a campaign to again turn back the radical right. We should not take the chance. As has been so often said, campaigns are won between elections.

The campaign of 1964 was long and exhausting—and ugly. I hoped when it was over that America would never have to face another like it. The Deseret News, in Salt Lake City, agreed. In an editorial, November 4, the News stated:

> The Democratic Party's historic landslide victory at the polls Tuesday represents a thunderous mandate for the course the Johnson-Kennedy administration has followed in world and domestic affairs.
>
> It represents a repudiation of the conservative wing that succeeded in taking control of the Republican Party nationally and, to a considerable extent, here in Utah.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In either case, the party should realize that support of the hate-mongering extremist groups is the kiss of death. The American people obviously are unpersuaded by the fear and suspicion sown so desperately by such groups. The Republican Party and America generally would be better off without them.

But there will be more campaigns like 1964 if we do not start now to meet the offensive of the radical right—so I commend again my colleague from Idaho for his penetrating speech on this subject, and for his intention to continue to discuss it in the coming months.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Utah for his remarks and for the important contribution he has just made to the discussion that is taking place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Idaho has performed a distinguished public service today in calling to the attention of the Senate and of all Americans this vexing, continuing problem. His analysis has been penetrating and incisive with respect to this strange, festering sore in American society, a movement directly contrary to all that this country has stood for for so long.

One can understand—although with difficulty—that a man of twisted mind might call Dwight Eisenhower an agent of the Communist conspiracy; but it is impossible to understand why and how other Americans could share in such a belief. It is altogether impossible for me to comprehend that a magazine article could have been printed, following the November election, saying that the election of Lyndon B. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY constituted a victory for the Communist Party and for Communists everywhere. This is, of course, arrant nonsense.

The Senator from Idaho put this question: How do you answer the charges made by such people; how do you answer the letters of those who have been misled by these charges? I suggest that the Senator from Idaho has given many of the answers in his address today. I join other Senators in congratulating the Senator from Idaho for his courage and effectiveness. What he said needed to be said. He said it logically and eloquently.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my seatmate, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my old friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, for the splendid address directed against the radical right, which he has just made. I commend also the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for the contributions they have made to this discussion.

I should like to present a point of view to my friend from Idaho and ask him, perhaps, to comment briefly on it. It occurs to me that the radical right is nothing really very new. We have had it all during the course of American history. Those of us who recall the frenetic attacks against President George Washington in the late days of the 18th century can, I think, identify many of those attacks with the same general philosophy that is presently being portrayed throughout the country by the modern radical right.

I suggest that the Alien and Sedition Acts in the administration of President John Adams were another exemplification of the same kind of philosophy.

We all know of the rather substantial growth of the Know Nothing or American Party in the middle years of the 19th century.

Then we come down—and those are not by any means all the examples anyone could cite—to the real scare, of which the principal proponent was former Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, which began to show its teeth in 1950, if not before, when the distinguished father of our present able junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was maligned, his position distorted, and fake photographs published, showing him falsely in the company of the head of the Communist Party. It is all a part of the same thing. I suppose we shall have this kind of movement so long as we have a republican form of government and rely, as we do, as we must and as we should, on the right of free speech. These people have the right to speak their piece; they have no right to distort the truth. But the only way, under our laws, since recent decisions of the Supreme Court indicate that much reliance is not to be placed any more on the law of libel, is simply to meet falsehood with truth.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the radical right is not very active. I have had a check made on my mail. I should say that I do not receive more than two or three letters a month from individuals who could be clearly identified as belonging to the radical right, or even from people who are mentally disturbed or are cranks. But I do receive about 50 pieces of mail a month, printed or mimeographed material, sent out by various organizations which the radical right sponsors. Most of that mail seems to originate either in Texas or California. I suspect that the reason for this is that there appears to be a certain number of rather fuzzy-minded millionaires in those States who made a certain amount of money rather rapidly, who have not a wide educational background, and who apparently have very little understanding of the purposes of America, her ideals, or her traditions. They appear to identify the status quo ante, a return to an era of many years ago, what might be called the robber baron era, with Americanism—quite falsely, of course.

So I suggest that what this really represents, and usually has represented throughout our history, is a sort of revolt against civilization; a desire to go back to the never-never land, a dream world that never existed in the past; a frustration with the strains and stresses of modern life; and a rather affirmative but quite human desire to find a scapegoat—any scapegoat—but preferably a scape-

goat that is not content with the status quo but would like to move ahead to a New Deal, a Fair Deal, a Square Deal, as in Teddy Roosevelt's day, a New Frontier, and a new Great Society. Those people, I think, must be ferreted out and their activities given the full light of day.

The Senator from Idaho has written a magnificent article for Look magazine, just published, which I had a chance to read before I came into the Chamber.

I wonder whether he would not agree that perhaps the best way to handle these attacks on freedom and, indeed, on Christianity in the world is to do what he is doing and the rest of us are trying to do; namely, resort to publicity and resort to the truth.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his keen insight into this problem which is manifest in the remarks he has just made.

First of all, it is true that throughout our history there have been groups that have propagated the conspiracy doctrine. These have always been extremist groups, although they have varied in size and character. Early in our history, there was a very strong anti-Masonic movement in this country. Certain extremists tried to circulate the line that the Masons were engaged in a conspiracy to tear down the churches and other traditional institutions of the land.

Later there was another extremist movement in this country. This group had as its target—not Masons, but Catholics and certain nationals like the Irish, coming in from the Catholic areas of Europe, who were, by their numbers, changing the ethnic complexion of our society.

These earlier nativist groups, feeling that they were being pressured out by the newly arriving immigrants, furnished many recruits for a new extremist movement, directed against the Catholics of the country. Again, the treachery doctrine was utilized. The argument was made that Catholics were involved in an insidious plot to hand the country over to the Pope.

But I suggest to the Senator that this is the first time we have had a movement directed against, not some particular minority group, as has been the case in the past, but against the entire prevailing American establishment, against the leaders of the Nation in both parties, against the foremost educators of the land, against the business foundations, against the labor unions, against the press itself.

This is a different kind of extremism. We have had our know-nothings before. Today's extremist movement, however, began, I believe, with McCarthyism, which seeded the bed for the radical right of today. The attack is of a different and more ominous character.

It is incumbent upon us to come to grips with this problem. We must not ignore it any longer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I highly commend the Senator from Idaho for his truly great speech this afternoon. It is a speech that I believe should have the subtitle "Defense of Individual Freedom in the United States and Political Liberty for the People."

What the Senator has to say about the extremists on the right is equally applicable to the extremists on the left. As the Senator indicated in his speech, and as the Senator knows, we have done something about what I consider to be reasonable constitutional checks under a government by law, dealing with the extremists on the left.

Some years ago, the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, and the senior Senator from Oregon introduced in this body, as coauthors, an amendment to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. The legislation passed Congress and was signed into law by the President. It is the law of the land today.

It does not mean that we destroyed any individual rights of any person merely because of his political ideology. But we did make illegal a hunting license on their part to destroy the freedom of the people of the country as a whole, which is the conspiracy objective, of course, of the Communists.

I believe the time has come, and is, in fact, long overdue, for the great speech that the Senator from Idaho has made this afternoon. I do not believe that this speech should be entombed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although it will receive some public notice. I am sure it will be a passing notice. I believe it is a speech that should be readily available to the representatives in Congress for dissemination to the people.

Therefore, I suggest, for the benefit of the people in this country who are interested in the preservation of their freedom that this speech be reprinted in a large volume of reprints and that those reprints be made available by Senators who can send them out in answer to the mail which they receive from sincere and dedicated citizens who are very much concerned about the propaganda that they, too, receive, dealing with the falsification of the radical right.

I hope, if it becomes possible to reprint the speech of the Senator from Idaho, that we shall receive his complete cooperation and authorization in having the speech reprinted for broad dissemination.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for his remarks. He compliments me very highly with his suggestion. I shall be happy to cooperate in any way that I can.

I am happy now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished orator from the West, our colleague, for calling to the attention of the American people the prophets of discord, the know-nothings of today, which the recent election seemed to have brought out of the woodwork.

I personally had some opportunity to observe the same type of extremists do their worst in 1950. I observed a campaign in Maryland where, among other types of campaigning, they did not hesitate to doctor an original photograph taken of my father and mother—my father then being the senior Senator from Maryland.

In the original photograph, my father had his arm around my mother. They were pictured as listening to a radio program on the election returns some years before. The original photograph was doctored. The picture of my mother was removed from the photograph, and a picture of the then head of the American Communist Party was inserted in the photograph in my mother's place.

Then the photograph was published in a newspaper, purporting to allege that my father was soft on communism. This doctored photograph was disseminated at the 12th hour to almost the entire electorate of our State.

The great service which the distinguished Senator from Idaho is performing for the American people is that he is calling to their attention some of the problems which extremism on the right and on the left cause in a democracy.

I am satisfied in my own mind that so long as the American people know the facts, so long as they have courageous Senators like the young orator from the West, we have nothing to fear from extremists, be they on the left or on the right; but the American people must have an opportunity to know the facts.

For that reason, I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. One of the principal reasons why I have derived such satisfaction from the election of the junior Senator from Maryland is that his presence here today stands in vindication of the great public service and reputation of his illustrious father.

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, Senate Resolution 7, which, under the rule, has come over from the previous legislative day, under the precedents of the Senate, will now be placed on the calendar. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 7) to amend appropriations for certain subcommittees passed February 10, 1964.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be laid before the Senate and made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and on behalf of the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add the following section:

SEC. 4. That section 4 of S. Res. 284, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing an examination, investigation, and

study of the problems of American small and independent business, agreed to February 10, 1964, is amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be suspended.

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

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution, as amended (S. Res. 7) to amend appropriations for certain subcommittees passed February 10, 1964.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 7, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as originally submitted, Senate Resolution 7 would have provided funds for three subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee in order to comply with the provisions of the Pay Increase Act passed last year. Only today, the resolution was amended by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alaska to include the Small Business Committee in the amount of $7,000.

I think I should recite the general chronology of what happened to make clear what the situation is.

On August 13, 1964, after Congress had enacted and the President had signed the pay increase bill, the Judiciary subcommittees, nine in number, filed resolutions for an increase in their allowance in the sum of $150,000.

On August 20, the Senate, by unanimous consent, approved the resolution, but we failed to ask that the vote be reconsidered so that it could be closed up.

Subsequently a motion to reconsider was filed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. We were getting close to adjournment. The only time we had to consider this matter was on the 2d or 3d of October. Had we pressed and had we been unsuccessful, we would have lost altogether. We still hoped a settlement could be consummated.

So the resolution now before the Senate was filed by the distinguished majority leader and me as of January 6. All it does is try to take care of three judiciary subcommittees plus the one added today, which is the Small Business Committee. The total would be $61,500 plus $7,000 for the Small Business Committee, or a total of $68,500.

If we fail to take favorable action, it will only mean that we are discriminating against staffs of committees and subcommittees that have received pay raises.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will approve the resolution. It is only fair to the clerical staffs of these subcommittees, notwithstanding any objection that might be interposed.

That is the whole story in capsule form. I submit the case and leave it right there, knowing that our distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has some remarks he wishes to make on a rather extended basis, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not very pleasant for me, at the beginning of each new session of Congress, to lay before the Senate the numerous so-called temporary subcommittees that are either created or revived from one session of Congress to another.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated, I objected to the approval of certain resolutions in August of last year. I felt then, as I feel now, that the various committee chairmen should, in my opinion look into the many large salary increases allowed by Congress, and provided for by the resolutions sponsored by certain of the Judiciary subcommittees. Those salary raises were not automatic. The chairmen of the various standing committees could have made any provision they thought fit and proper.

For instance, in the case of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as chairman of the committee, I consulted the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We agreed that the salary raises should be a certain amount, percentagewise, but not in accord with the pay increases allowed by Congress.

The resolution of August 1964, included nine subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, for a total of $150,700. However, the resolution now before us shows that of the nine subcommittees all but three were able to obtain the extra money from savings that they made. Evidently, substantial savings have been made, for the amount in the resolution was reduced from $150,700 to $61,500. Senate Resolution 7 would provide an additional $28,500 for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, $10,000 for the Subcommittee on Immigration, and $23,000 for that group supposedly studying juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask that a table showing the effects of the August resolutions be included at this point in my remarks.

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

Resolution	Subcommittee	Request	Appropriated by Senate February 1964	Resolution for supplemental	Additional amount requested
S. Res. 261	Administrative Practice and Procedures.	$120,000	$120,000	S. Res. 352	$10,000
S. Res. 262 [1]	Antitrust and Monopoly	512,000	512,000	S. Res. 353	49,000
S. Res. 264	Constitutional Amendments	68,215	55,000	S. Res. 354	4,000
S. Res. 265	Constitutional Rights	165,000	165,000	S. Res. 355	17,000
S. Res. 266 [1]	Immigration and Naturalization	135,000	135,000	S. Res. 356	10,000
S. Res. 268	Internal Security	360,000	360,000	S. Res. 357	26,600
S. Res. 271	Refugees and Escapees	87,500	87,500	S. Res. 358	6,300
S. Res. 272	Revision and Codification	28,200	28,200	S. Res. 359	2,800
S. Res. 274 [1]	Juvenile Delinquency	188,000	188,000	S. Res. 360	25,000
Total					150,700

[1] Indicating subcommittees requesting additional funds in S. Res. 7. All other subcommittees were able to stay within their original budgets.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we have an enormous number of employees on Capitol Hill and it seems to me that if we are to help President Johnson in cutting back expenses, as he is trying to do now, the place to begin is here. We could save a good deal of money if only the chairmen of the various committees and the chairmen of the subcommittees did what some of us have done: that is, take the schedule of rates paid to the various employees, and find out what they do and then pay them in accord with their capabilities.

That was not done at all in most cases; as seems readily apparent. I tried to get the full information from the Secretary of the Senate, but I was informed that the book which was usually published quarterly will now be published only semiannually. The information I desired, showing how much the pay has increased to the various subcommittees, special committees, and standing committees will have to await the time when this information is given to us in book form by the Secretary of the Senate.

It goes without saying that the committee chairmen and the chairmen of the subcommittees proceeded to pay money that was not available, money that Congress had not appropriated. That is why those subcommittees are in trouble today. Now we are being asked to supply the money, and put a stamp of approval on some serious mismanagement. It would seem to me that there was a violation of the rule when this extra pay in salaries was given to the subcommittees, although the money was not at hand.

That is why I objected last August to the adoption of the resolution. I am glad to note that of the nine subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, who had applied for an additional $150,700, six found money somewhere to pay their staffs.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand that if the resolution is adopted, it will not return to the Judiciary Committee that portion of the $150,000 that otherwise would have gone to these subcommittees?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It will not go back?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it will not go back. They found they did not need it after all. In August they asked for $150,700, and today they are asking for $61,500.

Under the new salary bill—and I wish Senators would listen to this—every standing committee will receive $168,432.89 to pay its regular employees. Who are these regular employees? They are six clerical employees and four specialists. Each standing committee can appoint those employees on its own. In order to disburse the pay for these 10 staff members, as I have said, each standing committee obtains $168,432.89. Of the standing committees, the Appropriations Committee is the only committee which is not limited to employing 10 persons.

There appears to be no limit to the number the Appropriations Committee can employ. The 15 committees of which I now speak are the 15 standing committees other than the Appropriations Committee.

The entire sum that could be paid to these 10 employees for each of the standing committees amounts to $2,526,493.35. With that money, these 15 standing committees can employ 150 people.

Let us see what has happened with the subcommittees and the number of people employed by many of the standing committees, in addition to the 150 provided under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

As of March 31 of last year, the various subcommittees created by the standing committees employed 245 persons in addition to the 150 regular staff members provided for by the Reorganization Act.

In addition to that, we had regular employees on the standing committee, other than those provided for by law, numbering 110.

In addition to those two categories, we had special employees for several committees aggregating 33.

Thus, the total number of employees from the subcommittees and from the regular committees—that is, in addition to the 150 which they could ordinarily employ—shows 388 employees hired by these various subcommittees and the standing committees.

Mr. President, I just think it is shameful for the business of the Senate to be handled in such a manner.

The entire cost of paying for the employees of the regular committees, as provided by the Reorganization Act of 1946, as I have just indicated, was $2,526,493.35. But to pay these extra employees selected from these committees and the special committees, the authorized amount was $4,552,955.

Mr. President, just stop and think. To run the regular committees, we started out with each committee having 10 regular employees. Multiply the 15 that I am accounting for by the 10, and that means 150 employees. But all committees together, in addition to the regular 150 employees provided for under the Reorganization Act of 1946, last year employed 388 persons.

If we add the 150 to that, it makes over 500 employees on Capitol Hill doing work for Senators.

Mr. President, in the next few days we are going to have the chairmen of the regular committees, particularly the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, coming before us and asking for money to operate the various subcommittees for the year ending next February—for the next 12 months.

I hope that the chairman of that committee, as well as the chairmen of the subcommittees, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, look into these matters and try to work out a schedule so that employees will be paid in accordance with their duties and their capabilities, if it is at all possible.

Running down the list of a few employees on the Committee on the Judiciary, here is what happened under the new pay bill. This list contains only those receiving $10,000 or more. It does not include all the clericals and those receiving less than $10,000.

It would seem to me that the chairmen of these committees should look into this situation and try to adjust these salaries to the end that there will be some kind of fairness among the employees and that the most capable will receive their just due.

Most of the employees on these committees apparently were given the full amount of the pay raise provided for under the law, irrespective of whether they deserved it or not. That is why those three subcommittees are in trouble today. Most of them received an increase of from 14 percent on up to 20.5 percent.

I am hopeful, as I have stated, that when the chairmen of various committees present the resolutions for their subcommittees, they will look into this matter and evaluate the employees and pay them according to the work they do and not according to their titles. I notice that there are legislative assistants, editors, and editorial directors, minority staff members, chief counsels, records managers, and many other titles, which more than likely means that little real work is done.

Mr. President, I cite specifically the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is chairman. In this resolution there is a request for $28,500. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], as chairman of this subcommittee, has under him 41 employees. I could go down the list and show where there are economists, a minority counsel, an editorial director and office manager, a chief economist, an assistant counsel, and so on and so forth. The salaries are, to my way of thinking, very large. Some of those salaries are almost as large as the salary a Senator received prior to enactment of the pay bill.

Although I could not ascertain the amount that was actually paid to all the employees of the subcommittees of the committees that I have mentioned in the document on the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I am informed that this subcommittee gave the full measure of increase in most cases. I assume that the same thing was done as to all other subcommittees. I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed in the RECORD.

Exhibit 1, from which I read, indicates the salary which could be paid under the act by these various subcommittees.

Exhibit 2 presents a list of the employees of these subcommittees named in Resolution 7. It also shows their titles and what they received before the pay bill went into effect, together with what they are receiving at the present time.

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

EXHIBIT 1

Subcommittee	Name	Job	Present salary	Percent increase	New salary
Immigration and Naturalization	Blair, Drury H.	Staff member	$17,305.20	20.5	$20,775.20
	Brown, James M.	Legislative assistant	13,130.64	15.5	15,166.75
	Buckner, Catlett L.	Staff member	14,371.68	16.5	16,743.01
	Mesmer, Fred M.	do	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Piotrow, Phyllis	do	12,904.92	15.5	14,905.18
	Stevens, William A.	Minority staff member	15,951.36	18.5	18,902.36
Federal Judicial System	Finzel, Hubert H.	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Internal Security	Baker, Dorothy C.	Records manager	11,757.36	14.5	13,462.17
	Hutto, Ralph H.	Assistant editorial director	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	Littman, A. Warren	Associate counsel	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	Jefferson, Louis	Research analyst	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38
	Lowell, William E.	Editorial director	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	McArthur, Alan D.	Associate counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,774.20
	McManus, Robert	Investigation analyst	15,500.04	18.5	18,367.55
	Mandel, Benjamin	Research director	16,515.48	19.5	19,736.00
	Schroeder, Frank	Chief investigator	16,515.48	19.5	19,736.00
	Sourwine, J. G.	Chief counsel	18,563.48	21.5	22,554.63
	Tarabachia, Alfonso	Investigator	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Subcommittee	Name	Job	Present salary	Percent increase	New salary
Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights	Brennan, Thomas	Assistant counsel	$13,243.44	15.5	$15,296.17
	Dinkins, Clarence	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Haaser, Stephen G	Chief clerk	13,243.44	15.5	15,296.17
Administrative Practices and Procedures	Coulter, Kathryn	Special assistant	11,012.64	12.5	12,389.22
	Fensterwald, Bernard	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Kennedy, Cornelius	Minority counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation	Bailey, James	do	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
	Blair, John M	Chief economist	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Brown, E. Wayles	Economist	16,176.96	18.5	19,169.96
	Chumbris, Peter N	Chief minority counsel	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Clifford, George E	Assistant counsel	13,807.56	16.5	16,085.56
	Cohen, S. Jerry	Staff director and chief counsel.	17,192.40	19.5	20,544.92
	Corkey, James E	General counsel	17,192.40	19.5	20,544.92
	Flurry, Horace L	Assistant staff director and chief counsel.	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Hamilton, Irene	Economist	16,176.96	18.5	19,169.96
	Leban, Abbott A	Minority counsel	14,484.48	17.5	17,019.26
	Measday, Walter S	Economist	15,951.36	18.5	18,902.36
	Raitt, Ronald D	Minority counsel	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
	Sharp, Dean E	Assistant counsel	13,356.24	15.5	15,426.45
	Waters, Bernard	Minority counsel	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
Constitutional Rights	Creech, William A	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Statutes of the United States	Kitchin, A. Paul	Counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Juvenile Delinquency	Connell, Patricia	Assistant counsel	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38
	Gleason, Eugene W	Editorial director	15,048.72	17.5	17,682.24
	Glick, Edward M	Special assistant	13,017.72	15.5	15,035.47
	Perian, Carl L	Staff director	16,064.16	18.5	19,036.03
	Sturm, Rex L	Minority counsel	15,506.36	18.5	18,375.04
Refugees and Escapees	Chang, Donald M	do	15,838.44	18.5	18,768.55
	Moskowitz, Jack	Staff director	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Ziemba, Carl	Counsel	15,838.44	18.5	18,768.55

EXHIBIT 2

Committee on the Judiciary

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 266, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

Name	Title	Compensation		Name	Title	Compensation	
		Basic annual salary	Gross annual salary			Basic annual salary	Gross annual salary
Ann Ashcraft	Clerk	$2,340	$6,320.81	Mary J. McCloskey	Clerk	$3,120	$8,305.11
Drury H. Blair	Staff member	8,040	20,852.89	Fred M. Mesmer	Staff member	8,040	20,852.89
Catlett L. Buckner	do	6,480	16,743.10	William A. Stevens	Minority staff member	7,320	18,902.37
Franzetta R. DeGooyer	Clerk	3,120	8,305.11				

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 274, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

Adele V. Beaton	Secretary	$2,940	$7,802.82	Mary M. Goulart	Secretary	$2,460	$6,602.96
Susan G. Bennett	Staff assistant	2,820	7,518.06	Anne M. Ketcham	do	3,120	8,305.11
Margaret C. Bray	Secretary	2,640	7,090.94	Elizabeth A. Knipe	do	2,040	5,615.46
Alexandra V. de Smitt	Assistant chief clerk	2,040	5,615.46	Elizabeth T. McGill	Chief clerk	4,140	10,942.09
Peter Freivalds	Research director	4,080	10,795.83	William C. Mooney, Jr	Investigator	3,900	10,264.93
Eugene W. Gleason	Editorial director	7,380	19,036.06	Carl L. Perian	Staff director	7,920	20,410.18
Edward M. Glick	Special assistant	5,760	15,035.58	Jean Wegner	Secretary	2,460	6,602.96
Terry L. Golden	Secretary	2,220	6,038.66	Milton H. Wernstrom	Clerk	5,100	13,462.23

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 262, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

		Salary as of June 30, 1964	Salary as of January 1965			Salary as of June 30, 1964	Salary as of January 1965
Lois E. Alexander	Economist	$10,900.12	$12,499.44	Horace L. Flurry	Assistant staff director and chief counsel.	$17,230.08	$20,589.96
James E. Bailey	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43				
Charles E. Bangert	Assistant counsel	14,811.12	18,367.55	Dorothy D. Goodwin	Assistant counsel	12,192.12	14,130.27
Patricia Y. Bario	Editorial director and office manager.	6,749.72	9,540.06	O. Marie Graffam	Telephone operator	5,045.52	5,423.94
				Paul S. Green	Investigator and editor	4,225.48	16,611.65
John M. Blair	Chief economist	17,230.08	20,589.96	Irene T. Hamilton	Economist	16,176.96	19,169.75
Giacomo J. Bologna	Assistant Counsel		15,035.58	Helen L. Kelly	Secretary	8,851.28	7,660.46
E. Wayles Browne, Jr	Economist	17,230.08	19,169.75	Abbott A. Leban	Counsel for the minority	14,484.48	17,019.39
Lucile Bryant	Stenographer	9,055.80	7,945.21	Catherine McQuaid McCarthy.	Stenographer	6,345.72	6,948.58
Fred B. Burke	Investigator	16,402.68	18,902.37				
Katherine Ford Chaney	Information clerk	6,475.68	7,375.72	Walter S. Measday	Economist	15,951.36	18,902.37
Peter N. Chumbris	Chief counsel to the minority	17,230.08	20,589.96	Gladys E. Montier	Clerk	9,454.68	10,795.83
George E. Clifford	Assistant counsel	13,807.56	16,085.87	Ronald D. Raitt	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43
S. Jerry Cohen	Staff director and chief counsel.	19,192.40	20,545.01	Arlone Read	Stenographer	7,645.92	8,736.13
				Eurydice Richman	do		6,038.66
Raymond C. Cole, Jr	Investigator	7,838.20	13,462.23	Dean E. Sharp	Assistant counsel	13,356.24	15,426.51
James E. Corkey	General counsel	17,192.40	20,545.01	Wilbur D. Sparks	do	13,085.44	15,296.19
Kirkley S. Coulter	Economist for the minority	16,515.48	19,736.03	Sara N. Van Oosterhout	Secretary for the minority	5,435.52	5,897.58
Antoinette M. DeFelice	Stenographer	3,976.56	3,402.65	Bernard J. Waters	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43
Thomas A. DiMattina	Investigator	6,232.96	6,948.58	Thomas C. Williams	Assistant counsel		16,085.87
Esther H. Esmond	Secretary to the counsel for the minority.	6,995.76	7,660.46	Jo Anne Youngblood	Stenographer	6,909.04	7,660.46
				Robert R. Zanes	Messenger	4,525.32	4,864.83
Margie R. Felton	Stenographer		6,038.66	Emily W. Zayyani	Stenographer	9,055.80	7,945.21

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more time of the Senate, except to emphasize and repeat what I have said. Something should be done to reduce the number of employees who are hired by the various subcommittees. As I tried to point out a moment ago, four categories of regular employees are provided under the Reorganization Act. Then there are employees of the subcommittees. As I have said, subcommittee employees number

245, and while I do not know whether the entire amount appropriated for the purpose was spent or not, in order to take care of the 245 special employees of the subcommittees there has been set aside $3,039,600.

There is yet another category. Funds are made available to certain committees for the hire of special investigators. I point out the case of the Committee on Space and Aeronautical Sciences. The amount of money provided for that committee was $88,500. The committee employed six additional people, and much of that money was spent by hiring people on a reimbursable basis.

The Committee on Commerce received $360,000. All of this is in addition to the amount appropriated for the subcommittees that I have mentioned. The Committee on Commerce has employed 30 additional people.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has employed 10, with $150,000 allocated.

The Committee on Government Operations has employed 24, with $450,000 appropriated for that purpose.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been given $105,000, for 10 employees.

The Subcommittee on Small Business has been given $125,000, for 14 additional employees. The is in addition to the regular contingent.

The Committee on Aging has been given $213,016 for a total of 16 employees who, as I said, have been added to the subcommittee employees. The 133 additional employees make a total of 388 people.

I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will look into these subjects with the view that some money can be saved the Government. I believe that President Johnson is making an effort to curtail expenses. In the Senate we could do a good job of leading the way.

I do not like to mention my own personal experience, that is, with the Agriculture Committee. I do not wish to appear as one leading the way, or anything like that. But the moment that the bill providing for an increase in pay was enacted, I proceeded to fix reasonable salaries for the employees of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I heard no complaints from those employees. But I have noted that the employees of other committees received whatever the traffic would bear—whatever the bill provided that they might receive.

I am very hopeful that something will be done in order, first, to reduce the number of employees. Unless we do so, we shall have to start constructing additional buildings to take care of the additional employees. I am sure that if Senators who have the responsibility of subcommittees would work together and coordinate their efforts with the Committee on Rules and Administration, a good deal of saving could be accomplished. There is no doubt in my mind that the work necessary in order to keep the Senate going could be done at a lesser cost and with fewer employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 7, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 262, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States), is hereby amended on page 3, line 8, by striking out "$512,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$540,500".

SEC. 2. S. Res. 266, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964, to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, is hereby amended on page 2, line 16, by striking out "$135,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$145,000".

SEC. 3. S. Res. 274, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 2, by striking out "$188,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$211,000".

SEC. 4. That section 4 of S. Res. 284, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing an examination, investigation, and study of the problems of American small and independent business, agreed to February 10, 1964, is amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,000".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, very briefly, the comments made by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on this subject, as has been the case in past years, have been helpful. In a sense I feel a responsibility to reply for those who are on the staffs of some of the subcommittees. The quality of professional skill represented by many of the members of the staffs of its subcommittees is extraordinarily high. None of us in the abstract, I suppose, could say that their services would be worth $22,900, $21,700, or $18,500.

Those of us with a measure of responsibility for proposing budgets for subcommittees seek prudently to measure the capacity of a staff and then reflect it in the recommended salaries.

For the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I assure the Senator from Louisiana that some rather substantial economies were made subsequent to the August failure of the Senate to act on the motion to reconsider. I think perhaps that action was a good lesson, and that we shall discover that in the operation of the subcommittee, we may be able to operate with less money than heretofore, but I think not primarily in the area of service salaries, but rather in the area of other expenses.

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

Mr. HART. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator tell us the extent to which the number of employees was reduced?

What actually happened that caused the amount to be cut? That action ought to stand out as an example to all others. For example, in the case of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, the subcommittee had requested $4,000, and it did with what it had. In the case of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, the subcommittee asked for $17,000. It evidently did with what it had. In the case of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, there was an additional amount of $26,600 requested, and that amount remained as was. It would seem to me that, as the Senator states, we learned a little lesson, and it is apparent from what was asked heretofore that some effort was made to cut back.

While I am on my feet, and if the Senator will permit me to say so, I notice that in the case of the juvenile delinquency study there was a reduction in the staff of 11, as I recall.

Mr. DODD. Nine.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nine, but there was a reduction. I hope that the same result will be accomplished when the Senator presents his request to continue these subcommittees. I am sure they will, particularly as to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As I have stated on many occasions, the Committee on the Judiciary has more subcommittees than all the rest of the committees combined. I realize that much more work is done in that committee than in the average standing committee, for the reason that the Committee on the Judiciary deals with numerous claims and naturalization cases. I have often heard the chairman state that more than 50 percent—sometimes as much as 52 percent—of the bills enacted by Congress emanate from these two subcommittees. I can appreciate that because before reorganization, I was chairman of the Committee on Claims. Oftentimes 52 percent of the bills that were enacted by Congress came from the Committee on Claims.

The subcommittees that handle claims and naturalization matters do a large amount of work. I realize that. Still, it seems to me that the staffs of those subcommittees could be trimmed down somewhat because, as I have said on many occasions, most of the preparatory work is done by the departments in which the requests are first made for the payments of the claims.

I hope that in all subcommittees, not only the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, but all other committees, an effort will be made to reduce the number of employees, in an effort to assist the President in balancing the budget.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I indicated, and as the Senator from Louisiana noted, following the August failure on the part of the Senate to act on the reconsideration motion, economies were effected.

I rise only to voice this caution. I know this is not the purpose or motive of the Senator from Louisiana. Let us recognize a hard fact of life. Many forces in this country would be delighted if there were no Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate. While we must seek prudently to effect economy, let us be cautious not to lend ourselves to an effort to destroy the effectiveness of the committee which in this body has primary responsibility for attempting to draw a balance between some strong, competitive forces and the general society. I voice that caution for what lies ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the question been put?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution, as amended, has been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with enthusiasm and a sense of high expectation that today, on my own behalf and on behalf of those members of the subcommittee of which I am chairman whom I have been able to talk with this afternoon, I introduce for appropriate reference the administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce the bill out of order for appropriate reference on the basis of the time factor that I shall discuss in a moment.

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

The bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senators who are joining with me this afternoon in the introduction of the bill are the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I am sure that many other Senators will, by next Friday night, wish to cosponsor the bill with us. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until 5 p.m. on Friday next, to receive the signatures of other Senators who may wish to become cosponsors.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know that many Senators who have fought valiantly for education legislation in the past would wish to be associated in this important educational endeavor, which we hope will soon be enacted.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the President's message on education, the text of the proposed act, and a fact sheet relevant to it, which was developed by the Office of Education.

There being no objection, the message, bill, and fact sheet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance: "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today:

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task. And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years—400,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide: facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges; major new resources for vocational training; more loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education; enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take. We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us: to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most; to put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students; to advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers; to provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared: "Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons have narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special "headstart" program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational

centers and services (recommended below) will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the tap root is ignorance. Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling. Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation. Nearly half the youths rejected by selective service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs. Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided: On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States; through payments made to States for distribution to school districts; with the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas; on the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts; for the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said, "All that mankind has done, thought, gained, or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books."

Yet our school libraries are limping along. Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books. Many schools have an average of less than one-half a book per child. To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the "new" math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as: Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art. Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children. Special assistance after regular school hours. Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters. A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents. A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices. A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional educational laboratories

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to: Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects. Train educational research personnel. Provide grants for research, development of new curriculums, dissemination of information, and implementation of educational innovations. Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading and examinations. After testing, they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curriculums and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to: Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership. Formulate long-range plans. Expand educational research and development. Improve local and State information about education. Identify emerging educational problems. Provide for the training of State and local education personnel. Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs. Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with ongoing and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes: An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries and laboratories. An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages. An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families. To help small and less

well-developed colleges improve their programs. To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities. To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. Assistance to students

1. Scholarships: I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist: Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs. Only 1 out of 3 young people from low-income families attend college compared with 4 out of 5 from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans:

I recommend: that the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—that a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education. First, the existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second, many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. Aid to smaller colleges

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system. Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as: A program of faculty exchanges, special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields, a national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges, the development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. Support for college library resources

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research: 50 percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities, they must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. University-community extension program

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning, research and development in pressing educational problems, economic and job market studies, continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership, and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. Special manpower needs

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend: Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services. Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared: "The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free man acknowledges. It is the only security that free man desires."

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

S. 370

A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools

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

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 81-874, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236-244), is amended by inserting:

"TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITY"

immediately above the heading of section 1, by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 1 through 6, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof "this title", and by adding immediately after section 6 the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including where necessary the construction of school facilities) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

"Kinds and duration of grants

"SEC. 202. The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for basic grants to local educational agencies in the period beginning July 1,

1965, and ending June 30, 1968, and he shall make payments to State educational agencies for special incentive grants to local educational agencies in the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1968.

"Basic grants—Amount and eligibility

"SEC. 203. (a)(1) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available from the Department of Commerce, the maximum amount of a basic grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (2)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (determined pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor determined pursuant to subsection (c). In any other case, the maximum basic grant for any local educational agency shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. For purposes of this subsection the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

"(2) If the maximum amount of the basic grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) for any local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, is greater than 30 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 30 per centum of such budgeted sum.

"(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this title only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as determined pursuant to subsection (c)):

"(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children of such families are available on a school district basis, the number of such children of such families in the school district of such local educational agencies shall be—

"(A) at least one hundred, or

"(B) equal to 3 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district, whichever is less, except that it shall in no case be less than ten.

"(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of children of such ages of families with such income in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be one hundred or more.

"(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of children of such ages of families of such income for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively. For each of the two succeeding fiscal years the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the Federal percentage and the low-income factor on such basis, in the light of the sums appropriated for that year for making grants under this title, as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as determined pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of such children in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate.

"Special incentive grants

"SEC. 204. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be eligible to receive an additional special incentive grant equal to not more than the amount by which the current expenditures of that agency for the preceding fiscal year exceeded 105 per centum of such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Each such agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be eligible to receive an additional special incentive grant equal to not more than the amount by which the current expenditures of that agency for the preceding fiscal year exceeded 110 per centum of such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

"Application

"SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs;

"(2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who attend nonpublic schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services) in which children can participate without full-time public school attendance;

"(3) in the case of any project for construction of school facilities, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 209 will be complied with on all such construction projects;

"(4) that effective procedures will be adopted for making continuing and periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of children of low-income families;

"(5) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports, and

"(6) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program.

"(b) The State educational agency shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds under this title without first affording the local educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Assurances from States

"SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program of this title shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance—

"(1) that except as provided in section 207(b) payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 205(a) and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed upon a local educational agency under section 205(a);

"(2) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this title; and

"(3) that the State educational agency will make an annual and such other reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title, including such reports as the Commissioner may require (A) to evaluate the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children and their financial status and requirements, and (B) to determine the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive for any fiscal year, and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a) and he shall not finally disapprove an application except after

reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"Payment

"SEC. 207. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 208, from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(2) From the funds paid to it pursuant to paragraph (1) each State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency of the State which is not ineligible by reason of section 203(b) and which has submitted an application approved pursuant to section 205(a) the amount for which such application has been approved, except that this amount shall not exceed an amount equal to the total of the maximum amount of the basic grant plus the maximum amount of the special incentive grant as determined for that agency pursuant to sections 203 and 204, respectively.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title, except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the total of the amount of the basic grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State.

"(c) (1) No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"Adjustments where necessitated by appropriations

"SEC. 208. If the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably. In case additional funds become available for making payments under this title for that year, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis that they were reduced.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Withholding

"SEC. 210. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the assurances set forth in the application of that State approved under section 206(b), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 211. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 206(a) or with his final action under section 210, such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Comprehensive study

"SEC. 212. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, a full report of the operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and his recommendations as to whether this title should be extended and, if so, as to what amendments thereto should be made."

SEC. 3. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 81–874, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is further amended by inserting "TITLE III—GENERAL" above the heading for section 7 and by redesignating sections 7, 8, and 9, and references thereto, as sections 301, 302, and 303, respectively.

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section 302 are amended by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "title I".

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (2) of the section of such Act herein redesignated as section 303 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'child', except as used in section 203, means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable State provides free public education."

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section 303 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", except that for the purposes of title II such term does not include any education provided beyond grade 12".

(c) (1) Paragraph (8) of such section 303 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "the District of Columbia,".

(2) Sections 3(d) and 6(c) are each amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time that it appears.

(d) Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(11) The term 'county' means those divisions of a State utilized by the Secretary of Commerce in compiling and reporting data regarding counties.

"(12) The term 'construction' includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

"(13) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) for free public education and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvements) on which such facilities are constructed, except that such term does not include those gymnasiums and similar facilities intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public."

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 201. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for making grants under this title for the acquisition of school library resources and printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the State.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of children enrolled in the public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools of that State bears to the total number of children enrolled in such schools in all of the States. The number of children so enrolled shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

State plans

SEC. 203. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan, in such

detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 202 will be expended solely for (A) acquisition of library resources (which for the purposes of this title means books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other related library materials) and printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and (B) administration of the State plan, including the development and revision of standards relating to library resources and printed and published instructional materials furnished for the use of children and teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, except that the amount used for administration of the State plan shall not exceed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, an amount equal to 5 per cent of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year, and for any fiscal year thereafter an amount equal to 3 per cent of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year;

(3) provides assurance that only such library resources and printed and published instructional materials will be furnished to schools under this title as are approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority for use, or are used, in public elementary or secondary schools of the State;

(4) sets forth the criteria to be used in allocating library resources and printed and published instructional materials provided under this title among the schools of the State, which criteria shall—

(A) take into consideration the relative need of the schools of the State for such library resources or instructional materials, or both, and

(B) provide assurance that to the extent consistent with law such library resources and instructional materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory education laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State;

(5) sets forth the criteria to be used in selecting the library resources and instructional materials to be provided under this title and for determining the proportions of the State's allotment for each fiscal year which will be expended for library resources and for printed and published instructional materials, respectively, and the method (such as grant, loan, or otherwise) by which such library resources and instructional materials will be made available for the use of children and teachers in the schools of the State;

(6) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and nonprofit private school funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for library resources and instructional materials, and in no case supplant such State, local, and nonprofit private school funds;

(7) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to other agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

(8) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Payments to States

SEC. 204. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 202 the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 203(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources or printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for the provision on an equitable basis of such resources or materials, or both if necessary, for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, out of that State's allotment. The library resources and printed and published instructional materials made available pursuant to this subsection shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority for use, or are used, in public elementary or secondary schools of the State.

Administration of State plans

SEC. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 203(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

SEC. 206. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 203(a) or with his final action under section 205(b), such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner, through grants for supplementary educational centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for such purposes.

Apportionment among States

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion $50,000 each to American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands and $200,000 to each of the other States. The Commissioner shall apportion the remainder of such sums among the States as follows:

(1) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

(2) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

(b) The number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and the total population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(c) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be available for payments to applicants with approved applications in that State during that year and the next fiscal year.

(d) The amount apportioned to any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Commissioner may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) for that year.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 303. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 304(b), for—

(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to provide supplementary educational activities and services described in paragraph (b), including pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to enrich the programs of local elementary and secondary schools and to offer a diverse range of educational experience to children of varying talents and needs by providing supplementary educational services and activities such as—

(1) comprehensive guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, and school health, psychological, and social work services designed to enable and encourage persons to enter, remain in, or reenter educational programs, including the provision of special educational programs and study areas during periods when schools are not regularly in session;

(2) comprehensive academic services and, where appropriate, vocational guidance and counseling, for continuing adult education;

(3) developing and conducting exemplary educational programs, including dual-enrollment programs, for the purpose of stimulating the adoption of improved or new educational programs in the schools of the State;

(4) specialized instruction and equipment for students interested in studying advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages, and other academic subjects which are not taught in the local schools or which can be provided more effectively on a centralized basis, or for persons who are handicapped or of preschool age;

(5) making available modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel, including artists and musicians, on a temporary or other basis to public and other nonprofit schools, organizations, and institutions;

(6) developing, producing and transmitting radio and television programs for classroom and other educational use;

(7) providing special educational and related services for persons who are in or from rural areas or who are or have been otherwise isolated from normal educational opportunities, including, where appropriate, the provision of mobile educational services, special home study courses, radio, television, and related forms of instruction, and visiting teachers' programs; and

(8) other specially designed educational programs which meet the purpose of this title.

SEC. 304. (a) A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or other duly constituted public or nonprofit private agency or organization which has authority to establish, maintain, and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services, but only if there is satisfactory assurance that in the conduct of such program there will be representation of, or participation by, a local educational agency (if not itself the grantee) and one or more of the following: institutions of higher education, the appropriate State educational agency or agencies, and other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations or institutions. Such grants may be made only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such applications shall—

(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the supplementary educational services agency or organization;

(2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 303 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(3) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 303, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) in the case of an application for assistance under this title which includes a project for construction of necessary facilities, (A) provide satisfactory assurance (except in the case of minor remodeling or alteration) that upon completion of the construction title to the facility will be in a State or local educational agency and (B) provide assurance that the requirements of section 308 will be complied with on all construction projects assisted under this title;

(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

(2) the program set forth in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the size and population of the State, (B) the geographic distribution of the population within the State, (C) the relative need of persons in different geographic areas and in different population groups within the State for the kinds of services and activities described in paragraph (b) of section 303, including their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (D) the relative ability of particular local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions within the State to provide those services and activities;

(3) in the case of an application for assistance for carrying out purposes described in paragraph (b) of section 303, the Commissioner determines (A) that the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunities in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) that each person in that area will have an opportunity, to the extent consistent with law and with his educational needs, to receive the services and participate in the activities carried out under this title; and

(4) the application has been submitted for review and recommendations to the State educational agency.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Payments

SEC. 305. (a) From the amounts apportioned to each State under section 302 the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this title an amount equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Advisory committee

SEC. 306. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Recovery of payments

SEC. 307. If, within twenty years after completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which Federal funds have been paid under this title—

(a) the owner of the facility shall cease to be a State or local educational agency, or

(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the educational and related purposes for which it was constructed, unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligations to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

Labor standards

SEC. 308. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered

14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 401. The second section of the Act of July 26, 1954, 68 Stat. 533 (20 U.S.C. 331), entitled "An Act to authorize cooperative research in education", is redesignated section 3 and the material which precedes it is amended to read as follows:

"Purpose

"SECTION 1. The purpose of this Act is to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established.

"Educational research and research training

"SEC. 2. (a)(1) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') is authorized to make grants to universities and colleges and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education, and for the dissemination of information derived from educational research (whether or not financed under this Act) and, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5) to provide by contracts or jointly financed cooperative agreements with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, institution, other than a nonprofit one.

"(2) No grant shall be made or contract or jointly financed cooperative agreement entered into under this subsection until the Commissioner has obtained the advice and recommendations of specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in progress.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit universities and colleges and to other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in providing training in research in the field of education, including the development and strengthening of training staff and curricular capability for such training. Grants under this subsection may, when so authorized by the Commissioner, also be used by such grantees (1) in establishing and maintaining research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, and for stipends and allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, or (2) where the grantee is a State educational agency, in providing for such traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and fellowships either directly or through arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions or organizations.

"(c) In addition to the authority granted by section 603(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, funds available to the Commissioner for grants or contracts or jointly financed cooperative agreements under this section shall, with the approval of the Secretary, be available for transfer to any other Federal agency for use (in accordance with an interagency agreement) by such department or agency (alone or in combination with funds of that agency) for purposes for which such transferred funds could be otherwise expended by the Commissioner under the foregoing provisions of this section, and the Commissioner is likewise authorized to accept and expend funds of any other Federal agency for use under this section.

"(d) The Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, demonstrations, and the training in research, initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations."

SEC. 402. The section of such Act redesignated section 3 is amended by striking out "this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2".

SEC. 403. Such Act is further amended by inserting the following new sections at the end of such Act:

"Construction of regional facilities for research and related purposes

"SEC. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated over a period of five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $100,000,000 in the aggregate, to enable the Commissioner to carry out the purposes of this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended for payments with respect to projects for which applications have been filed under this part before July 1, 1970, and approved by the Commissioner before July 1, 1971.

"(b) When the Commissioner finds that in any case the purposes of this Act can best be achieved through the construction of a facility for research, or for research and related purposes (as defined in this section), and that such facility would be of particular value to the Nation or a region thereof as a national or regional resource for research or related purposes, he may make a grant for part or all of the cost of constructing such facility to a university, college, or other appropriate public or nonprofit private agency or institution competent to engage in the types of activity for which the facility is to be constructed, or to a combination of such agencies or institutions, or may construct or make arrangements for constructing such facility through contracts for paying part or all of the cost of construction or otherwise. The Commissioner may, where he deems such action appropriate, make arrangements, by contract or otherwise, for the operation of such facilities or may make contributions toward the cost of such operation of facilities of this nature whether or not constructed pursuant to, or with the aid provided under, this section. Title to any facility constructed under this section, if vested in the United States, may be transferred by the Commissioner on behalf of the United States to any such college or university or other public or nonprofit private agency or institution, but such transfer shall be made subject to the condition that the facility will be operated for the purposes for which it was constructed and to such other conditions as the Commissioner deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this title and to protect the interests of the United States.

"(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of any project under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Number 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(d) Payments under this section shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments consistent with construction progress, and on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

"(e) As used in this section, the term research and related purposes means research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of education, or the dissemination of information derived therefrom, or all of such activities, including (but without limitation) experimental schools.

"Definitions

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(2) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any agency, organization, or institution means an agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(4) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered.

"Short Title

"Sec. 6. This act may be cited as the 'Cooperative Research Act'."

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 501. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for such purposes.

Apportionment among States

SEC. 502. (a)(1) From 85 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and shall apportion to each State such part of the remainder of such 85 per centum of such sums as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(2) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be reserved by the Commissioner for grants for special projects pursuant to section 505.

(b)(1) The amount apportioned to any State under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a)(1) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates

that State needs and will be able to use for that year; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 401 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a)(1) for that year.

(2) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a)(1) be added to the amount apportioned to another State under that subsection for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share (as defined in section 503(b)) of the cost of carrying out one or more programs or activities under an approved application of that other State. If the Commissioner finds that the programs or activities with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of the amount apportioned to that State, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, that portion shall be added to the amount apportioned to the other State under subsection (a)(1) to be used for the purpose referred to above. The Federal share of the total funds expended for such programs or activities shall be adjusted on the basis of the proportion of such total funds so expended by each participating State or from the amounts originally apportioned to each such State.

Grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 503. (a) From the amount apportioned to any State for any fiscal year under section 502 the Commissioner may, upon approval of an application or applications therefor submitted to him by such State through the State educational agency, make a grant or grants to such agency equal to the Federal share of expenditures incurred by such agency for the planning of, and for programs for, the development, improvement, or expansion of activities promoting the purposes set forth in section 501 and more particularly described in such application and for which such application is approved, such as—

(1) educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs in the State and the evaluation on a periodic or continuing basis of education programs in the State;

(2) providing support or services for the comprehensive and compatible recording, collecting, processing, analyzing, interpreting, storing, retrieving, and reporting of State and local educational data, including the use of automated data systems;

(3) dissemination or support for the dissemination of information relating to the condition, progress, and needs of education in the State;

(4) programs for conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research programs and projects such as (A) establishing and maintaining curriculum research and innovation centers to assist in locating and evaluating curriculum research findings, (B) discovering and testing new educational ideas and more effective educational practices, and putting into use those which show promise of success, and (C) studying ways to improve the legal and organizational structure for education and the management and administration of education in the State;

(5) publication and distribution, or support for the publication and distribution, of curricular materials collected and developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere;

(6) programs to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student-teaching arrangements, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies.

(7) studies or support for studies concerning the financing of public education in the State;

(8) support for statewide programs designed to measure the educational achievement of pupils;

(9) training and otherwise developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative, or specialist services throughout the State, or throughout the area served by a local educational agency, through the initiation, improvement, and expansion of activities such as (A) sabbatical leave programs, (B) fellowships and traineeships (including educational expenses and the cost of travel) for State educational agency personnel to pursue graduate studies, and (C) conducting institutes, workshops, and conferences (including related costs of operation and payment of the expenses of participants); and

(10) providing local educational agencies and the schools of those agencies with consultative and technical assistance and related services relating to academic subjects and to particular aspects of education such as the education of the handicapped, school building design and utilization, school social work, transportation, and educational administrative procedures.

(b) For the purposes of this section the "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 50 per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum. The "State percentage" for any State shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands).

Approval of applications for grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 504. An application for a grant under section 503 may be approved by the Commissioner only upon his determination that—

(a) each of the proposed projects, programs, and activities for which it is approved meets the requirements of section 503 (a) and will make a significant contribution to strengthening the leadership resources of the applicant or its ability to participate effectively in meeting the educational needs of the State;

(b) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that Federal funds made available under the approved application will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for projects and activities which meet the requirements of section 503(a);

(c) the application sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

(d) the application provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Special project grants

SEC. 505. Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States.

Payments

SEC. 506. Payments pursuant to grants under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine.

Interchange of personnel with States

SEC. 507. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" means a State or any agency of a State engaged in activities in the field of education, but it does not include a local educational agency; and the term "Office" means the Office of Education.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized, through agreements or otherwise, to arrange for assignment of officers and employees of States to the Office and assignment of officers and employees in the Office to States, for work which the Commissioner determines will aid the Office in more effective discharge of its responsibilities as authorized by law, including cooperation with States and the provision of technical or other assistance. The period of assignment of any officer or employee under such an arrangement shall not exceed two years.

(c)(1) Officers and employees in the Office assigned to any State pursuant to this section shall be considered, during such assignment, to be (A) on detail to a regular work assignment in the Office, or (B) on leave without pay from their positions in the Office.

(2) Persons considered to be so detailed shall remain as officers or employees, as the case may be, in the Office for all purposes, except that the supervision of their duties during the period of detail may be governed by agreement between the Office and the State involved.

(3) In the case of persons so assigned and on leave without pay—

(A) if the rate of compensation (including allowances) for their employment by the State is less than the rate of compensation (including allowances) they would be receiving had they continued in their regular assignment in the Office, they may receive supplemental salary payments from the Office in the amount considered by the Commissioner to be justified, but not at a rate in excess of the difference between the State rate and the Office rate; and

(B) they may be granted annual leave and sick leave to the extent authorized by law, but only in circumstances considered by the Commissioner to justify approval of such leave.

Such officers and employees on leave without pay shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be entitled—

(C) to continuation of their insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so long as the Office continues to collect the employee's contribution from the officer or employee involved and to transmit for timely deposit into the funds created under such Acts the amount of the employee's contributions and the Government's contribution from appropriations of the Office; and

(D) to credit the period of their assignment under the arrangement under this section toward periodic or longevity step increases and, upon payment into the civil service retirement and disability fund of the percentage of their State salary, and of their supplemental salary payments, if any, which would have been deducted from a like Federal salary for the period of such assignment and payment by the Commissioner into such

fund of the amount which would have been payable by him during the period of such assignment with respect to a like Federal salary, to treat (notwithstanding the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund") their service during such period as service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act;

except that no officer or employee or his beneficiary may receive any benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, or the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, based on service during an assignment hereunder for which the officer or employee or (if he dies without making such election) his beneficiary elects to receive benefits, under any State retirement or insurance law or program, which the Civil Service Commission determines to be similar. The Office shall deposit currently in the funds created under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, and the civil service retirement and disability fund, respectively, the amount of the Government's contribution under these Acts on account of service with respect to which employee contributions are collected as provided in subparagraph (C) and the amount of the Government's contribution under the Civil Service Retirement Act on account of service with respect to which payments (of the amount which would have been deducted under that Act) referred to in subparagraph (D) are made to such civil service retirement and disability fund.

(4) Any such officer or employee on leave without pay who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during an assignment hereunder, shall be treated, for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as thought he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(d) Assignment of any officer or employee in the Office to a State under this section may be made with or without reimbursement by the State for the compensation (or supplementary compensation), travel and transportation expenses (to or from the place of assignment), and allowances, or any part thereof, of such officer or employee during the period of assignment, and any such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation utilized for paying such compensation, travel or transportation expenses, or allowances.

(e) Appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, for the expenses of travel of officers and employees assigned to States under an arrangement under this section on either a detail or leave-without-pay basis and, in accordance with applicable law, orders, and regulations, for expenses of transportation of their immediate families and expenses of transportation of their household goods and personal effects, in connection with the travel of such officers and employees to the location of their posts of assignment and their return to their official stations.

(f) Officers and employees of States who are assigned to the Office under an arrangement under this section may (1) be given appointments in the Office covering the periods of such assignments, or (2) be considered to be on detail to the Office. Appointments of persons so assigned may be made without regard to the civil service laws. Persons so appointed in the Office shall be paid at rates of compensation determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office for the purposes of (1) the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, or (3) unless their appointments result in the loss of coverage in a group health benefits plan whose premium has been paid in whole or in part by a State contribution, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. State officers and employees who are assigned to the Office without appointment shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office, except as provided in subsection (g), nor shall they be paid a salary or wage by the Office during the period of their assignment. The supervision of the duties of such persons during the assignment may be governed by agreement between the Commissioner and the State involved.

(g)(1) Any State officer or employee who is assigned to the Office without appointment shall nevertheless be subject to the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) Any State officer or employee who is given an appointment while assigned to the Office, or who is assigned to the Office without appointment, under an arrangement under this section, and who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during such assignment shall be treated, for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents, in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(h) The appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, during the period of assignment and in the case of travel to and from their places of assignment or appointment, for the payment of expenses of travel of persons assigned to, or given appointments by, the Office under an arrangement under this section.

(i) All arrangements under this section for assignment of officers or employees in the Office to States or for assignments of officers or employees of States to the Office shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

Administration of State plans

SEC. 508. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under section 504, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

SEC. 509. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 404(a) or with his final action under section 407(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

Periodic review of program and laws

SEC. 510. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1968, appoint an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this title and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such programs and this title and with respect to other Acts under which funds are appropriated to assist State educational agencies to administer Federal programs relating to education.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the educational needs of the Nation, persons familiar with the administration of State and local educational programs, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than March 31, 1969, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as

prescribed in subsection (d), not later than March 31 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 601. As used in titles II, III, and V of this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "construction" means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefor; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(c) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(d) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as necessary furniture, printed and published instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other related materials.

(e) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specifically qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(g) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(k) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

Advisory councils

SEC. 602. (a) The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, and subject to the Secretary's approval in such cases as the Secretary may prescribe, from time to time appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law.

(b) Members of such an advisory council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such council or otherwise engaged on business of such council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Federal Administration

SEC. 603. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act or any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 604. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources or printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

Limitation on payments under this title

SEC. 605. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act, or under any Act amended by this Act, for religious worship or instruction.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965.

FACT SHEETS: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

	Authorization for fiscal 1966
Title I: Education of Children of Low Income Families	$1,000,000,000
Title II: School Library Resources and Instructional Materials	100,000,000
Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services	100,000,000
Title IV: Educational Research and Training; Cooperative Research Act	45,000,000
Title V: State Departments of Education	10,000,000
Total	1,255,000,000

FACT SHEET 1: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE I: IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than 9 years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less, 20 percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earing less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our school children go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children

in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county would be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5–17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering schoolwork by the time he reaches the third grade and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only one chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (School Assistance for Local Educational Agencies in Areas Affected by Federal Activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children (aged 5 to 17) in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percentage of total children (aged 5 to 17)	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	70,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	$27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,686
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First-year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

FACT SHEET 2: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than 2 out of every 3 public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school levels or 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First-year authorization would be $100 million.

FACT SHEET 3: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE III: SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries,

and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 schools systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968, at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968, elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only 1 school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

FACT SHEET 4: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) to develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's No. 1 industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record of education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Harvard.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was etsablished, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a 10th as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new R. & D. programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

FACT SHEET 5: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE V—STRENTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of insuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and Territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all or several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators will be receiving a large amount of mail asking for information about the bill. It is my hope that the material I have just placed in the RECORD will be helpful to them in meeting these requests.

The fact sheet, which was developed by the Office of Education, will, I am sure, be most helpful and I congratulate the Commissioner and his associates for having made it available to us. It provides Senators with a succinct and accurate description and explanation of the contents of this major educational measure.

Mr. President, the primary interest of those who are concerned with education at this moment is the language in which the President of the United States couched this most significant educational advance in his message and in his bill. I shall therefore at this time not dwell at length upon the specific provisions of the bill. I shall only as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pledge to Senators that hearings on this measure will be scheduled at a very early date and that prompt but careful consideration will be given to the views of all who wish to be heard upon the measure.

I have already advised committee counsel to proceed to schedule hearings on this elementary and secondary school bill on the following dates: January 26, January 29, February 1, February 2, February 4, and February 11.

I hope that it will be possible for my subcommittee on those days, if the Senate is in session, to receive unanimous consent of the Senate to conduct the hearings beyond the 12 o'clock noon cutoff, when the Senate usually convenes. I am sure that permission to meet will be given unless there is some legislative emergency, in the Senate, which would preclude my subcommittee from receiving that courtesy.

Senators who serve with me on the Education Subcommittee will agree, I am sure, that we are under a great obligation to proceed with dispatch to complete our hearings on this bill at the earliest possible date. I do not know whether we can complete the hearings on this bill in the 6 days that I have just announced, but I have reason to believe that we can come close to it if we are able to obtain the necessary unanimous consent from the Senate to hold our hearings during the period when the Senate is in session. If we do not receive the unanimous consent of the Senate to do so, I shall then announce subsequent hearing dates for the purpose of completing the hearings at the earliest possible time. The hearings on this bill should be concluded at the earliest date possible consistent with careful consideration of the bill provisions.

In the very near future, the President will send us draft legislation on higher education. As soon as hearings on the elementary and secondary school bill are completed, I shall proceed without delay to schedule hearings on the higher education legislation.

At this time, I issue a general invitation to the educational community of the country and other interested organizations and individuals to advise the Education Subcommittee, room 4230, New Senate Office Building, telephone number 225–5375, as soon as possible of their interest in presenting testimony on this bill in order that the subcommittee may be able to plan the details of the hearings with dispatch.

With respect to the framework and the substance of the bill itself which I enthusiastically endorse, I merely make this additional comment, since I know that Senators and their constituents will want to know immediately what will be the total cost of this legislation on the first year. The total cost for the fiscal year 1966 would be $1.225 billion. Of this $1.225 billion, $1 billion is earmarked for the improvement of education provided children of low-income families.

Let me dwell momentarily on that point. I refer to this recommendation of the President with some personal pride and enthusiasm. This proposal carries out the principle of the Morse bill of last year—S. 2528 of the 88th Congress.

If we think that the education process does not work in this country, I offer this proof that it does. I introduced S. 2528 last year, to expand our impacted area laws to include funds for children in the low-income school districts of the country. I used as an index for payments to schools the number of children attending whose parents either are unemployed, or are in receipt of welfare funds for their children. These children are attending our schools, and many of those schools are in areas which suffer from the blight of poverty. Thus schools do not have the financial tax base to offer education of the caliber and scope afforded by schools in more favored communities. The children attending these schools are educationally disadvantaged just because their parents are economically disadvantaged. The impact of disadvantage is a burden on the community as well as the burden of new installations of the Federal Government is upon the municipal resources of a country town or rural school district.

As the presiding officer knows, the impacted area legislation, passed in 1950, has poured billions of dollars into certain school districts of this country. It has assisted school districts which educate approximately one-third of the schoolchildren in the public elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. The 1950 acts were passed on the theory

that the Federal Government has a responsibility to reduce the burden it has created by locating in an area. It was felt that it is not fair to the taxpayers of a local government or school district to establish a great Federal installation, an air base, a shipyard, or an atomic energy plant, in a locality without providing a payment to offset the burden of increased school costs necessary to provide a decent education to the children of the Federal employees. Congress has supported the Federal impacted area legislation for many years, and rightly so. No one has been a more ardent supporter of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 than the senior Senator from Oregon.

Yet, in the 87th Congress and the 88th Congress, evidence presented before my subcommittee was overpowering over the years, in proof of the fact that there are many school district facilities attended by little boys and girls and our young men and women which are inferior to those attended by students in schools which receive Federal impacted areas aid. The compelling evidence caused us to ask: What are the causes of this situation? What can be done about it?

The causes are those to which I have referred. In short, poverty, and unemployment of parents. These conditions bring in their train, poor to squalid housing, a physical environment in which it is difficult or impossible to study. It is an environment certainly that is characterized by little economic opportunity or advantage.

As I worked on the subcommittee and I listened in hearing after hearing to the mounting evidence of the cause-to-effect relationship between school dropouts and the socioeconomic environment from which the students come, I found that the evidence was unanswerable. We shall have an increasing percentage of school dropouts from the slum areas, the underprivileged areas, and the poverty-stricken rural areas.

The able counsel of my committee went to work, with me, and we came forth last year with S. 2528, which sought to expand the impacted area program by providing some Federal assistance to the schools in such underprivileged areas.

I was a little surprised during our hearings on the bill to hear the witnesses for the administration testify against it. But I forgave them, for they had not then done their bookwork. I forgave them because they had not taken the necessary time to study fully the facts. I was very respectful to the Government witnesses when they were before my subcommittee. I conduct my hearings and my subcommittee work on a seminar basis with the witnesses for the administration as the graduate students. When I heard their testimony against the bill I was forced to tell them, most respectfully, that they had just flunked; that they had not passed the test. I intimated gently that a return to the library and to the books was indicated. They were good natured about it. They did just that.

I shall never forget the day that I went down to the signing last fall, after Congress had adjourned, of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964. One of the chief assistants for the administration came to me and said, good naturedly, "Senator, we are going to pass your course next time. We are going to come up next session to testify for the principle of your bill."

I have explained the matter somewhat jocularly here this afternoon, but I think I have made my point. The Johnson administration, however, this year has gone me one better. The administration has even expanded upon the Morse bill of last year. I am delighted about it, because the administration in this legislation has covered some areas that I had hoped to reach some time in the future. But there is no better time than now. So I thank the President; I thank the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and I thank the U.S. Commissioner of Education for not only approving the basic principle of the Morse expanded impacted area bill of last year, but for having expanded it even further, because their expansion in this bill is completely sound. I applaud them for their educational statesmanship.

Senators have heard me say before, but I should like to repeat it in my brief discussion this afternoon. It is a truism that a democracy, so far as its enlightened action is concerned, can be no stronger than its educational system. When we are dealing with the schools of America, which should be dedicated to the development, to the maximum extent possible, of the intellectual potential of our own people, we are dealing, I think, with the greatest security weapon a democracy ever possesses.

When the President recognizes this, as he does in this great bill that I have the high honor of introducing this afternoon in behalf of the administration, and when he recognizes the need for strengthening the elementary and secondary school systems of this country, he is demonstrating what a great Jeffersonian Democrat he is. What he is doing is to implement the great lesson that Jefferson taught us, namely, that a democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people. I would footnote that statement by saying that our people can be no more enlightened than the educational opportunities open to them. It is up to us to provide them opportunities. This President Johnson is seeking to do, to a degre that never before has been proposed by a Chief Executive of this country, in the great bill he offers this afternoon.

When President Johnson took office, he faced us with a challenge of the obligations we all have to continue to bring into being the great program of the New Frontier that the late John F. Kennedy inaugurated. This bill is a continuation of a great educational program that President Kennedy initiated and which the 88th Congress did so much to implement.

The Kennedy omnibus bill, S. 580, in its 6 titles had 24 legislative components or topics connected with it. As I said a few days ago in the Senate, I am very proud of the fact that there was recommended to the Senate during the 88th Congress, legislation that called for action on 20 of the 24 sections of the Kennedy education program. Not only the Senate, but the Congress as a whole, passed, in major principle, those 20 sections of the 24 of the so-called Kennedy omnibus education bill. President Johnson is continuing the educational idealism, the sound idealism, and the educational practicalities of President Kennedy, enlarging upon them, and expanding them. We find them in this bill in regard to primary and secondary education.

As I earlier indicated, title I of this new bill provides $1 billion for the education of children of low-income families.

Title II of the bill provides $100 million for school library resources and instructional materials.

Title III of the bill provides $100 million for supplementary educational centers and services.

Title IV of the bill provides $45 million for educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act.

Title V provides $10 million for State departments of education.

The total is $1.255 billion.

It would be very helpful to my subcommittee and to the full committee of the Senate dealing with educational problems if Members of the Senate would familiarize themselves with the contents of this bill. That is why I have referred to the explanatory information I have placed in the RECORD this afternoon.

Let me say also to Members of the Senate that they will always be most welcome to attend my hearings, to bring to the hearings educators from their States who are vitally interested in the educational problem, to the end that we may dispose of this bill with dispatch, and then to get on with the problem of considering and passing a higher education bill.

THE EAST AND GULF COAST LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter I wish to make a few comments in regard to the very serious strike that is occurring on the east and gulf coast docks at a cost of a good many millions of dollars each day to the economy of this country. I speak on the subject this afternoon because of the part I played some 2 years ago as Chairman of the special Commission appointed by President Kennedy to seek to bring an end to the costly strike that had the east coast and the gulf coast tied up at that time in the longshore strike. We reached a mediation settlement that resulted in the end of that strike.

It will be recalled that the most troublesome issue involved was the issue pertaining to allegations of the shipowners concerning "make work" policies, sometimes referred to as "featherbedding" policies, practiced by the union on the east coast and gulf coast docks in the longshore industry.

Of course, it was impossible, in the 5 days President Kennedy gave to my Commission, to make any findings factually in regard to the so-called job utilization program, or featherbedding practices that were alleged to prevail on the docks.

But it seems to me that the shipowners were entitled to a consideration of their allegations on the basis of whatever supporting facts could be presented by way of proof of such uneconomic practices, because featherbedding cannot be justified as a proper economic practice on the part of any labor group.

This is not a new position for the senior Senator from Oregon to take. I believe the records will show that I wrote the first decision in a major labor arbitration dispute in this country, dealing not only with the legal aspects but also with the economic aspects of make-work policies in the longshore industry. That involved the well-known Seattle Harbor tieup of the late 1930's, when the longshoremen on the west coast insisted upon being given the right to engage in obvious featherbedding practices.

That decision pointed out that it was not only unjustifiable from the standpoint of the best economic interests of the employees and of the public, but also was unjustifiable from the standpoint of the longtime best interests of the workers themselves.

Any policy that is based upon the destruction of economic values—and that is what a make-work program amounts to—cannot possibly accrue to the benefit of any one of the three parties in a labor dispute, namely, the workers, the employers, and the general public.

Therefore, in the east coast dock strike of some 2 years ago, our Commission provided in that settlement that there would be set up by the U.S. Department of Labor a committee or commission of qualified experts in the field of job utilization, to make a 15-month analysis of job utilization on the docks on the east coast and on the gulf coast; that following such study, the Department of Labor would make its findings and its recommendations in respect thereto; and that there would follow a period of time for negotiations between the parties prior to the negotiation of a new contract.

The study was made; and it is a classic. It is a very thorough and able study. Those who participated in it deserve a great deal of credit for what they did. The person in charge of it was Mr. David Stowe, a former administrative assistant to President Truman and well-known labor arbitrator and mediator. He was brought to the Department of Labor on the basis of the settlement that my Commission handed down, which brought the strike of more than 2 years ago to an end. He was brought to the Department of Labor by Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds, and given the authority to supervise the manpower utilization study program in all ports from New York to Galveston.

He and his associates did a tremendous job.

Following the submission of the report, the parties to the dispute, in accordance with the terms of the mediation settlement which the Commission handed down, proceeded with negotiations.

But they ended up in disagreement. The able President of ILA, Mr. Teddy Gleason, made it very clear that his union was adamant in opposition to certain recommendations contained in the job utilization report.

Under Taft-Hartley Act procedures, a special board was set up under Mr. Herbert Schmertz, a former aid to the Director of the Federal Mediation Service. When this board failed to produce an agreement, there followed, as provided for in the mediation settlement my Commission had handed down, further negotiations with Mr. James Reynolds, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, as chairman; Prof. James Healey, professor of industrial relations of Harvard Business School in Boston, as a member of the special panel; and Mr. Theodore Kheel, a well-known lawyer, one of America's outstanding arbitrators, of New York City, as the third member of the panel.

Professor Healey and Mr. Kheel were the two other members of my Commission of 2 years ago which brought forth the proposed mediation settlement of the dock strike of that time, which was accepted by the parties to the dispute and served as the basis for the agreement in regard to the manpower utilization study on the docks.

Jim Reynolds, by my insistence and appointment, was the Chief Counsel of the Commission of 2 years ago. I do not know of anyone in the field of labor arbitration and mediation and negotiation whom I would put above Mr. James Reynolds in ability and judicial handling and understanding of labor disputes in this country.

Mr. President, when President Johnson asked me, toward the end of the congressional session last year, to assume a part in an attempted settlement of the oncoming east coast dock strike, I satisfied him that my work in the Senate would make it impossible for me to be away from the Senate during the latter weeks of the last session, which would have been the time that I would have had to serve in New York City on this project.

In my judgment, President Johnson very wisely agreed that no one could possibly do a better job than the Assistant Secretary of Labor, James Reynolds. The President appointed him as chairman of the panel.

I wish to say to Mr. Reynolds, Professor Healey, and Mr. Kheel that the negotiated settlement which brought forth the signing of a new contract by the officials of the union and the shipowners was a masterly substitution of reason and commonsense for economic force in a dispute which, after all, can be settled rightly only by the application of the rules of reason, rather than the application of the picket line.

I am sure that none of us familiar with the operative facts of this dispute could have been more surprised than to read that in the vote on the settlement by a majority of approximately 800 out of the total vote cast, which was a total vote of some 3,000, the contract was turned down.

Sometimes I am accustomed to tread where angels fear to tread, but I have a great many friends in the Longshore Union on the east and gulf coasts, both in the rank and file and in the officialdom of that union. I also have a great many friends among the shipowners in this industry. I shall always prize the memories of the expressions of those friendships on the part of both labor and management during the very difficult negotiations that my Commission conducted some 2 years ago.

This afternoon, I take the liberty to give this piece of advice to the parties to this dispute, on the good faith belief that they know my advice comes from complete sincerity of motivation and dedication to the settlement of this dispute on the basis of a fair and equitable proposal.

Therefore, I say pleadingly to the rank and file membership of the Longshore Union on the east and gulf coasts: Take another look at it, and be sure that you are satisfied you really have analyzed the contents of the contract that your elected union officials have signed in your behalf.

Mr. President, I am convinced that if they will take the time to study this contract, they will—when the contract is put to them again for another vote—approve it.

In my judgment, this contract represents not only great progress with the Longshore Union on the east coast, but also represents a great leap forward in improvement of their economic lot.

As one who has had a great deal to do with maritime disputes for many years, I believe that this contract is the greatest step forward economically which the Longshore Union on the east coast has ever had an opportunity to take.

It is a remarkably fair contract. It is well to note that the agreement was entered into by the top officials of the International Longshore Union and representatives of the shipping industry with an absolute minimum of Government intervention.

It is a generous and honorable agreement. The failure of the rank and file to ratify it is a great tragedy. In my opinion, failure to ratify it resulted from an inadequate job of thoroughly informing the rank and file of the generous and fair terms of the agreement.

There is one added factor which I have not seen mentioned in the press, but which I believe might very well have had some influence in the voting which took place on the contract—knowing longshoremen as I know them—and that was the inclusion of an issue completely irrelevant to the contract. It had nothing to do with the contract. However, the ballot was so presented that when the longshoremen cast their vote, yes or no, they were also voting on this item.

What was the item?

It was a proposal to increase the dues payments of the ILA International from 1 cent an hour to 2 cents an hour.

If anyone is at all familiar with the individualism which prevails in longshore unions and locals—and I would not have it any other way if they are to remain free workers—I can well understand the report that was given to me this morning from one who has had a great opportunity to observe what happened in this voting.

Apparently, in some locals there was as much or more talk about this 1-cent-an-hour increase in union dues than there was in regard to the terms of the contract itself. I sincerely hope that

when the contract is put to the membership for a vote again—and the report is that the very able president of the International Longshoremen's Union, Mr. Teddy Gleason, is giving favorable consideration to putting the contract to a vote again—there will be a separation of the dues-increase question from the question of approval or rejection of the contract.

Mr. President, I am not saying on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that this issue might have made a controlling difference in the voting result. But that might very well be the case. At least there should be a second vote with the dues issue separated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of the New York Shipping Association-International Longshoremen's Association agreement. That résumé sets forth item by item the major provisions of the contract. It is desirable to have it publicly available, because the reading of that résumé in my judgment will cause any reasonable person to reach the same conclusion that I have reached. The contract is fair and good, and I hope that it will be approved.

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

RÉSUMÉ OF NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSOCIATION-INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT

1. Wage increases: 36 cents per hour spread over 4 years, as follows: October 1, 1964, 10 cents per hour; October 1, 1965, 10 cents per hour; October 1, 1966, 8 cents per hour; October 1, 1967, 8 cents per hour.

2. Paid holidays: 3 new holidays (bringing total paid holidays to 12).

3. Vacations: A fourth week of vacations for regular employees with 12 years' seniority (effective October 1, 1964).

4. Guaranteed annual hours: All crafts (longshoremen, checkers, clerks, etc.) are guaranteed 1,600 hours per year, whether or not work is available. All employees qualify for the guarantee who worked 700 or more hours in the preceding year. (Guarantee effective April 1, 1966.)

5. Pensions:

Effective April 1, 1965, the monthly pension (for current pensioners and those who retire prior to January 1, 1966), will be increased from $100 to $125 per month.

Effective January 1, 1966, pensions will be increased to $175 per month and will be eligible to all employees with 25 years of service at age 62.

Effective January 1, 1966, widows of employees with 25 years of service who die before reaching age 62 will receive $87.50 per month.

6. Hospitalization: Surgical, major medical: 5 cents per hour added during life of the contract.

7. Clinics: 3 cents added during life of the contract.

8. Manpower changes:

Longshoremen: The current general cargo gang size is 20 members plus a foreman. Effective April 1, 1966, two men shall be eliminated from each general cargo gang. Effective October 11, 1967, one additional man shall be eliminated from each general cargo gang.

Terminal labor and checkers: All terminal employees will continue to be employed, but may be assigned to other work if idle. However, terminal labor will not be assigned to ship work (or vice-versa). Hatch checking may gradually be eliminated, where desired, by natural attrition (approximately 250 regular employees). After April 1, 1966, checker details, when idle, may be temporarily reassigned.

9. Human relations committee: The parties agreed to the establishment of a special committee to handle problems growing out of the agreement, particularly with respect to the annual guarantee and manpower utilization.

10. Stability of the workforce: The parties agreed to take steps to stabilize the longshore workforce (close the register of longshoremen).

11. Length of contract: A 4-year contract, extending from October 1, 1964, to October 1, 1968.

12. Summary: The agreement reached, following a year-long study of the industry's manpower utilization-job security problems by the Department of Labor but with a minimum of Government intervention in the collective bargaining process, includes these key features:

(a) An 80 cents per hour increase spread over 4 years, including 36 cents per hour in wages; 3 additional paid holidays (a total of 12); 4 weeks of vacation for 12-year employees; pension increase from $100 to $175 per month; $87.50 to widows of long service employees who die before retirement age; additional contribution to hospitalization, surgical, major medical, and clinic plans.

(b) Income guarantee of 1,600 hours per year to all employees who worked more than 700 hours the preceding year.

(c) Gradual reduction in general cargo gang size from 20 to 17 members. Elimination, through attrition, of frozen details in terminals and the right to use terminal labor, when idle, on other terminal jobs.

(d) Establishment of a human relations and implementation committee to deal with problems that may arise in the administration of the agreement and joint agreement to stabilize the workforce through limiting entry into the industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of various locals of the ILA on January 8, 1965, in respect to the contract that was submitted to them for a vote.

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

Jan. 8, 1965, ILA vote

Craft	Area	Local No.	Delegate	Yes	No	Total
Checkers	Portwide	1	Gleason	1,092	1,209	2,301
Longshore	North of 42d St	824	Bowers	684	652	1,336
	Chelsea	791	Lynch	169	672	841
	Canal St	895	Coughlin	48	329	377
		1258	Hickey	49	392	441
	Lower Manhattan	856	Fields	247	378	62
Total, Manhattan				1,197	2,423	3,620
	Brooklyn	1814	Scotto	4,013	2,741	6,754
	Green Point	955	Johnson	27	167	194
Total, Brooklyn				4,040	2,908	6,948
	Hoboken	2	Murphy	178	280	458
		1198	D'Onofrio	80	149	229
	Jersey City	1247	Murray	13	395	408
	Port Newark	1233	Walker	202	259	461
		1235	Leonardis	215	400	615
	Bayonne	1588	De Lap	3	136	139
	Staten Island	920	Di Brizzi	72	281	353
Total, Jersey City and Staten Island.				763	1,900	2,663
Total, longshore				6,000	7,231	13,231
Maintenance	Manhattan and Jersey	1804-1	Cashiw	265	89	354
	Brooklyn	1277-1	Scannavino	86	54	140
Total, maintenance				351	143	494
Carpenters	Manhattan and Jersey	901	Walker	67	125	192
	Manhattan	901-1	Cummerford	26	4	30
	Brooklyn	958	Nicotra	44	73	117
Total, carpenters				137	202	339
Coopers	Portwide	1171	Porto	9	3	12
Grand total				7,589	8,788	16,377

Mr. MORSE. As one looks at the tabulation, when locals are compared with locals, apparently the great disparity in results would seem to indicate that probably a much better information job was done in explaining the contents of the contract in some locals in comparison with others. That is the only explanation that I can think of that will explain the wide divergency in the voting results among locals.

I know some of these locals very well. It is difficult for me to understand how in one local in Jersey City 375 would vote "no" and 13 would vote "yes." I only raise the question—"I wonder if they fully understood the benefits that would accrue to them from this contract?"

It is said that the feature of the contract that seemed to raise the greatest amount of opposition was the part that dealt with the size of the gangs. But the contract would not automatically reduce the size of the gangs the next hour. It does provide for a period of time over which the standard gang would be reduced from 20 men to 17 men. The manpower utilization study that was made would seem to indicate very clearly that attrition alone would almost take care of that problem because of the timespan that would be involved in the application of the recommendation.

I doubt very much if that part of the contract would result in any great number losing their jobs. But here again let us face it. If on the merits the evidence shows that the shipowners are being charged for economic waste—that the shipowners are paying for jobs that

in fact are not needed—we cannot justify asking the shipowners or any other employer to subsidize unneeded work.

I wish to say most respectfully that that gets back to the decision, to which I referred, that I wrote many years ago in relation to economic waste practiced by workers. I yield to no one, as these workers know, in supporting proposed legislation necessary to provide people in this country with the economic protection which they deserve. But I shall not go on record in ever supporting a perpetuation of any "make work" program in connection with any dispute that has come to involve the rights of the employers in a labor dispute. I do not need to explain my consistent record over the years of standing up for the protection of legitimate economic rights of labor.

Mr. President, if one defends a "make work" program, as such, if the facts show it, the effort amounts to defending people taking the property of others without payment.

There are all sorts of ways to engage in an economic embezzlement; and a make-work program, in my judgment, constitutes a form of economic embezzlement.

Secretary Reynolds has made clear, and rightly so, that, so far as the Government is concerned, it does not intend to participate in further negotiations or hearings in regard to this contract. The shipowners have made clear that they stand on the contract that they have signed. To the everlasting credit of the officers of the union, through Mr. Gleason, their public announcements have been to the effect that the contract speaks for itself, and that they are not asking for a reopening of the proposed contract and further negotiations on that basis. I think the shipowners, the Government, and the union officials are completely correct in the position that they have taken.

Then I hear the statement, "But the fact remains, Senator, that a strike is going on."

That statement causes me again to walk where others might advise one not to tread. That causes me to give the following gratuitous advice to the rank and file of the longshoremen:

You know, as well as I do, that, of course, a strike in an industry as major as this one, long existing, costing the economy of this country many millions of dollars a day, is bound to create a serious domestic issue. For 20 years I have been opposing any legislation that proposed the substitution of compulsion for free collective bargaining and volunteerism in the relationships between management and worker.

I can be counted upon to continue to oppose it. I would cast the same vote today that I cast some 2 years ago, along with one other Member of the Senate, in opposition to the first compulsory arbitration bill that ever passed this body.

I do not believe in compulsory arbitration, because of its infringement on the precious right of economic freedom on the part of free workers and free employers. I consider that compulsory arbitration is as detrimental to the economic freedom of employers as it is to that of workers.

But I do not keep my head in the political sand. I would urge the longshoremen of the east coast also not to sink their heads in political sand, for we already read in today's press various trial balloon stories about rumbling movements that are on foot to seek to bring this dispute, if the situation worsens, to compulsory arbitration on the legislative stage. That would be a great mistake.

The longshoremen have two major, feasible courses of action open to them. The first is to restudy the contract, to be sure that they would cast the same vote against it that they cast before, after they have taken more time to analyze it, and to insist upon the right to vote on the contract separate and distinct from any issue involving internal union affairs, such as union dues.

I have a feeling that if the longshoremen will follow that wise course, they will, upon reflection, in their second vote, approve the contract. They should. It is a fair contract. I do not recommend that they vote for the contract in the belief that the contract gives them unfair advantages over the shipowners, because, in my judgment, it does not. The contract is equally fair and square to both sides to the dispute. That is why, with pleasure and justification, I heap my praises upon Jim Reynolds, Jim Healy, and Ted Kheel. I particularly pay high commendation to Jim Reynolds, because his two associates have made it very clear to me that it has been Jim Reynolds who, in these last critical stages resulting in the approval of the contract, has carried the great load.

My hunches and intuition tell me that if the longshoremen get a chance to vote a second time, the odds are in favor of their reconsideration and support for the contract. But if I should be mistaken in those hunches, I hope, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate in connection with other disputes, that the workers will not forget that the most precious right they have is the right to retain voluntarism in their relationship with their employers. In keeping with that principle of voluntarism, I hope that if they turn down the contract—it will be a tragic mistake if they do—they will at least give favorable consideration to offering to submit the dispute to voluntary arbitration on the basis of procedures that the parties can seek to negotiate between themselves, but with agreement in advance that they will agree to the decision handed down by the arbitrator or the board of arbitrators that may be established.

Let me quickly say, in closing, in order that there may be no question as to my meaning in respect to this proposal, that if the longshoremen follow the latter course, all the issues must be submitted to arbitration. It would be quite unfair and improper for the longshoremen to select only certain issues and ask that they go to arbitration, because the contract involves a package proposal, and the interrelationships of the various sections of a collective bargaining agreement bear heavily upon one another. It would be like serving a cake to one's children. Sometimes they may be tempted to eat only the frosting; then it is necessary to make clear to them that they must eat the whole cake, and not limit themselves to the sweeties.

I hope it will not be necessary for the membership of the Longshoremen's Union to have to consider suggesting the type of voluntary arbitration I have outlined this afternoon. I hope that upon a re-vote upon the contract, following a further explanation of it to the membership, and a further study by the individuals, they will vote to approve the contract. But if they do not, as a friend of the collective bargaining and the settlement of disputes by peaceful procedures, not by compulsory mandate, I urge them not to put their heads in the political sand and blind themselves to what I believe would be the ugly reality of proposals in Congress to have compulsory arbitration. Although I would vote against such proposals, experience has already shown in the railroad case that a majority of Congress has voted for such proposal in the past, and I do not know of anyone who can give assurance that that would not happen again.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order previously entered, until Friday, January 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12, 1965:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General vice Burke Marshall, resigning.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. Charles (n) Tighe.
Capt. Frank V. Helmer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted a twofold promise of the Scriptures, Psalm 29: 11: *The Lord will give strength unto His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace.*

O Thou God of all goodness may we daily become increasingly sensitive and aware of the glorious certainty that Thou hast placed at our disposal and

made available Thy bountiful providence.

May our minds and hearts expand with pride that our beloved country, conceived in sacrifice, and dedicated to Thy glory, is sharing its blessings with all mankind.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to fulfillment and fruition its capacities for the true, the beautiful, and the noble qualities of the greater society and the more abundant life.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION IN THE FIELD OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson, as well as the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committees, the 88th Congress became known as the educational Congress.

I am introducing today the President's educational legislation in the field of our elementary and secondary programs.

Ever since I came to the Congress in 1948, I have been convinced of the great need for Federal financial assistance in strengthening elementary and secondary school programs so as to assure every child in the United States, and in particular, those school districts with limited financial resources, an opportunity for a solid foundation in the basic educational skills.

I am extremely pleased today in President Johnson's education message to the Congress, not only because of the total commitment it represents to strengthening elementary and secondary education, but also because it represents a realistic approach to the needs. I feel confident that it will be supported by all who are sincerely concerned as I am about the great need for strengthening our elementary and secondary school programs.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has indeed translated words of commitment into positive action in transmitting to the Congress today his legislative recommendations for elementary and secondary education and for the continued Federal concern and support that it evidences of programs to assist our institutions of higher learning.

The formula for the distribution of $1 billion in Federal funds among the States for the support of elementary and secondary school programs will enable each county, and in turn, each school district to know precisely the amount of Federal support for its school program so that school administrators will be in a position to plan elementary and secondary school expenditures so as to best enrich, expand, and strengthen learning opportunities. The use of funds apportioned to each school district is sufficiently flexible so as to enable the school district to meet the particular pressing needs confronting that district whether it be the construction of facilities, the improvement of teachers salaries structures, purchase of equipment and materials or the provision of supplementary school services.

The legislation, I feel confident, will meet the growing deficiencies in our elementary and secondary schools which have been occasioned by diminishing local financial resources in many areas.

In the educational programs strengthened through legislation enacted by the 88th Congress, we have done much to improve conditions in the special educational fields of higher learning and in vocational training. However, the success of these programs depends upon the ability of our elementary and secondary school systems to provide full opportunity for a strong academic background in basic educational skills. Elementary and secondary education is the foundation of our educational system and the message of the President recognizes this fact in the strengthening of the Federal aid program recommended.

I am very pleased to sponsor today the administration's bill and hereby insert for the RECORD additional information regarding this the most significant educational legislative proposal to be transmitted from the Office of the President to the Congress.

[From the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Jan. 12, 1965]

FACT SHEETS ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Millions
Title I—Education of children of low-income families	$1,000
Title II—School library resources and instructional materials	100
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services	100
Title IV—Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act	45
Title V—State departments of education	10
Total	1,255

[Fact sheet 1]

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than nine years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less, twenty percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earning less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our schoolchildren go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade and up to three years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only 1 chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school-age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (school assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educa-

tional radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county could be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5 to 17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children aged 5 to 17 in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percent of total children aged 5 to 17	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	60,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,686
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improveing the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First-year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

[Fact sheet 2]

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than two out of every three public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school level of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren, school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for secretarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First-year authorization would be $100 million.

[Fact sheet 3]

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor 1 or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 school systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968 at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968 elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only 1 school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State

educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: Institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Education Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and Territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

[Fact sheet 4]

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) To develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in discovering the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's No. 1 industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record of education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin, and at Harvard University.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was established, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a tenth as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new R. & D. programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

[Fact sheet 5]

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of ensuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and Territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all or several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

Estimated Federal payments under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

State	Education of children of low-income families	Supplementary educational centers and services	School library resources and instructional materials	Strengthening State departments of education	Total
United States and outlying areas	$1,000,000,000	$100,000,000	$100,000,000	$8,500,000	$1,208,500,000
Alabama	31,738,000	1,848,183	1,743,209	161,458	35,490,850
Alaska	1,336,472	318,630	119,467	104,208	1,878,777
Arizona	9,100,006	937,181	819,362	127,384	10,983,933
Arkansas	21,095,002	1,100,693	942,684	133,576	23,271,955
California	60,137,510	8,263,535	9,356,424	410,041	78,167,510
Colorado	7,721,560	1,109,926	1,071,419	135,638	10,038,543
Connecticut	6,155,076	1,436,389	1,400,169	141,940	9,133,574
Delaware	1,966,851	425,768	258,226	107,837	2,758,682
Florida	27,896,230	2,710,131	2,617,466	188,687	33,412,514
Georgia	34,517,871	2,235,274	2,185,906	178,025	39,117,076
Hawaii	1,904,676	531,380	393,138	111,804	2,940,998
Idaho	2,100,136	537,339	372,489	112,917	3,122,881
Illinois	37,288,765	4,943,134	5,389,313	253,009	47,874,221
Indiana	18,424,129	2,458,260	2,541,258	182,383	23,606,030
Iowa	16,346,232	1,491,506	1,491,407	146,459	19,475,604
Kansas	9,090,592	1,233,866	1,152,628	137,925	11,615,011
Kentucky	28,215,150	1,691,776	1,557,466	149,679	31,614,071
Louisiana	37,904,234	1,882,932	1,932,808	158,875	41,878,849
Maine	3,780,000	660,364	528,537	116,335	5,085,236
Maryland	13,741,401	1,783,996	1,818,913	155,096	17,499,406
Massachusetts	11,908,492	2,588,350	2,635,630	174,363	17,306,835
Michigan	29,765,556	4,062,794	4,695,888	243,670	38,767,908
Minnesota	19,248,386	1,867,997	1,998,425	159,008	23,273,816
Mississippi	28,028,704	1,341,527	1,224,582	143,346	30,738,159
Missouri	25,957,735	2,194,717	2,321,138	171,011	30,644,601
Montana	3,511,907	538,784	384,799	112,351	4,547,841
Nebraska	6,774,304	881,108	779,136	123,765	8,558,313
Nevada	631,040	377,940	212,853	104,473	1,326,306
New Hampshire	$1,451,592	$496,163	$337,963	$109,388	$2,395,106
New Jersey	17,777,548	3,159,017	3,250,467	193,995	24,381,027
New Mexico	8,351,640	699,717	593,744	119,486	9,764,587
New York	75,127,295	8,034,171	8,336,439	334,342	91,832,247
North Carolina	48,496,960	2,514,127	2,447,947	188,249	53,647,283
North Dakota	4,834,410	513,786	349,089	111,055	5,808,340
Ohio	35,235,338	4,926,076	5,434,535	266,996	45,862,945
Oklahoma	14,777,840	1,325,618	1,273,402	144,929	17,521,789
Oregon	6,853,177	1,069,776	980,782	133,013	9,036,748
Pennsylvania	44,890,181	5,407,680	5,938,648	265,660	56,502,169
Rhode Island	3,399,750	601,767	430,178	111,285	4,542,980
South Carolina	25,519,125	1,452,925	1,326,833	147,371	28,446,254
South Dakota	6,142,156	542,251	388,881	112,284	7,185,572
Tennessee	31,092,525	1,970,661	1,835,751	167,730	35,066,667
Texas	74,580,048	5,097,472	5,373,277	284,529	85,335,326
Utah	2,373,062	691,632	590,688	121,164	3,776,546
Vermont	1,489,957	390,835	209,098	106,137	2,196,027
Virginia	29,312,850	2,221,193	2,106,138	172,557	33,812,738
Washington	9,525,713	1,592,775	1,599,956	153,808	12,872,252
West Virginia	15,554,250	1,072,551	929,563	132,645	17,689,009
Wisconsin	14,471,631	2,123,991	2,290,563	162,258	19,048,443
Wyoming	1,358,100	363,499	188,433	106,592	2,016,624
District of Columbia	3,825,800	534,934	347,598	110,588	4,818,920
American Samoa		62,258	16,814	50,505	208,231
Canal Zone					
Guam		82,921	44,901	51,215	368,109
Puerto Rico		1,531,408	1,407,539	146,269	48,219,573
Virgin Islands		67,316	26,033	50,687	768,576

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who has done so much in this field for so many years, on the statement he has made in reference to the message on education which President Johnson has sent to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the President has sent the Congress a great and challenging message on education. It should be broadcast throughout the land.

He has laid his case in eloquent terms for a massive assault on ignorance. All Americans should know why his cornerstone for the building of a Great Society, why his master battle plan of the war against poverty, is the creation of full educational opportunity.

America is more than the land of the free. It is equally the land of opportunity. Today, more than ever, freedom and opportunity are the creation and children of education.

Our schoolrooms are crowded by the postwar baby booms. Our labor force suffers from the upgrading of skills demanded by automation. Our local school districts—especially those in low-income areas—are strained to raise the means to support the school systems demanded by the times.

President Johnson made the case that education is the No. 1 business of the American people. In the coming decade, education must become the No. 1 industry in America. To do less is to jeopardize freedom, curtail opportunity, and risk the birthright of every American.

I am confident this Congress and this administration, together with the 50 States and the local school authorities, will meet the educational challenge of today.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to add my compliments to those of the majority leader. I think the gentleman from Kentucky has made a magnificent contribution in this field.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's great education program will provide exciting new breakthroughs from the top to the bottom of our educational system. Education is the keystone of the arch in building the Great Society. We have suffered by failing to recognize the terrible urgency of action; we have suffered through internecine warfare over religious and other matters; precious time has been lost by squabbling, shibboleths, and scapegoats. The President has now sounded the clarion call and made education the national imperative.

As a former teacher, I have the deep conviction that we must act now to bolster education or be resigned to the role of a second-rate power. Long ago we should have realized the truth of the President's statement that education is more important than military expenditures. The President very correctly noted that "armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace."

We in West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, are acutely aware of the extremely close relationship between education and economic progress. We are making great strides in vocational training and retraining programs, in implementing the tremendous boost given to higher education by the 88th Congress, and in devising new educational programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. Under the terms of the President's proposals for elementary and secondary education, out of $1.2 billion nationally, the State of West Virginia would receive $15,554,250 to aid in the education of children of low-income families; $1,072,551 for supplementary educational centers and services; $929,563 for strengthening school library resources and instructional materials; and $132,645 for strengthening the West Virginia State Department of Education.

The President's new education program contains many features which will prove particularly beneficial to West Virginia. Children of low-income families and in areas where the tax base is inadequate have the right to get an education just as much as those children who grow up in wealthy suburbs. I am glad to see the emphasis placed on improving school libraries, on setting up supplementary educational centers and regional education laboratories. The student assistance features of the President's higher

education proposals and the strengthening of smaller colleges will aid also in building higher education in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, that we face a critical shortage and serious future demand for trained scientists. Yet we must train not only in the sciences, but it is also vital to educate for future leadership in the social sciences and the humanities. Dr. Albert Schweitzer once said that this is the most dangerous period in all human history because up to now nature has controlled man, but now man has learned to harness and control certain elemental forces before he has learned to control himself. The genius in the laboratory must be matched by the genius in social organization, human relationships, the proper use and enjoyment of leisure, and above all the nurturing of those spiritual qualities without which humanity cannot survive. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we must seek out and cultivate excellence and superiority in every field of human endeavor.

President Johnson has blown the trumpet call to action. On this 12th day of January, I am. proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States as we rise to our responsibility to enact a program for education which now constitutes America's great unfinished business.

LITERACY AND CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION TESTS MUST BE ABOLISHED

Mr. RYAN. 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. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message on January 4 the President proposed that "we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote."

The right to vote is a fundamental principle, upon which rests the very foundation of our democracy. The 15th amendment to the Constitution recognizes the vital importance of the right to vote and declares:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Despite the constitutional guarantee, the right to vote has been denied to a substantial number of American citizens.

The fact of discrimination against Negro citizens in voting is well established. In Mississippi only 5 to 6 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. In Alabama only 18.7 percent of the nonwhites are registered. In Virginia nonwhite registration is 24.8 percent, while in South Carolina and Louisiana it is 30 percent and 31.4 percent, respectively.

The events of last summer focused national attention on the efforts of the State of Mississippi to deny Negro citizens the right to vote. Terror, intimidation, and even murder are used to keep the Negro from the voting booth.

However, more subtle means are also used to accomplish this unconstitutional result. The literacy test, including constitutional interpretation tests, is a primary tool employed to flaunt the 15th amendment.

I have seen at firsthand how the constitutional interpretation test is used in Mississippi to discriminate against Negro citizens.

Section 244 of the Mississippi constitution requires that an applicant "be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the State and give a reasonable interpretation thereof to the county registrar." County clerks have complete discretion in administering and grading the test. They select the section to be interpreted. I have seen sections selected for Negroes which constitutional lawyers would find difficult to explain. On the other hand, white applicants are given the easiest sections.

Even when a reasonable interpretation has been given by a Negro, the application has been rejected. In many instances whites who were unable to interpret the simple sections have been accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not abolish constitutional interpretation tests and similar devices is a glaring omission which must be corrected immediately. The time is long overdue to end discrimination in voting and abolish all literacy tests.

Today I have introduced the first bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It outlaws all literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election—State or Federal. Literacy tests, interpretation and comprehension tests, tests designed to test reasoning ability or power of analysis are obstacles to the right and opportunity to vote which must be eliminated.

The abolition of literacy tests will also make it possible for large numbers of Spanish-speaking citizens of New York and other States to exercise their rights to vote which have been impeded by the existence of literacy requirements—no matter how fairly and objectively administered. In a democracy there is no reason to erect barriers to the franchise, and Congress must remove them wherever they exist.

HARBOR AT PORT ORFORD, OREG.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today seeks the assistance of the Federal Government in improving the harbor at Port Orford, Oreg., the only port on the Oregon coast that has relied solely on its own efforts to create a safe harbor for commerce and refuge. Port Orford has never had a Federal project for navigation.

The people of Port Orford, at their own expense 30 years ago, constructed a lumber and fish pier. This was destroyed by storm the following year, and the people rebuilt the pier again with only local funds and constructed a breakwater to protect the harbor to the extent they could from the ravages of winter storms.

But this was not enough protection because they had to rebuild the pier four times and extend the breakwater for additional protection, again with local funds only.

This harbor is vital to the livelihoods of the people in the Port Orford area but, as the Army Corps of Engineers study points out, the exposure to winter storms hampers the use of the harbor. The corps has recommended a 550-foot extension of the breakwater to eliminate damages to the terminal structures, assure more efficient and economical movement of wood products, and permit safe moorage of fishing boats and other small craft. Corps studies showed a 1.9 cost benefit ratio for this feasible and necessary harbor improvement.

The people of the Port Orford area are to be complimented for their willingness to carry this burden alone for decades. They have invested almost $500,000 to create a commercially efficient harbor as well as a safe refuge port.

Port Orford is a deepwater port. No bar hampers ingress and egress. Its development is essential to the economic growth of the community.

If this port is to serve the commercial needs of the area upon which the people depend for their livings, and if the port is to be protected from winter storms and serve as a refuge, the breakwater must be extended. It is economically feasible. It is necessary. But local people can no longer carry the burden alone. The estimated total cost of the project would be $696,000.

I am confident this project will have the support of the Congress.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND THEIR LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. REID of New York. 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. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution which would establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to recommend to the House a comprehensive code of ethics for Members and their legislative employees. It specifically requires the select committee to make its recommendations within 1 year. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, is also introducing today in the other body similar legislation relating to Senators and their legislative employees.

It is essential in my judgment that the House regain to every extent possible the confidence of the American people in the area of congressional ethics.

We cannot continue to function with a double standard of ethics—one set for the executive branch, but none for the legislative branch. In 1962 the Congress passed a modern conflicts-of-interest code for the executive branch of our Government. This was a signal achievement and represented the first major overhaul of our conflicts-of-interest laws in the 20th century. However, an appropriate code for employees and Members of the Congress totaling some 25,000 was not enacted. This is an omission which should be promptly remedied.

The resolution would establish an interim code of ethics—which would require a Member of the House to file with the Comptroller General a record of any financial interests valued at $5,000 or more—in an activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. It would ban the use of confidential information for other than official purposes; and would bar the use of official influence to gain special privileges or exemptions. Another provision would require Members of the House to disclose any pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of legislation before voting on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing a companion measure which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to require that any written or oral communication between a Member of the Congress or his staff and a regulatory agency in adjudicatory proceedings be made a part of the public record.

In a word, I, along with others of my colleagues, urge the need for Congress to put its own Houses in order. Only in this fashion can we be a respected and truly coordinate branch of the Government.

TOWARD FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 45)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance:

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today—

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task.

And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years. Four hundred thousand new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide—

Facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges;

Major new resources for vocational training;

More loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education;

Enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us:

To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youths who need it most;

To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students;

To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers;

To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared:

> Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons are narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special "head start" program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational centers and services—recommended below—will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts:

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance.

Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling.

Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Nearly half the youth rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs.

Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high-income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th-grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided—

On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States.

Through payments made to States for distribution to school districts.

With the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas.

On the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts.

For the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials:

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said:

All that mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books.

Yet our school libraries are limping along.

Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books.

Many schools have an average of less than one-half book per child.

To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services:

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education, and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the "new" math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as:

Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art.

Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children.

Special assistance after regular school hours.

Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters.

A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents.

A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices.

A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert, and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional education laboratories:

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to—

Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects.

Train educational research personnel.

Provide grants for research, development of new curricula, dissemination of information, and implementation of educational innovations.

Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading, and examinations. After testing they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curricula and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies:

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to—

Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership.

Formulate long-range plans.

Expand educational research and development.

Improve local and State information about education.

Identify emerging educational problems.

Provide for the training of State and local education personnel.

Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with on-going and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes:

An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages.

An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families.

To help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs.

To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities.

To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Scholarships:

I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist:

Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs.

Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans.

I recommend—

That the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education. First, the existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second, many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. AID TO SMALLER COLLEGES

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are lacking proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system; Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as:

A program of faculty exchanges.

Special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields.

A national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges.

The development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities. They must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY EXTENSION PROGRAM

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for

public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges, American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning; research and development in pressing educational problems; economic and job market studies; continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership; and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. SPECIAL MANPOWER NEEDS

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend:

Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services.

Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared:

> The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freeman acknowledges. It is the only security that freeman desires.

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, may extend his remarks at this point on the President's message and include extraneous matter, fact sheets, and other pertinent data.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the administration's proposals on education as enumerated above, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary fact sheet on the proposals, as embodied in "The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965":

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Millions
Title I—Education of children of low-income families	$1,000
Title II—School library resources and instructional materials	100
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services	100
Title IV—Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act	45
Title V—State departments of education	10
Total	1,255

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than 9 years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less, 20 percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earning less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our schoolchildren go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only 1 chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 million to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 million to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school-age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (school assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county would be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5 to 17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children (aged 5 to 17) in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percentage of total children (aged 5 to 17)	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	60,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,686
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than two out of every three public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school levels of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First year authorization would be $100 million.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 school systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968 at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968 elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only one school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: Institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) To develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's number one industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record or education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin and at Harvard University.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was established, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a tenth as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new research and development programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of ensuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all for several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

FAIR SHARE EDUCATION—EVERY SCHOLAR AN EQUAL DOLLAR

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on education is a call for the 89th Congress to continue along the path of educational excellence which we traveled so well in the 88th Congress. It is not only a call to continue but to accelerate and escalate.

It would be premature for me to comment on the context of the message or to evaluate the details of the Department program.

However, I do note that a piece of legislation which I have been advocating for some time is included in substantial form in the program.

I refer to my bill, H.R. 13, which I introduced on January 4, the first day of this Congress. This bill would provide for textbooks in critical subject matter areas for all children in all schools.

I view this as a logical extension of categorical assistance to elementary and secondary education and I submit that better books, more modern texts are indispensable to better education.

It is gratifying to note that the President is recommending greater support for this school lending library approach to the Congress.

I have made a number of addresses on this subject to educational groups throughout the country in the past year.

Speaking to the Publications Conference, held at Fordham University on October 3, 1964, I made specific recommendations on:

First. Amendment of the National Defense Education Act to authorize grants to all schools for mechanical facilities in critical subject matter areas.

Second. Support for book loan programs in these same stress areas for all children in all schools.

I include the text of my address on this subject at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUGH L. CAREY, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, TO THE PUBLICATIONS CONFERENCE AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N.Y., OCTOBER 3, 1964

I have been serving on the House Education Committee during the 88th Congress which has made more legislative educational progress in pursuit of scholastic excellence than any other in history. For that reason I believe you and I are full partners in the search and spread of truth, understanding, wisdom and justice in the era of the educated man.

It is a summons to full participation in the era of equality and justice in the education that I serve upon you now.

You are here as a highly representative segment of the 900,000 students who receive your education in nonpublic schools in this State. You have an attribute which Benjamin Bradlee ascribed to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as "that special grace of intellect." Recognizing that attribute I call upon you as editors and writers to use that grace to advance the cause of great freedoms that must thrive in education in order that we may survive as a free and godly nation.

These freedoms exist in the hierarchy of liberty which is anterior to government and most precious to the dignity of the human person.

We possess and must preserve freedom to know, not only all that is secular but freedom to know God without the sanction of the state.

We possess and must preserve freedom of conscience, free from the totalitarian conformity of state monopoly in education.

We possess and must preserve freedom of choice in education which is the key to cultural diversity and pluralism in the free society at home and in the free world.

I say that these freedoms can exist and extend only if 900,000 students in this State and the 7 million students in this country who attend private schools fully participate in opportunities for educational excellence on equal terms with all other Americans.

The record of the 88th Congress is a testament that this can be done not only under our Constitution but in support of the cardinal constitutional principles of equality, freedom of choice, freedom of conscience and freedom to know.

Extensive hearings, intensive study, open debate and fastidious draftsmanship produced these great laws in the education Congress to give substance to that testament:

1. The Higher Education Facilities Act in which Fordham and St. John's will participate with the city and State universities in the first grant and loan program for college construction.

2. The Health and Nursing Professions Acts in which Georgetown, St. Vincent's, and Yeshiva will share on equal terms with State medical schools in a direct grant program for the healing arts.

3. The Economic Assistance Act—or Antipoverty Act—in which student work study programs and aid to educationally disadvantaged individuals will enable us to break the sequence that poverty begets ignorance and ignorance begets poverty.

The spirit of Thomas Jefferson is in these acts for it was he who said:

"If you expect a people to be ignorant and free you expect what never was and never will be."

And the spirit of Jefferson, the great friend to higher education, was advanced in the National Defense Education Act which we passed for the President's signature only 2 days ago.

This act increased fellowships for graduate study sevenfold, adjusted the imbalanced incentive forgiveness between public and private schoolteachers, and extended quality education institutes to all education for the benefit of all children in all schools.

* * * * *

And if we must mention separation of church and state when we mention Jefferson let it be said here and now, we not only preserved the principle of separation but, by its true and constructive application, advanced education for all Americans, proving that when fairminded men and women legislate, fairness can prevail.

In doing so we set guidelines and laid down these principles that will aid lawmakers in the balance of this century of knowledgeable man to meet our educational needs with equality, justice, and freedom.

The first principle is that aid to the individual is distinguishable from aid to institutions. Therefore, while the state may not give direct economic support to the church and the church has no wish to interfere in the secular functions of the state, there is no law which precludes the state from assisting a student because he is also the beneficiary of assistance from a church. We recognized that as an individual he is a citizen of one and a member of the other and both have a common interest in his mental and moral development.

Specifically, in the tradition of the GI bill, this principle is identified in fellowship, scholarship, and student loan and loan forgiveness titles; in quality institutes for individual teachers and work study and remedial education aid to low-income individuals, in the poverty bill.

The second principle that is educationally sound and constitutionally permissible to give selective aid to specific secular categories to public and private institutions with precise safeguards and appropriate delineations.

This second principle is exemplified in the Higher Education Facilities Act where we provided matching grant funds for the construction of classroom and other buildings in the categories of science, languages, mathematics, and libraries, in similar provisions in the Health Professions and Nursing Act, and even in the new milestone legislation of the Mental Retardation Act.

Most importantly, there are enacted new directions in the National Defense Education Act providing for audiovisual and mechanical facilities, maps, globes, and other teaching materials in the categories of geography, civics, history, English, and reading.

Federal support equal to about $1.50 per child in elementary and secondary schools is provided in this program through grants to public schools and loans to private schools.

This is the area where I seek your help today.

I want to change this to a grant program for all schools and I believe I will have the support of my colleagues in the committee in doing so. A loan is a limited grant of credit and full grants can be justified since 7 million children in private schools are required by the State to know just as much about civics, history, English, geography, and mathematics as are the children in the State schools.

I want to raise the ante from $1.50 per child in this $100 million program to $15 per child for every school child in America, by the addition of a major new category of assistance.

This category of assistance is in the field of your special interest—publications for education.

I plan to introduce legislation to authorize the Federal Government to assist State educational agencies in the development, publication, and distribution of textbooks, research works, manuals, and teaching aids to be made available to all children in all schools in such categories of secular subject matter and as are now covered in the National Defense Education Act.

These textbooks would be chosen by State boards whose membership would be broadly comprehensive of all the educational interests in the State, public and private.

These textbooks would remain the property of the State and be on loan to the students in all schools which choose to use them exactly as are the books in our public libraries today.

The Federal Government would have no authority or participation in the selection of texts, preserving the principle of local and parental control in education.

The Federal textbook assistance program would be optional with the States who would participate on a voluntary basis only, based upon State educational policy.

This program would encourage other States to initiate programs for equality in educational excellence such as those which have already been enacted in Rhode Island and Louisiana.

To finance the program I would suggest a figure of exactly $651 million. I chose the amount because this is precisely the total that the Federal Government is currently spending on aid to education through publication support which does not directly aid our elementary and secondary schoolchildren, public or private.

In fact, this Government subsidy of publications for education in some cases is actually an educational and moral detriment to the minor child.

The aid to publications program curiously is not in the Office of Education but in the Postmaster General's Office. I refer to the fact that since 1879 postal subsidies specially designed by intent of Congress to assist in the education of the American people by encouraging the wide dissemination of reading matter have been in effect in our country and they now amount to $651 million.

If we can justify, and I do justify the expenditure of that sum for aid to publications to those not involved in formal education, surely we can make out a good case, in justice and logic for similar aid to those who not only need but are required to have school books.

The record speaks for itself, category by category. Since 1939, through the fourth-class subsidy, books, texts, library materials, and phonograph records have been subsidized in distribution to the extent of $651 million. I say here and now that I am not "anti-Beatle," but the Beatle records are distributed through subsidized fourth-class privilege. If we can subsidize the Beatles but not textbooks in biology, where is the justice in this?

Since 1890 newspapers and magazines considered as educational matter have enjoyed a second-class subsidy, which amounts to $300 million. This extends from the secular press to the religious newspapers, from the New York Times to the Christian Science Monitor and even to the antireligious and the extremist publications.

If we can subsidize the Police Gazette—or 50 pages of trash—but not a textbook on English, where is the justice of that?

Since 1879 we have subsidized bulk mailing of circulars, catalogs and advertisements under the third-class privilege which amounts to $300 million, as an inducement to the migration of knowledge through reading of anything on the printed page. Under this subsidy we encourage everything from instant beauty aids to surplus elephants, whether the public wants them or not. In fact, through this privilege comes most of the "come-on" circulars for pornography and perversion. If we can subsidize borderline obscenity or Lydia Pinkham's Compound but not a textbook on geography, mathematics, or civics, where is the justice in that?

I believe that with the knowledge explosion before us and the intellectual and cultural craving of 65 million young students willing and anxious to be served we can and must provide publications and new teaching materials for all Americans.

No people, no nation, no generation ever had the opportunity for the bold, the new, the dynamic advance in education you have now. But we must make a commitment and an investment to take advantage of that opportunity.

It will avail us little if a few of the highly trained and highly skilled soar in space while the masses below sink in culture and knowledge.

We have the means and the minds to make the printed page, the projector, the electronic teaching machine bring us to a new plane of understanding in all the sciences and in all the humanities.

With these means and minds before us we must not be a dog-eared society cramped within the covers of outworn texts and backward books.

Dr. Zacharias and 50 of our country's greatest physicists are developing a totally new course of instruction in physics which will make old methods as modern as the crystal radio. Will their work be available to all or the fortunate few?

Sister Jacqueline, the great president of Webster Grove College is working with Syracuse University in the development of a new system of mathematics instruction, teaching high school mathematics to grade school children.

Will this work be available to all or the fortunate few?

The answer is up to you.

You are the leaders on campus and you will be the leaders in the community. You are the doers of the word, the voices of truth and the propagandists for progress.

You owe a great commitment to education for what it has given you.

You owe a great commitment to private education for preserving the great freedoms it stands for.

You owe your Creator and your country a commitment to organize, to discuss, to debate, and to resolve the great questions in education so that we can continue to make the kind of progress we made in the 88th Congress.

Through your journals and your yearbooks and your activities in the community, I summon you to aid us, all of us, in advancing the cause of freedom of choice, of conscience, of knowledge, through educational excellence for all Americans.

In the words of our late President, John F. Kennedy before Congress in 1961:

"May we be worthy of the unlimited opportunities which God has given us."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my bill, H.R. 13 in full at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 13

A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make available to students in all elementary and secondary schools textbooks selected by such schools.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Educational Assistance Act of 1965".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a four-year program of financial assistance in the improvement of educational quality for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all of the States.

It is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government recognize its continuing responsibility to assist in the achievement of educational excellence and the elimination of inequalities and disadvantage for every American child. In the fulfillment of that responsibility the Congress further intends that there be no distinction or discrimination among the children of this Nation in the distribution of educational benefits in order that every child may be enabled to acquire knowledge to the full extent of his or her capacity.

To that end it is the purpose of this bill to extend the span and depth of knowledge among all students by providing funds for modern and effective texts and teaching materials and instructional aids.

In order to achieve equality of educational opportunities to the greatest possible degree the Congress intends that the Commissioner of Education provide such criteria as are necessary to give priority in the use of moneys under the title to those children most in need, handicapped or otherwise disadvantaged.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making textbooks in certain critical subject areas available on a loan basis to students in public and private elementary and secondary schools in accordance with this Act; the selection of such textbooks to be made by the appropriate educational agency.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) Funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of students enrolled in grades 1 to 12 (both inclusive) of elementary and secondary schools in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such grades in such schools in all of the States. Determination of the number of students in such schools in a State and in all the States shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect thereto are available to him.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this Act shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such other States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) Each State which desires to have students in all elementary and secondary schools in the State receive textbooks on a loan basis under this Act shall designate an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of educational agencies in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for its participation in the textbook program provided for in this Act. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) provides that it will receive applications from educational agencies under this Act and assign them a priority for approval relative to other applications received by it;

(3) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted an application to the State commission, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State commission as to the priority assigned to such application; and

(4) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of an accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this Act; and (B) for the making of such reports in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $1,000,000 during each fiscal year of the program under this Act in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this Act, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES AND AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for assigning to applications their relative priorities for approval, and the application of such standards and methods to such agencies under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plans, standards, and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of educational agencies in the several States. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant educational agencies are making an effort commensurate with their financial resources toward meeting their textbook needs, and for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, educational agencies according to functional or educational type.

(b) Section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the prescription regulations under this section, notwithstanding the provisions of clause (2) thereof.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Each educational agency which desires to obtain textbooks suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading from the Commissioner for use by its students, on a loan basis, shall submit an application therefor to the Commissioner. Each such application must (1) have been assigned a relative priority for approval by the appropriate educational agency, (2) specify the textbooks to be made available by the Commissioner and the estimated cost of providing such textbooks, and (3) be in such form and contain such additional information as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any application submitted by an educational agency if (1) it meets the requirements of this Act, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, (2) the application has been assigned a priority for approval by the State commission higher than that assigned any other application, and (3) there are sufficient funds available in the applicable State allotment to meet the costs which the Commissioner determines would arise if the application were approved.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

TEXTBOOK PROGRAM

SEC. 8 (a) When the Commissioner approves an application under this Act, he shall proceed to acquire the textbooks suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading provided for in the application, if sufficient numbers thereof are not otherwise available. The textbooks provided for under the application shall be made available to the applicant educational agency which shall distribute them to students as provided in the application. Such textbooks shall at all times remain the property of the United States.

(b) The Commissioner shall make appropriate regulations to assure that textbooks made available under this Act are used in accordance with the provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder throughout their useful life, or returned to the Commissioner.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 4(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commission shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, and trust territories of the Pacific islands.

(b) The term "elementary or secondary school" means any public or nonpublic school providing elementary or secondary education, which satisfies the compulsory education law of the State or which is accredited or approved under State law.

(c) The term "public" as applied to a school does not include a school of any agency of the United States.

(d) The term "educational agency" means a public or other school authority having administrative control and direction of one or more schools in a State.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. (a) No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational agency or institution.

(b) Neither the Commissioner nor any State commission shall attempt to affect the selection of by educational agencies of textbooks to be made available under this Act.

NATIONAL DIVIDENDS FROM A NUCLEAR NAVY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1965 edition of Navy—the magazine of seapower—contains an excellent article by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. The article is entitled "The National Dividends From a Nuclear Navy."

I am sure that all of us are aware of the fact that Representative ANDERSON commanded the submarine *Nautilus* when it made its dramatic voyage from Pearl Harbor to London via the North Pole and thence to New York, between July 23 and August 25, 1958. In this brief and searching article, Representative ANDERSON points to the great dividends which have and will come from the nuclear program, as the Nation takes stock on the 10th anniversary of nuclear propulsion.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate our new colleague from Tennessee not alone for his prowess on the high seas, but because of his deep and sensitive interest in issues which concern all Americans. As a West Virginian, I personally wish to pay tribute to him for the pioneer work which he did in blazing the trail for what is now known as the VISTA program—Volunteers in Service to America—under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The article referred to follows:

THE NATIONAL DIVIDENDS FROM A NUCLEAR NAVY

(By Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON)

A few years ago a Navy surgeon mentioned to Vice Admiral Rickover the need for a great deal more knowledge regarding the chemistry of the human body. The physician cited as an example the behavior of stainless steel pins when used for bone repairs. Apparently such pins last indefinitely in some cases, while in others the surgeon must reoperate and replace them after just a few years. The pins corrode away.

Admiral Rickover inquired as to the specifications used in purchasing the pins, having learned long before that the difference in performance among various grades and types of stainless steel can be remarkable. Now, thanks to Navy nuclear power and its stringent requirements for extremely durable stainless steel, you can count on your steel pins lasting longer, if unfortunately you have to have some bones put back together this way.

Technical developments made for military purposes more often than not result in important side benefits to our economy, national stature, and well-being. How remarkably this has been true in the aircraft field, where most features of commercial aviation can be traced back to military drawing boards and conference tables. Certainly, it is also true in the Navy nuclear propulsion program and perhaps it is appropriate that we appraise the matter on this 10th anniversary of the operating end of that program.

RESOURCEFUL ENGINEERING

Just as a new business or new factory tends to beget another, developments in one area of engineering often provide an uplifting in other areas of engineering. To develop the *Nautilus* powerplant, Admiral Rickover and his team had to solve many unprecedented problems. Engineers and manufacturers who had thought in terms of tolerances measured in thousandths of an inch had to start dealing with millionths. Quality control had to be pushed to a new and much higher plateau. In many instances new materials and fabrication processes had to be developed. For example, zirconium, an exotic metal and a laboratory curiosity prior to the *Nautilus* development, had to be called on for the cladding of reactor fuel plates. Today zirconium forms the basis for a booming industry of vital importance to the entire nuclear energy program.

The approach to the problems of developing naval reactors will, I believe, prove to be as significant as the solutions so successfully gained. Resourceful and honest engineering has been and remains the hallmark of the nuclear propulsion program—a tidal wave of engineering inspiration and leadership already spilling on many seemingly unrelated beaches. If the wave had but sooner reached the entire field of submarine design, perhaps the *Thresher* would not be at the bottom of the sea.

Thus one very valuable side benefit of the nuclear Navy is the significant uplift provided to other engineering efforts.

Though the methods used to select and train nuclear propulsion crews have not been without controversy, one does find universal agreement that the people who operate and maintain the plants and ships are the very zenith of the program. As they branch out to other duties or to related civilian careers they comprise a continuing prime national asset. (I hasten to emphasize "related civilian careers" to subtract myself from those I describe. There is not much connection between nuclear propulsion duties and politics, but my experience has been that the former sure hasn't hurt me in pursuing the latter.)

PROGRAM'S IMPACT

The Navy nuclear program has had a tremendous impact on most developments relating to the practical and peaceful applications of atomic energy.

Next to the land, the water, and the air, energy is by far the most important of our terrestrial resources. Although our own supply of coal and oil is vast, we are consuming these materials at such a rapidly increasing rate that if not supplemented they will begin to approach exhaustion within the span of a few generations.

Other nations, less fortunately endowed with coal and oil reserves, will face the problem much sooner than the United States. Thus we must pursue a vigorous civilian nuclear power policy not only to satisfy our own needs but to meet our world leadership responsibilities as well.

The *Nautilus* and the nuclear submarines which followed provided the first long step toward these essential goals. The propulsion plants in these ships provided both the fundamental technology and the confidence to undertake the Shippingport plant—this Nation's first nuclear central power station. Every dollar used in developing the Navy's various nuclear plants would have been well spent if the net result were only a safe and successful situation at Shippingport. The investment made in developing Navy nuclear propulsion has produced technology and manufacturing abilities applicable to the complete civilian nuclear power industry.

Since January 17, 1955, the United States has enjoyed a commanding lead over all other nations in the use of nuclear power for ship propulsion and the accompanying benefits to our prestige have been immense. This lead has been dramatized in many ways and my thoughts, when we reached the North Pole in the *Nautilus*, were built around the pride that it was a United States submarine that arrived there first, not a Russian.

SPIN-OFFS

These polar voyages, besides giving a boost to our prestige, have supplied a remarkable increase in our knowledge of the Arctic Ocean. The greatest surprise of the *Nautilus* voyage in 1958 was the revelation of a completely unpredicted underwater plateau which reached up some 8,000 feet from the surrounding ocean floor. I understand that this feature, located about a third of the way between Alaska and the pole, has been determined to be about the size of the State of Connecticut.

The spin-offs from the Navy nuclear program are indeed many and varied.

It is fitting on the 10th anniversary of nuclear propulsion that the Nation take stock of the vast dividends that have come from this program. We can sleep a great deal better at night because of its contribution to our defense posture. We stand a great deal taller as a nation because of its contribution to man's ability to use the atom for his own benefit.

The late Prof. Albert Einstein once said, "If you can utilize the nuclear physical findings for peaceful purposes, it will lead to a new paradise." Distinctly, the Navy nuclear propulsion development brightens the future for mankind.

FPC CONTINUES HARASSMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of last Sunday carried an excellent article under the heading: "The Kid Gloves Are on Toward Business." It points out that no President, in recent years, has worked as effectively as President Johnson to gain the confidence of the business community. I believe that this is quite true.

I have watched the President over the years and have noted, with great appreciation, how hard he has worked in behalf of all segments of our economy, private enterprise no exception, and how determined he has always been to keep the Government out of business wherever possible.

The Post article mentions the Federal Power Commission and the problem which it poses to the industries with which it is involved. This brings to mind the attitude of the FPC in such matters as investment credit and the determination of that Agency to take away from industry the tax incentives which the Congress intended to give to all industry. We straightened this out after much effort and some rather pointed legislation which said, in effect, that the Congress knows what it is doing and expects Federal bureaus to act accordingly.

Recent actions show the FPC majority to be disregarding a principle of law set forth by a U.S. court of appeals even though no appeal of the court's decision was filed with the Supreme Court. The issue involved who was to receive the congressionally authorized tax incentive resulting from a group of affiliated corporations filing a consolidated tax return. The tax incentive was not consumer contributed but arose from corporate losses having no relation to any regulated enterprise. As intended by Congress the incentive acts as a stimulus to new industry by allowing the investor to reduce the initial losses incurred when starting a new business. In its decision in the Cities Service Gas Co. rate case, the FPC majority decided to ignore congressional intent and gave the investors tax loss savings to the gas consumer. Cities Service was a regulated transportation company while the tax losses resulted from the operations of other companies.

On October 9 of 1964, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit unanimously reversed the Commission's ruling, stating that "the Commission would transgress the jurisdictional lines which Congress wrote into the act." It is reasonable to assume that if the FPC had disagreed with the court's ruling and wish to seek affirmation of its own decision, an appeal would have been taken to the Supreme Court. But no appeal was taken, thus leaving the court's decision as the law of the land, that is, to all but the Federal Power Commission.

Recently, the FPC refused to comply with the principle enunciated by the court. In a rate settlement proceeding involving United Gas Pipe Line Co., the Commission decided to ignore the court's ruling by refusing to settle the tax issue on the basis of the court's decision, obviously hoping to squeeze out a more favorable decision from another court of appeals. Meanwhile, business uncertainty is continued and compounded.

Thus, after years of litigation before the Commission and courts, a bare majority of the FPC still attempts to breathe life into a doctrine repugnant to Congress and rejected by the courts. For over 20 years industry had utilized this tax incentive to venture into new businesses. In 1963, for the first time, a majority of the FPC decided that all prior Commissions had been wrong.

This, to me, would appear to be heckling business and indicates an unwillingness to accept a court decision just as the same agency was so reluctant to accept the mandate of the Congress.

I venture the hope that all Federal agencies and particularly those so directly involved in business affairs will heed the President's often demonstrated desire, and help rather than harass private enterprise. The results of the President's friendly attitude are already bearing fruit and they should be encouraged rather than hampered.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. SPRINGER. 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. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

There never has been any ceiling on the amount of investment income a person can have and still receive the full social security for which he is eligible.

The lid on earnings discriminates against persons who must work for a living.

This was a depression device that was designed to create job opportunities by putting financial pressure on persons eligible for social security benefits to retire and make way for others.

It never accomplished this purpose even in the depression years. In these times of high employment and inflated prices, the earnings ceiling helps no one and imposes a severe financial hardship on many retired heads of families and widowed mothers of young children.

It is cruel to cut off payments to people in these circumstances who are capable and willing to work to provide a better life for their families. Social security income went further during the depression. Now it often is not enough to provide the necessities of life, let alone some of the comforts.

The Johnson administration considers families with less than $3,000 annual income to be living at the poverty level. If this is true, I should think that repeal of the earnings limit would be the most effective antipoverty measure we could take.

The Government's own figures show that 16.2 percent of the families in the below $3,000 income bracket are headed by women under 65. Another 30.5 percent of such families are headed by persons 65 or older.

So almost 47 percent of families at the poverty income level are potentially eligible for social security benefits. Many are denied benefits because the family heads must work to get an income of even $3,000 or less.

These families could be helped by passage of my bill and it will not cost one dime for the type of bureaucracy needed to run the antipoverty programs.

Along with my bill to repeal this archaic and senseless provision of the Social Security Act, I have also introduced a separate bill to increase the present monthly $100 limitation on earnings to $200.

Although I am firmly committed to full repeal of the ceiling, I know that it is doubtful that my goal can be achieved in this Congress. I do believe, however, that we will be able to get a substantial increase. The present limitations were established in 1961. Wage levels have risen considerably during the last 4 years so, at the very least, a sizable rise of the ceiling is long overdue.

Both Houses of the Congress, as my colleagues know, agreed last year on an increase to $1,500 a year. This certainly would be an improvement but, if we are not able to remove the ceiling completely, I believe we should double it to $2,400, a figure that is still below the poverty income level. My bill to raise the monthly permitted earnings to $200 would accomplish this.

AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my unequivocal opposition to further extension of aid to the United Arab Republic and other countries which substantially damage our Nation's policy interests and materially disrupt the peace of the world.

I do so with the hope that my remarks, and the thinking of like-minded colleagues, will stir a consensus sufficient to set our course straight.

It has been the strategy of the State Department to tender aid to Egypt as a diplomatic lever. Their feeling persists that the Public Law 480 grants constitute an effective instrument in influencing the United Arab Republic Government toward arms limitation. They insist that the aid keeps the American foot in the door. Additionally, the Department does not believe that a stoppage of aid, producing greater economic hardship, would necessarily limit the Egyptian military buildup.

I have received from the Department of State, in answer to my inquiry of December 14, a succinct outline of their policy. The message is unmistakable. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Phillips Talbot, replied thusly:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: Thank you for your letter of December 14 in which you set forth your views on our relations with the United Arab Republic and ask us to comment specifically on an article by Hedrick Smith in the December 10 New York Times.

As you know, under the multiyear Public Law 480 agreement which we have with the United Arab Republic there are periodic reviews of the quantities of various commodities programed at the beginning of the year. At the moment the Department has under consideration a request from the United Arab Republic for certain additional amounts of corn and poultry. The amount which would be involved, incidentally, would be considerably less than the $35 million reported by Mr. Smith of the New York Times.

On the second point which you raise, the desirability of bringing the arms race in the Middle East under control, we have put a great deal of thought and effort into finding ways and means of making progress on this serious problem. We have explored the matter with the various governments concerned, and these efforts will continue. As far as the United Arab Republic is concerned, one of the few effective tools which we have to influence its government toward this objective, as well as responsible policies in other areas, is our Public Law 480 program. A cutback in our aid would unquestionably compound the United Arab Republic's economic difficulties. I do not think it follows that Nasser would therefore necessarily spend less for military purposes or that he would be induced to pursue a more reasonable course in the field of arms control.

I appreciated having your views on our relations with the United Arab Republic, and I hope that you will not hesitate to write again if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIPS TALBOT,
Assistant Secretary.

The importance of American surplus assistance to Egypt is undeniable. The United Arab Republic's position in the International Monetary Fund is precarious at best. A UPI dispatch datelined January 5, printed in the New York Times of January 6, sums up the bewildering economic situation confronting President Nasser. He is faced with severe conditions; the Cairo and Alexandria Stock Exchanges have been closed temporarily; a number of key factories were shut down due to the lack of raw materials, and others will also face temporary stoppages.

Egypt has accumulated $250 million of short-term debt to Western countries, half of which is overdue. Three hundred million dollars is owed to the Communist bloc. Recently, the United Arab Republic Government sold $30 million of gold for hard currency, for expedient purposes. The situation is, indeed, harsh and growing more dangerous. The State Department is correct in establishing the significance of American surplus food.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's letter to me indicates how fully the political motivations are shaping our aid program vis-a-vis the United Arab Republic.

In my view, the official justification for continuing this aid program, whether based on political or economic arguments, is false. I question whether American policy is and will secure the political objectives envisaged.

The United Arab Republic military advance surely contradicts our Government's thinking that by the Public Law

480 leverage, the United States is succeeding in impressing upon Mr. Nasser the urgency of arms limitation in the Middle East. If, as the Assistant Secretary states, the Public Law 480 extensions to Egypt are mainly intended to counter upward military expenditures, this has hitherto failed conclusively.

Now I think it is legitimate to question the aid criteria applied to Egypt. It is important that we have an understandable impression of what our foreign aid program is and what it seeks to achieve.

In whatever form, assistance abroad becomes intuitively an arm of American foreign policy. In this process there must be both political, economic, and strategic motivations.

My conception of aid is a mixture of the possible and the prudent. It must conform with U.S. long-range goals for the countries and regions where it is directed. In this sense, aid is partially a political instrument.

We therefore fuse political and economic thought. For the future, aid is important in the attempt to achieve reasonably independent, reasonably viable, and reasonably stable governments in the underdeveloped world. We do not wish that newly free states, weak and insecure, come to lean too heavily upon enemy forces, thereby losing their maneuverability and neutrality. Economic assistance is part and parcel of this vital American interest.

At the same time, on humanitarian grounds, it is foolhardy to isolate the genius of productivity and its overabundant wealth. We are a civilized nation and I think one of the grand exercises of this generation must be the extension of our knowledge and surplus to meet human want.

And so one must view foreign assistance as a mixture of ideologies, a mixture of emotion and motivation. It is self-interest and world interest at the same time. Admittedly, it is a difficult criteria and the practical judgments which must be made from day to day are difficult and thus rarely questions of pure white and black.

It is my contention here, nonetheless, that Egypt has transgressed the outer limits of eligibility. This applies similarly to Indonesia.

Presently, the Public Law 480 agreement with the United Arab Republic is still in effect. The 3-year contract will terminate next June 30. We must insist that no further assistance is granted until the Egyptian Government has shown itself willing to live in peace, and until their leaders adopt a more responsible course which is reasonably allied with U.S. vital interests.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore expounded upon my reasons in the House. Let me briefly touch upon a few of them in light of recent developments.

The Government of Egypt is destroying the principle of American foreign aid. It is ruining the rational thinking which proponents of our programs have for so long adopted in defending the principle in this House and before an increasingly hostile public opinion. I fear that additional aid to Egypt will render our programs almost indefensible, opening the floodgates to unwise and indiscriminate trimming, subjecting the principle to even greater unpopularity througout the country.

In the first place, the awesome Egyptian arms buildup is contrary to U.S. interests. Our assistance is underwriting this adventure. Relative military superiority in the hands of the Egyptian leaders cannot possibly further American aims in the Middle East; it will make the resolution of old enmities and conflicts less possible; it will enhance the means of subversion and indirect aggression.

We have the Egyptian intervention in the Yemen as an example of duplicity and hostility. The Government is expending millions on this sad project. U.S. assistance is helping to feed Egypt's poor, enabling the Government to divert its resources to war engagement and making it possible to avoid the cruel internal demands which arise. In this sense, the validity of American aid has already been damaged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me quote briefly from President Nasser's speech at Port Said on December 23 last:

Nasser then sneered at the $1½ billion of U.S. aid that he has received:

I want to say that we are getting wheat from the Americans. We must disclose the matter openly. [Laughter and jeers.] We get wheat, meat, and leftovers * * * yesterday the American Ambassador called on the Deputy Premier for Supply and sat for a few minutes looking glum and sulky. He was supposed to talk about supplies we are obtaining from America in accordance with the products law. The Ambassador told the Deputy Premier that he cannot at present talk about this matter at all. Why? Because he does not like our currency, that is the currency of Egypt. I would like him to know that whoever does not like our currency can go and drink up the sea. If the Mediterranean is not enough, there is the Red Sea. We can give him that as well. * * * As for American aid * * * we tell them "Thank you" and "May you have plenty," but we are not prepared to accept words and arrogance.

It might be of interest for you to consider the United Arab Republic representative's statement on aid to the General Assembly, United Nations:

Foreign aid in both the financial and technical fields is an essential element for enabling the developing countries to reach a reasonable stage of development. Foreign aid, however, should not be a means of bringing pressure on developing countries, nor should it be a method of political or ideological interference. Rather, it is a right to which developing countries are entitled.

Regarding Colonel Nasser's remarks, it must be said that they were meant for internal consumption. But it refutes the official apologetic attitude that the United States, through its aid program, is acquiring leverage. And if one object of our aid is to build some understanding of American goals and standards throughout the world, the hysterical outbursts of Mr. Nasser, along with his controlled, anti-Western communications media, is certainly not affording America a very reliable opening.

The second statement poses an irrational thought; that aid to the developing countries is expected as a matter of right. It is not. This presumption affirms my earlier contention that the Egyptians have not the slightest concept of what our aid program is and why it exists. They have got their thinking wrong because we have failed to enforce understandable criteria. While I agree that aid should not constitute a direct, short-term political instrument, it would not hurt to explain to the Egyptian gentleman that the United States, as well as Egypt, has certain worldwide objectives not inimical to those of the United Arab Republic, and that we are not wholly selfish in pursuing them. This is not wanton interference in domestic affairs, a much abused phrase. The fact of the matter is that we live in a world of competing interests, and that these must be adjusted to strengthen the peace.

Now we have learned that Egypt is materially supporting the rebellion against the legal Congo Government—Leopoldville. Aside from the question of whether this is affordable—financially justifiable—this assistance is directly contrary to our interest in a stable Congo situation. Any growing strength of the rebels means greater military difficulty for the central government forces, which we are supporting. Will a steadily worsening picture mean that American policy is once again faced with the agonizing decision of extended involvement in Afro-Asia? I do not want us to be faced with this untimely choice, should the rebellion recoup substantially and turn the tide against the Tshombe regime.

In essence, Nasser's policy is contrary to our immediate goals in the Congo and our long-range objectives in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the original amendment to the food-for-peace program, offered by the former Representative of Ohio, Mr. Bolton, was not agreed to in 1964. This would have helped to set our course right.

I have attempted to report on my thinking as to why our aid program to Egypt is self-defeating. Manifestly, our policymakers have gotten themselves embroiled in a maze of worried counter-pressures. The scare is always that in forthrightly denying assistance, and explaining the decision carefully, our country will lose a friend.

The hurtful tendency in this respect is always to think in terms of tomorrow and not the future. We are frozen by a checkerboard of short-term gains and losses. Nations are more likely to have permanent interests rather than permanent friends, and even interests should not become hardened for all time. Fate often plays dirty tricks, and the one sure factor of international politics is that adherences and interests will shift because no one state can control absolutely the world scene, and no two nations have precisely similar instincts.

The validity and success of our foreign aid program, never easily tested, should not be subjected to risk by the unreasoned pressures of any one recipient.

I would like to see now a firm declaration of purpose. The request of Egypt for an additional surplus should be denied and a full explanation given.

In this connection, we would be implementing the antiaggressor amendment of 1963 which states that no assistance be rendered to countries which are engaging in or preparing for war against the United States or her other aid recipients.

Second, I firmly urge that upon completion of the current Public Law 480 agreement, Egypt be forewarned that no extension can be granted under present circumstances. The Egyptian Government, and other interested governments, should be advised of this decision with a full explanation so that there will be no excuse for misunderstanding.

In so doing, we will be acting to reaffirm the validity of our assistance program, and our vital policy interests can be pursued.

THE FAMOUS UCLA-LABOR REPORT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, "chaotic" is the most accurate description of the agriculture situation in California's fresh fruit and vegetable industries.

In anticipation of the termination of the bracero program—for supplying necessary supplemental labor during peak harvesting and cultivating seasons—California farmers and governmental agencies experimented thoroughly with every conceivable suggestion to replace foreign workers. Every proposal failed. There is still no practical, satisfactory solution. The situation is deteriorating hourly. California produces more than 40 percent of the Nation's fresh vegetables. Chaos in California will adversely affect all Americans.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture are not publishing reports about the situation and have not proposed satisfactory solutions. There are some reports you probably will not see.

The UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations' report on problems of farm labor recruitment has created quite a disturbance.

One chapter of their rather voluminous report was entitled "Can Recipients of Public Assistance Be Recruited for Farm Work?" Here are some facts taken from the report.

The bureau of public assistance in Los Angeles County had 177,026 open cases in July 1964. These cases covered 303,458 persons. Of the 177,026 case files, the largest category consists of 100,230 persons who were 65 years of age or older. The average age was about 75.

There were 4,489 blind persons, 18,359 permanently disabled, 5,653 children who were placed in boarding homes or institutions, and 9,653 cases of unemployables who did not come into any of these categories.

Included in the 177,026 cases were 33,997 families receiving aid to their dependent children. In 9 out of 10 of these families the mother was the only adult in home and had an average of 3 children, more than 80 percent of whom were under 12 years of age.

Because of the large number of preschool children in these homes, the mother was needed in the home and could not become self-supporting. Even so, their number is not static, for 9,021 families left the relief rolls in 1963, often because the mothers obtained adequate supervision of their children and employment which made them self-supporting.

An examination of these cases leaves 3,879 in which there was at least 1 clearly employable person. Of these, 2,993 were added since February of this year when the bureau began administration of the new aid to families with dependent children—unemployed, and 886 were classed as general relief cases.

Thus, in seeking the number of public assistance cases in which persons clearly might become more gainfully employed, we are talking about 1¼ percent of the persons receiving aid.

Well, we get up to this point in the report and we have been quoting directly from the report in hopes that the makeup of the welfare rolls would be of interest to you. Then the people making this survey decided to send a questionnaire to social caseworkers to get their views on the feasibility and desirability of recruiting unemployed persons for farmwork. The caseworkers were those who help administer the program of aid to families with dependent children including unemployed parents.

The following are some of the answers given by social caseworkers to the question, "From your experience, what response would you make to persons who make the charge that most people would rather stay on welfare than do farm or any other type of work?" Fifteen percent of the social workers agreed with the statement, 45 percent disagreed, and 31 percent cautiously recoiled from the question.

Following are some of the answers given by social workers to the question:

Social status of aid is better than farm labor.

People would rather be on aid than do strenuous farm labor.

I would think that persons who make this charge are ill advised, nearsighted, have little or no respect for the unfortunates, gage human worth primarily by wealth, and believe that all poverty is the wages of sin.

Hard work is no longer considered dignified.

Farm work provides no incentive.

Planning toward future self-maintenance is an eligibility requirement for receipt of current aid.

Many clients specifically state that they left the South to free themselves from a rural economy.

Generally, when people make the above charge, I ask them if they have ever spoken to anyone on welfare. They say "No," and I first smirk; second, look surprised; third, look superior, and/or give a brief speech on the "Dignity of Man in the 20th Century." Then I change the conversation to something less controversial like Goldwater or birth control.

I would agree with them for the following reasons: First, men generally seek pleasure, not hardship; second, farming connotes the simple, the unlearned, the square; third, our clients envisage any kind of work to mean something menial, difficult, nonunion, and odious; and, fourth, why work when you can get paid for doing nothing?

Offer them a job and find out.

As long as society offers them no better position, why should they not be supported by that society?

Some people are just plain lazy.

Why should they not have a choice to work in a field in which they are skilled?

Transportation would be a tremendous problem for most of my clients.

Many, many clients have financial security for the first time in their lives when they first begin to receive public assistance. They are reluctant to give up this security for the uncertainty of competing in the labor market, especially when they know layoffs may be frequent. Besides, many clients work at casual labor while receiving aid and thus have two incomes.

It is a matter of simple economics. Until farm wages are raised and conditions improved, people would rather stay on welfare, just to eat. This does not mean they prefer welfare, but only that they do that which is most economically feasible. The above listed statement is not a charge, it is a cold fact.

URBAN RENEWAL PROBLEMS THAT MUST BE MET

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial books ever written on the Federal urban renewal program, "The Federal Bulldozer," has, in effect, been condensed for the January-February issue of the Harvard Business Review, by its author, Dr. Martin Anderson.

I do not agree with Dr. Anderson's final conclusion that the urban renewal program must immediately be repealed. It is not necessary to agree with the author's conclusion of repeal to recognize that the facts he presents pose important problems in the urban renewal field, problems which this administration has yet to meet or even admit exist.

Last year, when the Republican minority presented a housing program prior to that offered by the administration, we pointed out that an overemphasis on high-rent commercial developments and luxury apartments had sacrified the original goal of providing low- and moderate-income housing. At the same time, private developers without Federal assistance had, with less delay and more success, renewed downtown areas in many of our Nation's cities. For that reason, the Widnall bill and companion measures proposed a strict priority for housing redevelopment, and the placing of commercial renewal on a loan basis.

Relocation problems, particularly for minority groups, the elderly, and small

businesses, and the lack of adequate compensation for property taken, were also noted last year. The Widnall bill again met these problems by providing for a physical verification of decent, safe, and sanitary housing at the time of relocation, advanced planning for small businessmen, and a complete overhaul of the concept of just compensation. All of these, as Dr. Anderson's article shows, are problems contained in or caused by the urban renewal program.

Over the past year, in hearings held before the House Special Housing Subcommittee, I have raised questions concerning the alleged increase in tax revenues to localities as a result of urban renewal programs. The increase, as the answers to my questions show, is still in the "estimated" stage, one it has been in since the beginning of the program. This same "myth" has been dealt with by Dr. Anderson.

And a recent report by the General Accounting Office on relocation in Washington, D.C., confirms the suspicion I have expressed before, and Dr. Anderson has also developed, that standards for relocation housing are sometimes not as high as housing code standards used to declare an area "blighted."

Most of the suggestions by the minority were not acted upon last year. In two cases, however, Congress did begin major new programs that I had proposed. As Dr. Anderson's figures indicate, the number of dilapidated structures suitable for clearance is in a continuing decline, yet the administration still insists on the bulldozer technique. Congress last year, however, provided for a new $50 million rehabilitation loan program, proposed in my bill, to allow the individual homeowner and small businessman a chance to survive. The second proposal enacted into law provides for a code enforcement urban renewal project, and a cutoff of funds in the future if cities do not take enough local responsibility in this area.

The administration's reaction to these new laws has done nothing to insure against future criticism by scholars such as Dr. Anderson. First the Bureau of the Budget refused to fund the loan program, then the Urban Renewal Administration ignored the code enforcement program, although many cities have expressed interest in it. Perhaps a reading of Dr. Anderson's article will shake them out of their lethargy.

I include the article at this point:

[From the Harvard Business Review, January–February 1965]

THINKING AHEAD

Business leaders have heard many times in recent years that our housing and our cities are decaying, that private enterprise cannot save them, that the Government must step in and help private enterprise with urban renewal, and that they—as responsible citizens and businessmen—should collaborate with the Government in this effort.[1] In my judgment, none of these statements is true.

The purpose of this article is to evaluate the Federal urban renewal program—its goals, its methods, its accomplishments—and to compare them with those of the free marketplace. A comparison of the results that these two forces—the Federal urban renewal program and private enterprise—have produced since 1949 brings out some fundamental issues and questions that have been obscured in a fog of good intentions and platitudes. The basic question is this: Should the Federal urban renewal program be continued and expanded, or should it be stopped? I shall argue that it should be stopped.

GOALS OF RENEWAL

In response to continual exhortation and pressure to do something to "save" the cities and improve housing, Congress enacted the Federal urban renewal program in 1949, proceeding on the conviction that a program of this type would help to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through clearance of slums and blighted areas.

Stimulate sufficient housing production and community development to remedy the housing shortage.

Realize the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

I doubt that anyone can argue with these goals. Better homes, improved neighborhoods, and the elimination of slums—all are desirable. The difficulty is not with the goals, but with the means of accomplishing them and with the consequences that result.

HOW PROGRAM WORKS

In essence the Federal urban renewal program attempts to rebuild rundown areas of cities by feeding large amounts of public money and government power into the normal operations of the private marketplace. It does not complement the private market; it short-circuits it.

This is how the program works. First, a section of a city is designated as an urban renewal area, and plans are drawn up and approved by the local renewal agency, the local governing body, and the Federal authorities in Washington. A public hearing is then held at which local renewal officials document their case for urban renewal. At this time other persons interested in the project have the opportunity to speak for or against it.

Once the planning is complete, execution starts. Though some execution activities may be carried on simultaneously, there are six basic steps:

1. Land acquisition: The land and the buildings are usually acquired by negotiation with the owners, but, if this fails, the renewal authorities will use the power of eminent domain to force the recalcitrant owners to sell; in cases like this, the purchase price is determined by independent appraisers.

2. Displacement and relocation: Individuals, families, and businesses located in the area are forced to move and find homes or establish businesses elsewhere. The law provides for some compensation and requires renewal authorities to relocate them satisfactorily, although in practice this does not always happen.

3. Site clearance: The wrecking cranes and the bulldozers demolish any buildings not considered useful by the renewal authorities.

4. Site improvements and supporting facilities: The cleared land is usually improved by the construction of streets, sewers, water mains, lighting systems, schools, libraries and parks.

5. Disposition of improved land: The cleared and improved land can be sold, leased, donated, or retained by the renewal agency. Usually the land is sold to private persons either by competitive bidding or by negotiation between renewal officials and the private buyer.

6. New construction: The new construction may be residential, industrial, commercial, or public; so far it has been predominantly private residential. The private developer is usually obliged to build according to a general plan approved by the renewal authorities.

This, then, is urban renewal—damned by some, praised by many, and understood by very few. At first glance, urban renewal would seem to be a most desirable program, both plausible and appealing. The picture is often painted like this: before—dirty, dark, ugly slums; after—clean, bright, beautiful buildings. The contrast is clear, the appeal seductive, but this picture shows only the hopes and wishes of urban renewal. The realities of its costs and consequences are drastically different.

EVERYBODY PAYS

Urban renewal is, of course, expensive. The gross project cost of urban renewal includes all expenses incurred by a local renewal authority—planning costs, land, buildings, overhead, interest, relocation, site improvements, and supporting facilities.

Assume that all this costs $9 million for a good-sized project. Where does the money come from?

Some of it comes from private developers who buy the cleared and improved land. On the average, private developers have been buying urban renewal land for about 30 percent of the gross cost of the project—say $3 million for our $9 million project. This leaves the city with a net cost of $6 million. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of this net cost, or, in this case, $4 million.

Thus, for our $9 million project, we get $3 million from the private developer who becomes the new owner, $4 million from taxpayers all over the United States, and $2 million from taxpayers living in the community with the urban renewal project. Additional features called noncash grants-in-aid, can reduce the net cost to the city still further.

Because the Federal Government subsidizes two-thirds of the net cost to the city, some people feel that urban renewal is a bonanza that cannot be passed up. This might be true if only one city were engaged in urban renewal, but there are over 1,500 projects in about 750 cities throughout the country. Through Federal taxes, the residents of any one of these cities are helping to pay for all the other projects. As more and more cities attempt to "get their share" and the overall cost of the program rises, the cost to all necessarily increases.

BETTER HOUSING?

One of the most serious consequences of the Federal urban renewal program is the effect that it has had on the supply of housing, especially low-rent housing. This is ironic because one of the goals of the program is to improve living conditions. Why has this goal not been realized?

The typical urban renewal project destroys a great many homes. Between 1950 and 1960, the program was responsible for the destruction of approximately 126,000 housing units. Of these homes, 101,000 had been classified as substandard by the local renewal authorities, while 25,000 were in good condition. The good ones were destroyed because they were judged to be incompatible with the proposed plan for the area.

I have estimated that in this same decade approximately 28,000 new housing units were completed within urban renewal areas.[2] About 25,000 of these were privately owned homes; 3,000 or so were public housing units. Score: 126,000 down, about 28,000 up. This means that almost four times as many homes were destroyed as were built.

The total effect on housing conditions was even worse. All the 126,000 homes that were destroyed were located in older sections of

[1] See, for example, Leland Hazard, "Are We Committing Urban Suicide?" Thinking Ahead, HBR July–August 1964, p. 152.

[2] "The Federal Bulldozer" (Cambridge, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1964), pp. 65–67.

cities, and almost all were low-rent units. It is doubtful whether the average rent paid exceeded $50 or $60 a month. On the other hand, the rents of the new privately owned homes were very high. For example, those homes built in 1962 in urban renewal areas had rents averaging $195 a month. (A small percentage rented for over $360 a month.) Hence it was virtually impossible for any person displaced from an urban renewal area to move back in: he could afford it only if he moved into public housing. And only 3,000 units of public housing were built—an insignificant number in comparison to the number of units destroyed.

Thus the net effect of the Federal urban renewal program in the field of housing for the period I have studied can be summed up in this way:

More homes were destroyed than were built.

Those destroyed were predominantly low-rent homes.

Those built were predominantly high-rent homes.

Housing conditions were made worse for those whose housing conditions were least good.

Housing conditions were improved for those whose housing conditions were best.

IMPROVED LIVING CONDITIONS?

Private studies indicate that the people displaced by urban renewal usually move into housing of approximately the same quality as the housing they were forced out of—but they often pay more for it. Their predicament is compounded, not alleviated, by urban renewal. Government studies, on the other hand, indicate that about 80 percent of the displaced people move into standard housing. Obviously, both the private studies and the Government studies cannot be correct.

I suspect the reason for the discrepancy between them is that local government officials decide whether or not a dwelling unit in an urban renewal area is standard or substandard, and their estimates are therefore subject to bias. An official interested in speeding up the process of an urban renewal project may be tempted to apply high housing standards to justify the taking of the property, and then, when it comes to relocating the people displaced, he may be tempted to use quite low housing standards to justify the quick relocation of these people.

The notion that over 80 percent of the displaced people move into good housing is difficult to reconcile with other relevant facts. The people living in these areas are relatively poor. A great many of them come from minority groups; approximately two-thirds of all those forced to move are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Good-quality, conveniently located housing costs so much more than poor housing that it is difficult to conceive of hundreds of thousands of low-income people, many of them subject to racial discrimination, suddenly moving from low-quality housing into higher quality housing at rents they can afford.

And then one might ask the following question: If it is true that all this good-quality, conveniently located, low-rent housing is available, why then is it necessary to force these people out of their homes with a bulldozer? Would it not be far simpler, more just, and much cheaper just to tell them about the better homes available elsewhere?

ONE MILLION EVICTIONS

The number of people affected by the program was small during its first few years of operation. But I have estimated that as of December 31, 1962, approximately 1,665,000 persons were living or had lived in urban renewal areas. This is about the same number of people that live in Detroit, Mich.—the fifth largest city in the United States. Some of these people have already been forced out; the rest will be on their way eventually.

The number of people actually evicted so far is very large. By March 31, 1963, about 609,000 persons had been forced to move, and the number has, of course, continued to go up. I estimate that at least 1 million people will be evicted by the end of 1965. And this is by no means the end; in fact, it is probably just a small start. In 1962, William Slayton, the Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, stated that approximately 1 million families would be displaced during the next decade. This means that somewhere around 4 million persons will be actually displaced by 1972—or about 1 person out of every 50 living in the United States.

GOOD FOR BUSINESS?

Although most urban renewal areas are predominantly residential, they often contain a number of businesses. These businesses range from one-man offices to industrial concerns with several hundred employees. According to a 1960 report financed by the Small Business Administration:

"It is estimated that there are over 100,000 business firms in all 650 project areas. The approximately 100,000 firms scheduled for dislocation from project areas on December 31, 1959, represent a beginning only. Now projects have been started at an increasing rate. Although no precise forecasts have been made, it is expected that the volume of business dislocations from renewal areas over the 1960–70 decade will be at least twice the 100,000 already underway or planned." [3]

What happens to a business when it is forced to move? Does it stay in business? Where does it move to?

According to the study quoted above, many firms never relocate at all. This study covered 14 cities with 21 urban renewal projects containing a total of 2,946 displaced firms. The finding: 756 of them either went out of business or disappeared. Similar findings have been made by others.

A study conducted by Brown University in the city of Providence, R.I., found that 40 percent of the businesses displaced went out of business.[4]

A study prepared by the Library of Congress concluded that urban renewal projects "are destroying small businesses and jobs and contributing to the unemployment problem." [5]

What about rents for firms forced to relocate? In the study prepared for the Small Business Administration, a sample was taken of 4 cities that contained 1,142 displaced firms. Only 41, or 3.1 percent, actually moved back into the urban renewal area. The researchers observed:

"Approximately 75 percent of those who do relocate find quarters within 1 mile of their former location; and nearly 40 percent within one-quarter mile. They generally occupy about the same floor area they did before (which is less than they claimed to want or need), at a square foot rental at least double what they were paying (which is much more than they claimed to be able to afford or to be willing to pay)." [6]

THE TAX MYTH

One of the most valued arguments presented by those who favor expansion of the urban renewal program is that it will strengthen and increase the tax base and thus increase tax revenues to the city. Unfortunately this has not happened, and the chances of urban renewal producing a significant tax revenue increase in the future are small.

The latest data I have on new construction actually started in urban renewal areas goes through March 31, 1961. It shows that the urban renewal programs actually decreased the tax revenues flowing into the cities' tax coffers. By the end of 1960, approximately $735 million of real estate had been destroyed in urban renewal project areas. About $824 million of real estate construction had been started, $577 million of which was privately owned and thus taxable. If we optimistically assume that 70 percent of this total amount privately started was ever finished, the net result is about $400 million worth of taxable property—$335 million less than we had before urban renewal.[7]

Is this a temporary situation, or is an adverse tax effect a fundamental quality of urgan renewal? Several factors militate against net tax increases:

1. Interim tax losses from real estate destroyed are often overlooked. Once buildings are down, no taxes are paid on them. Nor are any taxes paid until new buildings have been put up. The new buildings will probably be worth much more than the old ones. But the length of time between the destruction of the old buildings and the construction of the new ones can easily be 5 years or more. During this time the city is losing tax revenue.

2. Tax revenue increases that would have occurred in the absence of urban renewal must be considered. In most cases, a certain amount of new construction and rehabilitation would probably have been accomplished with private funds, thereby increasing the tax base with no cost to the city.

3. Much of the new construction in the urban renewal area would have been built elsewhere in the city anyway. Some experts in the field estimate that from 50 to 75 percent of this construction would have been accomplished by private enterprise.

4. Many of the new tenants in an urban renewal area will come from other parts of the city. What happens to the value of the buildings they vacate?

5. Some cities have had to give special tax abatements to induce private developers to come in. This, of course, will further reduce any net gain in tax revenues that might materialize.

To be sure, some of the factors operating may tend to increase the tax revenues. If an urban renewal project is successful, it is possible that the value of the surrounding buildings may increase. But before this is translated into increased taxes, the assessment on the buildings must be raised.

The whole issue of tax revenue changes is still a cloudy one and will probably remain so. It should be kept in mind that the net change will be the result of many complex factors. It is not enough just to compare the value of the old real estate with the proposed value of the new real estate. Timing of payments, effect on the rest of the city, what would have happened without urban renewal—these must all be considered, along with the fact that the process of urban renewal itself costs the city a considerable amount of money.

CONSTITUTIONAL?

Under the Constitution of the United States, it is understood that a man is free to use his property as he desires as long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. Traditionally, public use is the only reason for which the Government may seize private

---

[3] William N. Kinnard, Jr., and Zenon S. Malinowski. "The Impact of Dislocation From Urban Renewal Areas on Small Business," prepared by the University of Connecticut under a grant from the Small Business Administration, July 1960, pp. 2–3.

[4] Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "Washington Report," December 20, 1963.

[5] Ibid.

[6] W. N. Kinnard, Jr., and Z. S. Malinowski, op. cit., p. 75.

[7] See "The Federal Bulldozer," pp. 180, 181.

property. The Supreme Court changed this in 1954, and today, under the Federal urban renewal program, it is possible for the Government to seize the property of one man, destroy it, and then sell the cleared land to some other man at a negotiated price.

The Constitution clearly states that the power of eminent domain may be used only to seize private property for public use. Approximately 70 percent of the new construction in urban renewal areas is privately owned. By no distortion of the thinking process can this be construed to be a public use; it is clearly a private use.

The Supreme Court essentially justified this procedure on the grounds that it was in the public interest. They neatly sidestepped the problem of clearly defining the public interest. The use of the public interest to justify a Government program often means that one group of people will gain at the expense of some other group. Those who do not mind sacrificing the rights of a few persons in the name of the public interest eventually may end up sacrificing the rights of the public in the name of the public interest.

The equation of public interest with public use is a dangerous principle to accept. It means that the Government theoretically could seize anyone's property for any reason that an official claimed was in the public interest if he could justify it to the satisfaction of the Court. Every citizen has the responsibility of questioning the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court is not infallible in its interpretation of the law; and its decisions can be reversed.

POWER OF FREE ENTERPRISE

According to certain experts, things are getting worse in urban housing. In a report of the President's Commission on National Goals in 1960, Catherine Bauer Wurster stated:

"There is a great deal of seriously substandard housing in American communities, and spreading 'gray areas' in various stages of actual or potential decay, plus commercial and industrial blight. It is quite evident that economic progress alone does not cure these evils, and that local governments cannot do the necessary job alone." [8]

Others have made similar statements. If they are correct, it seems that we are in for serious trouble. Fortunately, the actual developments of recent years contradict these pessimistic opinions.

Impressive progress has been made toward achieving the objectives set forth by Congress in 1949. Overall housing conditions have improved dramatically, in cities and outside of cities for the poor and the rich, and for the nonwhites as well as the whites. This progress has been furthered by businessmen operating in the free marketplace. The improvements in housing quality and the increase in the housing supply accomplished through private enterprise. To summarize some of the more important aspects of the record:

Both the relative and absolute changes in housing quality between 1940 and 1960 were striking. In 1940, 51 percent of all housing in the United States was considered standard or sound; in 1950 the proportion had moved up to 63 percent; and in 1960, fully 81 percent was classified as standard. If this trend continues, it is likely that the Census of 1970 will reveal that 90 to 95 percent of all our housing is standard.

From 1950 to 1960 alone the total number of standard homes increased from 29.1 to 47.4 million, a 63-percent increase in just 10 years. This increase of over 18 million standard homes was the result of both new construction and rehabilitation. Over 12 million new units were built, and the number of substandard units declined from 17 million to under 11 million. Virtually all of this was accomplished by private construction, rehabilitation, and demolition efforts; massive amounts of private funds were invested in housing. These investments were in no way connected with the Federal urban renewal program.

From 1945 to 1960, private mortgage debt outstanding increased by almost $170 billion. Although approximately 40 percent of this total was insured by the Federal Government through the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, this does not mean that the Government was responsible for the increase in housing quality. The underlying demand for housing and the growing income of those who desired better housing were clearly the predominating factors. The effect of government insurance programs was probably to produce a slight increase in the amount of housing starts; but it should be kept in mind that if these government insurance programs had not existed, private insurance companies, such as the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation would have surely developed at a much faster rate than they did.

The amount of really bad housing—that classified as dilapidated by the Bureau of the Census—declined from 9.8 percent in 1950 to 5.2 percent in 1960. The 1960 overall vacancy rate was slightly over 9 percent. The number of dilapidated homes was actually smaller than the number of vacant homes. Vacancy rates were much higher for poor housing than for good housing. In 1960, 6.8 percent of the standard housing was vacant, whereas the vacancy rate was 20 percent for dilapidated housing. Then, as now, the fact seemed to be that there were a certain number of people who either could not or would not spend enough money to rent or to buy the available standard housing.

HOUSING FOR MINORITIES

It is sometimes charged that the free working of capitalism cannot produce gains for some groups of people, particularly the nonwhite population. Many are convinced that the only answer must lie in the direction of greater Government intervention and higher public subsidies.

In fact, the nonwhite population of the United States has enjoyed a very substantial increase in the quality of its housing. From 1950 to 1960 there was an overall net increase of 1,813,000 standard units and a decrease of 537,000 substandard units. Between 1950 and 1960 the percent of standard housing occupied by nonwhites doubled—going from 28 to 56 percent. Most of the bad housing is now located in the South, where only 38 percent is standard. In the Northeast, 77 percent is standard; in the North Central, 73 percent; in the West, 79 percent. In comparisons like this it should be remembered that the rents paid by whites are about 29 percent higher than those paid by nonwhites, and that the values of the homes owned by whites are over 82 percent higher.

The housing conditions of nonwhites have improved substantially, and although the quality of their housing does not yet equal that of the whites, it is rapidly approaching it, particularly in areas outside the South. Compared to the Federal urban renewal program, the private marketplace is making swift, substantial progress.

MARCHING METROPOLISES

The same type of improvement in housing quality that has taken place throughout the country has taken place in our cities. In 1960, fully 88.6 percent of the housing located in central cities of over 100,000 population was classified as standard. In these same 128 central cities, the dilapidated housing had declined to slightly over 3 percent of the total. In our 13 largest cities, taken as a group, 90.1 percent of all housing was standard in 1960; only 2.6 percent was dilapidated.

Housing quality in cities has been continually improving, and now, as in the past, housing in cities is substantially better than in the country taken as a whole. Today the bulk of the relatively small amount of bad housing that still exists lies outside of our cities, particularly in the rural areas. Only 18 percent of the substandard housing lies within cities having populations of more than 100,000. There appears to be a definite correlation between the degree of urbanization and the amount of good housing.

Since the war, construction activity has been booming all over the United States and its cities. From 1950 to 1960, approximately $52.6 billion of new building construction went up in cities with populations over 100,000. Only a little over 1 percent of this was urban renewal construction. If our cities are declining, as is often claimed, how does one account for the steady increase in building activity?

What about the worrisome claim that the middle-income group is disappearing from the city? The city of the future is prophesied by some as the city of the very rich and the very poor. The facts indicate that this has not happened and probably will not happen. If we define "middle income" as $4,000 to $10,000 a year, we find that almost 57 percent of all people living in large cities fall within this range. In fact, the income distribution in large cities is roughly the same as that for the country as a whole. Today's city is not the city of the very rich and the very poor; it is predominantly the city of the middle-income group.

By any objective measure, the indications are clear that our cities—in overall terms—are continually improving and that today they are better than they ever were before.

Validity of data: The foregoing facts were taken from the data on housing quality collected every 10 years by the Bureau of the Census. These Census data were the result of observations made by 150,000 enumerators, all of whom were given careful instructions on how to classify housing.

The three categories used in 1960 were "sound," "deteriorating," and "dilapidated." Categories or definitions of categories vary slightly from decade to decade, but adjustments were made to make the data comparable in time, and the effect of the slightly changed definitions was negligible. Generally speaking, "sound" housing has no defects or has slight defects that would normally be corrected during regular maintenance (lack of paint, for example). "Deteriorating" housing needs more repair than that required by normal maintenance (a shaky porch or broken plaster, for example). "Dilapidated" housing does not provide safe and adequate shelter.

Although the Bureau of the Census data can be criticized, they are by far the best available today—most accurate, broadest in scope, and most consistent over time. I emphasize this because a considerable number of self-styled experts consider their lone opinions superior to those of 150,000 trained enumerators. They would justify their conclusion that the city or housing is deteriorating solely on the basis of their visual impressions. This is not a valid way to measure changes in housing quality. The amateur's experience is very limited, his standards cannot be identified, and there is no way of knowing whether his standards change from year to year.

The next time you hear that the city is deteriorating ask: "In what way? By whose standard?"

CONCLUSION

Since 1949 two different methods have been used to grapple with the "problems" of housing and cities. One of these is basically the system of free enterprise, guided by the com-

[8] "Framework for an Urban Society," "Goals for Americans—The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals" (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 229.

plex interplay of the marketplace. The other force is the Federal urban renewal program guided by overall plans prepared by city planning experts and backed up with the taxpayers' money and the police power of the Government.

The facts tell us that private enterprise has made enormous gains, while the Federal program has not. Contrast, for example, the fantastic increase of 18 million homes in areas outside urban renewal projects with the net decrease of homes within urban renewal projects. Consider also the decrease in low-rent housing and the increase in high-rent housing in the urban renewal areas; urban renewal actually subsidizes high-income groups and hurts low-income groups. Add to this the destruction of businesses and the forcible displacement of people from their homes. The program endangers the right of private property—commercial and residential—in its equating of public interest with public use.

The overall results of the Government program when compared to the results of private forces are negligible. Its overall costs when compared with its results are high. On balance the Federal urban renewal program has accomplished little of benefit in the past and it appears doubtful that it will do better in the future.

However, there are times when participating in a Federal urban renewal project—as a contractor, a banker, or a businessman—may be attractive if only shortrun gains or profits are considered. Participation may make it possible for a businessman to get that location he wants from an owner who has been unwilling to sell. It may renovate an adjacent area and thus increase the value of his property. It may eliminate buildings that are visually offensive to him and he may even make some money out of it.

But in supporting the program for these or other reasons, the businessman should be aware that he is supporting a Government program that, in the long run, is detrimental to his own interests. It uses the concept of eminent domain in such a way that private property—business as well as residential—can be taken and resold by the Government to other private persons for their own use simply because it is supposed to be in the public interest. It implies acceptance of the idea that private enterprise cannot work effectively in the field of housing and that Government must intervene, when, in fact, this is not true. It subsidizes some businesses and construction interests that are in direct competition with those of other private businessmen. During execution it lowers the tax base of the city—in some cases perhaps permanently—and thus increases the tax burden for the rest of the city.

And, finally, the businessman may be hurt directly when the local renewal authorities decide that the area in which he is located is blighted. The irony of Washington's urban renewal program is that without the enthusiastic collaboration of many businessmen it would come to a grinding halt.

In my judgment, the program should be repealed now. This could be accomplished simply by not authorizing any new projects. All projects currently under contract could be carried through to completion if the individual cities desired to do so.

As the Greek Philosopher Aristotle stated more than 2,200 years ago: "Even when laws have been written down, they ought not always remain unaltered."

What would be the results of such clear-cut, positive action? Would slums proliferate? Would housing get worse? Would cities die? Clearly, no. The record of what has been achieved outside of the Federal urban renewal program by private forces is concrete evidence of what can be done by an essentially free enterprise economic system. If this is what can be accomplished by free enterprise, the rational course of action is to encourage it to function, not to attack it or to sabotage it.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LOTTERY NEEDED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, during each of my prior six terms in Congress, I have introduced legislation to establish a national lottery. Despite the fact that each of our NATO allies sponsors a national lottery, the Congress has not even held hearings on my bills. Few of my colleagues have the public courage of their private convictions.

I am hopeful that the success of the New Hampshire lottery will prod some of our reluctant legislators into action. America badly needs a national lottery. It shocks me that so internationally plausible a revenue-raising device has been ignored by the United States. The Federal Government, always on the alert for new revenue sources, has, with typical ineptness, missed the obvious one right under its nose.

Not only will the national lottery raise badly needed revenue—which I estimate at $10 billion—but it would strike at the heart of organized crime by knocking out crime's financial bulwark. The reasons for a national lottery are many—each complementing the other. To me, they are convincing. I strongly urge the Congress to adopt this much-needed measure now.

NEED FOR REFORMS IN THE METHOD BY WHICH WE ELECT OUR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message President Johnson made reference to the need for reforms in the method by which we elect our President and Vice President. He said, specifically:

> I will propose reforms in the electoral college leaving undisturbed the vote by States—but making sure no elector can substitute his will for that of the people.

Responsible press statements have indicated that what the President has in mind is a plan for automatically awarding a State's electoral votes to the candidate who wins a majority of the popular vote in the State. The plan would abolish either the function or the whole existence of the electoral college. It would serve to make impossible the election of unpledged electors and also would prevent an elector pledged to one candidate from switching his vote to another candidate.

In my opinion this plan is a good one. It serves to preserve the integrity of our election system, and should be supported.

However, I believe we need to go beyond that and work for a solution of the electoral college problem which is considerably deeper than the matter of unpledged electors.

The problem has been obvious for some years. And every so often proposals are made and we see some newspaper editorials citing the need for a solution. But we have made no real progress, and progress is overdue. Further delay makes a mockery of our democratic process.

Today I am reintroducing my proposal for a change in our electoral college system. The plan is essentially the same as I put forth in 1961 and in 1963. I urge its consideration at an early date.

We talk about "one man one vote" at the State legislative level, and properly so. Each citizen ought to be able to know that his vote carries the same weight as every other citizen's vote. The Supreme Court has affirmed this principle.

But the fact is that we do not have this system prevailing at the presidential election level. One vote in Minnesota, for example, does not carry the same weight in electing a President as one vote in New York City or in Los Angeles.

What we have in each State is the "winner take all" system. The winning presidential candidate in each State takes all of the State's electoral votes. And the President is actually elected, as we know, by the electoral votes, and not by popular votes at all.

If a presidential candidate carries the State of New York by 500 votes he wins all of New York's 45 electoral votes. But he could carry Alaska by 8,000 votes, and he gets only 3 electoral votes allotted to Alaska.

The 5 largest States have a total of 185 electoral votes, and this gives much greater weight to these big States and to the huge cities within those States as opposed to the other 45 middle-sized and smaller States in the Nation.

Actually, in 14 different presidential elections the man elected President had won only a minority of the popular vote. The Constitution does not make any provision for the "winner take all" electoral system. It simply evolved in practice, and there is no good reason why it should not and could not be changed.

Several specific changes have been proposed. Some feel that we should rely simply on the popular vote alone, and abolish the electoral college altogether.

I prefer a compromise between that plan and our present system. I propose that we retain the electoral college itself with a total of 538 electoral votes. But the system of allocating electoral votes should be improved. Under my plan two electoral votes in each State would be cast for the presidential candidate winning the popular vote in that State. This provision would be in accord with our Federal system which gives each State two Senators in Congress regardless of the State's size.

But then, with 100 of the 538 electoral votes accounted for, plus the 3 from the District of Columbia, the remainder of the electoral votes—435—would be divided according to the ratio of the popular vote in the country as a whole.

This would insure integrity of our system. It would refine our democratic process in a way which is long overdue.

LIMITING THE TENURE OF OUR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have once again introduced a proposal, in the form of a constitutional amendment, to limit the tenure of U.S. Senators and Representatives. In operation, this proposal would limit a Member of Congress to 12 consecutive years of service; two Senate terms or six House terms, and then require that he take a 2-year sabbatical leave before he would once again be eligible to serve in our National Legislature.

This proposal, which I have offered in earlier Congresses, has often appeared in lists of "legislation least likely to succeed." And, to that conclusion I must sadly agree. Sadly, I say, because I believe that there is a kernel of real hope in this proposal, hope to improve the operation of our Congress and to help its Members do a better job in framing the policies for our country. Yet, despite the possible help which this amendment might provide, it receives no serious consideration from the Congress and little more from outside these two Chambers.

The kernel of hope which I see is this proposal is in two areas. First, it would help to overcome the detrimental aspects of the seniority system. I see many valid bases for recognizing the length of service in this body and in its committees as one of the factors of leadership. I have defended the system as the best compromise we can achieve under our present rules of operation when shallow criticism calls for scrapping it without offering any valid alternative. The proposal which I have offered would allow a continued use of the seniority system but the chain of seniority would be broken from time to time and greater flexibility would be permitted in congressional leadership.

The second aspect of this hope deals with the work of the individual Congressman. As the name implies, it is the function of Representatives, and no less of Senators, to represent the people from whom they have been sent to Washington. Representation, in this context, has two facets; to represent, the Congressman must use his best abilities in studying and understanding the legislation which is brought before him, and further he must strive to understand the community of which he is a part and which he is called upon to represent. This does not mean that he is to be a personified public opinion poll. There is more to representation, as the former part of my definition indicates, than being a mirror to the unstudied reactions of one's constituency.

This sabbatical leave would give the chance to the Congressman to get reacquainted with his constituents and their feelings. It would put his feet back on the ground and would put him back into the mainstream of his community. Certainly the experience of recent Congresses, running for 9 and 10 months each year, indicates that there is to be precious little time for such a process of reaquaintance in the normal congressional year. I sincerely believe the Congress would be stronger for having its Members better attuned to the crosscurrents of the districts which they represent.

There is one further facet of this problem of lack of "representation" that should be considered here. During the past few sessions of Congress adjournment did not come until late in the year, long after the date set by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Theoretically, if a Congressman stayed in the Washington area attending the meetings of Congress, this would mean that he would never have much time to return to his district. This could then mean that many of the Representatives and Senators would never see their districts between the time elected and nearly the next time that they had to run. This is not to my mind being "a Representative from," or "a Senator from." Practically, however, a solution has been worked out—the Tuesday-Thursday club—when the work of the Congress really begins on Tuesday and terminates on Thursday, thereby allowing a 4-day recess each week. As a remedy to this weakness, it was last week—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1965, page 423—that I proposed that the Congress conform to the "work a full week" idea, and adjourn at the proper time.

To my mind, if the Congress worked a full week for a full session, adjourned at the proper time, then a sabbatical such as I am proposing today would be welcomed by the Members.

Perhaps once again it can be said that these proposals are among the least likely to succeed. I hope, however, that they will be given serious consideration by those interested in improving the institution, and making the Congress more representative in these modern times.

A copy of an article that I wrote for the American Legion magazine, January 1964, a reply of Congressman HALE BOGGS, and the text of the bill appear, as follows:

SHOULD CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE BE LIMITED TO 12 CONSECUTIVE YEARS?

YES

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, Second District)

The quality of the work of the Congress and, as a result, the functioning of our Federal Government would be improved by requiring Congressmen to take 2 years off after 12 consecutive years of service before they could once again run for a seat in the Congress.

This idea is not as novel as it might at first seem. The sabbatical, or seventh year leave, is common in our institutions of higher learning. It permits professors a chance to recharge their batteries.

And it is catching hold in other fields. Corporations are using it as a way to refresh their executives, and community charities are putting the idea into use with their boards of directors.

The way limited tenure is employed by charities and business gives a good example of the advantages it offers. It attracts top caliber people to serve by letting them know their tenure is limited; they are not trapped, there is a graceful way for them to step down after giving a certain number of years of service. It requires rotation so that "deadwood" directors can be eased out tactfully, without bruised feelings, when their terms are up. And, in those cases in which the individual maintains a high interest in serving with this charity or organization and it wants him back, he can be named to a new series of terms once the period of required leave has run.

It would work much the same way in the Congress. A Senator or Representative could serve 12 consecutive years—two consecutive terms in the Senate or six consecutive terms in the House if the people elected him each time. He would then have to sit out 2 years before he would once again be eligible for election. But, in addition to the advantages noted above, there are further benefits to be gained from applying his system to the Congress.

First, it would give the individual Member of Congress a chance to get out gracefully. If he wished to continue a political career, it would give him an opportunity to get acquainted with his constituents, and to get his feet back on the ground. In these days of nearly year-round sessions of Congress it is difficult for a Member of Congress to keep in close touch with his people and represent them well. It would also give him the chance to reflect on national issues away from the day-to-day pressures of lawmaking.

Second, it would break the chain of seniority which now concentrates power in the hands of Congressmen from safe districts whose reelection is guaranteed. Posts of leadership, such as committee chairmanships, would be rotated and would gravitate more to ability than political long-livedness.

Finally, the man who really wishes to continue in public service, and whose constituents wish to be represented by him, will be able to return refreshed and give another 12 years service in the Congress.

NO

(By Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, Second District)

No. Congressional service should not be limited to 12 consecutive years for a number of reasons:

1. Governing the most powerful and the most prosperous nation on earth—a nation of 190 million people—and the leader of the free world—is perhaps the most difficult task being undertaken by any group of men in the world today.

As a result, the complex problems confronting the Members of Congress are hard to grasp. The intricacies of international affairs, the problems of the nuclear age, the conservation of our natural resources, the complexities of urban congestion—these are but a few of the complicated fields in which the Congress must make decisions on which the future of the United States depends. Wisdom comes in large measure from experience; of experience, of wisdom, we never have enough.

To deprive the Nation of the service of our wisest, most competent, and most knowledgeable lawmakers at the end of 12 years serv-

ice seems very detrimental to our national welfare.

2. No business, industry, college or other institution in our country would adopt a personnel policy which said, "after each employee has been here 12 years—just long enough to have achieved thoroughly familiarity with his work—he must be discharged for 2 years before being given an opportunity to return, and then only in a junior capacity once again." Yet this is exactly what this proposal would mean for the U.S. Congress.

The late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn often said that if the people of a congressional district were wise, they would carefully pick a good man as their Congressman, and then elect and reelect him term after term, because the longer a good man serves, the better service he can render to his people and country.

3. Our Government never has all the good men and women it needs. We need more and more talented people who are willing to dedicate their lives to public service.

I am afraid that this proposal would discourage people from considering public service in the Congress as a career. If a man knows that he will not be allowed to remain in Congress more than 12 consecutive years, he probably would be reluctant to give up his livelihood to go to Congress in the first place.

4. This idea of limiting public service is not a new one. In the early days of our Nation, our forefathers tried it. Under the Articles of Confederation, delegates to the Continental Congress could not serve for more than any 3 out of 6 consecutive years. This deprived the Congress of the able services of such delegates as James Madison and others, thus impairing seriously the work of the Congress.

When the Founding Fathers drafted our present Constitution, some delegates proposed to make Members of Congress ineligible for reelection. Remembering the unhappy experience of the Continental Congress, the Founding Fathers rejected this idea without debate or dissent.

I think that we should continue to respect the wisdom of their decision.

H. RES. 95

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-eighth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-ninth Congress, with the following amendments therein as a part thereof, to wit:

In rule XI, strike out clause 23 and insert:

"23. The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Committee on Rules seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report, or fail to report within twenty-one calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it is in order to call up motions to discharge committees, it shall be in order for the chairman or any member of the committee which reported such a bill or joint resolution who has been so authorized by said committee to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of."

In rule XX, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point: *Provided, however,* That a motion to disagree with the amendments of the Senate to a House bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, or a motion to insist on the House amendments to a Senate bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, shall always be in order if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill or resolution."

In rule XXI, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: 'Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?', and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, and the question shall then be put upon its passage."

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest contributions that our country can make in the field of foreign aid is to help underdeveloped countries emulate the success that this country has had in certain areas, and then urge them to understand and then to adapt them to their own way of life. With this thought in mind, I have reintroduced a proposal which I have made in conjunction with a number of my colleagues in the Senate and House over the past several years—an International Home Loan Bank.

This proposal, which is favored by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the U.S. Savings and Loan League—though the Agency for International Development has expressed some reservations—has as its purpose the development of a savings and loan system to promote thrift, encourage homeownership, and aid in the rise of the middle class of people in the underdeveloped countries. The mechanism of this bill, by which these goals would be accomplished, would be an International Home Loan Bank through which financial backing could be given to the developing savings and loan industry abroad.

This bill would utilize the lesson that we learned in our own savings and loan experience. It would provide for an agency to charter, examine, and supervise the local thrift and home financing institutions, corresponding to the functions now performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for Federal institutions and the State authorities for State-chartered organizations. It would provide these new associations with a facility much like the Federal home loan banks to provide funds to local institutions so they could meet the needs for seasonal and emergency funds. It would establish a facility much like the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure funds placed in these associations, and lastly it would provide a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

Clearly these functions as set forth above would encourage homeownership in the underdeveloped countries. This development would be meaningful even considered apart from any Communist threat that is being experienced in many such countries today. It is a real step forward in the structure of the society of the nation establishing these institutions. It meets problems which exist independent of the cold war, and it envisions the involvement of the people of the recipient nation—indeed their involvement as a primary force in this matter—in the effort to overcome these problems.

I note that the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on this matter during the last Congress, on August 22, 23, and September 12, 1963, on H.R. 8143, a bill very similar to the one that I am proposing today. I trust that some legislation on this matter will be forthcoming in this session.

As illustrative of the statements that I have made above, I wish to include at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times on October 21, 1962, which points up the importance of the problem:

SPURS ARE SOUGHT IN LATIN HOUSING

(By Philip Shabecoff)

In much of Latin America, a penny saved is a rare coin—and therein lies one of the chief reasons for Latin America's acute shortage of housing.

"There are 18 million Latin American families now living in urban slums who can afford some kind of decent housing," Rodman C. Rockefeller said recently.

The problem, he explained, is that in most areas of Latin America, a lack of individual savings means that mortgages simply are not available for middle and lower class housing.

Mr. Rockefeller, eldest son of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, is vice president in charge of housing for the International Basic Economy Corp. (IBEC). The company, a financing development and investment concern controlled by Rockefeller interests, soon will build its 10,000th home in Puerto Rico and South America.

Although most Latin American governments have set up housing programs, often with grants from U.S. agencies such as the Agency for International Development, millions of people continue to live in tin shacks and apartment house slums. The answer to this blight, Mr. Rockefeller believes, lies in private rather than government housing.

Some 50 percent of South America's urban population earns enough money to amortize mortgages, he asserted. But mortgages generally are available only for luxury housing, and on exorbitant terms.

FEW INDIVIDUALS SAVE

The reason for this, Mr. Rockefeller explained, is that there is little individual saving in Latin America. Inflation and low income levels discourage savings in most of the countries there, and virtually no savings institutions exist in an effective form. And lack of individual savings means a dearth of capital for mortgages.

What is needed in Latin America, Mr. Rockefeller said, is a system of insured savings and loan associations similar to that in this country. But except for recently organized projects in Chile and Peru, these institutions are rare in Latin America.

Help may be on the way, however, as a result of a bill introduced in the Senate on October 2 by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida.

The legislation, which was designed to help Latin Americans save their own money for private housing, was a casualty of the recent congressional scramble for adjournment and never got out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, Senator SMATHERS plans to reintroduce it when the Senate next convenes.

The bill, an amendment to previously proposed legislation to alter the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the Home Owners Land Act, called for the establishment of an "International Home Loan Bank."

FOREIGN INVESTMENT PERMITTED

Through this bank U.S. savings and loan companies will have the privilege of investing up to 1 percent of their assets in similar institutions in Latin America and elsewhere overseas, laying the groundwork for the establishment of savings and loan systems in those areas.

The bill, which also was sponsored by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, is reported to have a good chance of passing in the next session of Congress.

The U.S. savings and loan organizations which might invest in counterpart institutions in South America are regarding the Chilean experiment with keen interest. A little more than a year ago, at the advice of American economic experts, 18 associations were started there under the supervision of a central bank, with American capital serving as seed money.

The associations pay 6 percent interest on savings and charge 10 percent on mortgages, Mr. Rockefeller said. They also operate under an unusual inflation-protection mechanism which adjusts interest and principal on both savings and mortgages on the basis of an index of wages and prices.

By the end of the first year, 23,000 people were participating in the program, and 1,780 mortgages had been approved or were in the process of approval.

DEMAND EXCEEDS BUILDING

Because of the associations, many new houses are being built in Chile. However, there is evidence that the mortgage system has grown faster than the construction business. Demand for houses is far exceeding actual production, Mr. Rockefeller said.

In most cases, he explained, builders are short of sufficient working capital. It is also difficult to convince them that the new system is here to stay and that their profits for building homes will not be wiped out by inflation.

This is where IBEC steps in. The company has built most of its houses in Puerto Rico, but it believes the establishment of savings and loan companies will provide opportunity in South America.

IBEC already has under construction 750 houses in Santiago, Chile, and plans to build more. Most of the houses are three-bedroom dwellings that sell for $7,000 to $8,000. The company also is building in Peru, where two associations have been established, one by a Roman Catholic priest.

One of IBEC's basic functions, Mr. Rockefeller said, is to demonstrate that U.S. industrial methods and techniques are applicable abroad.

"It is not an original idea, but we try to concentrate on businesses, such as housing, that directly affect people. We also make a profit by doing so," he said.

One of these techniques is the IBEC method of home construction. This makes use of a house-sized steel form to mold reinforced concrete on a previously prepared floor slab. Once a site is prepared, the company can produce six houses a day on that site.

PRECAST PANELS HELPFUL

IBEC also uses precast concrete wall panel and roof systems in its housing projects.

Recently, however, IBEC has recognized that its methods are not always applicable in South America. Often, the absence of materials and large-scale demand makes the mass construction method too expensive. Construction also is slowed by government inspection methods and equipment breakdowns. The company, therefore, is beginning to turn to local manual labor as the cheapest method of building in some areas.

As soon as the new bill is passed, Mr. Rockefeller predicted, at least five U.S. savings and loan companies will invest in South American countries. IBEC will be prepared to construct about 2,500 housing units a year to meet the expected demand for homes.

Mr. Rockefeller believes that the middle class housing shortage in Latin America must be alleviated for the security of this country as well as for the needs of the Latin Americans.

"The middle class in Latin America, which certainly has the ability to revolt, has been denied the normal material rewards that the middle class expects in the United States," he said. "While the Latin middle class is loyal to the Western concept of government, this denial puts a tremendous strain on its loyalty."

COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT UNIONS AND UNRECOGNIZED GROUPS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able definitions of that category of economic entities known as small business is the expression that a small business is one that does not have a Washington representative. Implicit in this definition is the importance to any group in our country, with the ever-increasing role being played by the Federal Government, of having a voice in Washington, a way in which its views on the matters affecting it can be drawn to the attention of America's policymakers.

There are various channels through which these interest groups can make their feelings known. A common way is through the employment of lobbyists and Washington attorneys knowledgeable in the ways of the Congress and the regulatory agencies. The agencies and departments themselves often act to give a forum to representatives of interest groups in the consideration of matters within their special province.

Similarly, the work of congressional committees in areas of their jurisdiction help to give a voice to the needs and opinions of the groups whose interests are touched by the legislation the committee studies. The Select Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate are excellent examples of this, and go along well with the definition of small business which I noted earlier.

I have today reintroduced a proposal to create in the House of Representatives a Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups. The purpose of this proposal is to offer to these organizations a chance to have their interests weighed in with those of the other segments of our society. Just as small business before the advent of the House and Senate select committees, these groups have no representative in Washington assuring that their voices are heard, nor is there any congressional or executive body specifically attuned to meeting their problems.

In many ways these groups can be found parallel to small business. They are generally small, struggling in a competitive world to find a place and often provide an organizational context for a new idea. The idea may be good, perhaps even great, yet without a fair chance of survival in a competitive world, it might be lost. One element of survival in the United States is assuring that full consideration be given the interests of the group involved. With the many voices clamoring to be heard in the process of making public policy, it is too easy to overlook one which does not have an adequate sounding board on the Washington scene. This committee, which I suggest, would offer the type of sounding board which would permit the interests of these groups to be given the recognition they deserve.

An example of this is found in the labor field. Concern is properly given the AFL–CIO as the largest representative of organized labor in our country. Similarly the large independent unions, an example being the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, gain recognition. Yet, some 2.7 million workers are joined in small, independent unions whose voices are seldom heard in deliberations of the Congress or policies of the executive departments and agencies. Beyond this number are many other workers, not organized into unions as such but represented to some extent by a formal grouping. It is to give a forum to these groups that I offer the proposal for the Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups.

As I mentioned before, I introduced this legislation in the last Congress. I also had the occasion to comment further on the situation in some remarks on the floor of the House under the title "The Case for the Independent Unions" which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 4, page 4329. Under unanimous consent, I include

those remarks in the RECORD at this point:

THE CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have shown a proper concern in our society for the problem of small business, recognizing that small business is the lifeblood of our economic endeavor and that big business which is also beneficial, started as small business. However for some reason or other we have not shown a similar concern for the counterpart of small business, the small or independent unions.

The AFL–CIO represents approximately 15 million workers out of our work force of around 70 million. Probably 30 million workers are members of unaffiliated independent unions. The voice and point of view of the independent unions is little heard in the councils of the great Government far away in Washington. Indeed, the Department of Labor is oversolicitous of big labor whose voice is heard in all its corridors. There are many areas where big labor is the opponent of independent unions, just as big business in some areas is in opposition to small business. It is important that the voice of independent labor be heard, particularly when it expresses a point of view contrary to that of big labor.

Part of the difficulty is that the story of the independent union labor movement has not been told widely enough. I was particularly happy, therefore, to see in the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1963, an article entitled "The Case for the Independent Unions" which tells part of the story, and refers to a recent book written by Prof. John J. Collins telling the story. I am placing this material in the RECORD because this story needs to be broadcast throughout our land and certainly needs to be known in the Congress.

I also wish to again call to my colleagues attention House Resolution 137 which I reintroduced in this Congress to create a House Committee on Independent Unions and unrecognized labor groups to particularly look after and give a forum to the problems of independent unions and nonunion workers. The remarks I made at the time of introducing this legislation appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 527.

"CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

"(By Walter Hamshar)

"Since 1945 the Nation's maritime industry has been wracked by 38 major seamen's strikes. During the same 19-year period, a sizable group of American-flag tankers has never been held up by a work stoppage because their licensed officers and unlicensed crewmen are members of independent unions.

"John J. Collins, a professor of history at Fordham University, who has been the adviser to those unions since 1938, tells the story of independent unions in 'Never Off Pay,' a book published last week by the Fordham University Press.

"The title of the book is the keynote of Mr. Collins' many arguments in favor of independent unions in an industry which only lately has won for itself the title of 'Strike-Strangled Merchant Marine.'

"Independent unions, meaning organizations which are not industrywide affiliates of the AFL–CIO are in a better position to bargain for their members, Mr. Collins argues.

" 'Each [union] has the right to, and does, negotiate agreements which to them seem most suitable to their type of operation,' he said. 'This control at the local level and the ability to tailormake an agreement is one of the reasons why an independent union confined to the employees of one company or one plant is so often preferred by those employees to the large affiliated union.'

"Officers of small independent unions are more receptive to ideas from their members and usually, through their own experience, are familiar with the peculiar problems of the membership. This is not true of large unions, Mr. Collins contends, where the leadership is too frequently influenced by political motives rather than the needs of members. Thus, in independent unions there are no propaganda buildups by power-hungry officers; no strikes called to strengthen the leaders' political power; no theatrics of marathon bargaining, and no feuds which result in costly work stoppages without gains to the members.

" 'In their use of commonsense, the independent tanker associations have never sought to push for an economic gain which, if achieved, would have become a pyrrhic victory,' he stated. 'Perhaps it is this quality of commonsense that can be exercised so widely in a nonpolitical atmosphere that has enabled these associations to have had such unique success.'

"While Mr. Collins attributes the success of the independence among crewmen to commonsense collective bargaining which has produced high pay and working conditions without work stoppages, he does not highlight two other factors which have also contributed to the independent union's prosperity.

"First, there was the willingness of the big oil companies to negotiate agreements which gave the independent unions better contracts than those of the large affiliated organizations. Mr. Collins relates that these agreements were negotiated. But the generosity of the companies is implied, not described.

"The second factor is that the big unions have created the climate under which the independents exist. The reader cannot help but get the impression that cordial relations between companies and independent unions are actually the result of the existence of larger affiliated labor organizations poised to organize dissatisfied tanker crewmen. It is to the advantage of the companies to encourage independents, Mr. Collins said. As long as the powerful, big unions stand in the offing, they will continue to prefer the independents.

"But there never were grounds for the charges so frequently made by the big unions that the independents were company organizations. These charges have been thoroughly investigated on several occasions by the National Labor Relations Board and found to be without foundation.

"The independent unions cover officers and unlicensed seamen in the fleets of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the Socony Vacuum Fleet Co., Tidewater, and the officers of Texaco and Cities Service.

"These companies, as well as their crewmen, have benefited from the contracts with independent unions. The advantages go beyond the avoidance of the periodic strikes which have plagued relations between maritime management and unions.

"One important benefit enjoyed by the oil companies is that they are not required to hire their ship personnel through union hiring halls. This requirement by the big unions has given them a powerful weapon in securing the loyalty and obedience of their members.

"A second benefit is that the welfare and pension plans of the independents are confined to company personnel. This has encouraged continuity of service within the companies. It also has encouraged a company loyalty rather than a loyalty to unions contrasted to the psychological impact on the seaman in large unions who get their welfare or pension payments from the NMU or SIU plans.

"Mr. Collins' book shows that these two factors, never opposed by the independents, have done much to promote cordial relations between management and labor. So cordial have these relations been that the National Maritime Union, the Seafarers International Union, or any of the large ship officers unions have been unable to make any headway in organizing within the membership of the independents."

IMPROVING THE BOND MARKET FOR MUNICIPALS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a recognition of the importance of bond financing for State and local governmental bodies, our present Internal Revenue Code provides that interest on these obligations shall be free from Federal income taxation. This exemption from taxation is effective in making State and local government obligations attractive to investors and permits their sale at lower interest than would be possible otherwise.

The role of bond financing is not difficult to trace. School bond issues, sewer bond issues, and hundreds of others are commonplace in financial circles. The need for adequate debt financing capital to our State and local governmental bodies cannot be overemphasized, and the availability of this capital at advantageous interest rates, made possible by the tax-exempt nature of their interest, depends upon a ready market for these bonds.

I have today reintroduced a bill which would help expand and improve the market for municipals. While individual bondholders may receive the interest from municipals tax free, when this interest is channeled to them through a corporate investing mechanism the investors fail to get the full benefit of tax exemption. The interest comes to the investment corporation tax free, just as it does to individuals, but there is no carry-through provision. Thus, the entire income of the corporation, from tax-free and taxable sources, is merged and divided and the entire amount received by each shareholder in the investment corporation is fully taxed. What my bill suggests is that there be allowed exclusion on the part of the individual taxpayer of his pro rata share of the tax-exempt interest received by the corporation thereby giving the taxpayer the direct benefit of the tax-exempt status of these securities.

By making municipal bonds more attractive to investment corporations, which control a very large amount of capital, a better market will be created for these securities and the problem of financing State and local government will be eased.

Today I am reintroducing the bill which was H.R. 3062 in the last Congress.

OUR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one better able to give us a prognostication of what our transportation system will be like in the year 2000 than Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co.

Mr. Forgash outlined his ideas in a speech before the Second Annual European Regional Conference of the National Defense Transportation Association at the Hotel Intercontinental in Frankfurt, Germany, on October 30, 1964.

His very interesting and provocative predictions follow:

TRANSPORTATION—YEAR 2000

(By Morris Forgash, president, United States Freight Co.)

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and to participate in your interesting and challenging program. To all those responsible for the staging of this Second Annual European Regional Conference of NDTA, I extend congratulations upon an excellent idea splendidly executed.

No oracle, prophet, or seer was ever called upon to deal with a more elusive or demanding subject than the one assigned to me. I have no occult powers but I speak with utmost assurance. for if time proves me wrong I will very likely be out of the jurisdiction when the verdict is brought in.

Transportation in the year 2000. Why should any of us have any concern today about mobility in a world that by the year 2000 may be only a tiny way-station in a universe of worlds—or, by accident or design, a cloud of dust in the galaxy of limitless space? Because we have faith. Faith that we can shape the course of future events and write on the scrolls of time the terms of our own legacy for ourselves and our posterity.

Essayist William Hazlitt said man is the only animal that laughs and weeps for he is the only animal that is struck by the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. This awareness of imperfection is responsible for the fact that man is the only animal that has acquired the ability to modify his own environment. And in straining at the leash of his environment man has achieved a measure of his manifest and only laudable destiny—civilization.

Kipling wrote that transportation is civilization. He was not quite right. Transportation certainly has paced civilization from the time when man first came to inhabit the earth. But transportation is an instrumentality which produces nothing in itself. Transportation is the mobility of human resources but humanity charts its own course. Transportation can carry us over any horizon but what we find there we bring in our own hearts.

How will we go in the year 2000? By what media, responsive to what energy, with what degree of dispatch will people and the people's resources then be moved from one place to another? The intelligence accumulated through all the milleniums of recorded and derivative history sheds only a flickering light on the mists that shroud the path of transport during the next 35 years. But we must nevertheless scan the pages of history if we expect to sit in the jury box of time.

Where will we go in the year 2000? Over what horizons, to what destinations will the restless race of man then be traveling to make another rendezvous with destiny?

If we are to find any answers to the questions I have posed, we must realize that the caliper of history is our only tool of measurement and our only certainty is that there will be change. The fact of change is immutable. It is only the acceleration or rate of change with which we must be concerned as we try to illuminate the road to the future with the torchlight of the past.

THE DAWN OF TRANSPORTATION

Why should it be difficult to anticipate developments that may reasonably be expected to transpire in transportation in the next 35 years? Can we not make a simple projection based on the rate of progress in the past? The calendar measures time as the earth turns and 35 years is an imperceptible speck in the spectrum of history. The beginnings of civilization can be traced back at least a million years, and in that perspective we are dealing with a period of time that would transpire many times over during the next tick of the clock.

The problem is not so simple. Progress is not measured by the calendar but by human accomplishment. And if it be taken that man has lived on earth for a million years it follows that for the first 990,000 years his progress in transportation was absolutely nil. During all of that time he walked on the legs he was born with and what he transported he carried in his arms. For it was only about 10,000 years ago, give or take a few hundred, that man first conceived the idea of employing animals as a media of transport. This oldest form of transportation has survived to this day—the ox, the camel, the elephant, the reindeer, the dog, and the horse are still important carriers.

A historic breakthrough in transportation occurred when man discovered the secret of propulsion by animal, giving us the standard of measurement called horsepower. During the next 3,000 or 4,000 years such marvelous inventions as the sled, the raft, the dugout, and the canoe made their appearance and added immeasurably to the mobility of humanity. Then came the sail—first instrument of transport to harness the forces of nature to man's bidding. Wonders were unceasing.

The wheel—there is an invention to remember! It still is a nominee for the greatest discovery of the human race. The wheel evolved only about 5,000 or 6,000 years ago. It will stand forever for the first revolution in transportation. But giddy as the pace of progress in transportation had become, wheel and sail were destined to continue to be powered by wind and muscle for another 5,000 years or more. This does not detract from the significance of those fabulous instrumentalities. They made it possible for man to explore, to colonize, and in a degree to civilize the globe on which he lived. Of course they also made it possible for him to annihilate people, to destroy civilizations, and to topple the world into dark ages. But in the slow and painful process of recovery from the consequences of his own folly man added to the sum of human intelligence, and as he marched forward the chapters of transportation history covered less time and embraced ever greater accomplishment.

TRANSPORTATION FINDS MECHANICAL POWER

The 35 years that lie immediately ahead cannot reasonably be focused against the million years of man's sojourn on earth, or against the 10,000 years since the discovery of horsepower, or even against the 5,000 years since the advent of the wheel and sail. Change has compounded the rate of change with such astonishing rapidity that such comparisons are no longer valid. Actually, all we are talking about is simply what remains of two centuries of transportation progress.

For it was not until after the beginning of the last century, less than 165 years ago, that the era of transportation in the accepted sense began. The age of mechanical power—the goal toward which man had been struggling since he was first invested with the power of rational thought—had its birth in the last century. When steampower was first successfully employed as a propellant of the instrumentalities of transport man crashed through a barrier which had defied the ages and eluded countless generations of highly intelligent and ingenious men.

The year 2000 seems a more distant target of speculation when it is realized that in point of time 35 years is 20 percent of the entire era of transportation. It seems more distant still when it is appreciated that as time has marched on progress in transportation has compressed centuries into decades, decades into years, and years into days, so that what we and those who come after us may expect to witness in 35 years may make everything that has been developed heretofore as rudimentary as the canoe.

How has transportation gone since the paddle wheels of "Fulton's Folly" churned dreams into realities 157 years ago? Well, steamship and iron horse served the 19th century very well, but during all that time dreamers who knew that this was not the outer periphery of man's environment were at work on other things. Self-propelled land vehicles were sputtering about on the streets and roads causing amusement and some consternation before the end of the last century. When, a few years later, the internal combustion engine made these monsters of the road practical a new dimension in mobility was created.

But as the world spun into the present century man had not yet realized his oldest dream—he had not found his wings—he was still confined to the surface of the globe. Then at Kitty Hawk, in North Carolina, on December 17, 1903, when some of us in this room had already been born, the Wright Brothers inaugurated the age of flight.

What secrets of mobility then remained to be wrested from nature? With great efficiency and dispatch people and things could be transported anywhere on the surface of the earth or in the earth's atmosphere. For half a century the prevalent view was that transportation had crossed its last horizon and that the future was for improvement of existing media. Improvement there certainly was.

The diesel engine vastly increased the economy and efficiency of railroading. World War I speeded the inauguration of the trucks as a carrier of freight. Improved roads and better automobiles put the world on rubber tires. The 1940's ushered in the jet age in air transport. In 1954 the atom was harnessed to transportation with the launching of the *Nautilus*, first atomic-powered submarine. Nuclear-powered merchant shipping was inaugurated in 1959 when the SS *Savannah* was launched. Then the hydrofoil, a ship on stilts, made its appearance.

But 50 years of tinkering with the same media of transport was all that the modern mind could take. New frontiers were beckoning genius and enterprise. A sort of in-between machine—an air-cushion vehicle which rolls on a cushion of air over land, sea, swamp, sand, or snow made its appearance in the sixth decade of this century and soon may be cutting across all lines of existing transportation, revolutionizing all modes.

The air-cushion phenomenon did not, however, take us across an unknown border—it simply created a new dimension of transport. The latest barrier of mobility was crashed in 1957, with the orbiting of the space vehicle Sputnik I. Four years later, in 1961, the first earth man made the first trip to outer space and returned. He was not yet an explorer of the universe—he had only invaded the majesty of space. That is something which may be corrected very soon. On July 31, 1964, the spacecraft Ranger VII zeroed in for a crash landing on the moon,

sending back to earth more than 4,000 pictures of that inscrutable globe.

OF PROGRESS, DREAMS AND PERSEVERANCE

That, in brief compass, is a panoramic view of where we stand in transportation today. How and where do we go from here? We go however and wherever we have the vision and determination to go. For all the progress which we have made to this point in time has been the slow and tardy consequence of long-held dreams. Let history speak to that point for just a moment.

When the steam engine gave birth to the mechanical age in transport just over a century and a half ago it simply represented the practical application of a principle that had been known for hundreds of years. Hero of Alexandria, Greek scientist of the second century before Christ, developed a toy-like machine for deriving power from thermal energy. A man named Savery developed a steam engine for pumping water from mines in 1698. When James Watt patented his very practical steam engine in 1769 he was only improving on an engine developed by Thomas Newcomen in 1705. In 1707, a hundred years before Robert Fulton's *Clermont* made its maiden run, Denis Papin of France built and launched the steam-powered *Cassel* in Germany. Angry boatmen, fearing for their livelihood, destroyed Papin's boat and nearly killed its inventor. Where would we stand now if modern transportation had been inaugurated just 100 years earlier, as it would have been except for an accident of history?

The idea of human flight has fascinated all peoples throughout the ages. The famous legend of Daedalus and Icarus, related by Ovid, is only one of a multitude of tales of human flight that date back more than 6,000 years. Magic carpets, flying chariots, flying horses, characterized all mythologies. By the 13th century A.D., man had begun seriously to try to make his dreams of flight come true. Roger Bacon anticipated the balloon and suggested heavier-than-air craft propelled by flapping wings.

Leonardo da Vinci discovered the helicopter principle of vertical lift from rotating wings, and his model helicopters actually flew. About 1490 he designed a man-carrying flying machine, but his craft was never built because da Vinci undoubtedly realized that there was then no source of power capable of lifting it. Around the turn of the 19th century Sir George Cayley began investigations of flight which formed the basis of modern aerodynamics. One of his gliders carried a man a distance of 900 feet. It was 500 years after human flight was theoretically demonstrated to be possible before the Wright brothers made flight a reality.

Jet propulsion, which began to revolutionize air transport less than a quarter of a century ago, is founded on laws formulated by Sir Isaac Newton in the 17th century. But the theory was not then new. At least 100 years B.C. the Alexandrian philosopher, Hero, designed and demonstrated a jet engine. All those things which may transpire between now and the year 2000 might have happened long ago if man had mobilized the resources to capitalize on his own inventiveness several hundred years sooner than he did.

Rocket propulsion is even older than the jet. The Chinese are said to have employed the principle of the rocket several centuries B.C. Rockets were used in the War of 1812. The bazooka of World War II was only one of a number of types of rocket used in that conflict. Developed as implements of war, rockets now have become symbols of the conquest of outer space. Perhaps it is as well for mankind that the destructive potential of the rocket was not recognized sooner, but the inertia of the human mind is responsible for failure to have recognized its peaceful uses long ago.

Incidentally, Ranger VII was not the first projectile to land on the moon—at least in the imagination of man. Jules Verne's projectile carried three men to the moon in 1863. The journey required approximately 4 days, or 96 hours. Ranger VII made the trip in 68 hours and 35 minutes. Who is to fault Jules Verne for a miscalculation of 30 hours? After all, his ship got stuck for a while in the "weightless" band which, perhaps out of sheer perversity, he pictured as only a narrow strip between earth and moon. And he brought his men back to earth because his capsule was equipped with rockets to kick it out of the moon's orbit and back into earth's gravity.

The most awesome secret which man has extracted from nature is the release of energy from the atom. This knowledge, which is no longer a secret, can incalculably advance the cause of civilized man, or it can render him completely obsolete. This most potent of all sources of energy was not a sudden discovery. The Greek philosophers Epicurus and Democritus postulated the atomic concept at least 300 years before the Christian era. Beginning as early as A.D. 1500, a long succession of professional people contributed to the accumulated knowledge which led to the operational use of the atom—Boyle, Newton, Dalton, the Curies, Rutherford, Becquerel, the enigmatic Albert Einstein, and a host of others.

The instinct for staying alive provided the ultimate incentive which led to the discovery of the means for extinguishing all life. In the dark days of World War II the United States and her allies, impressed with the knowledge that the enemy was as well aware as they of the potential of the atom, simply decided to apply the old axiom of getting there "fustest with the mostest." Mobilizing the scientific intelligence of the allied nations into the greatest scientific and engineering project of all time—the Manhattan project—the atomic bomb was developed in a period of about 4 years. The dropping of the first atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, is fixed as the dawn of the atomic age. That is not quite accurate. A test bomb was exploded at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on July 16, 1945, and it was on that date that a handful of men assumed the fearful responsibility of releasing a force which even they could not be sure would not obliterate the world.

So it has happened that man has dreamed, then theorized about his dreams, then studied the scientific basis of his theories, and centuries later other generations have made his dreams come true. And the important consideration always has been not what man has discovered but the uses which he makes of his discoveries. The greatest challenge facing the peoples of the world today is how they shall use the sources of energy represented by the atom. Depending on how that challenge is met we will have a better world or no world at all.

THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE, A.D. 2000

On this philosophic note I think I should turn from the pages of history on which the accomplishments of man in his search for mobility have already been written and, with the temerity if not the foresight of a Jules Verne, undertake to project history a short distance into the future.

The ingredients or "mix" with which we have to work as we stir the brew of transport in the cauldron of tomorrow are railroads, highway carriers, water-borne vessels, aircraft, pipelines, and those exotic developments still standing on the horizon—air-cushion vehicles, hovercraft, monorails, pneumatic tubes, rockets, continuous belts and others not yet categorized.

Will all of these existing and embryonic media of transport still be in use in the year 2000? My answer is: Yes, and more. But some of them will not look the same. If, perchance, any agency of transport that we know today joins the pony express and other museum pieces of transport history it will be because it failed to accept the inevitability of change.

Standing clear among the unknown quantities which cloud the horizon of the year 2000 are certain things which we can postulate as fact. The people will determine for themselves the kind and quantity of transportation they want—and what they demand they will get. The engineering has been done, the horizons are unlimited and the choice is the people's choice. We knew this too: There will be a great many more people in the world of A.D. 2000 than there are today, and they will have a great deal more leisure time to dispose of, en masse and per capita. They will know more about their world and themselves than the people of today. They will be able to communicate, face to face through space, with other people everywhere. They will be able to read the news media of the world on screens in the comfort of their own homes. These people will have different tastes, a different outlook, a different philosophy of life, leisure, civilization, and the dignity of man.

We will be wise to put on some brakes on the exploding population, but we will have no choice except to support and transport what the world produces and requires. The world population of 3.2 billion is increasing at a rate that will cause it to very nearly double in 35 years. That means 5 to 6 billion people in the year 2000. There will be neither the need nor the opportunity for that many people to work a 5-day, 40-hour week. A 3- or 4-day, 20-hour workweek will be standard. Six billion people with 4 days of leisure each week adds up to a great deal of leisure.

The time was not far back when anybody who was not a member of the "leisure classes" would turn aside from his daily pursuits only on special holidays of which there were few. This was by design as well as necessity. The old saying, "The Devil finds work for idle hands to do" sprang from a popular belief that too much leisure would expose the average man to the temptations of evil. Leisure was for the rich. In the middle ages the creators of the world, the artists, writers, sculptors, architects, were not expected to earn their livelihood by toil and trade. They were patronized by those who were born to blood and wealth. Whatever the fault of such a system it is a fact that it spawned the great Renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries which changed the course of history and immeasurably enriched the lives of men everywhere.

But in the next 35 years we will experience a new renaissance, kindled not by patronage but by opportunity—the opening of new vistas to a new leisure class which will embrace the whole population not just the upper crust. Leisure and the economic freedom to enjoy it will come to the "common man." In the United States the average family income will be at least $15,000 a year, which will be commensurate with the gross national product of $2 trillion per year which will maintain in the year A.D. 2000. In Europe and other places in the world comparable advances will be made.

Not only will the average citizen living in the year 2000 have more leisure during his working years, he will retire at an earlier age with guaranteed minimum income that will permit him to live in comfort and enjoy the finer things of life. I foresee, for that time, a voluntary retirement age of 55 and a retirement income of $500 per month. With an estimated population of 350 million in the United States, there will be upward of 45 million persons of age 55 years and over receiving retirement payments in excess of $130 billion annually. Not only will this add an entirely new layer of consumer spending to our economy, but of particular significance is the fact that the availability of

these pension dollars will have been insured by prior funding. Therefore, we are contemplating in excess of $130 billion of additional consumer spending that will not be dependent upon the year-to-year prosperity of our economy, but instead will act as a stabilizer and a deterrent against business depressions.

All of these factors will free the resources of the human mind and rekindle the instincts of the human spirit so as to bring about not only a renaissance of culture and civilization but a closer unity of governments and peoples. The curiosity and desire for enrichment which leads the people of one nation to travel to far lands will cause the people of those lands to reciprocate. The barriers to world travel will be eliminated. The complicated visa systems will disappear and a single document, issued by a world organization, will be acceptable.

Ideologies and concepts which offer the people utopia in the distant future in return for sacrifice and the loss of personal identity in the present will have little appeal in a world where the people have already created their own utopia without the sacrifice of human dignity.

Trade and tariff barriers will crumble before the needs and desires of peoples drawn closer together by the common bonds of understanding and the ability to communicate and move swiftly across international boundaries. Geographic affinity will breed political, sociological, and moral affinity among nations and populations. The relationships among nations will improve, and the emphasis on sovereign rights will diminish as the common goals of humanity become visible to more people. Common control of the instrumentalities of destruction, cherished by all men of good will, will cease to be a mirage and will become a reality when we achieve that unity of purpose without which we know that none will survive.

Confederations of nations will develop in direct ratio to the infusion of understanding and the dissipation of fear of aggression. Neighbors quarrel and insulate themselves from each other because of lack of understanding and as transportation and communication shrink the physical world the bonds of understanding will be strengthened.

In undertaking to project the course of transportation to the year 2000 we must take these political, social, economic, and moral factors into account. For as the people shape a better world they will create the demand which will insure the ultimate in mobility.

What will the people demand—and demanding get—in the way of personal transport in the year 2000? Curiously enough there may be less demand for commutation and business travel than there is today. The reason—communication. People come together to promote enterprise because they have a need to communicate. But when everybody is equipped with a Dick Tracy wrist radio and wide-screen, closed-circuit TV is a commonplace fixture of every business organization there will be very little need to commute in order to communicate. The board chairman will call his meeting to order in his own living room. The secretary will dictate the minutes into an automatic machine which will file them for all future reference and reproduce copies instantly on demand. Surely there will be less need for people to congregate together in cities when instantaneous and universal communication is perfected.

THE AGE OF HYPERSONIC FLIGHT

But business is one thing and leisure is another and man will always want to go places to see an art treasure or an opera—to sun, surf, and chase golf balls. Knowing that distance is no longer a matter of miles but of time he will demand the ultimate in speed and the airlines will oblige. When the "man on the street"—any street—in the year 2000 decides to take his lady for a night "on the town" he will offer her a choice of Paris, Rome, or Reno. A weekend at the beach of the Sioux City set may mean Catalina or the Riviera, Miami Beach or Travemunde.

The supersonic airliner will not serve the day we are talking about. Of course the supersonic flying machine will still be with us. In fact it will be standard among the transports that ply the earth's atmosphere, and mach 3 speeds will be at the minimum not the maximum end of the scale.

The man in a hurry will take a rocket in the year 2000. In our preoccupation with space travel and exploration of the universe we have given too little attention to the very practical potentials of the rocket for transport on earth. In the interest of security we have developed rockets that can hit any target on earth. All that remains is to adapt the craft to carry a different cargo.

Without hesitation I predict that in the year 2000 people and things will be transported between all the more distant points on earth by rocket-powered craft. Instead of the 2,000 miles an hour already known to be a practicable speed we will achieve a speed of perhaps 20,000 miles per hour.

THE IRON HORSE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

Rockets to railroads is quite a jump, but let's consider the future of the mode of transport that on the land mass of the earth has the most illustrious past. In most places in the world the railroad has occupied the center of the stage of land transport during almost the entire history of the era of modern transportation. Why? Because it creates less propulsive resistance over a wider range of speeds than any other mode of transport. In other words a railroad uses less horsepower in relation to load carried than any other form of land transportation. Ironically, this colossus of mobility, conqueror of time, terrain, and distance, has run a troubled course for a long time. Everywhere except in the United States and a few other countries it has become necessary or expedient for Government to manage and maintain the railroads in order to save for the people the only mode of transport capable of fully serving their needs. For my purposes today I need not explore the reasons for this enigma. There is nothing in the picture that modernization of thinking and method, and aggressive exploitation of inherent advantages, will not cure. And the railroads will survive because we cannot afford to let them die.

But the railroad that greets the 21st century will have only vestigial resemblance to the industry of today. Today's railroad is the most efficient instrumentality yet invented for moving goods between given terminals, but things that are shipped do not all originate or find their destination at rail terminals. Traffic moves between the suburbs of St. Louis and the outskirts of Baltimore or Bremerhaven. Railroad transport has to be harmonious with all forms of transportation, land, sea, and air, so that when goods are put into one end of the transit pipeline they will come out of the other and not get stuck in the joints.

Traditional methods established during a century and a quarter of proud history are not easily broken, but the railroads are slowly yet surely making their equipment compatible, interchangeable, and versatile. Long before the year 2000 the boxcar will have completely disappeared. Everything except commodities requiring specialized equipment—grain, ore, lumber—will move in containers that will hardly interrupt their journey as they are transferred swiftly from highway to rail or ship or air for continuous movement from the door of the shipper to the platform of the consignee. One bill of lading and one rate will apply to the movement of anything from anywhere to anywhere else. It is in these areas that the freight forwarder will play the indispensable role in coordinating the services of the underlying modes of transport.

More dramatic will be the breakthroughs in power, speed, efficiency, and the pattern of rail operations. All locomotives will be nuclear powered. For this and other reasons locomotives will be wider and tracks will be widened. Tracks also will be straighter and grades will be reduced to a minimum. With today's techniques of earthmoving there is no need to run over a mountain. Speeds of as high as several hundred miles per hour may be attained and consistently maintained, if not on rails then on air cushions or monorails.

Cars will be cut out, switched (sideways), and loaded and unloaded automatically by radio-controlled devices. Yards and humps, for which there will be only minimal necessity, will be completed automated and computer controlled. Somebody may ride the locomotive in token to tradition but he will have little to do. Arrivals and departures will be scanned on closed-circuit TV. Radar will measure distance to obstacles and signal automatic retarders on the tracks which will prevent collisions.

Passenger and freight trains will effectuate a compatible marriage long before A.D. 2000. People pods will be whisked from convenient locations in the major cities and deposited by helicopter on special flatcars to ride in streamlined comfort with the less distinguished freight. Those who wish to insure their continuous mobility will be able to drive their own automobiles onto a special rail car and go up to the passenger lounge above. The speed, comfort, and convenience of this combined form of travel will make it attractive to a wider range of patrons than simply the people who have an antipathy for those "flying contraptions."

In the United States, at least, there will be fewer railroads—perhaps three or four systems at the most. There will be a greater number of main-line tracks and practically no feeder lines. Archaic regulations which have prevented the acquisition of other media of transportation will have been swept aside to make way for progress. Rail movements will be confined to the area where rail transport is most efficient and feeder service will be performed by truck, helicopter, or air-cushion machine, whether these supplemental services are performed by the railroad, the shipper, or by a carrier of different ownership.

The iron horse, fascinator of the youth of yesterday, is not about to ride into the sunset like the heroes of old. With renewed vigor this trusty steed is about to charge the dawn.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORT—ON, UNDER, AND ABOVE GROUND

First to successfully challenge the supremacy of the railroad in almost half a century was the motor carrier—automobile and truck. The private automobile, later joined by the bus and the airline, made the once profitable rail passenger business a deficit operation. Then, beginning about 35 years ago, the motortruck began to eat into the rail freight business with an ever-increasing appetite. We have been content to try to referee the fight between the modes by regulation in the United States whereas most governments have found it necessary to take stronger measures.

There is a place in the future for both road and rail transport and by one means or another each will find its economic sphere. My concern now is to highlight some of the dramatic developments in highway transport which I think the next three and a half decades will unveil.

Versatility is the lever which hoisted motor transport into its position of eminence. The

truck brought transportation to the door of the patron. The automobile made every man his own charioteer. The maneuverability of each was limited only by the availability of a street or way upon which to run. That, it turns out, has come to be quite a problem. We have built vehicles at a faster rate than we have built highways to accommodate them. City streets are not elastic. In the United States we are at the midpoint of the greatest public works project ever undertaken in the annals of time—a 16-year project to construct 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways. We are on schedule, but already we are making plans to feed new mileage into the system.

So swiftly does the magic wand of time now alter the face of transportation that motor transport, circa 2000, will bear as little resemblance to that of today as Cinderella's coach and six to a pumpkin and six white mice. Mammoth truck and midget auto will no longer vie for position on the highways, for private and commercial vehicles will move on separate ways. These thoroughfares will be laid out side by side or double or triple decked with one deck above and one below the surface. The arteries for trucks will be freed of obstructions which now limit the size of rig and load.

Highway travel will still frequently be bumper to bumper but traffic will move at high speeds with complete safety because of the built-in control devices of radar and electronics to regulate speed and prevent collisions. Trucks and autos will stop themselves before they collide with another object.

We will have advanced highways equipped with radio beams so that drivers can put their vehicles on automatic pilot. Between certain important centers there may be conveyor networks. Vehicles will be automatically whisked onto the system at terminals and will ride a belt or electrified rail to an exit point where they will automatically be discharged.

The truck train will be as common in the year 2000 as the rail freight train is today. Five, six, or even more bottoms will be moved as a unit, pulled by one huge tractor or by a tractor and one or more automatically controlled booster units. Some highway trains will be made up of self-propelled units, all controlled by the driver of the leading vehicle. Self-propelled units will add great maneuverability. The consist of the train can be changed by adding and dropping units at interchange points along the superhighway.

Nuclear propulsion for trucks, to say nothing of automobiles, seems a rather remote possibility today, but nuclear energy certainly will be harnessed to the larger units of A.D. 2000, and even more exotic forms of power will be in vogue. We have already unlocked the secret of taking energy from the sun, and I confidently believe that private automobiles will, in time, be powered by solar energy, which will constantly restore itself from the rays of the sun.

Metropolitan area transit has reached a saturation point and there is no place for it to go now except up, or down, or both. First of all, trucks will be banned from city streets. From terminals in the outskirts goods will be transported to and from points in the city through pneumatic tubes, by helicopter, or in some other fashion. Monorails high in the air, or "people pipelines" running underground will relieve the congestion which is choking our cities to death. We will not, like the author of Dick Tracy, wait for the people on the moon to show us how to construct individual air cars for personal transport. The town car of tomorrow will look more like a flying saucer than like a pullman car on rubber tires, and it will be able to park on the roof or the balcony, or simply remain suspended in the air.

OF PIPELINES AND THINGS

The pipeline or underground conduit, already a major instrumentality of transport, will be in much wider use and will have a much wider range of usefulness in the year 2000. Not only will the pipeline be used to relieve the traffic of city streets—it will be employed to move all types of commodities over long distances. Coal slurry has been transported by pipeline. In Canada plans are underway to build a pipeline to carry wood chips. Britain's Transport Minister has announced that a tunnel under the English Channel will join England and France within 10 years. As land becomes more valuable for other purposes transit pipelines will become more prevalent.

Incidentally, coal and petroleum may be too valuable to use as fuel by the year 2000. As a source for the manufacture of synthetics and a wide range of things which come from other sources today, these products will be precious gems of science. When land becomes too valuable for the grazing of sheep, wool will cease to be the staple commodity of cloth and synthetic fibers made from the storehouses of nature will take its place.

And while I am out of context let me point out that farmland to produce the food necessary to feed the teeming population in the year 2000 will be in short supply but we will solve that problem by tapping the inexhaustible protein resources of the measureless oceans.

MIRACLES OF THE SEA

Now, let us turn the long-range binoculars on that ancient, fabled, challenging pathway of transport, the "bounding main" with its fingers of water reaching into all the land areas of the earth. Tradition and custom have kept a tight grip on water transport, but change is about to break over the fleets of the world like a storm.

Exciting, almost incredible, developments in the area of water transport crowd across the pages of the daily press. Automation, nuclear power, hydrofoils, hydroskimmers, containerization. But wait. Look a little closer and you will see just beneath the surface an industry encrusted with the barnacles of time and obsolescence of thought. During the past quarter of a century and more, when newer forms of transport were breaking barrier after barrier, the improvements in ship design, speed, and efficiency have been relatively insignificant.

Water covers three-fourths of the earth's surface, and world geography plus vital statistics will force us to make better use of water transport in the future. There is a limit to the highways of concrete and steel that we can build, and to the space available for their building, but the pathways of the seas are almost limitless.

It is now just a decade since nuclear energy was first successfully employed to power the submarine *Nautilus*, launched in 1954. During that decade we have invaded outer space, put new stars in the heavens, landed a rocket on the moon, and established worldwide communications through relay stations in the sky. But we have been slow to exploit the greatest breakthrough in water and land transport since the inauguration of mechanical power. It was not until 1959, with the launching of the SS *Savannah*, that this fantastic new source of energy was employed to propel a cargo-passenger ship.

In an age where miracles abound the miracle of nuclear propulsion is just breaking free. The *Savannah* can operate for 3½ years on a single core of fuel. She can cruise at 21 knots for 336,000 nautical miles on a single fuel load. But like Robert Fulton's Clermont, the *Savannah* is only the beginning. Last month a large U.S. manufacturer announced that it is developing a reactor plant that will require refueling only once during the entire life of a ship. When history writes the saga of ocean transport from the vantage point of the year 2000, the chapter headed "Nautilus, 1954" will be longer than the chapter headed "Christopher Columbus, 1492."

The ship of the future will be mass-produced—certainly production methods will be revolutionized—from one of the strong, light metals or even plastic. All will be nuclear powered and propelled at speeds of at least 30 knots per hour. The size will be suited to the environment and the type of cargo to be handled. The bottleneck of shipping is the port operation. That handicap will be overcome in a number of ways. All cargo that is susceptibile of being boxed will be containerized and will move between ship and land vehicles without breaking bulk—by crane, conveyor, monorail, or some other device. Bulk cargoes will be loaded and discharged automatically by remotely controlled mechanical devices.

What will happen to the containers when they are emptied at destination? The answer is a "world bank" of containers under the control and direction of an international organization. This could be a branch of the United Nations or some specially constituted world organization. The establishment of such a worldwide pool of standard, interchangeable, multiple-use containers will require diplomacy and the cooperation of all governments, but in the face of necessity and in the interest of humanity it can and will be worked out.

The only limitation on the size of ships is the facility for docking at ports, and it will be possible for the ship of tomorrow to take on and discharge cargo at almost any place, so that vessels of mountainous size will ply the seas. The screw propeller probably will be supplanted by jet-type propulsion using either air or water to provide the thrust. Oceangoing barges, with capacity almost unlimited, will move anything that needs to be moved.

The subsurface ship, or submarine, may carry a substantial part of the heavy or bulk cargo of the world in A.D. 2000. It has many advantages. The submarine is capable of much higher speeds with less resistance than surface ships. There is no wave or wind resistance. Storms which slow down and sometimes imperil surface craft have no effect on the submerged vessel.

As the giant submarine torpedoes its way through the oceans under the surface of the water a greyhound of the seas, the fleet hydrofoil will be skimming over the waves, adding a dimension of mobility the uses of which will be infinite. The ship on "stilts" or hydrofoil, like many other departures from the normal has been known and employed for a long time, but its potentials are just beginning to be realized. Jet propelled, these ships which rise on their foils like a water skier, are capable of tremendous speeds. Consequently, they reduce the time differential between air and water travel to a minimum. Carrying their hulls above all except the highest waves they are not subject to pounding. Their power-to-speed curve, contrary to that of surface vessels, climbs steadily as speed increases.

By the year 2000 the hydrofoils will be the buslines of the oceans. Millions will commute between home and office by this fast and economical form of taxi service. But hydrofoils will have even more vital roles in transportation. Since they can operate in very shallow water they will be used as a supplemental carrier, making it possible for the giant ocean liners to transfer their cargo to hydrofoil or hydroskimmer and discharge it on any beach. These shallow-draft vessels also can act as ferries to carry oceangoing freight between a shipside and interior river ports. This should prove especially beneficial in the emerging nations of the world which are deficient in road and rail transport

but which are traversed by many natural waterways.

Transportation always has developed in response to the will and the needs of the people. The 5 or 6 billion people who will live in the year 2000, having more time to travel, a keener appreciation of the cultural aspects of life, an unquenchable desire to see and to explore the far reaches of the world, will create a demand for more, better, and cheaper ocean transport. The largest passenger liners today accommodate only about 2,000 passengers. Nuclear-powered superliners can be built to accommodate 10,000 or more passengers—a complete city on water—a traveling resort or cultural center.

The cost of such mass-produced transportation can be reduced to as low as $100 between the United States and Europe—a world cruise for as low as $500. No need for hotels for those who wish to make their traveling city a home. By helicopter and hydroskimmer the vacationeer will explore the interior of all countries from the ports of call. These floating cities will provide ideal convention facilities and places to "get away from it all" or facilities from which to "see the world, depending upon the whim of the passenger."

I have mentioned before the one phenomenal, newly emerging, mode of transport which, because it cuts across all known media seems destined to have a more profound effect on the pattern of transportation in the year 2000 than anything else on the horizon today. That is the vehicle that rides on a cushion of air. These strange craft are called, variously, hydroskimmers, air-cushion vehicles, and ground-effect machines (GEM). In England one of these types of air-cushion vehicles is called the Hovercraft on which considerable progress is now being made. The principle on which these vessels operate has been known and explored for more than 20 years but it is only in recent times that serious efforts were begun to make practical application of the idea.

The feasibility of the air-cushion vehicle has been established. It can hover inches above the surface of land or water or rise to a considerable height. It can be powered by propellers, by jet engines, or by air jet. Fantastic speeds will be possible. Since it can go where no other surface craft can go it will be an indispensable adjunct to rail, motor, water, and air transport. It can take frozen foods and medical supplies to peoples in heretofore inaccessible places, over swamps, marshes, rocky cliffs, or frozen wastes. This machine can and will immeasurably advance the cause of civilization.

In the year 2000 the flying saucer myth or mystery will be no more—there will be flying saucers everywhere, and if some of them are from Mars no one will worry except the man responsible for selling license plates. There will be no need for bumpers on the machines because radar will prevent crashes and computers will direct traffic.

CONCLUSION

What a confluence of centuries—what a juncture of history—when the sun sets on the 20th century and rises on the 21st. If all the dreams I have spun come true in the next 35 years, the bells will ring loudly and the people will cheer wildly and there will be peace on earth when the clock ticks in the first syllable of the next century. But have I dealt with dreams? Is anything that I have predicted more improbable than that a manmade satellite known as Syncom III is standing out in space right now through the instrumentality of which these very proceedings could be made to come alive in the living rooms of people everywhere?

Were Da Vinci, Marconi, and Watt, or Stevenson, Fulton, and the Wright brothers dreaming dreams or paving the way for the future when they postulated things that had never theretofore been achieved?

Before you mark off anything that I have predicted for the next three and a half decades look back on the startling developments of the recent past. The breaking of the sound barrier. Space travel. Substitution of a cushion of air for the ageless wheel. The broadcasting of a message of good will to the world by a President of the United States not by cable, phone, or radio, but from a satellite circling around the globe in outer space—then the erasure of the message and substitution of another while the satellite was in orbit. The Olympic games in Tokyo brought into the homes of people on the far side of the earth through the medium of a relay station in space. Multiply these miracles of science by the rate of change which is being constantly compounded and see if my predictions do not come out on the modest side even to the point of reticence.

I believe the most important fact for us to understand is that transportation, though it opens new worlds and changes old concepts of time and distance, will not shape the world of A.D. 2000. Transportation is the servant of the people—the genie which makes their dreams come true—the magic carpet of their future—the mobility of their desires, their aspirations, and their resources.

A long time ago one of those great men who are born with a mission to change the environment of their time, Benjamin Franklin, wrote to his friend Joseph Priestly, that he sometimes regretted he was born too soon, because he found it impossible to imagine the height to which might be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. And after speculating for a while about a great many things that might come to pass, much as I have speculated here today, Franklin ended his letter with a sentence which I should like to leave with you: "O, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity."

OPENING AT FRANKFURT (MAIN), GERMANY OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY EXHIBIT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1964, at Frankfurt (Main) in Germany, the John F. Kennedy Library Exhibit was opened, and present on this occasion was Mrs. Joan Kennedy, the wife of U.S. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

An eloquent and most touching address was made on that occasion by one of Germany's leading citizens, Mr. Walther Casper.

In my remarks, I include the appropriate and splendid address delivered by Mr. Casper:

ADDRESS BY MR. WALTHER CASPER AT THE OCCASION OF THE OPENING OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY MOBILE LIBRARY EXHIBIT IN THE PRESENCE OF MRS. EDWARD KENNEDY AT THE GERMAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN FRANKFURT (MAIN), NOVEMBER 15, 1964

Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, in the name of the German Committee for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library I would like to welcome you and open the exhibit of documents and personal effects of the late President. You will permit me to welcome especially Mayor Brundert and his predecessor, a member of our committee, Dr. Bockelmann, as representatives of all present on the German side and Consul General Ford and commander of the 5th Army Corps, General Polk, for our American friends in the Frankfurt area. At the same time I would like to thank the city of Frankfurt and our friends from the America House. Only your exemplary cooperation in the extensive organizational preparations and your hospitality made today's event possible.

I may then turn right away to our guests from the United States and welcome you heartily in our midst. Above all you, Mrs. Kennedy, who together with your sister, Mrs. McMurrey, and Miss Keyes, who worked many years with President Kennedy, accompany the exhibition and plan to spend 2 days in our city. It is also a pleasure for me to have a number of labor union leaders with us including Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America, and his brother, Mr. Victor Reuther.

Originally the exhibit that we are opening here in Frankfurt today was selected to enlist support for the Kennedy Memorial Library in the United States. In Germany, following the desire of the Kennedy family, it is to have another purpose. The family of the deceased President and the board of trustees of the Kennedy Memorial Library have made available to us the collection of personal effects and extremely important documents from President Kennedy's period in office as an expression of thanks for the affection with which the President was met during his visit to Germany and the deep sorrow which the German people manifested over the terrible occurrence of last November. We are especially grateful to your family, Mrs. Kennedy, that this exhibit, at the express wish of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, is being shown during these November days in Frankfurt and next weekend in Berlin.

Even if no support is enlisted and no funds collected with this exhibit, a direct relationship with the institute in Boston clearly exists, a relationship to the idea of this institute with which in the next 2 weeks the students of 15 German universities will be concerned during collections, speeches, and discussions. The youth of at least 20 other German cities will be doing the same. As climax and conclusion of these assemblies, the President of the Federal Republic will speak on this theme in the University of Cologne on November 27 to representatives of all German youth and student organizations assembled there.

I think this is the place to remember a member of our committee who passed away yesterday evening: Dr. Heinrich von Brentano.

His performance and services as a human being, a politician, and as one of the architects of postwar Europe will be given recognition from more qualified voices. I may, however, assure you that Heinrich von Brentano supported wholeheartedly the idea of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation. His last deed before his serious operation last November was the moving obituary that he dedicated to President Kennedy. When he then heard of the plans of the youth and student organizations, he immediately declared himself ready to speak in one of the universities. Only a few days ago at the advice of his doctors did he have to decline.

The library on the land of Harvard University in Boston (Cambridge), which will come into being in the next 3 years, will not only be dedicated to the memory of a great man. In an Institute for Contemporary History, equipped with the most modern technical devices, scholarship students from all countries of the world will have the opportunity to work on the decisive questions of our time, and it will occur that, above all, these questions will be those which President Ken-

nedy, as no one else before him, brought to the center of our attention: the questions of the Atlantic partnership and the developing countries, the questions of atomic weapons and of world peace.

Commensurate with the contributions of the individual countries, their political and scientific younger generations will have the opportunity to work in this international meeting place as holders of scholarships.

I believe it is clear to us all that it is not a question of sentimental reminiscences or idolization of Kennedy here; it is, however, a concern that future politicians from the entire world through mutual acquaintance and discussion together learn to recognize the temporary and piecemeal solutions which are so often praised with the words "real" and "practical" and that their vision be clarified for the whole of this one world and the problems to be solved by this generation.

What is more necessary, as Kennedy made apparent in his short period of office, than that the bearers of political responsibility demonstrate that power and spirit, politics and intelligence are not opposed but that their union more than all else is capable of creating the proper and genuine spirit of citizenship.

Ladies and gentlemen, among us are sitting 23 development helpers who are taking off today in a chartered plane for Tanganyika. They will cooperate for 2 years on slum clearance projects in Dar es Salaam. The Government of Tanganyika has decided upon a 5-year program for building 5,000 houses, and the German Federal States under guidance from the State of Hesse have made the building equipment and tools available. The program will largely be carried through with the self-help of the population concerned. Our male development helpers are bringing technical knowledge to thousands of unskilled Africans and hundreds of trained craftsmen, who on their part should carry the knowledge on to volunteers and trained craftsmen of their own country. At the same time our women development helpers are working as nurses in health education and as home economics and kindergarten teachers. They too, following the principle of multiplication, are to pass on their abilities and skills to the largest possible number of African counterparts and thereby help to assure that this slum clearance project can become an example for other parts of east Africa.

It is by no means a digression from the purpose of our assembly when we ask you, development helpers, goodby here; you are in a manner of speaking the living witnesses for the continued presence of one of the noblest of President Kennedy's ideas. He took a most personal part in the coming into being of the German Development Service, and he allowed nothing to prevent him from being present at the founding of our Development Service on June 24, 1963. He said at that time: "I hope that outside of the American Peace Corps and the new German Development Service young people from still many other countries will cooperate in this work * * * and that we can make a great common effort in the solving of these problems in the 1960's."

Today numerous volunteers from France, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are standing on this frontline of peace. Preparations are underway in Sweden, Italy, Austria, and Japan, and finally, this idea has taken hold also in several developing countries, such as Argentina, Peru, El Salvador, Zambia, Tanganyika, Thailand, and the Philippines.

President Kennedy's vision of the future, that during this decade the community of volunteers from many countries might represent an important contribution to understanding among peoples and to peace in the world, therefore, does not seem unrealistic.

The Federal President also, in his capacity as patron of the German Development Service, has commissioned me to extend to you, development helpers, his greetings and wishes on your way and to remind you of the admonition that he gave in wishing the first 55 volunteers goodby on July 15 of this year: "To see it through voluntarily when you are witness to great want, and to consider yourselves as representatives of a country that abhors war, that rejects it as a means of politics, and would like to wash every stain from its name through peaceful efforts."

Ladies and gentlemen, we must now bring to a close the reflections which have united us in this hour in the memory of President Kennedy.

President Kennedy in his image of the New Frontier has brought to the attention of our time that the difference between men and ants does not lie in their physical order of magnitude but in their possession of freedom, and, that wherever this blessing is threatened, from within ourselves or from outside, the New Frontier becomes visible.

Thank you.

EDITORIAL BY JAMES L. HARRINGTON EXPRESSING WORLDWIDE FEELINGS AND SENTIMENTS FOR THE LATE BELOVED PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a splendid and touching editorial written by James L. Harrington, and appearing in the November 13, 1964, issue of the Boston Naval Shipyard News.

The editorial expresses the worldwide feelings and sentiments of people everywhere who not only deeply respected, but had an intense affection for the late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

HE LEFT US A LEGACY

"He led an entire Nation and found his way to the secret hopes of man. He was Irish, and he was Massachusetts born, and he was Boston bred.

"He belongs to the world. But part of him belongs especially to you.

"When he died the sound of mourning was heard in every street of the earth. But tears came more plentifully to Boston eyes, and grief more painfully to Boston hearts.

"His qualities were many. But two especially explain his hold on men. He made them feel they were better than they thought they were; that perhaps, on earth, God's work could truly be their own.

"And he could absorb, in his imagination, the dreams, and longings, the fears and ambitions, of others; whether they lived in mud huts in Africa or in the palaces of kings. And somehow, they understood this was so.

"No memory is more fresh, none is so bright, none so mingles pain and gratitude, as that of John Fitzgerald Kennedy of Massachusetts."

President Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking in the fading twilight of Boston's Postoffice Square, was paying tribute to a beloved fallen leader and speaking of a national legacy left behind by the 35th President of the United States.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy engaged himself in a struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

When he was taken from our midst on a warm day in Dallas almost a year ago, a hidden assassin's bullet snuffed out the life of a man of wisdom, strength and peace—who molded and moved the power of our Nation in the service of a world of growing liberty and order. All who loved freedom mourned his death.

Within a few days the Nation and the world will observe the first anniversary of his passing from the American scene—a Nation and world that was enriched by his brief presence. And what better way is there to pay tribute to the fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

Carry out the aims, ideals, and objectives of the national legacy left to us by him.

Now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, let us follow the paths of intelligence and reason to which John Fitzgerald Kennedy pointed. History has judged him well—for his wisdom, compassion, and grace.

Let history judge us as we carry out his legacy—while we seek life, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness—the timeworn words of a Republic that fought tyranny, oppression, and hunger from its birth.

If we fulfill this legacy, then the final words of his inauguration address will be brought to a fruitful close:

"Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

A MINIMUM WAGE FOR FARMWORKERS

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide minimum wages for certain farmworkers. Employees covered by this proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 would be entitled to $1 an hour during the first year following the effective date of the act, $1.15 during the second year, and $1.30 during the third year. Farmworkers who are members of the employer's immediate family and sharecroppers are not covered by this bill.

The American farmworker is the most underpaid, and unprotected labor group in the Nation. This is supposed to be a land of plenty. We boast of the most efficient and productive agricultural system in the world. Yet, the wages paid to most farmworkers are at shockingly low levels, far below the minimum wage standards established by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The authors of the Fair Labor Standards Act intended to provide protection for farmworkers. President Roosevelt

stated in his message to Congress on May 24, 1937:

> Legislation can, I hope, be passed at this session of the Congress further to help those who toil in factory and on farm.

And, although the exemption for farmworkers was placed in the original act of 1938, since that time there have been a number of proposals in Congress to bring this disadvantaged group under FLSA. The Tolan committee of 1941 and the La Follette committee of 1942 each recommended placing a floor under farm wages. Bills similar to mine were introduced in the Senate in the 87th Congress and the 88th Congress. In 1960 the Department of Labor stated in a report that it would be both desirable and feasible to extend Federal minimum wage legislation to agriculture in order to improve the wage structure of hired farm labor.

Recent data demonstrates more than ever the need and the desirability of extending FLSA protection to farmworkers, especially migrant farmworkers. In May 1963 average hourly earnings of farmworkers were 89 cents an hour. This was equivalent to about one-fourth the earnings of workers in contract construction, to about one-third the earnings of workers in mining, manufacturing, and wholesale trade, and to about one-half the earnings of employees in retail trade. Statistics from the Bureau of the Census show that in 1957, when the average family income in the United States was about $5,000, 45 percent of the families of farm laborers had cash incomes below $2,000. That means $2,000 for an entire family. Individual farmworkers were averaging just $892 per year, including earnings for nonfarm work. Of course, the majority of farmworkers work less than 150 days a year at seasonal jobs, and they have to do the best they can during the off season when there is no farm work to be had. Even during the periods when they are employed, if weather or other conditions prevent them from working they are not paid for the days that are lost. For the migrant farmworker, it is common for housing to be inadequate and, in fact, deplorable, for sanitation facilities to be nonexistent, and for educational opportunities for their children to be absent.

The relative position of the farm laborer is growing worse instead of improving. Since World War II the differences between farm and nonfarm wage rates has become greater. Between 1947 and 1962, average hourly wages in contract construction increased 115 percent; in manufacturing, 96 percent; in wholesale trade, 94 percent; in retail trade, 93 percent; in mining, 84 percent; but in agriculture, only 56 percent. This gap is widening despite the fact that farmworkers' output per man-hour increased 2.4 times during that period, while for nonfarmworkers it was only 1.5 times as great.

The minimum wages provided in my bill are in line with the new schedule recently promulgated for foreign workers under Public Law 414. These hourly wage rates vary from 95 cents to $1.40, and after April 1 of this year the lowest hourly wages allowed under Public Law 414 will be $1.15.

Mr. Speaker, no lobbyists will come to Washington and buttonhole Members of Congress on behalf of the farmworkers. They are perhaps the most underrepresented and unorganized group in the country. No pressure groups, therefore, will organize letterwriting campaigns, purchase full-page ads in newspapers and magazines, or distribute newsletters or circulars for them. But it is right and proper for every Member of Congress to consider the plight and the miserable pay of the American farmworker. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to support my bill to place a floor under the wage levels of the men and women who help produce the bounty in which all of us share.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AS TO QUALITY AND HEALTH FACTORS OF TOBACCO

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1965, I introduced House Joint Resolution 138, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research into the quality and health factors of tobacco and other ingredients and materials used in the manufacture of tobacco products.

On January 7, I noted in the Evening Star a very cogent and thoughtful story by James J. Kilpatrick, on the editorial page entitled "The Smoking Report, a Year Later." Mr. Kilpatrick has written a full and accurate summary of the year that has elapsed since the Surgeon General's report linking tobacco and cancer was published. Mr. Kilpatrick's article points out the various reactions to the controversial report of Government agencies, of the tobacco industry, and of the consumer market. The facts, Mr. Kilpatrick states, that the sales of tobacco products have again risen, that the prices of tobacco stocks are at their previous level, that the price supports for tobacco will be continued, that the tobacco industry has placed restrictions on its own advertising, and that several research investigations have found doubtful data in the Surgeon General's report—all demonstrate the Federal Government's principal responsibility in the tobacco controversy: to launch a thoroughgoing investigation into the production and use of tobacco products, in order to determine what factors, if any, are detrimental to human health and to discover ways in which these elements may be eliminated.

I am particularly impressed with Mr. Kilpatrick's belief in voluntarism as an essential part of the American way of life. The role of the Federal Government, as he sees it, is not to discipline the people in their use of tobacco—and this could refer to food, drink, and automobiles, as well—but to present the whole truth concerning this product and allow the American people to choose for themselves.

I am inserting this article by Mr. Kilpatrick in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress, since it so adequately presents the tobacco question, pointing up the need for research and investigation into the adverse health factors which may be found to exist in tobacco and/or tobacco products and clearly emphasizing the lack of concise and scientific pinpointing as to what these elements are in the smoking and health report to the Surgeon General, and since it is so germane to the resolution which I have introduced.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that we must launch such a crash research program without further delay, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the interest of the smoking public and of the tobacco industry, which is of such significant import to the economy of our Nation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1965]

THE SMOKING REPORT, A YEAR LATER

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Almost a year has passed since the Surgeon General, on January 11, brought forth the now famous report of his advisory committee on smoking and health. Certain things have happened in the meantime.

Cigarette consumption, after a precipitate drop, has returned to former levels.

The market in tobacco stocks has followed the same course.

A Federal trial jury has refused to hold a manufacturer liable for the lung cancer of a regular smoker.

The tobacco industry has adopted a self-policing advertising code.

A number of responsible research investigations have tended to cast doubt on some of the conclusions of the Surgeon General's report.

One agency of the Government has conducted a referendum to assure the continuation of Federal price supports for tobacco. Another agency of the Government has recommended a 3-year, $10 million Federal campaign to persuade people to stop smoking.

Each of these events contributes not merely to the confusion of the times, which are perhaps sufficiently confused already, but more usefully to an understanding of a free society, what is good about it and how it gets fouled up. We may not learn a great deal about the causal relationship, if any, between cigarettes and cancer, but we can learn a good deal about certain ailments of the body politic.

Why this reaction? It was because this was the Government speaking. It was the U.S. Surgeon General. The report carried on its title page the seal of a Federal agency. Copies were obtainable from the Government Printing Office. All of the trappings and publicity advantages that attach to Government helped to give the report an authority it did not deserve. This was the voice of "Big Brother" speaking; we tend to pay it too much heed.

If the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke has its way, Big Brother will speak even more forcefully over the next 3 years. The recommended appropriation would finance not only a campaign against smoking but also a network of smok-

ing control clinics. The whole weight of Government pressure would be thrown behind a habit that Government officially concludes is bad for us.

As the Wall Street Journal has observed, a whole lot of other things are probably bad for us, too. Automobiles, for example: They kill 40,000 persons a year. Liquor is bad for us; witness the tolls of alcohol. Rich food is a real danger; so are sweets; so is the lack of exercise. The world is full of perils, most of them as alluring as a third martini, and most of them we bring on ourselves. At what point should the compulsions of law and the awful powers of Government intrude upon our private lives?

That is the question that ought to be pondered in this whole controversy over cigarettes. Free men have to be left some room to turn around in, some room to be wrong in. If the tobacco industry is willing voluntarily to curb its appeals, why not let voluntarism have a try at this thing? Meanwhile, instead of supporting tobacco through Orville Freeman and condemning it through Anthony Celebrezze, why not let the Government (if it must do something) aid in the financing of the statistically valid research that remains to be done? It now is clear, to those who have taken the time to analyze the Surgeon General's report, that the committee's most publicized conclusion was based upon remarkably flimsy evidence. In the hullabaloo a year ago, it was widely overlooked that the committee itself undertook no new investigations of its own. The committee went over seven studies of smokers and nonsmokers, consolidated certain findings and conclusions, and came up with the ominous headline: "Cigarette smoking is causally related to lung cancer in men."

On close examination, it is seen that two of these studies were based on reports from untrained volunteers who chose their statistical sample "from among their acquaintances." The other five studies suffered from large rates of nonresponse to questionnaires. Almost half of 78,000 Canadian pensioners, in one study, failed to respond.

The commission itself noted that some figures were "inadequate" and others were marred by "discrepancies." Four of the five studies curiously agreed that the death rate among ex-pipe smokers is higher than the death rate both for nonsmokers and cigarette smokers; the commission could not explain "this puzzling phenomenon."

These statistical shortcomings—and remember that these were the best statistics the committee could find—were simply ignored a year ago. In point of fact, the various findings and conclusions were nothing new.

As the jury sensibly was to conclude in the Florida case, no man in his right mind imagines that cigarettes are really good for him; every rational being comprehends that if a man smokes very much he most likely will cough. Cigarettes have been known as "coffin nails" for at least a hundred years. Yet a year ago, when the report came out, veteran smokers shuddered and ran for their gum drops, and cigarettes stocks took a tumble.

Government was not meant to be preacher, parson, or grade school principal; Government was meant to be servant. And when Uncle pulls out a $10 million switch, those of us who smoke would rather fight.

FAIRNESS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNDER PERFORMANCE RATING SYSTEM

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would return fair employment practices to our dedicated Federal classified employees, by restoring use of the time-honored system of performance rating, by which the employee has rights of appeal from an unfair rating.

Such bill would remove from the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, one of its few really undesirable provisions which was put there by the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

That act provides as one of the conditions for an employee receiving a within-grade salary increase the requirement "that his work is of an acceptable level of competence as determined by the head of the department." At first this provision appears to be a statement of good personnel procedure. His competence to perform certain assigned duties should be at an acceptable level below which he should be considered as one who is not fully qualified to fill a particular position. However, this provision is not as desirable or as innocuous as it may appear.

The first objection is that it is unnecessary. The Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended, is still in effect, and it fully provides for the establishment and administration of satisfactory performance rating plans for the majority of employees in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It does not cover the Field Service of the Post Office Department, the Foreign Service of the United States, or the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and several Federal corporations and independent establishments because rating systems for those agencies are elsewhere provided in law. This act required each department to establish and use one or more performance rating plans "for evaluating the work performance of such officers and employees."

When the performance rating system was established, satisfactory performance was stipulated in section 701 of the Classification Act as a requirement for advancing to the next rate within a grade. Satisfactory performance was established as the criterion for determining satisfactory discharge of duties. Now there is set up another and conflicting standard. In effect the requirement of showing an acceptable level of competence establishes a conflicting method of measuring employee performance. It does more than that, in that it does not offer the protection afforded under the performance rating system. That system required supervisors to give an employee a 90-day warning before rating an employee as unsatisfactory. If the unsatisfactory rating is recorded, the supervisor is required to explain the rating, and the employee has the right of appeal to a board which includes an employee member.

The most confusing aspect of the level of competence provision is that it has been asserted that an employee can achieve satisfactory performance and yet fail to attain an acceptable level of competence.

This provision has been described by the Civil Service Commission as making it possible for an agency to deny within-grade increases to purely marginal workers. It is difficult, however, to think of an employee who would be rated satisfactory under the performance rating system and yet not be working at an acceptable level of competence. It appears to be a strange concept that an employee rated as satisfactory by one set of standards is considered substandard by another measurement of his performance.

Federal employees have been greatly disturbed by this requirement of showing an acceptable level of competence and they have expressed their fears through their organizations. Employees believe that this provision offers every opportunity for discrimination and reprisal. There have been some indications that such fears have been well founded.

What this provision does in practice is give a supervisor an unrestricted opportunity to withhold an employee's within-grade increase without having to explain his action. Nothing could be more undesirable in the entire field of personnel administration, particularly in the civil service which should provide true leadership.

The fact is that this requirement can denote as much or as little as a supervisor wishes, and therein lies the danger. This provision offers perhaps the greatest opportunities possible for reprisal by supervisors. As such, it should be removed from the law.

One further reason for eliminating this level of competence provision from the law is that it singles out only the Federal employees subject to the Classification Act and imposes on them a dual standard of performance which is inequitable and inconsistent. This requirement was not written into that portion of the 1962 Salary Reform Act which related to the postal service. Nor was it applied to the Foreign Service under the State Department or to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. The performance of classified employees is not only susceptible to appraisal in accordance with the Performance Rating Act but must be further reevaluated in accordance with another system which has yet to be clearly and satisfactorily explained.

THE SYSTEMATIC BREACHES OF THE PEACE AND DISREGARD OF LAW BY AMERICAN NAZIS

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress, the Members

of Congress were witnesses to a disgraceful incident when Robert Lloyd, a self-proclaimed member of the American Nazi Party, forced himself into the House Chamber and engaged in an ugly racist demonstration.

As a result I wrote the following letter to Chester H. Gray, Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia:

I am of the opinion that if Mr. Lloyd and other self-proclaimed members of the American Nazi Party get the impression that this course of action can be continued, they will feel that they are purchasing a license to disturb the peace. I believe that the incident of January 4, 1965, was so disgraceful and reprehensible that it should not be allowed to end with the forfeiture of bail, but that Mr. Lloyd should be apprehended and promptly tried on the charge pending.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report I received the following letter from Mr. Gray:

I thoroughly agree with you that Robert Lloyd should be prosecuted and punished for his disturbance of the Congress of the United States.

Upon receipt of your letter of January 6, 1965, I directed my assistant at the court of general sessions to take the necessary steps to have the forfeiture set aside and a prosecution initiated. A warrant for Robert Lloyd's arrest has already been issued. Upon his apprehension my assistant will prosecute vigorously and upon his conviction bring Mr. Lloyd's record to the attention of the court for consideration in the imposition of sentence.

I understand that the warrant for Lloyd's arrest can only be served within the District of Columbia. I hope that he will come in and stand trial, but if he does not, the outstanding warrant should serve to keep him out of the District which will be a blessing.

I am gratified with the action of Corporation Counsel Gray, and I hope it will serve as a warning to hoodlums that they will no longer get by with forfeiture of bail.

QUESTION OF AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, concerning the question of aid to the United Arab Republic and the views of some of the interested parties, I think it would be of benefit to the members of this House to have available to them a communication from His Excellency Seif Al-Islam Al-Hassan, Prime Minister of the National Government of Yemen, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, which is as follows:

Two years ago the United States and other countries recognized the military usurpation of power in Yemen on the condition that Egyptian armed forces would withdraw promptly from Yemen.

Two years have, however, passed and large Egyptian land and air forces still continue to wage war against the people of Yemen on behalf of the rebels who were originally created by Cairo.

Individuals and governments, influenced by Cairo, ignore the fact that these rebels have no real authority in Yemen.

Egypt, officially and publicly, has admitted that no republican authority or government exists in Yemen, when President Nasser, and others, declared "that the Egyptian forces will not withdraw until the revolutionary government is established and secured."

International law and the United Nations Charter only recognize as sovereign those who govern themselves. The national government of Yemen alone has this sovereign power, and, therefore, insists that its representative take his seat at the United Nations—a seat that has belonged for 18 years to the legitimate Yemen Government.

The national government protests against the continued seating of military usurpers who exist only because of tens of thousands of heavily armed Egyptian occupation forces.

The national government reminds the Communist governments that tens of thousands of Yemeni men, women, and children have been made homeless, and are suffering from hunger, poverty, and disease as the direct result of Communist guns and aircraft used against them by the Egyptian forces.

The national government points out that large-scale American economic aid is supplied to the aggressor country, the United Arab Republic, and that this aid helps it carry out its criminal actions.

The people of Yemen and their legitimate government appeal for justice from you and from the members of the United Nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HATHAWAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. HAWKINS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

322. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting an examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

323. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1964 (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

324. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

325. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during December 1964, pursuant to provisions of Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that miscellaneous appropriations have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

327. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Forest Service for "Forest protection and utilization" for the fiscal year 1965 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

328. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1964, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

329. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the biennial report on continuing studies of the quality of water of the Colorado River system, pursuant to section 15 of the act of Congress approved April 11, 1956; of section 15 of the act of June 13, 1962, and of section 6 of the act of August 16, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

330. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entiled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

331. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 19th annual report of the Federal Aviation Agency's operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

332. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1964, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

333. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

334. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

335. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Adminstration, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department during the 1964 fiscal year, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

336. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Lewis H. Nelson III against the United States, pursuant to 45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

338. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

340. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

341. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

342. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

343. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of, grand and petit jurors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Fourteenth Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (Rept. No. 1). 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. POWELL:

H.R. 2361. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2362. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2363. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AYERS:

H.R. 2364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans who served overseas for 90 days or more after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2365. A bill to facilitate the procurement of physicians and dentists for the Armed Forces by establishing scholarships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2366. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of scholarships for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2367. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2368. A bill to authorize hospitalization in civil hospitals for retired members of the armed services under group insurance sick and accident policies, based on specified payment of premiums from retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2369. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2370. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2371. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2372. A bill to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2373. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2374. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2375. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2376. A bill to provide increases in annuities granted under the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2379. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit hospitals from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2381. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to set forth the treatment processes considered as mining for percentage depletion purposes in the case of sodium chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, as a substitute for the existing requirement of production before 1830, that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age at the time of importation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by provision of a deduction for expenditures for reconversion of structures in a slum clearance program or rehabilitation project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend section 302(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit retired employees to elect use of either subsection (b) or subsection (d) to report income from employees' annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2390. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2391. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2392. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax on automotive parts and accessories certain modifications involving lengthening of truck trailers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to National and State political committees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a gift to an educational institution to be deducted as charitable contribution even though it is made to provide a scholarship for a specified individual, so long as such individual is not a relative of the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend, clarify, and make certain the applicability of section

4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to exemptions from tax imposed under section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 2396. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 2397. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2398. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 2400. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2401. A bill to establish rules of interpretation of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases; and to provide that confessions and other evidence shall be admissible in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2404. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to authorize the Attorney General to reduce, in certain circumstances, the period of time for which certain election records are otherwise required to be retained; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2406. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2408. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirment Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2411. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 2413. A bill authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2414. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2415. A bill to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2416. A bill to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds to provide for a reduction in the national debt and a reduction in the Federal individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2417. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2419. A bill to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2420. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2423. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, in order to establish two new time zones and so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2425. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2426. A bill to permit the withdrawal from social security coverage of policemen, firemen, and district attorney investigators in Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2427. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to the people of other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, in order to prevent the use of work measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 2432. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2433. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 to permit certain veterans to elect to receive pensions under title 38 of the United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2437. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2440. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2441. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for the education of a dependent child at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 2443. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 2445. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2446. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 2447. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 2448. A bill to reduce the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags from 10 percent to 5 percent on July 1, 1965, and to repeal such taxes on July 1, 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2449. A bill to provide that any person who illegally sells a narcotic drug to a minor shall be imprisoned for not less than 20 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2451. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2452. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 2453. A bill to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2454. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to restore the granting of step increases on the basis of performance ratings of satisfactory in lieu of the standard of acceptable level of competence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2455. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2457. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend section 3574 of title 39 relating to nightwork compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to change the computation of annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2460. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2462. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2463. A bill to extend the benefits of the retired Federal employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2464. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2466. A bill to create a Joint Committee on Education; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 2467. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2468. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2469. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2472. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2474. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Education to assist in the establishment of a Carver Memorial Library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2475. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2476. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide that all citizens of the United States may vote at all elections without being required to take literacy tests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2478. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to deny Federal assistance, under the program of aid to dependent children, for the families of women who are the mothers of two or more illegitimate children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as

amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2484. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes and for purposes of income-tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2486. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouse of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 2488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March in every year as Volunteers of America Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 183. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to create and prescribe the functions of a Commission on the Establishment of a National Humanities Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution proposing the recognition of the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., as the birthplace of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 101. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to create a committee for small unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 103. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Res. 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 105. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 104; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Signorile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2490. A bill relating to the transportation and gas distribution facilities operated by New Orleans Public Service, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana and operating in the city of New Orleans, La., and all the shares of whose common stock are owned by Middle South Utilities, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2491. A bill for the relief of Alicia Concepcion Zea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Fabro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Bryant L. Boatner, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Maria Mantia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Victor Neagu Manoliu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Allah P. Asker, Ahlam P. Asker, Talal P. Asker, Dia P. Asker, Samir P. Asker, and Samira P. Asker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2498. A bill for the relief of Marietta C. Bibeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Remedios Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Yoshihiro Okamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Wai Sing Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Isola Arrighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Melchiori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Alojz Grudenic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kay Sue Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Jack Sun (also known as Sun Hua Chak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maxima E. Chua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Tom Wai Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Tom Keng Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Milana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Lee Foo Sai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wan Yau Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Amooi and his wife, Sedighi Tan Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Sadat S. Zulfkar, Said H. Sharawi, Khadiga E. Arsalan, Hassan S. Sharawi, and Sherif S. Sharawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Curatolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Whenna Eugenia Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2517. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Catalino, his wife, Maria Donati Catalino, and their daughter, Maria Catalino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2518. A bill for the relief of Harbhajn S. Sandhu and his wife, Malathi Sandhu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2519. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carol Bright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2520. A bill for the relief of Si Chul Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2521. A bill for the relief of Clementina Filippotti Florenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2522. A bill for the relief of Meguerditch Avakian, his wife, Loosin Avakian, and their minor children, Ayda Avakian, Verjine-Eugenia Avakian, and Chazaros Avakian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Joseph Benudiz and his wife, Carmen Arregui Zuluaga Benudiz, and their children, Carlos Benudiz, Salmon Benudiz, and Messod Prosper Benudiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Mijo Zeljeznak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Douglas A. Smithers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Miss Estherina Zonghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Chin-Yao Cheng and Chin-Sui Cheng; to the Committee on the Judicary.

H.R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Alfred Siniora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Helen Pappa Konstantinou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Mario Dossi and Giuseppina Dossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fidelio and Concettina Fidelio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Francesco Trapani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GILBERT:
H.R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Nicola, Vera, Franco, and Ezio Milella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GRAY:
H.R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Ayhan Turkbas and his wife, Ozel O. Turkbas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HALPERN:
H.R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Rosa Vexelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2536. A bill for the relief of Cyla Gurewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Antonio Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2539. A bill for the relief of Claudine Annie Madec Hersh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2540. A bill for the relief of Ordella Agatha Aldred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Aram Bagdasar Dinkci and Araksi Dinkci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HANLEY:
H.R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Carcione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:
H.R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Guzin Delman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bonifacia Cruz Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rebii Mehmet Hankan and his wife, Mesadet Seher Hankan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HOSMER:
H.R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Yusef N. Musalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KEITH:
H.R. 2548. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosalinda de Medeiros Pacheco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2549. A bill for the relief of Marjorie E. Woodward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Ana Santos Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2551. A bill for the relief of Branco da Gloria Franco Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Mario Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Jesus Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2554. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Manuel Amaral Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2555. A bill for the relief of Rui Ferreira Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Manuel Paulo Tavares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCLORY:
H.R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Frank Simms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:
H.R. 2558. A bill for the relief of Chaido Giannopoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2559. A bill for the relief of Fang-Tsun Kuo and his wife Agatha Mei-Tso Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2560. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido V. Ticsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2561. A bill for the relief of Nandalal Yepuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MURPHY of New York:
H.R. 2562. A bill for the relief of Carmela Togni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2563. A bill for the relief of Avriel Cubas Price and Clinton L. Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2564. A bill for the relief of Michele Buffa, his wife Orsola Buffa, and children Juan and Geronima Buffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H.R. 2565. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:
H.R. 2566. A bill for the relief of Capt. Vernon H. Detrick, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PICKLE:
H.R. 2567. A bill for the relief of Tancredo Townsend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. POAGE:
H.R. 2568. A bill for the relief of Louis Jung Shaw Gore, his wife, Sue Won Wong Gore, and their two sons, Jone Yee Gore and Jone Fon Gore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eulalia Sayas DeBattiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROBISON:
H.R. 2570. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2571. A bill for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2572. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincent Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H.R. 2573. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Peter Sampson, also known as Kenneth Peter Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SCHEUER:
H.R. 2574. A bill for the relief of Amy Ann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMITH of California:
H.R. 2575. A bill for the relief of Miss Anahid Nerses Grashian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H.R. 2576. A bill for the relief of Joao Pereira Morais and Maria da Gloria Morais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TODD:
H.R. 2577. A bill for the relief of Gary Rosenhagen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:
H.R. 2579. A bill for the relief of Elvira Cammisa-Viggiani; 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:

70. By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce, Clarksburg, W. Va., favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Richmond, Calif. petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the challenge by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party of the five Mississippi Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Clash in Basic Assumptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a great deal of what is said during a national political campaign is intended only for the moment. Much of it takes on a peculiarly hollow ring when read or repeated several weeks after an election.

No such disadvantage attaches to the remarks of a colleague which I have obtained permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During the campaign, the Honorable RICHARD HANNA, who represents a portion of my neighboring Orange County, Calif., was asked to discuss a foreign policy conflict which had emerged in positions taken by the two major candidates for President.

With many of us, I am afraid such an opportunity would have become the occasion for intensely partisan remarks. But DICK HANNA, displaying the breadth and charity that have marked his outlook as a Member of this House, chose instead the clinical approach. He analyzed the dialogs developing on foreign policy. And he found that there existed a clash in basic assumptions which seemed to bar any sort of consensus. His assessment of the radical right—with which Mr. HANNA disagrees as strongly as with the radical left—is based on considerations of cause and effect, rather than what he sees as good or evil.

I commend this address to the attention of other Members.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—A CLASH OF BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

(By Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA)

We have had, in this campaign, a real conflict between the two presidential candidates over questions of foreign policy. To a

marked degree that conflict has highlighted the obvious sharp division which the subject of foreign policy occasions in our country today. We surely ought to look at some of the differing assumptions about it, and try for a more basic understanding of these differences.

Maybe one of the reasons we are so badly split as a national right now, on basic questions affecting our very survival, is that we have done very little examining of our assumptions. I mean both sides here, the assumptions of those, including myself, who for almost two decades since the end of World War II have supported an essentially bipartisan, internationalist, pro-United Nations, proforeign aid, pro-nuclear-test-ban foreign policy, and advocated the containment of communism, perhaps with some emphasis on the liberation of peoples under Communist rule. For want of a better term, let us call this group the "mainstream" in America, it being understood that we do not mean the mainstream of one party alone, but the mainstream, until recently, of the dominant elements of both. This broad mainstream or center position—center at least until the major challenge to it grew up on the right—would contain the foreign policies of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. The mainstream position also generally received the support during these administrations of a powerful bipartisan majority in both the House and the Senate.

I also want to look at the assumptions of the conservative group on the political right which is now so strongly challenging and cutting into this formerly bipartisan policy of the mainstream. This broad sector, which I will call the Right Branch, has grown to the point where it took over the leadership of the Republican Party at the GOP convention in San Francisco in July. The Right Branchers include those of both parties who are to a greater or lesser degree against the United Nations, against foreign aid, and against agreements with Communist countries. The Right Brancher expounds not the containment of communism or containment with some emphasis on liberation, but rather, complete victory over communism.

To complete a very rough division of the political spectrum in regard to foreign policy, I should mention three other categories. On the far right we have the familiar rightwing extremists, such as the John Birchers, the Ku Kluxers, the Minutemen and other groups which exaggerate the positions of the Right Branchers to the point where they fall wholly outside the democratic framework. Corresponding to them, but on the extreme political left, are the leftwing extremists, the American Communist Party and other revolutionaries seeking the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Our fifth group, within the democratic consensus but to the left of the American mainstream, is what I'll call the Left Branch. For one reason or another, members of this group do not support the mainstream of American policy, often objecting to our system of alliances or our military power buildup or our possession of nuclear weapons. They may disagree fundamentally with our policy in particular areas, such as Vietnam, usually from the standpoint that it is too interventionist or belligerent. In this group are the pacifists, those who would disarm unilaterally, and those members of so-called peace groups who differ basically with the mainstream's foreign policy.

When you're looking at basic assumptions that shape your views on foreign policy, where do you begin? I suppose with your views about the nature of man. I'll ignore at this point the assumption built into the question, the question of whether a man's philosophical assumptions do indeed shape his politics. At least it is clear that some syndromes of political views tend to go along with certain basic ideas about the nature of man. And perhaps the first thing on which our mainstreamers and Right Branchers would split has to do with people's similarities and differences. The Right Brancher tends to stress the uniqueness of each individual as well as the individual's natural rights, particularly his freedom from restraint by government. This is fine, by itself. But the idea that individuals are all different from each other somehow gets mixed up with the view that, across international boundaries, whole peoples too are very different from each other. Moreover, within countries, the Right Brancher often sees great and scarcely bridgeable differences between racial groups, religious groups, and social classes. Somehow the foreign groups, and the other groups within his own society, usually turn out to be inferior, if not actually subversive. If we shift our lens from the Right Brancher to the right wing extremist, we note that just about anyone who dares to disagree with him is so different that he is considered mildly or wholly traitorous.

Point 1 then about the nature of man, from Right Brancher's standpoint, is the differences he has with others of his kind. Point 2 follows closely behind: Since men have little in common with each other, particularly across different economic, social, religious, racial or national groupings, there is accordingly little basis for real agreement in a world that consists essentially of conflict rather than cooperation.

Point 3 has to do with how much free will a man has. He has a great deal of free will, in Right Brancher's view, with very little of his life or thinking determined by outside forces. Moreover, Right Brancher considers his politics to be primarily the product of his own mind, through right reasoning. This contrasts rather sharply with the various forms of determinism which may be encountered in the thinking of Left Brancher. Those on the left incline to the view that a man's politics is wholly determined by his economic interest, or perhaps by his relationships with his parents before the age of 7, or by his sense of social justice, or by his total environment.

As a middle-of-the-roader on this issue, I would myself guess that there are rather greater limitations on free will than Right Brancher assumes, but more than the various determinists of the Left Branch would allow. Right Brancher's assumption finds little or no support in psychology or other behavioral sciences. Still, Right Brancher would be merely a harmless, though negative and pessimistic, sort of fellow were it not for some other basic assumptions and characteristics. These transform him into an active threat to all that man has laboriously constructed over the centuries.

A primary factor in human events, in Right Brancher's view, is the dominance of physical force over the realm of ideas. Force rules the world in almost unchallenged rein, the sword is mightier than the pen; power is worthy of respect for its own sake; and respect for her power is what America must demand from the disorderly nations of the world. The American military man is to be glorified and trusted, while civilian authority is at least somewhat suspect, if indeed it is not actually selling America down the mainstream.

We have then men who are very different from each other, their thoughts very little influenced by the social conditions under which they live, and among whom there is very little basis for agreement or cooperations. It is a world of conflict, in which force dominates. Moreover (and this will be highly significant when we consider the ability of the Right Brancher to understand the appeals of the Communist enemy), it is a world in which social justice will pretty well take care of itself. Social welfare should not of course be any major concern of government, particularly at the national level. It should be left basically to the individual's own efforts and the operation of the economic laws of the marketplace. Government should not, above all, employ such devices as the graduated income tax, in a misguided effort to create an artificial, unnatural equality. If wealth tends to concentrate in the hands of a small class, this is only a fitting reward for those of superior ability and effort.

The Right Branch's assumptions about the nature of communism are also significant. Communism is an unmitigated, unchanging evil, uniformly so, everywhere. The fact that it seeks world rule and the downfall of the United States is a hidden truth which must somehow be made known, and which the leaders of the Government of the United States have stubbornly refused to believe. Any U.S. official who may have known this and who still supports U.S. policies toward Communist countries is at least soft on communism, and perhaps even infected with treason.

Like most of the other assumptions of the Right Branch, this one overlaps with and becomes stronger and more exaggerated among rightwing extremists. Its high point is the published view of Robert Welch that President Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

In addition to its assumptions, we should mention certain characteristic tendencies of the Right Branch approach: They can be summarized as the tendency to oversimplify, to be highly impatient, to be intolerant, and to be extremely suspicious. International politics is viewed in terms similar to those of a very short western, in which the good cowboys face down or shoot up the bandits. The plot is thickened only to the extent that meanwhile, back at the ranch, some dirty work is usually being plotted.

Another characteristic of the Right Brancher, and a particularly strong characteristic of the rightwing extremist, is a tendency to stress the menace, peril or threat of communism, and to play down or ignore any nonthreatening accomplishments in Communist countries. This is in part a natural inference from basic Right Branch assumptions. However, in some cases it is no doubt a consciously used technique in the Right Branch's bid for political support. The political strength of the right tends to increase with increases in the strength of the Communists and fears of them. This political phenomenon has been observed in many countries, and was particularly clear in the Nazi and Communist election returns under the Weimar Republic of Germany during Hitler's rise to power.

Our analytical groupings within the American foreign policy spectrum may not of course describe the views of any one man at all times. A man's views may be in one category one day and slip into another the next. Still, for those who at any given time are basing their thinking on the Right Branch assumptions we have outlined, a number of specific conclusions about American foreign policy logically follow.

The Right Brancher's basic aim for America is characteristically simple, negative, and forceful: complete victory over communism. This does not mean anything so mild as the evolution of communism in the direction of greater economic and political freedom. Such changes would be at least partly contrary to his assumption about the nature of communism. In any case, they would be complex, would take a lot of time, and would be wholly unsatisfying. Communism must be overthrown or, if war comes, defeated in war.

All American policies should be judged, according to the Right Brancher, according to whether they contribute to the defeat of communism. Anything which contributes to

our victory is good, anything which hinders it is evil.

To the Right Brancher, most contacts with Communist countries fall into the category of helping communism and impeding victory. Trade, aid and cultural exchange should be cut off; diplomatic relations of any kind are at best of dubious value, and might well be severed. Communist countries should in general be cut off from the free world and denied membership in international organizations.

The United Nations, owing to the very nature of the conflict in the world, can at best be a sort of debating society. It is useful only to the extent that it can serve as an instrument of U.S. policy. It is dangerous to the extent that the United States alters its policies to accommodate the U.N., which is increasingly made up of immature, nonwhite, new members.

Disarmament is, of course, a complete mirage as well as undesirable in itself, Right Brancher maintains. It can only be a screen under which the Communists seek to gain a decisive military advantage. The partial nuclear test ban is a dangerous indication of our willingness to be lulled to sleep. The Communists can be counted upon to break the ban whenever they believe this is in their interests.

Foreign aid is a drain on the U.S. taxpayer and a frightful example of waste and inefficiency. It is founded on the fallacious notion that if we fill people's stomachs, we can turn their minds from communism. On the contrary, Right Brancher holds, if they would merely straighten out their thinking, they could liberate the energies to improve their own economies. In short they have no one to blame but themselves. Certain types of aid might be extended to countries which are already our proven friends. None should go to Communist or neutralist countries.

Our alliances have limited value. Their worst feature is that they are essentially defensive. They do not adequately protect the free world against either internal subversion or overt aggression, and our main reliance must continue to be on our own power, particularly the capacity to wage limited nuclear wars. Our allies are socialistic and politically unreliable in many cases, and refuse to bring themselves into line with strong anti-Communist policy. We must be prepared on occasion to go it alone.

In general, negotiations with the Communist world are to be avoided, because they always seem to involve some right or territory of the free world which the Communists want. If what's theirs is theirs, and what's ours is negotiable, we can never hope to gain, we can at best hold even, according to Right Brancher. Since world tensions are created by the Communists, they can be relaxed by the Communists also, unilaterally, without negotiation. Since any agreement worth making with the Communists must be in the interests of the Communists to keep, there is no need to negotiate a treaty about it in the first place. The Communists will go ahead and do what's in their interest in any case.

As is evident, the foreign policy of the Right Branch would repeal much of existing U.S. foreign policy. But what would it put in its place? It is strong on what it is, and what it is, is strength. This means military strength, economic strength, strength to promote revolt in Communist countries and strength to participate ourselves in operations against vulnerable Communist regimes. Characteristically, it does not seem strong on other ideas, and appears to have little or no economic or social content. These things would presumably take care of themselves largely without interference by national governments or international organizations, once world communism were overthrown.

These are, in summary form, the main assumptions, characteristics, and policy recommendations of the Right Branch in this country. In general, I would have to take strong exception to most of the assumptions made in the Right Branch's challenge to American foreign policy. I also believe the characteristics associated with this approach are harmful in the conduct of foreign relations, and that the specific recommendations which the Right Branch offers would be disastrous. Far from achieving victory over communism, I believe they would result in the loss of America's position in the world to the point where we would indeed be forced to choose between allout war and surrender. Either one would be a catastrophe beyond measure.

I am proud to belong to what has until recently been the bipartisan mainstream of American policy. I disagree with those of the opposite Left Branch who hold that we can disarm unilaterally before our potential adversaries do likewise, in the hope that they will follow suit. Military power is an undeniable reality in the anarchic world from which we are slowly emerging, and during this process our country must be able to deal from a position of military strength.

And I recognize, as have successive American Presidents and Secretaries of State from the time of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, that this country must use its power effectively to thwart the attempted expansion of the Communist empire. But I must confess that just assembling the main assumptions and proposals of the Right Branch is itself an indication of their almost pathetically distorted, shallow and inadequate nature.

Of the major assumptions we have reviewed, one to which I have already entered a vigorous dissent, is the view that we have little in common with other peoples. I would concede that, in the absence of an effective rule of law in the world, force has dominated the relations of states. Potential agreements among nations in developing a more secure, prosperous world are everywhere impeded by the requirements of military preparedness. But this in no way denies that the potential is there. Even in the case of the deepest gulf, that between the Communists and ourselves, I would argue that we have certain strong interests in common.

I believe that everybody likes to be able to get his family enough to eat and enough of the other things they need, and would welcome the end of the financial burden he pays for military security; I think that everybody has an interest in seeing that his family and friends can live in a world without the threat of war. It seems to me every Russian, Communist or not, and every American, too, has a common interest in seeing that nuclear weapons do not spread all over the world. I believe we all have an interest in the health and perfection of coming generations of children.

With such common interests as these, there is, I believe, a basis on which to work for the achievement of arms control and disarmament. Our country should, with all awareness of the difficulties and risks involved, keep everlastingly at it.

I believe in the importance of looking at things from the longrun as well as the shortrun standpoint. When you do this, a number of assumptions of the Right Branch collapse in a heap. Ideas, which may be secondary in importance to military power in any given crisis, take on added importance as the time span increases. Over the decades and the centuries, the power of ideas is determining, while the power of armies fades. The ability of any social system to satisfy the yearning of most men for social justice will be crucial to its longrun survival. In these vital areas, the Right Branch would leave us defenseless.

A recent United Nations report has found that while considerable wealth was concentrated in the hands of 5 percent of the population, more than half the people of all of Latin America made a per capita income of only $120 a year. This is probably far less than many members of the wealthier group might spend on entertainment alone in a short period of time. This is a situation inviting Communist revolution. It breeds revolution not so much because people with empty stomachs tend to go Communist, but because it appalls any who may have a sense of social justice, whatever their income level.

The Right Branch's suggestion that whatever helps victory over communism is good is not a useful standard for American foreign policy. It ignores all the myriad problems of this world with which a great country such as ours must be concerned, and which exist wholly independently of the Communist movement: hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, exploding population, to name but a few.

This suggested standard has no power to command the allegiance of men, being wholly negative. And most ludicrous of all, those who propose it are obviously unqualified to judge when we are, and when we are not, making progress in the basic battle for men's minds, both inside the Communist orbit and in the contested areas. About all the Right Branch can do is see where the red is on the map, and then seek to combat it with ultimatums or force. It proposes, in fact, that we surrender the main part of the battle, because it doesn't understand it.

The American foreign policy which has developed over the years since 1945 is essentially sound. It will be improved, adjusted to changing conditions, and made more effective as we proceed. But above all, we must face the future with our minds open and with respect for our fellow man in our hearts.

The President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson rang the bell with me in his message to Congress on education, when he stated unequivocally that the education of our youth is the No. 1 business of the American people.

On the other hand, the President's bill is complex and requires more study than I have given it—especially the part that includes benefits for parochial schools. I understand that the administration estimates that 15 percent of the funds could go to private schools, mostly indirectly rather than directly, although they could share in some direct programs.

Personally, I am going to refrain from any comment on such details at this time, pending a thorough airing in the House Education Committee. In general, however, I agree with the President that our national goal should be full educational opportunity for all, and I likewise agree with President Johnson—and this should be emphasized—that education is primarily a State function.

In this latter connection, Mr. Speaker, there is a potential danger that I foresee. It could be that the $1.5 billion asked by the President in his message could give the various States the idea that the Federal Government, by this

new bill, would be assuming their traditional responsibility. On the contrary, this program—large as it may seem—is not intended to relieve the States of their financial responsibility. Under this program, State legislatures—and this is true of my own State of Washington—are not intended to reduce their expenditures for schools; and, speaking of Washington State, as an example, its established pattern of taxation has resulted in serious inequities. The burden on taxpayers has been inequitable. Our per capita expenditure is high compared with most States, but responsible school leaders admit there is a dangerous emergency facing Washington State in financing its schools adequately. In our State, we should revise our system of raising funds for education, and to properly carry out the State's own constitutional responsibility, the State legislature must increase and equalize school support. Getting back, however, I must point out that the headlines and news reports on the President's message could falsely indicate that new Federal aid is on the way to ease the cost of education in the States. But, as I see it, the reverse is true. The Federal Government, under the President's proposal, will actually require more in the way of State matching funds.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would comment that President Johnson has given Congress and the American people a most persuasive argument for more Federal encouragement and support of our schools at all levels. If the proposed program is free of Federal domination and control, I would certainly expect to vote for it, because I believe that the answer to America's problems such as poverty and full employment lies in upgrading our youth and adequately financing our educational system at the secondary as well as the higher levels.

In conclusion, let me repeat, the President's program does not meet all the Nation's educational needs; it does not afford anything like the resources needed for new school construction, teacher recruitment, or the improvement of teachers' salaries.

I sincerely hope that State and local governments will take care of these aspects of the problem.

We Must Say to Them That They Cannot Win "Elections" From a System Based on Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the opening day of this 89th Congress, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, made a speech in the House of Representatives of great significance on the subject of the seating of the Mississippi delegation. I commend him for his depth of thought and courage of expression, and recommend to all the reading of his poignant remarks, which begin on page 52 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Family Farm: A Blueprint for Its Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read with dismay and shock a recent magazine article by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, embracing a blueprint for doom of the family farm system in America.

Since the Bureau of the Budget is the policy arm of the White House, many people are asking if this blueprint, this prescription, this pattern for the destruction of the farm system that has become the envy of the world, soon may be presented to the Congress.

There are now 3,500,000 farms in the United States. As recently as 1940 there were 6,350,000 farms.

This rural attrition already has changed the face of our Nation, and we now are struggling in the Congress and in the executive department to deal with poverty, crime, and other pressing emergencies among the impacted populations in our cities.

Now, Mr. Gordon tells us, "One million farmers could produce all the Nation's farm needs, including large commercial exports," and he says the other 2,500,000 farmers "require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move."

Mr. Speaker, such a transition for 2,500,000 farmers and their families would move perhaps 7,500,000 farm people out of rural America. Where would they go, except into the poverty program in the cities?

Thousands of Main Street towns would become ghost towns. What would become of all the businesses and all the people who populate our rural towns?

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the President of these United States has greater wisdom than to follow such a course.

Moreover, Budget Director Gordon is an honorable man; he is an able man of very substantial accomplishments. Most of his experience has been in Government employment. I cannot find that he ever has had any direct association with agriculture. I can explain his position with respect to farmers, as stated in the magazine article, only by surmising that he has been listening to the wrong people. I am certain that when he broadens his knowledge his fine mind will impel him to become a foremost advocate of the family farm system that has blessed this country with the greatest abundance any people on earth ever has enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been, in recent days, a great deal of newspaper comment, along with the magazine article I have mentioned, which has treated in a very cavalier fashion the share of the national budget that goes for commodity programs in agriculture.

Considering the value of these programs to America's free agriculture, and the importance of new legislation in the present session, I think it is essential that we set in order some of the misstatements and misunderstandings that are reflected in these articles. Most of them, I might add, are authored by people without connection with farming and with little or no background in the subject.

It is always a fair and worthy enterprise—in any legislative year—to examine critically the ongoing programs of the Government as well as those proposed. It is essential—in fairness to taxpayers—that we examine the worth to the Nation and to the economy of every part of every program that is budgeted with public funds. So I welcome this examination of the farm programs—which are, after all, reckoned in a great many dollars.

I am troubled, however, by a number of quick assumptions which find ready acceptance among the unknowing, and eager credence among people who are looking for easy ways to cut Federal costs. And all of us are eager to find budget savings—to ease the burden on the taxpayer. So it is only too easy to fall into the trap of easy budget cutting—particularly when we cannot readily see a direct loss to our own families and our own security.

I am troubled.

I am troubled by the tendency to see the farm programs as welfare programs—programs that can only be justified as a handout to a submerged and needy peasantry. The price support and acreage adjustment programs are not welfare programs—and they never have been. They are not means of distributing funds to the needy—and they never have been. The real purpose is to enable U.S. agriculture to attain and maintain a level of income and family living that is fair in terms of the remainder of America's free society. And that was the basic idea, back in the 1930's, when we first began to develop effective commodity programs.

I am troubled—by repeated references to the so-called top million of America's farmers. These are the farmers who gross cash sales above $10,000 or more in the average year—and as a result are supposedly ready to set sail in a sea of laissez faire which does not prevail for any other segment of our economy. What is overlooked is this: The average farmer in this top million class is able to keep, as operator's earnings, only 20 percent of the dollars he gets for products sold. After allowing 5 percent interest on capital and hired hand wages for

himself and family, he still is not earning a return on his capital, labor, and management comparable with returns earned by nonfarmers.

Remember, too, that in order to produce $2,500 in earnings the farmer enterprise needs on the average an investment in the $50,000 range. Also that in order to earn even the $2,500, some farmers may have cash sales well over $20,000. These are, of course, subject to wide variation.

But most important: If some of these top million farmers have climbed near to income parity—they have climbed there, and are remaining there, in a farm economy stabilized by farm programs. Many, many farmers would drop out of this top group in a hurry, if they had to face the kind of price declines they would be up against in the absence of farm programs.

I am talking about a drop in wheat prices of almost half—a drop in feed grain prices of more than a fifth—severe drops in other commodities, including a 20-percent decline in the price of cattle, which are not even price supported. Indicated price declines in this magnitude are so well established by numerous nongovernmental studies that they cannot be doubted or ignored.

I am troubled because to suggest that the top million farmers no longer need income protection is like saying that the top 27 percent of industrial workers can now be deprived of union protection, because they are so well off. It is like saying that the top 27 percent of bank depositors should be deprived of deposit insurance. It is like saying that investors in the top 27 percent of U.S. corporations should all be deprived of the protection provided by limited liability under the law—by antitrust legislation, and countless other legal protections.

What some writers have been doing is to take the top 27 percent of America's farmers, compare their incomes with the average of industrial workers, and declare that their incomes are almost up to parity. And then say: These 1 million farmers are no longer peasants—so let them eat cake.

I am troubled by all this misunderstanding because I know that the support of income is only part of the tremendous job that commodity programs perform. The commodity programs are important in putting land to the uses that are best suited for it and in avoiding the waste and expense of excessive production that cannot be put to use here or abroad even with the best in salesmanship and the ultimate in generosity.

It is simply a matter of too many resources available to agriculture. For every 2 acres we harvested in 1964, there stood on the sidelines an additional acre that could easily have come into the game. With only two out of every three acres needed to produce abundantly for us all—it made more sense to conserve this extra acre. About half of this extra acre was in fallow, in temporary pasture, perhaps idle for one reason or another—but the other half was kept out of surplus production by a public program designed to do that very thing.

This is the resource situation as it exists in agriculture, and it is not well understood. For every 2 acres harvested, we have another acre in unneeded cropland, as I have said. But we also have between four and five acres in grassland and another four to five acres in woodland. In a real pinch, many of these acres could come into cropland use.

Without acreage adjustment programs, certainly much of the extra cropland would come into production. And this condition of excessive resources will continue into the future because rising technology is increasing the productive power of each acre. Meanwhile the individual farmer, acting alone, can do very little about this—and this would be true even if you sent 2½ million of him to town and kept only a million farmers in food and fiber production.

I am troubled because if that happened I fear for the traditional structure of our rural communities, town and farm alike. If a million farmers can produce food for all of us—why not a half million, a quarter of a million, a hundred thousand?

Then, where will these few thousand large individual or corporate operated farms get their supplies? From the local machinery dealers? The feed dealer? The seed dealer? Not on your life. You would see direct buying from wholesaler and manufacturer that would leave little room for the local farm supply dealer and little need for the other local retailers who would be depending on a dwindling hinterland.

You would create poverty in rural America faster than you could lick it—even with the best intentions.

It has been suggested that food production might eventually be concentrated in a few strong hands—which by that time might be able to exert sufficient control to manage their production as auto builders manage theirs. And this would avoid surpluses and get the Government out of agriculture. But would this be a happy solution?

Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance? Or would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production publicly as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline? Both of these have been suggested as serious possibilities.

Am I overdramatizing? I do not believe so. We have already gone a long way down a road marked by abandoned farms and dying towns. And this is no time to run out on agriculture. A famous farm economist said prophetically, just a few days ago, that agriculture is heading along a collision course—toward a point where the welfare and existence of family farm agriculture will clash with concern for the Federal budget.

I am truly concerned about the future of our traditional American freeholding agriculture. The agriculture that has done so much to sustain our democratic traditions. The agriculture that has made possible the great industrial society that is now America. The agriculture that stands, more than any other element of our society, as an example to the world.

A Japanese farmer once said:

> A farmer without land is like a man without a soul.

And, wherever in this world, the peasant and the sharecropper and the agrarian oppressed look for a better life on the land, they look for their model to the free agriculture of America.

In the world, America's farmers have not only exported food, they have exported hope. In America, they have not only sent their sons to become industrial and business and professional leaders, they have made food the biggest bargain in history. Indeed, American farmers for the last 10 years have not been subsidized by the public—farmers have instead subsidized the American consumer.

They have done this by providing food at a constantly declining real cost. The average family buys food for less than 19 percent of its take-home pay—compared with about 23 percent in the early 1950's. As an example, if the 23 percent had continued to this day, Americans would now be spending each year—for every man, woman, and child—better than $95 more for food than we are now spending. For a family of five, almost $500.

Even at subparity prices agriculture now contributes about $42 billion a year in new wealth, which jangles local cash registers and feeds a giant sector of the total economy. All this for 1½ cents of the Federal tax dollar. Let us search for budget savings, Mr. Speaker, but let us keep things in proportion.

May I say again that the farm commodity programs are not welfare. They are programs that help to strengthen and stabilize our entire economy—just as other economic groups have their protections. But let us not forget that U.S. agriculture is the way it is, and the success it is, because we have made it that way. As public policy, the encouragement of agrarian settlement goes back to the very beginnings—to colonial times and the early days of the Republic. The early grants of kings' lands. The grants of extensive rights-of-way to encourage railroad building and settlement. The Homestead Act.

The American public has, almost from the start, subsidized research and the improvement of crops and livestock. The extension idea developed as a natural sequence—and one that was unique in the world. The credit programs were developed, because we could see that wherever farmers have been oppressed and submerged, it was partly because they had no means of obtaining control of the land they farmed.

Our freeholding system of agriculture, widely held, is our own creature—developed in a free society, by a free society, because we thought it the best system and encouraged its growth along these lines through public policy. It is important that we not cast away lightly—in the name of economy—a farming system that has been 300 years in the making. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am troubled.