State officers are: Dr. Phillip E. Greenman, president; Dr. Ben C. Scharf, vice president; Dr. C. Fred Peckham, secretary; Dr. C. Gorham Beckwith, treasurer; and Dr. Arthur Prestine, sergeant at arms.

NYSOS directors are: Dr. Floyd Boshart, Dr. Harold S. Goldberg, Dr. Wendell Bizzozero, Dr. Morton H. Rothstein, and Dr. Max L. Kamen.

The new officers of the city society are: Dr. William D. Miller, president; Dr. Melvin Weiss, president-elect; Dr. Jerry Rosenblatt, vice president; Dr. Harry Teplitz, secretary; and Dr. Viola C. Kreuner, treasurer. Directors are: Dr. Stanley Schiowitz, Dr. Albert Heyman, and Dr. Aaron Weintraub.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., 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, amid the confusion of this clamorous world, we would wait in quietness, that the roiled waters of agitated discussions may become clear; and our disturbed spirits, tranquil pools of prayer and peace.

In the midst of events so colossal on the confused world's stage, O God, who sitteth above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we can ever know, by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent. Solemnize those who in this Chamber bear the burdens of the Nation with the consciousness that beyond the appraisals of men regarding what is done and said, there falls upon the record here made the searching light of Thy judgment.

Whatever the future holds, may we face it calmly and in confidence, with the assurance that there live truth and beauty that man cannot kill. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 10, 1965, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 287, S. 1698.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1698) to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by adding after the seventh sentence the following: "The Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall immediately notify the Attorney General of the approval of any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liability pursuant to this subsection, and such transaction shall not be consummated until thirty calendar days after the date of approval: *Provided, however,* That, if an antitrust suit to enjoin such transaction is instituted within said thirty-day period, the merger shall not be consummated until after the termination of such antitrust suit and then only to the extent consistent with the final judgment in such antitrust suit: *Provided further,* That when the agency finds that it must act immediately in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks and reports on the competitive factors involved may be dispensed with, the transaction may be consummated immediately upon approval by the agency: *And provided further,* That, when an emergency exists requiring expeditious action and reports on the competitive factors involved are requested within ten days, the transaction may not be consummated within less than five calendar days after approval by the agency. When a transaction is consummated pursuant to the above procedure, no proceedings under the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1–7) and the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12–27), shall thereafter be instituted concerning the transaction. Notwithstanding the above provisions, any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities involving an insured bank, which was consummated prior to the enactment of this amendment pursuant to the then appropriate regulatory approval or approvals, State or Federal, and where the resulting bank has not been dissolved or divided or has not effected a sale or distribution of assets or has not taken any other similar action pursuant to a final judgment under the antitrust laws prior to the enactment of this amendment, shall be exempt from the antitrust laws including the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1–7) and the Clayton Act (12 U.S.C. 12–27)."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the bill has the endorsement of practically all the bankers in the United States. The American Bankers Association preferred the bill as the junior Senator from Virginia originally introduced it. But that bill was objected to by some members of the Independent Bankers Association, who preferred the provision suggested by the Federal Reserve Board as an alternative in case the Congress did not choose to support my bill; namely, that there would be a brief waiting period after all the State and Federal banking agencies had approved a merger to give the Justice Department a time in which to go to court to seek an injunction against the merger if it wished to do so.

So in the interest of speedy action, and in the nature of a friendly gesture, in executive session the amendment suggested by the Federal Reserve Board and favored by the Independent Bankers Association was offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and agreed to. In its amended form the bill was unanimously reported to the Senate. It now has the endorsement of the American Bankers Association, even though they still prefer my original bill.

The proposed legislation met the only substantive objection that was raised before our committee on the bill. Everyone agrees that the present situation is undesirable. It is a real mess. Over 2,000 banks have merged since 1950; over $15 billion of assets are involved. The banks want to know what the situation is because there is no statute of limitations.

So the bill would do three things:

First. It would give a clearance to all past mergers.

Second. It would require all future mergers to wait for 30 days after approval before actually consolidating, in order to give the Justice Department an opportunity to go to court while the two banks were still separate. Generally there is a period of 6 months, perhaps 8 months before the approval is granted. I know of a Virginia case in which the State took a year and a half to act on a merger application. And in every case the Department of Justice has 30 days to review the application and report on the competitive factors involved in the merger, even before the banking agency approves the merger. So the Justice Department would have 60 days in every case. There are some exceptions for emergencies, such as cases where a bank is about to fail, but there is no problem about these, as far as I know. The Department would then have 1 additional month.

Third. If the Department had not acted within this 30-day period after the agency approval, they may merge and be free from attack under the antitrust laws. Remember that these are mergers that have the full approval of all the banking agencies—if it is a State bank, the bank must first get by the State authorities; the application is dead if it does not; and then the Federal agencies.

So I am pleased that the Senate has agreed to consider the bill by unanimous consent. The hearings have been printed. They are on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the committee report which go into more detail.

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

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

The bill would require that future bank mergers should not be consummated until 30 days after the date of approval by the appropriate banking agency under the Bank Merger Act. If the Justice Department did not institute a suit under the antitrust laws during this 30-day period, the merger could be consummated and would thereafter be exempt from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. If a suit were started, the merger could not take place until the suit had been concluded, and then only if consistent with the final judgment in the suit.

The bill would exempt from the Sherman and the Clayton Acts all mergers consummated before its enactment, unless action such as splitting the bank in two had in fact been taken pursuant to a final judgment in an antitrust suit.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 was the result of many years of legislative efforts following the enactment of the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, which made the restrictions of section 7 applicable to asset acquisitions by corporations subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission.

Two approaches were taken.

The Justice Department and a number of Senators and Representatives recommended that section 7 be made applicable to bank mergers. A bill to accomplish this purpose, H.R. 5948, 84th Congress, passed the House in 1956, but did not become law. Several other bills to the same effect were introduced in the Senate and in the House.

The banking agencies and a number of Senators and Representatives recommended that the Federal Deposit Insurance Act should be amended to provide that the banking agencies should review mergers by insured banks on the basis of competitive factors as well as banking factors. This suggestion appears to have been proposed first by the Federal Reserve Board in its letter of March 21, 1945, to the House Judiciary Committee in connection with H.R. 2357, 79th Congress (hearings on S. 1698, pp. 329–330, 345), and in a committee print of that bill dated June 8, 1945 (hearings on S. 1698, pp. 331–344). Bills along these lines were passed by the Senate in 1956 and 1957, but did not become law.

The Bank Merger Act was passed by the Senate in 1959. It was amended by the House in 1960, and the Senate accepted the House amendments.

The congressional understanding of the bank merger bill was clearly and succinctly stated at the time of its passage by the majority leader, Senator Johnson of Texas, in the following words: "This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permit many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

Following the enactment of the Bank Merger Act, suits under the antitrust laws were brought against several bank mergers effected pursuant to the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board under the Bank Merger Act. In the Philadelphia bank case, *U.S.* v. *Philadelphia National Bank et al.* (374 U.S. 321 (1963)) the Supreme Court held that section 7 of the Clayton Act was made applicable to bank mergers by the 1950 amendment to that section and that the proposed merger would violate that section. In *U.S.* v. *First National Bank and Trust Co. of Lexington, Ky.* (376 U.S. 665 (1964)) the Supreme Court held that a merger which had already been consummated violated section 1 of the Sherman Act. Subsequently the district court directed that the merged bank be split into two separate banks, and efforts are being made to accomplish this.

Four other suits against merged banks are pending in various U.S. district courts, but none have proceeded to final judgments. In all, 765 mergers were approved during the 5 years since the enactment of the Bank Merger Act on May 13, 1960, and 1,435 in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960. Since there is no statute of limitations on antitrust cases, these 2,200 mergers are subject to attack under the antitrust laws. In addition, no future merger can be consummated pursuant to approval under the Bank Merger Act without risk of attack at some future date under the antitrust laws.

The uncertainty created by this situation is harmful to the banking industry and to its customers. The committee, in reporting out in 1959 the bill which became the Bank Merger Act, made it clear that it wished to avoid the situation: "The advance approval feature is important in halting bank acquisitions before they are consummated and in preserving the depositors' confidence in an institution which might otherwise be destroyed by an attempt to unscramble assets after an acquisition has been completed" (S. Rept. 196, 86th Cong., p. 22, hearings on S. 1698, p. 270).

In order to clarify this situation S. 1698 was introduced on April 5, 1965. It would have amended the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers approved under that act would be subject exclusively to the provisions of that act, and it would have exempted from the antitrust laws all mergers heretofore or hereafter approved under the Bank Merger Act and all mergers consummated before May 13, 1960, the date of enactment of the Bank Merger Act.

Extensive hearings were held on S. 1698, on May 19, 20, 21, and 27, 1965. There was unanimous agreement by all the witnesses that the present situation was undesirable and should be changed. In particular there was unanimous agreement that the uncertainty hanging over the 2,200 mergers approved since 1950 should be removed and that future mergers should not take place until their status under the antitrust laws had been made clear, either by failure to file suit within a reasonable period of time or by litigation. There was, however, disagreement among the witnesses as to the desirability of a complete exemption from the antitrust laws for future mergers.

THE PROXMIRE AMENDMENT

In view of the importance of prompt action to clarify the present situation, the committee agreed, without dissent, to report a substitute bill proposed by Senator PROXMIRE embodying the elements on which there was unanimous agreement. As amended, the bill would clear up the status of all past mergers as to which final action pursuant to an antitrust decree had not yet been taken, and in the case of future mergers it would provide the Justice Department 30 days in which to institute suit before a merger could be effected; but if a merger had been consummated after the expiration of the 30-day waiting period, then the merger could not later be attacked.

THE BANKING INDUSTRY

In reporting the Bank Merger Act to the Senate in 1959, the Banking and Currency Committee discussed the special situation of the banking industry and the need to balance competition with sufficient regulation to protect against the evils which have resulted in the past from unregulated competition:

"BANKING IS VESTED WITH A PUBLIC INTEREST AND MUST BE REGULATED LIKE PUBLIC UTILITIES AND MONOPOLIES

"Banks are an integral and essential part of the Nation's fiscal and monetary system. The Government has a vital interest in the Nation's banks as suppliers of funds, as depositories, and as fiscal agents. Commerce, industry, and private citizens have a vital interest in banks as a source of credit needed for development and growth. Depositors have a vital interest in the safety of their deposits.

"Vigorous competition between strong, aggressive, and sound banks is highly desirable; lack of competition, restraints on competition, and monopolistic practices are undesirable. Competition in banking takes many forms—competition for deposits by individuals and corporations and by personal and business depositors; competition for individual, business, and governmental loans; competition for services of various sorts. Competition for deposits increases the amounts available for loans for the development and growth of the Nation's industry and commerce. Competition for loans gives the borrowers better terms and better service and furthers the development of industry and commerce. Vigorous competition in banking stimulates competition in the entire economy, in industry, commerce, and trade. There is no question that competition is desirable in banking, and that competitive factors should be considered in all aspects of the supervision and regulation of banks.

"But it is impossible to require unrestricted competition in the field of banking, and it would be impossible to subject banks to the rules applicable to ordinary industrial and commercial concerns, not subject to regulation and not vested with a public interest.

"Ever since the days of the first and second Banks of the United States and *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat, 316, 1819), it has been generally accepted that banking is a field subject to special regulation by virtue of its effect upon and relation to the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government under article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

"This Federal control over banking long antedated the antitrust laws. The first and second Banks of the United States, the National Bank Act of 1864, and the related tax on notes issued by State banks represented early efforts in the field. The Federal Reserve Act of 1913, the banking legislation of the 1930's, and the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 are more recent reflections of the Federal interest and concern.

"Time and again the Nation has suffered from the results of unregulated and uncontrolled competition in the field of banking, and from insufficiently regulated competition. Rapidly depreciating State and Continental paper money was an important factor in the adoption of the Constitution. After the termination of the first Bank of the United States, excessive State bank note issues, among other causes, led in 1814 to the suspension of specie payments by all the State banks in the country except those in

New England. Wildcat banks and uncontrolled note issuance played a large part in bringing about the panic of 1837 and the panic of 1857. The rapid increase in the number of small weak banks, to such a large number that the Comptroller could not effectively supervise them or control any but the worst abuses, was one of the factors which led to the panic of 1907.

"The banking collapse in the early 1930's again was in large part the result of insufficient regulation and control of banks, in effect the result of too much competition.

"The reform legislation of 1913, while removing many of the defects of the banking system as a system, did very little to strengthen the individual commercial bank. * * * The country continued to be served or disserved by thousands of small, weak, independent banks having inadequate capital, incapable executives, and poor outside connections.

"The banking collapse did not begin in 1931, but was really underway throughout the period of the 1920's. During that decade * * * thousands of banks failed, but the appalling weakness of the banking structure was not immediately realized, because most of the failures occurred in isolated agricultural communities.

"The following tables of bank suspensions from 1921 to 1936, and from 1946 to 1958, show the weakness of the banking system of the 1920's and the comparative strength of the system now.

"Bank suspensions in the United States, 1921–36 [1]

"Year	All banks	National banks	State member banks	State nonmember banks	Total deposits (thousands of dollars)
1921	505	52	19	434	172,188
1922	366	49	13	304	91,182
1923	646	90	32	524	149,601
1924	775	122	38	615	210,151
1925	618	118	28	472	167,555
1926	976	123	35	818	260,378
1927	669	91	31	547	199,329
1928	498	57	16	425	142,386
1929	659	64	17	578	230,643
1930	1,350	161	27	1,162	837,096
1931	2,293	409	107	1,777	1,690,232
1932	1,453	276	55	1,122	706,188
1933	4,000	1,101	174	2,725	3,596,698
1934	57	1	0	56	36,937
1935	34	4	0	30	10,015
1936	44	1	0	43	11,306

"[1] Including private banks but excluding mutual savings banks.

"Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1937, pp. 868–873.

"Commercial bank suspensions because of financial difficulties, United States and other areas, 1946 through 1958 [1]

"Year	All banks	National banks	State member banks	Insured nonmember banks	Noninsured nonmember banks	Deposits (thousands of dollars)
1946	2			1	1	494
1947	6	3		2	1	7,207
1948	3	1	2			10,674
1949	9	2		3	4	9,108
1950	5	2		2	1	5,543
1951	5	1		1	3	6,097
1952	4			3	1	3,313
1953	5		1	3	1	45,101
1954	4			2	2	2,947
1955	5	2		3		11,968
1956	3	1		1	1	11,644
1957	3	1	1		1	12,502
1958	9	1		3	5	10,412
Total	63	14	4	24	21	137,010

"[1] Includes private banks but excludes mutual savings banks. Includes insured banks placed in receivership or insured banks with deposits assumed by another insured bank with the financial aid of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and 3 insured bank suspensions that reopened or merged without financial aid of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"Source: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"The decline in the total number of banks from approximately 31,000 in 1921 to the present level of just over 14,000 must be viewed in the light of the contrast between suspensions in the 1920's and early 1930's, and recent suspensions.

"It was in the light of this background that section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act was written, requiring consideration of the following factors before granting insurance to a bank: the financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the communities to be served by the bank, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the act.

"The basis for handling banking through banking laws, specially framed to fit the particular needs of the field, instead of relying on unrestricted competition and the antitrust laws, is set forth in 'Banking Under the Antitrust Laws' 55 by A. A. Berle (49 Columbia Law Review (1949) 589, at p. 592):

" 'Operations in deposit banking not only affect the commercial field, but also determine in great measure the supply of credit, the volume of money, the value of the dollar, and even, perhaps, the stability of the currency system. Within this area considerations differing from and far more powerful than mere preservation of competition may be operating under direct sanction of law. It is the theory, in ordinary commercial fields, that competition is the desirable check on price levels—the process by which the efficient are rewarded by survival, and the inefficient eliminated by failure. The price of business failures is not regarded as too high for the community to pay in view of advantages to consumers, stimulus toward greater efficiency, and freedom of enterprise. But it is doubtful (to say the least) whether any such assumption is indulged in with respect to deposit banks; certainly the theory is not there accepted to the full extent of its logic. A bank failure is a community disaster, however, wherever, and whenever it occurs. While competition may be desirable up to a point in deposit banking, there is a clear bottom limit to its desirability. So long as 90 percent of the monetary needs of the country are supplied through bank credit, deposits, and checks, under a system which contemplates many thousands of banks and also a uniform, smooth, free flow of bank checks, a high degree of cooperation among banks is essential. So long as certain kinds of banking paper are accepted as a basis for currency through the operations of the Federal Reserve rediscount, a high factor of uniformity is needed. The economic and social premises of the Sherman Act in respect of other businesses are not fully accepted by the Congress, the States, or the public as the only considerations applicable to deposit banking.' " (S. Rept. 196, 86th Cong., pp. 16–19, hearings on S. 1698, pp. 264–267.)

PAST MERGERS

The bill would remove the cloud hanging over the mergers effected since 1950, including both the 1,435 mergers between 1950 and 1960 and the 765 mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act. The bill would apply to mergers against which suits have been brought by the Justice Department, and would free the banks involved in such suits from further proceedings under the antitrust laws. Some mergers have been approved but have not been consummated, either because of a court decree against the merger or because the banks abandoned the proposal. These would not be resurrected. So also, the bill would not undo actions taken pursuant to a final decree. For example, if a merged bank had in fact been split into two banks or had in fact sold some of its branches to another bank, these actions would not be disturbed.

The committee recognized that the bill would affect cases pending in the courts. Ordinarily the committee would be hesitant to do this. However, in view of the general understanding of the state of the law at the time the Bank Merger Act was passed—an understanding common to the committee, the Congress as a whole and the Justice Department and the banking and legal professions—the committee felt that good faith required that all past bank mergers, whether approved by the appropriate Federal banking authority under the Bank Merger Act or approved by the appropriate Federal or State authority before the enactment of the Bank Merger Act, should be treated equally.

The authority of Congress to provide such relief, even for cases pending in court, has been clearly recognized by the courts. *Hamm* v. *City of Rock Hill*, 379 U.S. 306, 312–317 (1964), involving the Civil Rights Act of 1964; *149 Madison Avenue Corp.* v. *Asselta*, 331 U.S. 199 (1947); modified in 331 U.S. 795; 79 F. Supp. 413 (S.D.N.Y. 1948), involving the Portal to Portal Act.

FUTURE MERGERS

The committee recognizes that the bill as reported involves a substantial change from the procedures contemplated when the Bank Merger Act was adopted. At that time it was clearly expected that the decision of the responsible Federal banking authority, based on its own investigation and on reports on competitive factors from the other two banking agencies and from the Department of Justice, would be final and conclusive. The Attorney General's report was expected to be advisory only.

The amended bill would postpone the effectiveness of the banking authority's approval for 30 days, recognizing that section 7 of the Clayton Act and sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act have now been interpreted to apply to bank mergers, so that the Justice Department can bring a suit under the antitrust laws without the problems involved in trying to break up a bank which has already merged.

At the same time the bill would impose a brief but reasonable limit on the time for the Justice Department to make this decision, 30 days was considered to be a reasonable period. The Justice Department would have had at least 30 days before the approval to look into the application and would have had the benefit of full information about the merger from the banking authorities and from the banks involved.

The committee recognized that the bill places in the hands of the Justice Department a considerable measure of authority which the committee expects will be used with care and discretion. The committee is aware that many banks proposing to merge under an approval by the Federal banking authorities might feel compelled to abandon their merger plans at the mere threat of a suit by the Justice Department, however insubstantial the basis for such a suit might be. The opportunity afforded to the Justice Department by the 30-day waiting period must be used with a full understanding and appreciation of the special circumstances applicable to the field of banking and with due consideration for the authority vested by the Congress in the Federal banking authorities to approve or disapprove mergers on the basis of their expert knowledge of the banking field and the judgment on which they base their decision that a merger is in the public interest.

EMERGENCY CLAUSES

The bill makes special provisions for emergency cases. Under the present law the Attorney General is given 30 days to report on the competitive factors involved in a proposed merger. A further provision is made that, if an agency finds an emergency exists, it may advise the Attorney General of it and may shorten the period for the Attorney General to report to 10 days. In a case of this sort the bill would limit the waiting period to 5 days before the merger can be consummated.

A second proviso in the existing law authorizes the banking agencies to dispense entirely with reports if "an emergency makes necessary immediate action in order to prevent the probable failure of one of the merging banks." In such a case the bill would authorize immediate consummation of the merger.

The committee expects that these special procedures will be used only for the most serious emergencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with the word "notwithstanding" in line 18, page 3, in the committee amendment, strike out all to and including line 4, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the material endorsed in quotation marks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the amendment, in effect, would strike out that section of the bill which would nullify legal proceedings already in progress in five bank merger cases. In two of these cases the court has already determined that the mergers are illegal under the antitrust laws.

I offer this amendment with somewhat mixed emotions because of the committee amendment to the proposed legislation. As this bill was introduced and later reported to the full Banking and Currency Committee, it made bank mergers immune from the antitrust laws. As now reported out to the Senate it keeps the banking industry within the antitrust laws with one exception. Certainly this is an improvement. But the exception is, in my opinion, a serious flaw in the legislaton.

It gives, in fact, amnesty to any antitrust violations occurring prior to the bill. And this amnesty attaches whether or not antitrust suits are in progress. Indeed, it gives amnesty to two cases where the courts have found the antitrust laws to have been violated.

To me, there is a fatal inconsistency here. On one hand we say that future mergers shall be subject to antitrust prohibitions; on the other we say all past violations are wiped clean.

Certainly anticompetitive effects of prior mergers—especially when in litigation—can be just as dangerous to our competitive economy as future ones.

We have by this legislation set up a double and inconsistent standard based on a point of time.

By subjecting future mergers to antitrust jurisdiction and nullifying decisions against past mergers, the bill gives the mergers already declared to be illegal under the antitrust laws a preferential status over all future mergers. There is no rational basis for this discrimination. If it is desirable to subject bank mergers to antitrust suits, as the bill presently assumes, it is plainly unjust to give antitrust immunity to a few mergers which have already been held to be illegal or which may be so adjudged in the course of pending antitrust litigation. Those litigating banks will receive a windfall of immunity at the expense of the far greater number of banks who have held off merging pending clarification of the law.

We are told that the different treatment is necessary because of the difficulty of untangling mergers already consummated; that to do so is not in the public interest. Yet in the five cases immediately affected, the banks in question were aware that suits would be started if approval were given to their mergers. And these cases were filed within days of notification by the regulatory agency to the Justice Department that the mergers had been approved. Certainly the banks knew that Justice intended to file cases and the result might be divestiture.

Yet the banks made the decision to take the chance. Having gambled and in two cases—so far—lost, it is difficult to understand their pleas of hardship. It was in their power to avoid the hardship by waiting for the culmination of the lawsuit before commingling the assets.

One bank, the Philadelphia National, did just that—it waited. As a result of its cooperation and good faith agreement with the Justice Department, it is being penalized because it did not commingle assets. Those that chose to go ahead are relieved of the consequences of their conscious actions by the provisions of this bill.

It is also argued that this bill is a good deal better antitrustwise than if it had been reported in original form; that a half dozen bank mergers more or less are a small price to pay for this improved version.

Possibly so. But what we are talking about here today is not price. It is equity, fairness, effective competition, and future enforcement procedures.

The provision of the bill I would strike is inequitable and unfair because although requiring an antitrust standard for future acquisitions, it wipes out the standard for past ones. It strikes at effective competition because the courts have already decided in two of the affected cases that antitrust violations are involved. It will set back future antitrust enforcement because it will long delay the precedents which guide the Antitrust Division in its work and businessmen in their operations. It often takes years for these cases to get before the appeals courts so that guidelines can be established. Now this bill proposes to wipe possible precedents off the books; to require Justice to begin again—in part. The certainty the banking industry says it wants must await a new beginning.

Another point missed is that the bill, even with my proposed amendment, is one which I am sure the banking industry will applaud. Under present law, the banking industry, like most industries, is unqualifiedly subject to the antitrust laws. This means—as all corporate executives are acutely aware—that no statute of limitations applies. Cases may be brought years after mergers have been consummated.

This bill imposes a 30-day statute of limitations for the banking industry—the shortest in the law of which I am aware. If no action is taken within 30 days after notification to Justice by the appropriate agency of approval, the merger is home free forever. This is a situation at which most other industries will look with envy. It is no small concession to the banking industry. They may sleep serenely where others may toss and turn.

It seems to me that the forgiveness of past violations—particularly those in litigation—is an extra bonus that makes little sense.

We in Congress are sensitive—as we should be—to courts usurping the functions of Congress. We should also be sensitive to Congress usurping the functions of courts.

With this proposed amendment, we will have a workable bill—one which will be beneficial to the banking industry and

one with which the Justice Department can live.

Without it, the public interest in a competitive economy and the integrity of the legal process suffers at the expense of too much for too few.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as the author of the amendment to which the Senator from Virginia has referred, I should say, in rebuttal to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, that that amendment to the bill in its present form would keep the Department of Justice in the ball game in bank merger cases. It would provide that banks shall still be subject to the Clayton Antitrust Act. Incidentally, they were not, in the view of most Members of the Congress, after the 1960 bank merger *bill* was passed. It seems to me that in accepting my amendment, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has gone much more than halfway toward those who feel that the Clayton Act should still be in force. From now on, in perpetuity the Justice Department can act under the antitrust laws to prevent bank mergers if they can prove in court that the mergers violate the antitrust laws.

If the amendment of the Senator from Michigan were adopted, it could work a serious injustice, it seems to me, in some of those five cases. Consider the situation in New York City. Under the bill as originally drafted and under the bill as it would read if the Hart amendment were adopted, there would be no prospect of action by the Department of Justice against the Chase Manhattan Bank, a bank having $11.4 billion in assets; or against the First National City Bank, having $10.8 billion in assets; but it would be possible—in fact, the Department of Justice would be encouraged—to proceed against the Manufacturers Hanover Bank, a much smaller bank, a bank having $6 billion in assets. This is what the Hart amendment would do. And I ask—as a practical matter, does that make any sense?

Under these circumstances, it seems to me that in all equity and fairness the bill as presently drafted and as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency is a sensible, equitable bill.

I point out that in all cases the Department of Justice would be required to file a report expressing its expert opinion on the effect of each bank merger on competition with the regulatory body which would decide whether or not the merger could be approved. Second, within 30 days after the approval of the merger, it would be possible for the Department of Justice to bring court action to stop the merger. Thirty days is ample time; in most cases, actions are filed within 3, 4, or 5 days. Thus, it seems to me that the Department of Justice is fully protected.

Under the circumstances, the two most difficult merger problems confronting the banking industry would be solved: First, the hanging over their heads, ad infinitum, of the possibility of suits by the Department of Justice to divide merged banks; second, the terrific problem once the suit is in effect of trying to dissolve mergers that have already been accomplished. The attempt to dissolve bank mergers that have been consummated works very serious hardships on depositors, borrowers, and stockholders, almost all of whom have had no really decisive, responsible part to play in the mergers themselves.

The bill as now approved by the American Bankers Association and by the Independent Bankers Association, and reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency, all Democrats and all Republicans approving, makes sense. I hope it will be passed.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I served on the Committee on Banking and Currency when the 1960 act was passed. I had something to do with the very technique which was employed under that act, an act which it was thought would answer one of the great objections of businessmen to dealing with the Government; that is, the proliferation of approvals required by various elements of the Government establishment, each able to contradict the other, leaving businessmen completely uncertain.

The question I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin is important: Is there in the bill anything which would inhibit or stop the Department of Justice from starting an antitrust suit under the Clayton and Sherman Acts against any merged bank if actually the merger resulted in a successful restraint of competition within the language of those acts? The exemption would apply, as I understand, to protect a merger itself from attack as a possible prospective restraint of competition; but if it should appear from the operations of the merged bank that there were monopolistic factors or factors contrary to the antitrust laws, there would be nothing to stop the Department of Justice from pursuing the results of that merger, although the Department might not be able to upset the merger—that is, to dissolve what had already been put together.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure that I fully comprehend what the Senator from New York is trying to ascertain. The Senator from New York agrees with me, does he not, that specifically with respect to the five cases that are now in the courts, as to which mergers have been accomplished, the Department of Justice would not, in the present form of the bill, be in a position to take further action? If the amendment of the Senator from Michigan were adopted, then the Department would be able to proceed in those five cases.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly; to seek to undo mergers which have already taken place.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Correct.

Mr. JAVITS. What I am now pursuing as a further point is this: If at a later date it should appear that a bank was violating the antitrust law, there is nothing in the bill to prohibit the Department from acting in such a situation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. That is a concession to the so-called liberal side. Under the amendment, it is recognized that the antitrust laws are applicable to banks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The Department of Justice could act to prevent a merger if it acted within 30 days after the approval of the regulatory agency—the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In addition, if a bank engaged in activities which were in restraint of trade, conspiracy and, so forth, it would, of course, be subject to antitrust action.

If a merged bank engaged in conspiracy in restraint of trade, it would be subject to the antitrust laws.

Mr. JAVITS. The one thing which we sought to do when we enacted the statute was to provide businessmen, bank officers, stockholders, and depositors certainty of obtaining immediate approval of a Federal agency.

The complaint made against the Manufacturers Hanover merger was that they moved so quickly that the regulatory agency did not have an opportunity to restrain them. That is really the complaint. That is being corrected in the bill by the fact that a 30-day waiting period will be required. That is an admirable provision.

The question of public policy then arises: Shall the Government upset what was not enjoined and what was consummated? It seems to me that in a private-enterprise society, it is elementary that we must go with the proposition of certainty. If it is found that a merger has not worked out to the Government's satisfaction, the situation should then be corrected. But to attempt to reverse what has already been done jeopardizes the fundamental good-faith and credit upon which all relations in business are conducted. The Government itself does that. It is extremely upsetting to the economy to act otherwise.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has reached a good solution, one which deals exactly with the single factor which experience shows was weak, namely, the waiting period. If an attempt is made to unscramble eggs that have already been scrambled, we tremendously jeopardize the confidence of business in the Government. Confidence will be impaired with respect to anything else which requires Government approval, because when an attempt is made to do other things that requires Government approval, business will be strongly against the Government. With justice, I think I could also say that anything which seeks to immobilize business while Government makes up its mind is harmful to business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York. The bill provides specific limited periods for the Department of Justice to bring suit. After that 30-day period they can be confident that

they need not fear dissolution or destruction.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the social phases, we must not seek to do anything which would be harmful to mergers which were consummated within the spirit and intent of the law. I was a member of the committee which wrote the present law. I believe we should let the operation be prospective, especially with respect to the validity of the concept of the antitrust laws as they apply to mergers, as well as to the future actions of merged banks.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and to note that I was prepared to offer a similar amendment in committee had he not done so. I strongly support the bill as amended.

Mr. President, I believe this is a fair and equitable arrangement which clears up a matter that has required clarity for some time. It is my fervent hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan will be defeated.

I believe we have arrived at legislation that all elements of the banking community can and do agree upon.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, is the Senate operating under a 3-minute limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement to consider the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withhold the request. However, I wish to make an explanation. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is now engaged in a hearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration. He has something to say before action upon this measure is consummated.

One of the mergers that is involved, a very difficult merger, involves banks in the State of Kentucky.

I believe that a quorum should be present.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before the Senator asks for a quorum, I give assurance to the Senator from Kentucky that the bill would apply to the merger in Kentucky until the merged bank has been split in two. It has not yet been split up. Therefore, the bill, as of now, would give relief to the bank in Kentucky.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, so far as I know, our banks in Massachusetts—and we have a number of banks in sound and good condition—are in favor of this legislation.

I hope that the bill of the Senator will go through in the form in which it now is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator. I had already been informed that the banks in Massachusetts were in favor of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Michigan. I do so because I do not see the justification for giving preferred treatment to mergers which, upon their approval by the relevant regulatory agencies, were promptly challenged by the Department of Justice and were nevertheless consummated in a context of full awareness by the banks that the litigation might result in an unfavorable decision.

The anomaly of this preferred treatment is emphasized by the fact that all five of the cases affected by the bill as it stands were brought within the 30 days following approval by the regulatory agencies. In fact, the longest interval between regulatory approval and time of suit was 4 days. In other words, if these cases had been brought at a time when the rest of the provisions of S. 1698 were in effect, the Justice Department's action would have been timely and wholly proper.

What happened is that the banks involved in these five cases simply took a calculated risk. Three of the five cases were actually filed before consummation of the mergers, and the other two were filed the same day. The banks well knew that the Justice Department thought their mergers violated the Sherman and Clayton Acts, and nevertheless proceeded to merge. Indeed, in at least one of the cases, the banks actually speeded up their final action to merge so as to consummate the merger hours before the Justice Department could file its suit.

These antitrust suits, it must be remembered, were not just brought because of some technical violation of the law. Just one paragraph from the Supreme Court's holding in the Philadelphia National Bank case illustrates the kind of danger to the consumers of banking services that can be presented by a bank merger:

> There is no reason to think that concentration is less inimical to the free play of competition in banking than in other service industries. On the contrary, it is in all probability more inimical. For example, banks compete to fill the credit needs of businessmen. Small businessmen especially, are, as a practical matter, confined to their particular locality for the satisfaction of their credit needs. If the number of banks in the locality is reduced, the vigor of competition for filling the marginal small-business borrower's needs is likely to diminish. At the same time, his concomitantly greater difficulty in obtaining credit is likely to put him at a disadvantage vis-a-vis larger businesses with which he competes. In this fashion, concentration in banking accelerates concentration generally.

And the following paragraphs from the Supreme Court's Lexington National Bank decision demonstrate the danger to competition in the banking field which can be posed by a bank merger:

> We think it clear that significant competition will be eliminated by the merger. There is testimony in the record from three of the four remaining banks that the consolidation will seriously affect their ability to compete effectively over the years; that the "image" of "bigness" is a powerful attraction to customers, an advantage that increases progressively with disparity in size; and that the multiplicity of extra services in the trust field which the new company could offer tends to foreclose competition there.
>
> We think it clear that the elimination of significant competition between First National and Security Trust constitutes an unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

These were, therefore, actions brought to protect the banking competitors involved, and really to protect the people as a whole. And the Supreme Court and other courts have found that at least two of the mergers affected by the present bill will have most undesirable effects on the interests of consumers and on the competitors of the banks involved.

In one of these two cases—the Lexington National Bank case—final judgment has actually been entered against the merger, and the bank has not complied. I find it most anomalous that Congress is now singling out this bank and nullifying its obligation to comply with a court order based directly on a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, a judgment that its merger is in violation of the antitrust laws—that the interests of consumers and competitors alike demand the unscrambling of the merger.

In another case, the Manufacturers Hanover litigation, the merger has also been adjudged illegal, although final judgment has not been entered since the course of appeal has not yet been completed.

Thus, S. 1698 overrules the carefully considered decisions of the courts that the interests of consumers and competitors require the undoing of these mergers. These defendants took a calculated risk and consummated their mergers despite the fact that they were fully on notice that the mergers might be undone by litigation which had already started or which they knew would be filed forthwith.

I therefore think that congressional action specifically approving these mergers regardless of their anticompetitive effects is wholly unwarranted. That is why I support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I direct a question to the chairman of the committee?

I take it, from reading the report, that the bill has been developed because of certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. One of them was concerned with a merger in Lexington, Ky. The case was United States against First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington, Ky.

I have received letters from banks and individuals who favor the bill and from other banks and other individuals who do not, but because of the situation that has arisen respecting this particular case in my own State, I think it would be helpful to know what effect, if any, the bill would have upon the situation in Lexington, Ky.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, prior to the arrival on the floor of our distinguished colleague, in response to a question of another Senator as to the effect of the bill, the chairman of the committee expressed his personal belief that the relief afforded under the bill applied to all cases which had been handled by the Department of Justice, including the two banks in Lexington, Ky., until they are actually split asunder and divided, which has not yet occurred. Therefore, the chairman expressed his belief that the relief afforded under this bill would apply to the Kentucky case.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

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

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes."

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5306. An act to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign government at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors;

H.R. 7847. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and

H.R. 8439. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5306. An act to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign government at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors;

H.R. 7847. An act to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8439. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 70 of the Oklahoma State Legislature, for appropriate referral, and ask that the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The resolution recognizes the importance of the agricultural conservation program to this great country of ours. It points out that, in addition to the economic benefit to our Nation that has accrued because of good soil and water management, the soil conservation program has added to the beauty of rural America. In this I concur.

The question that we as representatives of our people must ask and answer is: "Are we spending too much on conservation?" The answer must be obvious to all—to the Senators from the metropolitan areas, as well as to the Senators from the rural areas. As for me, I am convinced that the best investment we are making in America is in our conservation programs to properly conserve, develop, and utilize our natural resources.

When we accomplish this objective, we upgrade our human resources and make even a better place, a better environment, in which to rear our children.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 70

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program by supporting the annual appropriation measure for such program; noting and recognizing the merits of the agricultural conservation program; and directing distribution of this resolution

Whereas the preservation of the soils, water, forests, and wildlife of this Nation, and in particular the topsoil, is necessary; and

Whereas the preservation of these resources is a responsibility of all people; and

Whereas farmers and landowners through conservation practices have made Oklahoma a far more beautiful State for both rural and urban people to enjoy; and

Whereas for the past 30 years the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program, has done much to maintain and improve these resources, and make landowners and society in general more conscious of the need for such preservation; and

Whereas during the past 5 years some 100,000 Oklahoma farmers and landowners have put to good use the many conservation practices of the agricultural conservation program; and

Whereas in carrying out these practices Oklahoma farmers and landowners are now more than matching Government funds; and

Whereas through the medium of agricultural conservation program farmer-elected committeemen throughout the State, farm leadership has been developed to a most helpful degree; and

Whereas farmers will be forced to exploit their soil in the overproduction of food and fiber, unless adequate funds to continue the operation of the agricultural conservation program are appropriated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein:

SECTION 1. The 30th Oklahoma Legislature does memorialize the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program by supporting the annual appropriation of $250 million for such program.

SEC. 2. A duly authenticated copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Repreesntatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

Adopted by the senate the 25th day of May 1965.

JOHN MASSEY,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 1st day of June 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts) presented a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Resolution memorializing the U.S. Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention of 1948

Whereas in this year of 1965, our fellow citizens of Armenian extraction join their brothers throughout the world in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the initiation by the Turkish Government of a plan to destroy the Armenian minority in Turkey; and

Whereas this first modern genocide was to result in the massacre of over 1 million innocent Armenian men, women, and children in the brief period of several months and was to leave another million displaced, ill, maimed, and starving, torn forcibly from their homes; and

Whereas the massacres and deportations of the Armenians were accompanied by enormous cruelties, by torture, and by the abduction and forced conversion to Islam of countless children; and

Whereas the failure of the world to provide either justice for the Armenians or punishment for the Turkish war criminals pro-

vided encouragement to other would be mass murderers; and

Whereas Adolph Hitler himself, in ordering massacres in Poland in 1939, remarked "Who speaks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians"; and thereby embarked upon the systematic mass murder of some 6 million Jews, shocking again the conscience of civilized men throughout the world; and

Whereas the absence of justice for the Armenians motivated Prof. Rafael Lemkin to coin the term "genocide" and to work toward the development of an international treaty outlawing mass destruction of a minority; and

Whereas American leadership and encouragement did in 1948 result in the adoption by the United Nations of the Genocide Convention, with the United States as a signatory; and

Whereas the Genocide Convention declares that genocide murder with intent to destroy a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group; causing the groups' members serious bodily or mental harm; creating conditions calculated to bring about the group's destruction in whole or part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; forcibly transferring children of the group to another group—is a crime in international law; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman transmitted the Genocide Convention to the U.S. Senate in 1949, asking for its consent on ratification; and

Whereas today—after almost 16 years—the Genocide Convention still remains in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with three other human rights conventions—on forced labor, slavery, and women's political rights—transmitted to the Senate by the late President John F. Kennedy; and

Whereas American failure to ratify the Genocide Convention, when 67 other nations—including even West Germany and Turkey—have done so, contradicts the U.S. role as a champion of human rights, and as a leader in fostering the principle of rule of law and contradicts especially the U.S. role as a leader and signatory in relation to the convention itself; and

Whereas thousands of Armenians, as well as Greeks, Jews, and others, have found in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a refuge from the horrors of genocide: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Senate of the United States to give evidence of American commitment to the principles of universal human rights and justice by ratifying the Genocide Convention in this commemorative year of 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Ambassador to the United Nations, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Members of the Senate of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives, May 25, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code (Rept. No. 316).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (Rept. No. 315).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2080. A bill to provide for the coinage of the United States (Rept. No. 317).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 1566. A bill to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (Rept. No. 318).

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. BIBLE:

S. 2126. A bill for the relief of Sook Ja Kim, Ai Ja Kim, and Min Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 2127. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela Melisi De Nisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Bonnie Ann Lowrie, Mark Wayne Lowrie, and Paul Cameron Lowrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2130. A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2131. A bill to provide awards and other benefits to aliens supplying information with respect to Communist activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution establishing a national shrine commission to select and procure a site and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building in memory of the veterans of the War Between the States or the Civil War; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE SOVIET EMPIRE—A STUDY IN DISCRIMINATION AND ABUSE OF POWER"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 5,000 additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "The Soviet Empire—A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, at the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

RESOLUTIONS

RETURN OF FLAG FLOWN AT THE ALAMO TO STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 112) urging negotiations toward return from Mexico of a flag flown during the siege of the Alamo as a further symbol of present good-neighbor relations between the Republic of Mexico, the United States, and the State of Texas, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ENTITLED "COMMUNIST FORGERIES"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary four thousand three hundred additional copies of the hearing entitled "Communist Forgeries", held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BENNETT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 114) to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

SPECIAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing for myself and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would provide a special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones. Any person on active duty with the Armed Forces in a combat zone would be automatically insured by the United States without cost to such person against death in the principal amount of $10,000.

This indemnity would apply retroactive to January 1, 1962, and before such date as may be determined by Presidential proclamation.

It is my feeling, Mr. President, and I am sure this feeling is shared by all patriotic Americans that members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are assigned to hazardous duty in a combat zone anywhere in the world are entitled to insurance benefits in the event of their death in order that the economic security of their families, their wives, and their children may be made more secure.

American soldiers, sailors, and marines now fighting in the jungles of Vietnam, or who fought in the Dominican Republic, or who may be called upon to fight for the cause of freedom anywhere in the world, are no less entitled to this security than were the American fighting men who served their country in Europe or the Pacific in World War II, or in Korea.

Since December 12, 1961, more than 400 Americans have made the supreme sacrifice in an effort to bring freedom and democratic government to Vietnam. Just since May 10, more than 50 American soldiers have died in battle with the Communist Vietcong. This very moment, as I stand here on the Senate floor, a U.S. command of special forces is fighting to regain their positions overrun by several thousand Vietcong. Although no official estimates have been released, it is reported that more than 30 American lives have been lost in this single engagement alone which began Wednesday night.

Although the fighting in Vietnam is not a declared war of the United States, it is a hot and bloody war nonetheless, as the thousands upon thousands of American servicemen who are risking their lives daily to help stem the tide of communism in southeast Asia can testify.

Certainly, the Government of the United States and the worldwide cause of freedom which they are defending owes them no less than some measure of security for their families.

I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2127) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the proposal introduced by my distinguished colleague [Mr. TALMADGE] and myself, to provide benefits to those of our Armed Forces personnel fighting to protect our own national interest, as well as for freemen throughout the world, is long overdue.

We are engaged in a cold war that brings about the loss of life, as well as injury, to our Armed Forces personnel to the same extent as if we were engaged in a hot war declared by Congress.

These fathers and sons should be provided for by a grateful country, and I feel confident that the people of America, the Congress, and the President are anxious to provide indemnity protection for their families and for them in the event of death resulting from enemy action.

The prosperous economy which we enjoy today is to a great extent attributable to those who sacrificed and continue to sacrifice their lives for the cause of freedom. Their sacrifices are as great as those who have given up their lives or sustained injury in combat in our Nation's past wars.

I sincerely trust that the Congress will take prompt and favorable action on this proposal. Knowing that we care at home about the future welfare of our Armed Forces personnel certainly will do much toward bolstering their spirits at times when many of us too often forget and take for granted the freedoms which we enjoy today as a result of their services to our country.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act—59 Stat. 699; 22 U.S.C. 288–288f—to include the European Space Research Organization with those organizations given certain privileges and immunities under the act. Enactment of this measure is necessary to accommodate the objectives of the European Space Research Organization in establishing a proposed satellite telemetry command station near Fairbanks, Alaska.

It is my understanding the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee in the other body, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, has introduced an identical bill, H.R. 8210. The House bill, I am told, is now pending in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. President, the European Space Research Organization ESRO—was established to "provide for, and to promote, collaboration among European stations in space research and technology, exclusively for peaceful purposes." The following countries are members of ESRO: Belgium, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Because the United States is not a member of ESRO that organization cannot be afforded the immunities and privileges set out in the International Organizations Immunities Act. As a result, ESRO cannot proceed with the necessary negotiations preliminary to establishing its proposed tracking station in Alaska.

The bill I introduce today would bring ESRO in under the International Organizations Immunities Act and allow them to proceed with construction of this vital station in Alaska. The construction season is very short in my home State and for this reason I hope for swift action by the Congress on the legislation I propose today. This would allow ESRO to at least begin construction of its Fairbanks station this year.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that ESRO's request for an Alaskan station has been cleared not only by the State Department but also has been coordinated with the Federal Communications Commission, the Defense Department, and the Director of Telecommunications Management, Office of Emergency Planning. All of the agencies contacted have agreed that it is desirable to accommodate the ESRO request in every way proper in order to reciprocate in part for the fine and favorable reception which NASA has received in response to its request for tracking stations abroad.

The proposed Alaska station would constitute one element in the planned ESRO network, with other stations located at Spitzbergen, Falkland Islands, and Brussels. The telemetry data would be recorded on magnetic tapes at the Fairbanks and other stations and flown to the ESRO control center at Delft, Netherlands.

While it is not intended at present to use the ESRO station at Fairbanks in support of NASA programs, I am told such support would be technically feasible since the equipment planned to be installed at the ESRO stations is compatible with that of the NASA minitrack stations.

The report I have concerning the Fairbanks station indicates that a great portion of the proposed site is on State-owned land which the government of Alaska is willing to lease to ESRO on a long-term basis.

ESRO representatives have been briefed on U.S. communications law which requires that a transmitting facility within the United States be operated only by a U.S. individual or organization. ESRO understands that such intergovernmental agreements as may be reached in connection with the tracking station must satisfy this legal requirement. Operation of the Fairbanks station, according to present ESRO plans, will be through a U.S. contractor and no difficulty is anticipated. It is my understanding this station will require the presence of some 30 technical personnel during periods of 24-hour operation.

Mr. President, the customs and tax privileges with respect to both official property and personal property of ESRO personnel, which ESRO is seeking is the same kind of special treatment afforded NASA with respect to its tracking stations abroad and personnel abroad. I think it is very important that we do at least as much to encourage ESRO as the many nations around the world who cooperate with us in our space program have done for us.

Mr. President, so my colleagues will know something about the International Organizations Immunities Act, which I would amend with my bill, I ask unanimous consent to have a section-by-sec-

tion analysis of the act as well as the text of my bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2130) to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, 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 the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288–288f) is amended by adding a new section 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. The European Space Research Organization shall be deemed to be an international organization for the purposes of this Act."

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BARTLETT is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT (59 STAT. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288–288f)

This analysis is derived largely from a summary of the provisions of the legislation included in the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means when the legislation was reported out on November 12, 1945. For the full text of the committee's report, see United States Code Congressional Service, 79th Congress, 1st session, 1945, page 946. The act has not been amended since its original enactment.

Section 1 of the act defines the term "international organization" to mean a public international organization in which the U.S. participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designed by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the act.

Section 1 also provides for the revocation, by the President, of the privileges from any organization in the event of their abuse or for any other reason.

Section 2 of the act recognizes that international organizations shall, to the extent consistent with the instrument creating them, possess the capacity to make contracts, to acquire and dispose of real and personal property, and to institute legal proceedings.

Section 2 also sets forth certain general exemptions which would be extended to international organizations (if otherwise covered under the act), including immunity from suit, search, and confiscation, and inviolability of their archives. With respect to the specific matters of customs duties and internal revenue taxes, imposed upon or by reason of importation, and procedures for collection and enforcement of these duties and taxes, the privileges, exemptions, and immunities extended to international organizations are those accorded foreign governments under similar circumstances. Similarly, with respect to the registration of foreign agents, and the treatment of official communications, international organizations are put on the same basis as foreign governments.

Section 3 of the act provides exemption from customs duties and internal revenue taxes, imposed upon or by reason of importation, with respect to the baggage and effects of alien officers and employees of international organizations, aliens designated by foreign governments to serve as their representatives in or to such organizations, and the families, suites, or servants of such officers, employees, or representatives. In order to receive the exemption, baggage and effects must be imported in connection with the arrival of the owner in this country.

Section 4 of the act provides for amendments of the Internal Revenue Code in order to extend exemptions from Federal taxation to international organizations and their officers and employees.

International organizations are put on the same basis as foreign governments with respect to the exemption of income from sources within the United States.

Similarly, exemption from income tax is extended to alien officers and employees of international organizations but not to American citizens. In this respect the exemption is similar to the exemption provided for employees of a foreign government. The exemption is limited to wages, fees, or salary received as compensation for official services to such international organizations so that the beneficiaries of the exemption are not relieved by the act from taxes on income derived from commercial activities in the United States, speculation in securities, or other sources within the United States.

International organizations and all of their employees, including U.S. citizens as well as aliens, are exempted from social security taxes and the collection of tax at the source on wages. International organizations and their employees are thus placed in precisely the same position with respect to these taxes as the U.S. Government and foreign governments.

International organizations are also exempted from the Federal communications taxes and taxes on transportation of persons and property but neither they nor their officers and employees are exempted from any Federal excise or tax not specifically referred to in the act.

Section 5 of the act amends the Social Security Act to remove from covered employment, services performed in the employ of an international organization, paralleling the employment-tax exemptions accorded by section 4.

Section 6 of the act provides that international organizations shall be exempt from all property taxes imposed by or under the authority of any act of Congress, including such as are applicable to the District of Columbia, and also that they shall have the same exemptions from State and local taxes as does the U.S. Government. Since these exemptions are not extended to individuals, administrative difficulties in connection with local sales taxes will be kept to a minimum.

Section 7 of the act provides that alien officers and employees of international organizations and representatives of foreign governments therein shall enjoy the same privileges as officials of foreign governments in respect of laws regulating entering into and departure from the United States, alien registration and fingerprinting, registration of foreign agents, and selective training and service. The immigration laws are amended accordingly and, under section 7(d) and 8(b), the same procedure for deportation is made applicable to alien officers and employees of international organizations as in the case of officials of foreign governments.

Under section 7(b), all officials of international organizations, including American citizens, and representatives of foreign governments therein, would be granted immunity from suit and legal process for acts performed in their official capacity. It should be noted that under this provision and section 8(c) there would not be extended full diplomatic immunity from judicial process as in the case of diplomatic officers.

Section 8(a) of the act provides the procedure for notification to and acceptance by the Secretary of State of the persons to be entitled to the benefits of the legislation. Section 8(c) provides that no person shall by reason of the provisions of the legislation, receive diplomatic status or be entitled to any of the privileges incident thereto except as set forth in the act.

Section 9 of the act provides that the benefits of the legislation shall be granted notwithstanding the fact that similar privileges and immunities granted by the United States to a foreign government may be conditioned upon the extension of reciprocity by that government. This provision is included to make it clear that the privileges and immunities may be extended to international organizations even though such organizations are not in a position to accord similar treatment to the United States; in substance the effect is to state that the reciprocity provisions which are contained in certain laws providing for privileges and immunities to foreign governments would not be applicable in this situation. However, this section also provides that the Secretary of State shall not be precluded from withdrawing privileges and immunities from nationals of any foreign country which fails to provide corresponding privileges to the citizens of the United States.

Section 10 of the act provides that it may be cited as the "International Organizations Immunities Act."

INCENTIVES FOR PROSPECTIVE DEFECTORS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES WHO FURNISH CERTAIN VALUABLE INFORMATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide incentives for prospective defectors from Communist countries who may come over to our side with information of value to the United States.

The bill authorizes admission of such defectors for permanent residence in this counrty, and also authorizes the payment of annuities to insure the ability of each such defector to maintain a decent standard of living for himself and his family. Such annuities would be adjusted to take into account income of the defector from other sources; but during the period of adjustment which would be necessary in the case of any defector, these annuities would insure the ability of the defector to maintain himself and his family in reasonable security.

Their purpose is just as I have described, to assure a prospective defector that in addition to being received as a permanent resident of the United States, he will have reasonable security for himself and his family during the difficult period of adjustment to life in a new country.

This bill is in line with recommendations which have been made by the Internal Security Subcommittee. Its enactment should do a good deal to counter Communist propaganda against defections, which has as one of its strongest points the argument that a defector, by coming over to our side, sets himself and his family adrift in an unfamiliar society with which he may not be able to cope

and without any assurances that he will be able to make a living for himself and his loved ones. Often a defector has to leave all his property behind him, and in such a case it is naturally a serious problem, which he must consider, how he and his family are to get along until he can establish himself in his new surroundings.

My bill provides for administration of the program of defector awards by a Board to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Chief of the Intelligence Branch of the Department of Defense. The Secretary of State is placed on the Board because of the possible impact of defections upon our foreign relations. The Attorney General is placed on the Board because of his supervision of immigration, and his general overall supervision of law enforcement on the Federal level. The reason for inclusion in the Board of the members connected with the intelligence services needs no explanation. It may be the Board should be expanded to include others, and this can be considered when hearings are held on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2131) to provide awards and other benefits to aliens supplying information with respect to Communist activities, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF FLAG FLOWN AT THE ALAMO TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the story of the Alamo is known to all Americans. It was here that some 183 men died in the name of independence and liberty. Their story is the story of valor, of courage, of sacrifice.

The men who gathered at the Alamo were from many States. They rallied under a number of flags, but all their flags proclaimed a single purpose—liberty and independence.

For many months Texas had chafed under the excesses of Santa Ana's military dictatorship, which had been established in violation of and in violence to the liberal Mexican Constitution of 1824. Because their position had become intolerable, these men were willing to face the might of Santa Ana's army.

Historians record that there were probably several flags at the Alamo. Mr. Walter Lord, in his book "A Time To Stand" says:

> These men, like the rest of Texas, had their improvised flags. The New Orleans Greys carried their azure blue. Travis' regulars had the $5 flag bought en route to San Antonio—no description remains. Seguin's nine men might well have carried a Mexican tricolor with two stars standing for Coahuila and Texas as separate states.

But Mr. Lord also notes that "judging from Colonel Almonte's diary, only one Texan banner was taken on March 6; and judging from the Mexican archives, this was the azure emblem of the New Orleans Greys."

Mr. President, a flag means many things to different people. Our own wonderful Stars and Stripes evokes a feeling of patriotism in the hearts of all Americans. It sums up our feeling for our country; it is our symbol of unity, of greatness, and of our liberty.

But there are other flags, other banners, under which men have fought and died for liberty. And it is important that we approach Flag Day, that day when we pay special honor to our own Stars and Stripes, we consider another flag, of another day, but also of our own people.

That flag, Mr. President, is the flag of the Alamo. When the last of the Alamo's defenders died on March 6, 1836, the flag of the Alamo was sent to Mexico City by General Santa Ana as a trophy of war. It remains there to this day, enshrined now in the Mexico National Archives at Chapultepec Castle.

Mr. President, with the passing of time there has also been a passing of the bitterness of the past. Now the people of our two countries, Mexico and the United States, are good and peaceful friends. Mexico has also had its own revolution, and now proudly champions the idea of liberty and freedom. We stand together, Mr. President, in the field of seeking human betterment through peaceful means. In short, Mr. President, a new day has long since dawned in the relations between our two countries.

It is fitting at this time, Mr. President, and in light of present goodwill between the people of Texas and the people of Mexico, that the flag of the Alamo be returned to its home, to rest in honored glory forever.

According to Mr. William Gardner, the distinguished political writer for the Houston Post, and a man who has done much research on this subject, the flag of the New Orleans Greys accompanied a band of volunteers that came to Texas in late 1835. The company was organized in New Orleans. They took their flag with them to the Alamo, and it was this banner, from available evidence, around which the defenders rallied. At any rate, it was considered the chief flag of the defenders by Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana, for he sent it by special messenger to Gen. José María Rornel, the Secretary of War and Navy with the message of victory at the Alamo.

The flag was of azure blue, with the inscriptions "1st Company of Texas Volunteers from New Orleans," and "God and Liberty."

Mr. President, we do not know what flag would have been adopted had the azure blue flag of the New Orleans volunteers not been captured. Eventually, as all the world knows, the struggle for independence was successful, and our flag in Texas proudly became the flag of the Lone Star. But regardless of that, it was the banner of the Alamo under which the defenders of the Alamo fought, and gave up their lives for liberty. I believe all Americans will agree, Mr. President, that it is time for the flag to come home.

Mr. President, the Texas Legislature recently passed a resolution calling for friendly negotiations with Mexico aimed at returning the flag to its home. This resolution was the result of news stories both in Mexico and in the United States suggesting that perhaps the time is now ripe, in view of the mutual esteem with which our two peoples hold each other, to return the honored flag to the people of Texas.

However, Mr. President, there is some division of opinion in Texas as to the propriety of a State conducting negotiations, however friendly, with a foreign nation. Because of that, and because I believe this to be a matter of importance for the long-range friendly relations between our two countries, I will submit a resolution asking that the Department of State join in this effort, that it use its good offices with the Government of Mexico in order that the azure blue flag of the Alamo, the banner of the 1st Company of Texas Volunteers from New Orleans, be returned to its home in Texas.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

In addition, I ask that the text of articles about the Alamo flag, by the distinguished political affairs editor of the Houston Post, William H. Gardner, and by Larry Allen of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with excerpts about the flag from the book "The Romantic Flags of Texas" by Mamie Wynne Cox.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 112), submitted by Mr. TOWER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 112

Whereas the epic of the Alamo has stirred the imagination of generations and has remained a touchstone for courageous men everywhere; and

Whereas the deeds of the men who died at the Alamo in defense of liberty and independence have inspired bravery in men struggling against tyranny around the world; and

Whereas men from many States in our Union made up the band that fell at the Alamo; and

Whereas the standard of that valiant few, the azure blue banner of the 1st Company of Texan Volunteers from New Orleans with the inscription, "God and Liberty," is now enshrined in the Mexico National Archives at Chapultepec Castle; and

Whereas the Texas Legislature has passed a resolution calling for negotiations with our sister Republic and good neighbor, Mexico, aimed at returning the flag of the Alamo to Texas; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States believes that such a move would further cement the friendly relations now existing between our two countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Department of State is urged to lend its good offices in this effort, keeping in mind the high respect and admiration with which we regard our sister

Republic, in order that the flag of the Alamo may be returned to its home, to rest in honored glory.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this matter is especially appropriate for the attention of this Senate because men from 19 of the United States were among the heroic Alamo defenders. Represented were: North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Missouri, Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, New York, South Carolina, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Indiana, Georgia, Ohio, and Illinois.

The articles presented by Mr. TOWER are as follows:

HISTORIANS PUZZLED: MYSTERY OF ALAMO FLAG

(By William H. Gardner)

What flag flew over the beleagured Alamo, and flapped in the north wind on that cold morning of March 6, 1836, when Santa Ana's battalions stormed the walls to overpower the defenders?

The question is a minor one in the long vistas of history, but it has remained an exasperating little puzzle to historians over the generations.

Now it has popped up again as a matter of timely concern, and the answer is again being sought.

A handsome mural portraying the panorama of Texas history has just been completed in the State Library and Archives building in Austin and will be dedicated in the near future. The Alamo, of course, occupies a prominent position in the mural, and the question arises of what flag is to be painted on the staff above the fortress.

Dr. Dorman H. Winfrey, State librarian, is naturally desirous that the proper flag be shown in the painting, and he has asked members of the Texas Library and Historical Commission to help determine the matter. A decision will be made soon.

But what flag should be shown?

Should it be the red, white and green Mexican flag with the figures 1824 painted on the white bar, signifying adherance to the Mexican Constitution of that year? This flag has been accepted as the Alamo banner by many historians over the years.

Should it be the Mexican tricolor with two stars in the white bar, representing the twin States of Texas and Coahuila?

Should it be the blue flag, with a white star and the word "Independence," that Capt. William Scott provided for his company of Texas volunteers, and which might have found its way into the Alamo in the knapsack of one Thomas Bell?

Or should it be the azure blue banner of the New Orleans Greys (or Grays), a gallant company that came to Texas to "fight for their rights." About half of them perished in the Alamo—the others had marched to Goliad where they met a similar fate with Fannin 3 weeks later.

Obviously the Alamo flag would not be the Lone Star of Texas, for the 187 defenders of the mission-fortress died without ever knowing that independence had been declared at Washington-on-the-Brazos only 4 days earlier.

It could have been the flag which Col. William B. Travis bought with $5 of his own money when he set out for the Alamo with 30 men in late January 1836, but if so nobody knows what it looked like, for no description of it remains.

The artist, Peter Rogers, first put the 1824 Mexican flag in the mural. However, some authorities, among them State Archivists James M. Day and Robert E. Davis, historian and owner of the Texian Press at Waco, contended that the Alamo flag was the silk banner of the 1st Company of New Orleans Greys.

Accordingly, Artist Rogers changed his flag to that of the Greys, but again there were protests, and he reverted to the 1824 flag. The Library and Historical Commission will make a final decision, together with Librarian Winfrey, and the flag in the mural may well be changed again.

The 1824 flag has the virtue of familiarity since it was the standard depicted in H. A. McArdle's famous painting, "Dawn at the Alamo," which has hung in the senate chamber of the Texas Capitol since 1905.

However, Davis researched the old controversy in recent weeks and is convinced that the New Orleans Grays' flag is the right one. Archivist Day agrees.

One of their most telling arguments is that the Grays' flag is now in the Mexican National Museum at Chapultepec Castle, in Mexico City, sent there by Santa Ana when he captured the Alamo. This flag, its silk in shreds and its bright blue color faded to a yellowish gray, is now undergoing renovation and repairs in a basement workroom at Chapultepec. Mexican women, working from a photograph taken about 30 years ago, when the flag was in fairly good shape, are carefully piecing it together, resewing the scraps of silk onto the original cotton domestic base, which is in reasonably good condition. Museum officials estimate the repair work will take at least 3 months.

When the flag was rediscovered, wrapped in brown paper and tucked away in the museum files by the then director, Dr. Luis Castrillo Ledon, in 1934, it had a letter from Santa Ana attached. This letter also is being "reconditioned" by the museum.

This letter, or note, dated at Headquarters, Bexar, March 6, 1836, read as follows:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE SECRETARY OF THE WAR AND NAVY, GENERAL JOSE MARIA TORNEL.

"MOST EXCELLENT SIR: Victory belongs to the army. The bearer takes with him one of the flags of the enemy's battalion captured today. The inscription of it will show plainly the true intention of the treacherous colonists and of their abettors who come from parts of the United States of the north.

"God and liberty.

"ANTONIO LOPEZ DE SANTA ANA."

It is cruel irony that the Mexican dictator in his triumphant message borrowed a phrase from the captured flag.

The blue silk flag was presented to Captain Breece's company of the Grays when they reached Texas late in 1835, by a pretty Texas girl. It bore the inscription: "1st Company of Texan Volunteers from New Orleans. God and liberty."

The museum file card referring to the flag of the Grays says: "This flag was captured at the fortress of the Alamo, March 6, 1836, by Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana." A description of the flag is given. On another museum card is the text of Santa Ana's message.

Walter Lord, in his book on the Alamo, "A Time To Stand," thinks that the only flag flying over the Alamo on the morning of the assault was the azure emblem of the New Orleans Grays, though he acknowledges there may have been other flags in the fortress. At least five Mexicans, including Lt. Jose Maria Torres and Lt. Damasco Martinez of the Zapadores battalion, were shot as they tried to pull it down, but eventually none was left to defend it, and it was taken to Santa Ana.

The best available evidence, therefore, is that the flag of the Alamo was the blue banner a Texas girl had handed to the Grays as they crossed the Sabine 3 months before, their drums beating out the lively tune, "Beer in the Mug."

WEAVERS FINISH TASK—RESTORED FLAG OF ALAMO READY FOR RETURN TO UNITED STATES

(By Larry Allen)

MEXICO CITY.—The flag which Mexican historians say flew over the Alamo and fell into the hands of Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana as he wiped out the fortress' defenders is ready for return to Texas if the Lone Star State Legislature so requests and Mexico's Congress approves.

Thread by thread, two expert weavers, Miss Carmen Velaso Abrego and Mrs. Maria de la Luz Peredo de Vazquez, tediously piecing together the tattered bits of the banner, substantially achieved its reconstruction after 4 months of careful work daily.

The words: "1st Company of Texas Volunteers from New Orleans" which appeared on a light blue background in the Alamo flag have been restored sufficiently that each can be fairly well read although some letters, or parts of letters, are missing. Only a minor part of the design of an eagle with spreading wings and the words "God and Liberty" which formed the center of the emblem are visible.

Nevertheless, the diligent women weavers working doggedly at Chapultepec Castle's Museum of National History are generally credited by North Americans and Mexicans alike with having done a "remarkable job" in putting together a flag from powder-like bits and threads.

Santa Ana, who branded the Alamo flag as the "banner of treason," sent it down to Mexico City after the Alamo fell on March 6, 1836. It was furled and wrapped only in heavy brown paper.

In a note sent to Government authorities in Mexico City, Santa Ana indicated it would be better if the flag were never unfurled and put on public display.

Apparently, his wishes were respected, and the flag gradually disintegrated as it reposed in museums or elsewhere for decades.

Chapultepec Museum officials constantly finding new historical objects and restoring and cataloging them, came across the wrapped bits of the Alamo flag late in 1964 as preparations were being made to dedicate a new "Sala de Banderas" (Room of Flags).

Museum Chief Antonio Arriaga Ochoa immediately put the women weavers to work to see what they could do to reconstruct the emblem.

Day after day, week after week, they ran their hands through tattered silken bits "just like powder," trying to find the right piece for the right spot in the reconstruction work. To guide them in putting pieces together like a jigsaw puzzle, they had a photograph of the Alamo flag as it supposedly looked on the morning it fell into Santa Ana's hands.

The Texas Legislature now has before it a resolution to create a special commission to negotiate with Mexico for the return of the banner.

If the measure is adopted and a commission comes to Mexico City, there appears no doubt but that Mexico would graciously turn over the reconstructed banner with its identifying words in blue on a light blue background with gold-tasseled edges.

In support of that view, Mexicans and United States citizens here cite the "never better" United States-Mexico relations which would be still further improved with the Alamo flag's return to Texas.

THE TEXAS SCENE: ALAMO FLAG WILL STAY IN MEXICO

(By William H. Gardner)

AUSTIN.—The flag of the Alamo may remain in a Mexican museum for another 130 years, if its return depends on any official action by the State of Texas.

If the hallowed banner captured by Santa Ana when he stormed the Alamo on March

6, 1836, is ever brought back to Texas, it probably will have to be through the efforts of the U.S. State Department, with the Texas government interested, but aloof.

. Both Gov. John Connally and House Speaker Ben Barnes have indicated they would not comply with a resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) passed by the house and senate directing them to appoint two members each to a State commission to negotiate with the Republic of Mexico for the return of the flag, now in Chapultepec Castle at Mexico City.

On the other hand, Lt. Gov. Preston Smith promptly appointed his two members to the commission—Senators Charles Herring of Austin and Jim Bates of Edinburg.

Governor Connally allowed the resolution, by Representative W. H. Miller, of Houston, to become law without his signature and threw a bucket of cold water on it by saying he had serious doubts as to its constitutionality.

He commended the "sincere motives of the sponsors," but added that any effort to return the flag fell into the delicate field of international relations and should be handled by the State Department.

Speaker Barnes a few days ago echoed the Governor's opinion that the approach should be on the Federal, rather than the State, level and strongly implied that he would not make his two appointments to the commission.

Barnes told newsmen he understood Mexican newspapers had expressed violent opposition to relinguishing the flag to Texas.

When the flag question was first raised there was a news story out of Mexico City by United Press International that the Texas proposal had stirred up a "hornet's nest," but the facts provided in the story failed to bear out that assertion. Only one voice was quoted in opposition—that of Columnist Barrios Gomez, writing in the newspaper Novedades, who called the request "inopportune." And Gomez' principal peeve seemed to be the John Wayne movie on the Alamo, "glorifying the losers there."

The columnist was grossly confused on his facts and his history, reporting that "the old and peaceful Mission of San Antonio de Valero had been converted * * * into a slave center where black women, men, and children worked under the whip of white masters."

There were a few slaves serving the defenders of the Alamo—one of whom was spared by Santa Ana to accompany Mrs. Almeron Dickenson to take the word of the disaster to Sam Houston—but to describe the Alamo as a slave pen is, of course, the height of absurdity.

In contrast to the Gomez blast, the UPI story quoted Prof. Victor Medal Matamoros of the museum staff as saying: "With the silk fibers of the flag, have also gone the bitterness of the past."

A later story from Larry Allen, Mexico City correspondent for several Texas newspapers, reported that the tattered Alamo flag had been restored in the workroom of Chapultepec Castle by expert women weavers, "and is ready for return to Texas if the Lone Star State Legislature so requests and Mexico's Congress approves."

Allen said if a Texas commission comes to Mexico City with an official request for return of the flag, "there appears no doubt but that Mexico would graciously turn over the reconstructed banner."

Glenn E. Garrett, executive director of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, who is deeply interested in the return of the flag, said such an act of international friendship would doubtless require the approval of the Mexican Congress, but he was optimistic that such approval could be obtained.

It is admitted by all concerned that the assistance of the State Department, and perhaps the influence of President Lyndon Johnson, should be sought in making the request to President Diaz Ordaz and the Mexican Government. The current wave of anti-American feeling among segments of the Mexican populace because of the Dominican intervention may raise some doubts that this is the most propitious time to enter into the flag negotiations, but even if a delay is indicated, the idea should not be allowed to die. It has a good chance of ultimate success.

THE ROMANTIC FLAGS OF TEXAS

(By Mamie Wynne Cox)

CHAPTER XII: THE FLAG OF THE NEW ORLEANS GRAYS

"The tender hand of a fair Texan gave us, in the name of a number of beauties of the land a beautiful blue silk flag on which the following inscription appeared: 'First Company of Texan Volunteers, From New Orleans, God and Liberty.'" Thus Herman Ehrenberg, native of Germany, youngest member of the company of 64 volunteer soldiers from New Orleans, La., wrote in his diary. This most interesting and valuable history of the activities of the New Orleans Grays is preserved in the archives of the University of Texas and has recently been translated.

Thus, another company flag was added to the romantic flags of Texas, and this one proved to be one of the most important, witnessing one of the greatest tragedies of the war—the fall of the Alamo, on March 6, 1836.

There was excitement and enthusiasm in New Orleans over enlistment in the cause of Texas independence and the first volunteers from the United States were the two companies of New Orleans Grays, organized in November 1835. These troops were raised by Adolphus Sterne, of Nacogdoches, Tex., and some other citizens of the city who generously outfitted the men with many army supplies.

A short time previous Edward Hall, of New Orleans, had arrived at San Felipe as a representative of a committee in New Orleans and reported $7,000 was raised for Texas in a short time, and detachments of the New Orleans Grays were then on their way to join Austin at San Antonio. This news served to hearten the Texans.

One company of volunteers from New Orleans, La., came on the *Ocean*, a fighting vessel commanded by Captain Grayson who had previously commanded the *San Felipe*. The *Ocean*, a gift from Mobile, Ala., citizens, was a completely equipped fighting vessel and was filled to the guards with soldiers ready for a clash of arms. They had espoused the Texan cause wholeheartedly. A prominent seafaring man was Harwell Walker, a distinguished member of the New Orleans Grays who took a conspicuous part in the capture of San Antonio de Bexar. He was later commissioned a sailing master of the schooner of war *Invincible*.

The other company of New Orleans Grays organized in November 1835, came by the Mississippi River into the Red River, thence by land through Nachitoches, La., at length crossing the Sabine River into Texas. Herman Ehrenberg[1] who graphically chronicled their march, in his diary, states that as soon as the Grays arrived on the Texas side of the river Captain Breeze knelt and "kissed the soil and received the holy ordinance of citizenship." He also accepted a beautiful blue silk flag presented by Texas young ladies and to "some extent expressed to the ladies our unexpressible thanks." On the line of march the blue flag led the way to San Augustine. Although the soldiers met a typical Texas norther, they were said to have found the march swift and enjoyable.

Arriving at San Augustine Herman Ehrenberg wrote of their reception: "Three small cannons roared us a welcome, but what pleased us the most were the really gigantic beefsteaks and roast beef which were awaiting our arrival."

After being thus physically heartened, and encouraged by the enthusiasm of the citizens, the Grays, led by their flag, again set out. Their next stop was in Nacogdoches at the hotel of Adolphus Sterne, where the entire company and many citizens sat down at a banquet table 150 feet long. Among other good things to eat was a barbecued bear. The chairman of the entertainment committee said, "Gentlemen, the men of Nacogdoches have prepared this banquet for the New Orleans Grays." Speeches were made and the causes of the war were discussed.

The soldiers left the next morning and the townspeople turned out in great numbers and cheered them lustily as they marched off—and leading the way was their bright blue flag.

The hospitable citizens of Nacogdoches urged them to remain a few days, but the New Orleans Grays and Captain Breeze were eager to push on to San Antonio and take part in the proposed siege. They arrived in good time for the council of war, which was held at the Texans' San Antonio headquarters, at which an assault was determined upon. The army was paraded and Col. William H. Jack made a stirring speech, then called for volunteers. Four hundred and fifty men, including the New Orleans Grays, stepped forward and enrolled.

Both companies of New Orleans Grays were there, one commanded by Maj. R. C. Norris and Capt. William C. Cooke; the other by Captain Breeze whose men carried the bright blue silk flag given them by the Texas ladies on the banks of the Sabine River, when they had entered Texas.

The men were divided into three divisions and the attack was successfully made, and the Alamo opened to the Texans. They hoisted the independent flag—supposed to be the McGahey Flag of Independence—and took possession.

The evacuation of San Antonio was ordered on the 13th and the New Orleans Grays and their flag were sent to Goliad. There, the men under Fannin and Frank Johnson, there was much "marching up the hill and then marching down again," for they were sent down to San Patricio, then back up to Refugio, where Grant, according to Ehrenberg's record, tried to get them to join him in an attack on Matamoras by night. This they refused to do; and with one cannon the New Orleans Grays marched back to tell Fannin that Johnson and Grant would not join Fannin. The New Orleans Grays determined to go back to Bexar, but Fannin insisted that they remain with him, which they did.

Sad to relate this brave company of New Orleans Grays volunteers who had carried aloft their bright blue flag from the banks of the Sabine River through Texas and had fought so fearlessly for possession of the Alamo, were surprised by an overwhelming number of Mexican soldiers, captured, and led away as prisoners of war.

Most of the New Orleans Grays were massacred at Goliad on Palm Sunday, March 27, 1836. Those who escaped that debacle, again joined the Texan army and most of the remainder were with Old Ben Milam at the fall of the Alamo.

---

[1] From Clarence Wharton's writings in the Dallas News, May 21, 1936.

Herman Eherenberg, to whom we are indebted for much detail during his stay in Texas, remained here for 6 years and went to the Far West in the gold days.

He became a mining engineer of much prominence and was killed by Indians in the Mojave Desert 15 years later.

Eherenberg's memoirs were published in German in 1842 and have within the year for the first time been rendered in English.

It is odd that Eherenberg and Mordicai, the only two Jews with Fannin, escaped the massacre and that both of them were afterward killed by Indians.

With the tragic fall of the Alamo we are all familiar, but it is well that from time to time we should recount the deeds of our heroes. It is well that we should keep their memories fresh and ever hold before ourselves the ideals for which they stood, ideals for which they fought, ideals for which they died.

Twelve days the 4,000 Mexicans bombarded the Alamo garrisoned by 178 Americans. By the 12th day, March 6, 1836, through strength of numbers, after having been thrice repulsed, the Mexican Army entered the Alamo, where they found only five of those heroes alive. Brutally, they were dispatched by order of Santa Ana.

In the "Adventures of Davy Crockett, Mostly by Himself," Charles Scribners Sons, is found a supposed record of events at the Alamo as he saw them:

"We concluded to withdraw to the fortress of Alamo and defend it to the last extremity. We have had a large national flag made; it is composed of 13 stripes, red and white alternately on a blue ground with a large white star of five points in the center, and between the letters 'Texas.'

"As soon as our little band of 150 in number, had entered and secured the fortress in the best possible manner, we set about raising our flag on the battlements on which occasion there was no one more active than my young friend, the Bee Hunter. He had all along been sprightly, cheerful and spirited, but now notwithstanding the control he usually maintained over himself, it was with difficulty that he kept his enthusiasm within bounds. As soon as we commenced raising the flag, he burst forth in a clear, full tone of voice, that made the blood tingle in the veins of all who heard him:

" 'Up with your banner, freedom,
Thy champions cling to thee;
They'll follow where'er you lead 'em
To death or victory;
Up with your banner, freedom.'

"This song was followed by three cheers from all within the fortress, and the drums and trumpets commenced playing.

"The enemy marched into Bexar, and took possession of the town, a blood-red flag flying at their head, to indicate that we need not expect quarter if we should fall into their clutches."

We know without doubt that floating from the highest point of the Alamo building was the bright blue flag of the New Orleans Grays of our sister State, Louisiana. Señor Luis Castillo Ledon, director of the National Museum of Archeology of Mexico D. F. writes me:

"The flag was a light blue and placed at the highest point of the Alamo when the Mexicans attacked the fort. Three men of the Jiminez Battalion were shot down while attempting to tear the flag of the New Orleans Grays down from the topmost point of the Alamo and set the Mexican flag in its place. The fourth Mexican soldier succeeded because there was not one man left in the Alamo who could fire a shot.

"As to the names of these Mexican soldiers, history is silent; lost too, is the name of the man who successfully placed the Mexican flag where this one of the New Orleans Grays had waved."

The flag was photographed by Senor Ledon at it shows in the museum in 1935. Thus there is no question that the flag of the New Orleans Grays carried by those brave soldiers from Louisiana was on the Alamo when it fell. In further evidence we have the note sent at once to Tornel by Santa Ana:

"To His Excellency the Secretary of the War and Navy, Gen. Jose Maria Tornel.

"Most Excellent Sir: Victory belongs to the army. The bearer takes with him one of the flags of the enemy's battalion captured today. The inscription of it will show plainly the true intention of the treacherous colonists and of their abettors who come from parts of the United States of the north.

"God and liberty.

"Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana.

"Headquarters, Bexar, *March 6, 1836.*"

There are Mexicans in high positions who criticize Santa Ana's methods at the Alamo and condemn in no uncertain terms the actions of Tornel as unjustifiable butchery. Santa Ana, the dictator, and not the Mexican Government and people is held to blame.

Mr. TOWER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 112) I submitted during the morning hour today may be allowed to lie on the table for 7 days, for additional cosponsors.

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

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE—AMENDMENT TO HIGHER EDUCATION BILL (S. 600)

AMENDMENT NO. 265

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Higher Education Act (S. 600). This amendment is a substitute for the administration's proposal for insurance of reduced-interest loans to college students and would give Federal assistance on an even-matching basis to State and private, nonprofit student loan guarantee funds; would pay up to 2 percent of the interest on guaranteed student loans; would provide a one-time grant of up to $25,000 to individual States to establish a State loan guarantee program if the State does not already have one; and would provide loan forgiveness of up to 50 percent for low and moderate-income students who maintain scholarship in the upper half of their classes.

The administration program, in contrast, establishes the Federal Government itself as the guarantor of student loans in competition with State and private, nonprofit guarantee programs, has no loan forgiveness feature and gives no encouragement to States to establish their own student loan-guarantee programs. Both the administration and my proposals feature payment of up to 2 percent of the interest rate on guaranteed student loans.

There are other differences between the two proposals. Principal among them are the 6-percent interest ceiling on student loans set by my amendment—under the administration bill, the Commissioner of Education establishes an interest ceiling administratively—a requirement that repayments begin no sooner than 6 months after the borrower's studies have been completed—the administartion provides 1 year—and a stipulation that student loans may be guaranteed for not less than 90 percent of their full amount—the administration requires a 100-percent guarantee.

My amendment authorizes $15 million for the first year, $20 million for the second year, and $25 million for each of the 3 consecutive years.

The continuing 5-percent annual rise in college costs and heavier enrollments are placing greater financial burdens on students and their families and account for the growing reliance upon low-cost loans to pay for a higher education. My amendment will more effectively meet this need than the administration proposal because it strengthens individual State and private, nonprofit loan guarantee plans across the Nation and encourages the establishment of new ones rather than setting up a Federal loan-guarantee system which would displace these efforts.

Nineteen States could today be aided by the provision in my amendment for subventions to State programs. They are Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming. Other States would benefit as they qualify.

State plans have already guaranteed more than $100 million in student loans this school year; further growth is anticipated.

A word needs also be said of the private, nonprofit loan guarantee programs. The principal one among these is the United Student Aid Fund which operates in all the States except Alaska. It receives its funds from private philanthropy and from the colleges attended by the students who are benefited. Thus, in aiding such a nonprofit private fund, Federal dollars are in even partnership with donations from individual citizens and with the Nation's colleges. Attesting to the popularity of this approach is the fact that while the United Student Aid Fund guaranteed its first loan as recently as February 1, 1961, by February 1, of this year, it had endorsed 68,379 loans totaling almost $40 million with the participation of 5,522 banks and 685 colleges. Loans are now being guaranteed at a rate of $30 million annually and the rate is growing. All this is done with a staff of less than 20. Could the Federal Government match this?

The fact that the appropriate House subcommittee has rejected the administration's loan guarantee proposal gives me great hope for the enactment of my plan. It merits success.

One final word. My amendment does not affect the National Defense Education Act student loan program established during the Eisenhower years which is expanded and extended by S. 600, the administration's higher education bill. I will, however, at an appropriate time later propose amendments to strengthen the National Defense Education Act loan procedures which have come under criticism.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 265) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 45, beginning with line 16, strike out all through line 4 on page 68 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 421. (a) For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make grants to eligible

insurers, as defined in section 426, in order that they may insure increased amounts of loans to students pursuant to this part there is authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"(b) In addition to amounts authorized pursuant to subsection (a), where are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and succeeding fiscal years such amounts as may be necessary to make interest and other payments pursuant to section 125.

"APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS AMONG STATES

"SEC. 422. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 421(a) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion an amount equal to not more than 15 per centum of such sums among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part, and among such of the States as he determines will best achieve the purposes of this part. The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be apportioned among the States as provided in paragraph (2).

"(2) The sums apportioned under this paragraph shall be apportioned by the Commissioner among the States so that the apportionment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States.

"(3) For the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and

"(B) the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) If the total of the sums determined by the Commissioner to be required under section 423 for any fiscal year for eligible insurers in a State is less than the amount of the apportionment to that State under paragraphs (1) and (2) for that year, the Commissioner may reapportion the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this part.

"ALLOCATION OF APPORTIONED FUNDS TO ELIGIBLE INSURERS

"SEC. 423. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which eligible insurers in any State must file applications for allocation, to such insurers, of funds from the apportionment to that State (and of any reapportionment thereto) for any fiscal year pursuant to section 422(a), to be used for loan insurance pursuant to his part. Such allocations shall be made in accordance with equitable criteria which the Commissioner shall establish and which shall be designed to achieve such distribution of such funds among eligible insurers within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this part.

"(b) Payments shall be made from allotments under this section to eligible insurers as needed.

"AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE INSURERS—CONDITIONS

"SEC. 424. An eligible insurer which desires to obtain funds for insuring loans under this part, shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

"(a) provide that funds received under this part will be used by it only for the purposes specified in, and in accordance with the provisions of this part;

"(b) provide that such insurer will match amounts supplied by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, and that the total of such amounts supplied by the Commissioner and supplied by the insurer as matching funds in any fiscal year will be used as a reserve to insure loans representing an increase in the amount of loans insured by such insurer over the total amount of loans to students in eligible institutions insured by such insurer during the previous fiscal year;

"(c) provide that such a reserve established pursuant to this part will be used to insure a loan only if—

"(1) insured to not less than ninety per centum of the amount thereof;

"(2) it is not in excess of $1,500 in the aggregate to any student in any academic year or its equivalent, and if the aggregate unpaid principal amount of all loans so insured to such student does not exceed $6,000, or $9,000 if he is a graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), and including any such insured loans made to such student before he became a graduate or professional student, and such annual insurable limit shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments in any year are not in excess of the annual limit;

"(3) made to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such an institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

"(4) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

"(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required;

"(B) provides for repayment of the principal amount of the loan in installments during a period of not less than five years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than ten years beginning (i) not earlier than six months following the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution, or (ii) if sooner, and if agreed upon between the borrower and the lender, not earlier than one year following the date on which the student completes or ceases to pursue the study program in which he was enrolled or had been accepted for enrollment, except that the period of the loan may not exceed fifteen years, and the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made;

"(C) provides for interest or the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding six per centum (including any premiums charged), which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, payment of interest may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has accrued during such period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability);

"(D) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower that portion of the interest and other amounts which are payable by the Commissioner pursuant to section 425;

"(E) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan; and

"(F) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan;

"(d) provide that such insurer will submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make pursuant to section 425 with respect to that loan;

"(e) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the insurer; and

"(f) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out this function under this part, 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.

"FEDERAL INTEREST PAYMENTS AND PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS FOR MAINTAINING HIGH SCHOLASTIC STANDING

"SEC. 425. (a) Each student who has received a loan which is insured with reserves pursuant to this part, and each student who has received a loan which—

"(1) is insured by an eligible insurer who has entered into an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

"(2) meets the requirements of this part for a loan insured with reserves pursuant to this part, and

"(3) was contracted for after the effective date of that agreement and was paid to the student either prior to July 1, 1970, or prior to July 1, 1974, in the case of a loan made (or a loan installment paid pursuant to a line of credit) to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan so insured to continue or complete his educational program.

shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan—

"(A) a portion of the interest on the loan which shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary in effect at the time the loan is paid, and shall not equal more than 2 per centum of the unpaid principal (excluding interest which has been added to principal) of the loan, and

"(B) if such student is from a moderate or low income family, as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, and is not taking a major portion of his courses in a school or department of divinity, 50 per centum of the amount of any loan, including interest on such per centum, for any academic year in which such student maintained a standing in the upper 50 per centum of his class, as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner.

The holder of any loan shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive payments pursuant

to this section from the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall make such payments to the holder of the loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to this part was made.

"(b) Each holder of such a loan shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of payments which he must make with respect to that loan.

"(c) Any eligible insurer which insures loans, other than loans insured with reserves pursuant to this part, to students in eligible institutions, may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are so insured to have made on their behalf the payments authorized in subsection (a). Such an agreement shall—

"(1) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

"(2) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the insurer; and

"(3) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this part, 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.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 426. As used in this part—

"(a) The term 'eligible insurer' means any State agency or instrumentality wholly owned by the State, or any nonprofit institution or organization.

"(b) The term 'eligible institution' means either—

"(1) an institution of higher education; or

"(2) a business or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school, in any State, which (A) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left secondary school, (B) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within that State, a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designated to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations, and (C) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause: *Provided, however,* That if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools of that category, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met by those schools in order for loans to students attending them to be insurable under this part and shall also determine whether particular schools meet those standards.

For the purpose of clause (2) 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.

"(c) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years."

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 266

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 267

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1837, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF THIRD POWERPLANT AT GRAND COULEE DAM, COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WASHINGTON—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 268

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1761) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1938) to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be listed as a cosponsor.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the names of additional cosponsors to S. 1766, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 so as to establish a program of rural water systems.

I wish to have the following Senators listed as additional cosponsors to the bill: CANNON, CURTIS, DODD, ERVIN, GRUENING, HAYDEN, MCCLELLAN, PASTORE, PELL, SALTONSTALL, THURMOND, TOWER, SIMPSON, MORTON, and MCNAMARA.

Mr. President, I ask that at the next printing of the bill the names of all cosponsors be printed.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, could the Senator state the number of cosponsors on the Aiken bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The number of cosponsors at the present time is 93. I believe that indicates the interest in this legislation which is shown by the constituents of the 93 Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill (S. 1766) printed at this point in the RECORD, with a complete list of the cosponsors as of today.

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

The bill (S. 1766) with the complete list of cosponsors was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1766

A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies to provide for the application or establishment of soil conservation practices, shifts in land use, the conservation, development, use, and control of water, and the installation or improvement of drainage facilities, and recreational developments, all primarily serving farmers, ranchers, farm tenants, farm laborers, and other rural residents, and to furnish financial assistance or other aid in planning projects for such purposes.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants aggregating not to exceed $25,000,000 in any fiscal year to such associations to finance specific projects for works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water in rural areas. The amount of any grant made under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed the lesser of (i) 40 per centum of the development cost of that portion of the facility necessary to enable the project to serve the area which can be feasibly served by the facility and to adequately serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, (ii) that portion of the development costs which are above the probable ability of the association to repay a loan for such purposes from income or assessments levied at a rate or charge for service within the ability of a majority of the users to accept and pay for such service and maintain a reasonable standard of living, or (iii) that part of the development cost of a facility constructed by a public body which is in excess of the costs which can be financed within the amount of obligations or levies permitted by law for which alternate revenue financing is not available.

"(3) No grant shall be made under paragraph 2 of this subsection in connection with any facility unless the Secretary determines that the project (i) will serve a rural area which is not likely to decline in population below that for which the facility was designed, (ii) is designed and constructed so

that adequate capacity will be or can be made available to serve the present population of the area to the extent feasible and to serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (iii) is necessary for orderly community development consistent with a comprehensive community water development plan of the rural area and not inconsistent with any planned development under State, county, or municipal plans approved as official plans by competent authority for the area in which the rural community is located. Until October 1, 1968, the Secretary may make grants prior to the completion of the comprehensive plan, if the preparation of such plan has been undertaken for the area.

"(4) The term 'development cost' means the cost of construction of a facility and the land, easements, and rights-of-way, and water rights necessary to the construction and operation of the facility.

"(5) No loan shall be made under this subsection which would cause the unpaid principal indebtedness of any association under this Act and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, together with the amount of any assistance in the form of a grant to exceed $4,000,000 at any one time.

"*(6)* The Secretary may make grants aggregating not to exceed $5,000,000 in any fiscal year to any public body or such other agency as the Secretary may determine having authority to prepare official comprehensive plans for the development of water systems in rural areas which does not have funds available for immediate undertaking of the preparation of such plan.

"(7) Rural areas, for the purpose of water systems, shall include any area not included within the boundaries of any incorporated or unincorporated city, village, or borough having a population in excess of five thousand inhabitants."

SEC. 2. Section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$450,000,000";

(2) in clause (a) striking out "except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than three years from the date of the note"; and

(3) striking out clause (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) may retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate specified in the insurance agreement applicable to the loan".

(b) Section 309(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations and the remainder of such charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "all or a portion, not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the unpaid principal balance of the loan, of any charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans; and any remainder of any such charge".

(c) Section 309(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000,000".

SPONSORS OF S. 1766

Senators AIKEN and MANSFIELD, ALLOT, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BASS, BAYH, BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CARLSON, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRSKEN, DODD, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, ERVIN, FANNIN, FULBRIGHT, GORE, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HARTKE, HAYDEN, HICKENLOOPER, HILL, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, JORDAN of North Carolina, JORDAN of Idaho, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, LONG of Louisiana, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MILLER, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MONTOYA, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MUNDT, MURPHY, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PEARSON, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, RUSSELL of South Carolina, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, SMATHERS, SMITH, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, TALMADGE, THURMOND, TOWER, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, WILLIAMS of Delaware, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio; total, 93.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the need for this legislation is getting more apparent every day.

The cities are showing a concern over their water supply. However, the situation in rural areas is becoming even more acute than it is in the cities. In some cases, it reaches the proportion of a crisis.

I hope that we may have early action on this legislation. I realize that some States wish to participate in the program on a State basis. Therefore, early action is very highly desirable.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would it be advisable for the Senator to have the bill lay over for 3 or 4 days so that the reluctant 7 might make it a clear 100?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I think that the seven Senators who are not cosponsors have very good reasons for not joining in cosponsoring the bill. Therefore, I believe that we shall have to be satisfied.

The Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, was an original cosponsor of the bill with me. I believe that we shall have to be satisfied with 93, and hope for early action.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 264

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on yesterday I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. The amendment contemplates reducing the amount of the foreign loan program that might be used for multilateral purposes from 20 percent to 12 percent.

Mr. President, I ask that the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as cosponsors.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of May 26, 1965:

S. 2045. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. THURMOND.

Authority of June 3, 1965:

S. 2078. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States by regulating petroleum imports: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

Commencement address delivered by Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, at Mount Vernon Seminary, in Washington, D.C., on June 7, 1965.

OPPOSITION TO S. 1483, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed, by voice vote, S. 1483, a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. I was opposed to enactment of this bill, primarily because there is absolutely no constitutional authority for it. I desire for the RECORD to show this.

The bill establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities consisting of a National Endowment for the Arts, a National Endowment for the Humanities, and a Federal council to coordinate the two endowments.

The National Endowment for the Arts provides matching grants for States, to private nonprofit or public groups, and to individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts for the whole range of artistic activity. The National Endowment for the Humanities would provide grants and loans for research, award fellowships and grants to institutions for training, and would support the publication of scholarly works. There is authorized to be appropriated for each endowment $5 million for each of the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968.

The bill this year is broader than that brought before the Senate in previous years, in that the section on the humanities has been added. The sum involved, $10 million per fiscal year for both the arts and humanities program, is relatively small compared with many of the proposals brought before the Congress. However, it is no less important, because it injects the Government into an entirely new field of endeavor, a new field for which there is no constitutional authority for the National Government to enter.

The proponents of the bill should be put to the test of justifying this measure on the basis of the Constitution. However, neither the committee report nor the Senate debate discloses any serious attempt to do so. In my judgment, it would be impossible to find constitutional authority for this bill, even under the most liberal construction of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I recognize the need for increased emphasis in both the arts and in the teaching and studying of the hu-

manities. I am certain, nevertheless, that both these fields are best developed by private effort. In this great country of ours it is not necessary or advisable to subsidize every worthy endeavor in order to give it the proper recognition which it deserves. The danger is that Government intervention will eventually result in Government control and bring about stereotyped art forms and lessened imagination. In this eventuality, the stated purpose of the bill, "to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and arts in the United States," will not have been accomplished. A contrary result could very well be experienced if Congress were to enact S. 1483.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a short calendar call?

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana for that purpose, provided that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Montana is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 294, H.R. 1782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. H.R. 1782, to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act—reported without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the reports on bills to which there is no objection, and which have cleared both sides.

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

THE PURPOSE OF H.R. 1782

To relieve a budgetary and administrative problem encountered by the Civil Service Commission in administering the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960. The organic act provided that administrative expenses would be paid by an amount not to exceed 2 percent of the Government's contribution to the program. The limitation became effective during fiscal year 1963, after the program was successfully established.

For a variety of reasons, the retired employee's health program fell short of Congress and the Commissions' expectations. Annuitant participation is about 60 percent of the eligible whereas it was expected to be at least 95 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for the explanation.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 307), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

STATEMENT

This bill is an administration proposal first introduced in the 88th Congress. The present administration recommends enactment of H.R. 1782.

This legislation would relieve a budgetary and administrative problem encountered by the Civil Service Commission in administering the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960. The organic act provided that administrative expenses would be paid by an amount not to exceed 2 percent of the Government's contribution to the program. The limitation became effective during fiscal year 1963, after the program was successfully established.

For a variety of reasons, the retired employee's health program fell short of Congress and the Commission's expectations. Annuitant participation is about 60 percent of those eligible, whereas it was expected to be at least 95 percent. Consequently, the Government's contribution, from which funds to pay administrative expenses are derived, was less than planned. Relations and communications with the annuitants have proven difficult. Participants include only those retired prior to July 1, 1960. The experience of dealing with thousands of elderly people on a subject which was new and sometimes complex has shown a high level of activity.

For fiscal year 1965, the Commission expects to spend $283,687. The 2 percent of Government contribution will equal $281,574. The deficit will be (and has been since 1961) made up by direct appropriation by Congress. For fiscal year 1966, the Commission estimates that Government contributions will decline slightly, and expenses will rise by approximately 10 percent. The Commission believes that as time passes and the group of participants grows both older and smaller in number, the proportional expense of administering the act will increase, and the Government's contribution will necessarily decrease in amount.

To resolve this problem and eliminate the necessity of paying expenses from two sources (the 2 percent of Government contribution and supplemental amount appropriated annually by Congress), the Commission recommends that the 2-percent limitation be repealed and that the limitation on expenditures be set annually by Congress in enacting appropriations.

Public hearings were held on similar legislation before the Subcommittee on Health Benefits and Life Insurance on February 10, 1964. All testimony favored enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two bills on the calendar be considered in sequence.

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

ALLOTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF PAY TO COVER THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1732) to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relative to allotment and assignment of pay to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 308), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

STATEMENT

This bill would amend the Advance Pay and Allotment Act of 1961 to include the Government Printing Office in the group of Federal departments and agencies subject to that act.

Existing law provides that the heads of the Federal departments and agencies can authorize advance pay for Federal employees during emergency evacuation periods, and can authorize the withholding from an employee's salary of certain allotments designated by the employee. Standard policy for implementing the authority granted by the 1961 act is established by the Civil Service Commission (Executive Order No. 10982).

Although the 1961 act was aimed primarily to serve the interests of agencies and employees within the executive branch of the Government, the act also included the General Accounting Office and the Library of Congress (both of which are part of the legislative branch), the judicial branch of the Government, the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and corporations wholly owned or controlled by the Federal Government. The omission of the Government Printing Office appears to have been inadvertent.

The purpose of this amendment is to extend the rights and privileges of the law to the Government Printing Office and its employees. The Office and most of its employees are located in the District of Columbia. By coming under the Advance Pay and Allotment Act, employees who live in nearby Maryland and Virginia could request the Public Printer to withhold from their salaries biweekly deductions for State income taxes, employee organization dues, and organized charity contributions. Federal employees in almost all other agencies presently enjoy this convenience.

The committee is aware that by regulation the Civil Service Commission has restricted the kind of allotment which an agency can approve. At the present time, employees located within the continental limits of the United States can assign their pay only for payment of State income taxes, union dues, and organized charity contributions. The regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission are not binding on agencies outside the executive branch of the Government, but the committee recommends that the administrators of such outside agencies

follow the policy established by the Commission. The committee does not intend to authorize the assignment of any employee's salary (such employee being located within the continental limits of the United States) for the benefit of a creditor or for any organization or association other than those which have been approved by the regulations established by the Civil Service Commission.

DETAILING OF FIELD EMPLOYEES INTO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1496) to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, section 39, United States Code and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an administration proposal to repeal certain provisions of law which prohibit the detailing of employees from field positions into the District of Columbia except for the performance of duties in connection with their respective field offices.

Congress in 1882 enacted a law—22 Stat. 255—to prohibit an agency from detailing its field employees from their positions outside the District of Columbia to positions in the agency physically located in the District of Columbia. At that time, appropriation acts specified funds for the payment of personal services of employees located in field offices and a separate amount for employees located in the District of Columbia. By detailing field employees into the District, an agency could, in effect, augment its appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1496

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 255), as amended, and section 6 of the Act of June 22, 1906 (34 Stat. 449), as amended (5 U.S.C. 39), which prohibit the detail of field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia except for the performance of duties in connection with their respective field offices, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 255), as amended (5 U.S.C. 40), and section 525 of the Act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 741), as amended (19 U.S.C. 1525), which provide exceptions to the Treasury Department from the restrictions imposed by title 5, section 39, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 309), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

STATEMENT

This is an administration proposal to repeal certain provisions of law which prohibit the detailing of employees from field positions into the District of Columbia except for the performance of duties in connection with their respective field offices.

Congress in 1882 enacted a law (22 Stat. 255) to prohibit an agency from detailing its field employees from their positions outside the District of Columbia to positions in the agency physically located in the District of Columbia. At that time, appropriation acts specified funds for the payment for personal services of employees located in field offices and a separate amount for employees located in the District of Columbia. By detailing field employees into the District, an agency could, in effect, augment its appropriations for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The Classification Act of 1923 applied only to Federal employees located in the District of Columbia, and the practice of specifying appropriations continued. The Classification Act of 1949, however, applied to Federal employees both within and without the District. Subsequently, the Administrative Expenses Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 985) repealed the requirement for specific authorization in appropriations for personal services in the District of Columbia. Justification for the prohibition, therefore, no longer exists. The Comptroller General has ruled, however, that the 1882 law has not been repealed by implication (B–140939, Oct. 28, 1959). The administration believes that this prohibition serves as an unnecessary and undesirable deterrent to efficient management.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me express my thanks to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who yielded to me for the purpose of calling the calendar.

AMBITIOUS AND PROMISING GOLD MINING OPERATION IN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it was my pleasure last week to participate in the dedication of an ambitious and promising gold mining operation in Nevada. I refer to the Newmont Mining Corp.'s Carlin Mine in Elko County.

This new industry, which is a benefit to my State and to the Nation, is the second largest working gold production operation in the Nation and the fourth largest in North America, I am informed. It is also one of the first open pit gold mines.

More than all this, however, this operation is living proof that enterprising miners can overcome all obstacles—even hostile Government policies—to help keep this Nation in the gold mining business.

Despite the discouraging price our Government maintains on gold—and even despite the fact that the Carlin property has what used to be prohibitively poor ore—this company is producing gold and even making a profit from it.

I bring this to the Senate's attention simply to point up a position I have long supported—that the United States has a mining industry that is ready, willing, and extremely able to put this Nation back into gold and silver production. To those who say there is no significant amount of gold and silver remaining, I point only to what is going on in Elko County, Nev., today. I point to how much more might be going on in Nevada and many other States if there were proper encouragement.

If a mining company can produce gold in the hostile price climate perpetuated by the Federal Government today, we can easily see what will be possible in mining tomorrow if the climate were improved.

My argument has always been this: Only a free market on gold and silver and the resulting establishment of a realistic price on these metals will generate a mining recovery. Is that not the logical answer to all the cries of silver shortages and gold drains?

Eliminating silver from minor coins will not solve the silver shortage any more than it will solve the coinage shortage. If anything—unless there are drastic precautions—the shortages will only become worse.

As I stated earlier when the President's message on coinage was received by Congress, I can support a reduction in the silver content of our coinage but never an elimination. We must not debase our coins in the forlorn hope that this will somehow preserve both our silver reserves and our ability to impose an unrealistic and punitive price on silver. Instead, we must preserve the integrity of silver coinage. To do this, I again recommend effective legislation such as that which I have introduced, to prohibit hoarding, speculating, and profiteering in silver coins. I again recommend a critical reexamination of our silver certificate redemption policies. I again urge the creation of a silver reserve in the Treasury for defense. Above all, I again recommend a free market on silver to revitalize domestic production and end the chronic shortage of this increasingly valuable mineral.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Carlin Gold Mine published in the American Metal Market of June 2, together with an editorial regarding this gold mine published in the Elko Daily Free Press, May 28.

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

[From the Elko Daily Free Press, May 28, 1965]

POURING A GOLD BRICK

The roar from the small furnace was intense. Flames shot from the cylindrical furnace, propelled under pressure and 2,000° heat. A finger was applied to a switch. The noise stopped. It was a dramatic moment as newsmen and officials of Newmont Mining Corp. awaited the pouring of the gold brick, which would mark the dedication of the Carlin gold mine.

President Plato Malozemoff touched a button. The furnace turned and molten metal, blood red, was poured into a mold about the size of a loaf of bread. When filled with gold to the top it represented about $45,000. This gold bar today went, like the others which follow it, into the Nation's gold reserve which never needed bolstering more than now.

Thus a Nevada mine is writing a new chapter in history. The mine itself is the second largest in the United States, fourth in size in North America. The application of modern machines and automation is a far cry from the days when miners panned gold in the

Lynn mining district, where the mine is located, about 28 miles north of Carlin.

Mining officials and newsmen arrived in Elko for the occasion on Wednesday. Some of the marvels of the mine were explained to the newsmen Wednesday night; one of the most impressive facts being that the gold in the ore is so fine that it cannot be seen with the naked eye, that a ton of ore contains only a third of an ounce of gold.

Roland Merwin, Newmont's general superintendent, and now a resident of Elko, pointed to two piles of earth at the mine yesterday. He said, "This is gold ore and that isn't. I know because there is a line between the two piles and both have been assayed. The ore is so fine you can pan it all day and never find a thing."

One of the most significant and most important facts as far as Carlin and Elko is concerned is that the life of the mine is 15 years. It is no flash in the pan but a lasting industry of great value to the welfare of the country as well as being a lasting boon to the economy of the State, particularly this area. It could well be the start of further rewarding activities upon the part of the company whose explorations continue, along with others seeking new mineral discoveries.

Production at the mine will be 2,000 tons of ore a day and from this 200,000 fine ounces of gold will be recovered annually.

One of the most interesting facts pointed out to the visitors is that the entire milling operation is controlled from three central points. If trouble develops in any part of the operation a red light flashes, showing its location. This does not mean the plant must shut down. Auxiliary machines are used until the trouble is corrected. The job of recovering gold from the great mass of earth continues without interruption.

Steps have been taken to improve the road to the mine. It will be oiled and will lessen the wear and tear on cars as well as workers, who commute to the mine daily, either from Elko or Carlin. We sincerely hope this road will not be delayed, but built as soon as possible. Homes are not being built at the mine and mill site and this very fact contribute materially to the welfare of Carlin and Elko.

This area will receive wide publicity because of the presence of newsmen at the scene yesterday. One of the first stories we have seen was in the Salt Lake Tribune this morning, written by Robert H. Woody. It is extremely well done.

He quoted Mr. Malozemoff as observing, and this is one of the most significant things about the operation: "Its addition to the U.S. gold reserve will be about one-seventh of all U.S. production and will contribute to the solution of one of our Nation's problems, the shrinkage of our gold reserve."

Another significant remark was made yesterday at the luncheon attended by about 200 invited guests. Senator ALAN BIBLE declared: "It is high time the United States reexamined its monetary policies with respect to gold and silver." We hope he will use his position in making this a reality. We were promised silver dollars but this move has been blocked. None of the opponents of silver seem to realize the boon it would be to our Nation to put silver mines back into production. This could very well be the answer to hoarding. If more and more silver becomes available and if more and more silver dollars are minted they would lose their value to hoarders.

Nothing, and we mean nothing, does more good for the economy of our Nation than mining, yet we have knuckleheads in Washington who oppose it. What we need in Washington is legislation to help mining, not to hinder it.—C.

[From the American Metal Market, June 2, 1965]

NEWMONT'S CARLIN MINE RESERVES OF GOLD ESTIMATED AT SOME 3,500,000 OUNCES

CARLIN, NEV.—One of the biggest gold mines to begin production in the United States in the last half century, second only to Homestake, was dedicated here last week in special ceremonies attended by Federal, State, and local officials.

Carlin Gold Mining Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of Newmont Mining Corp. of New York, owns and operates this open-pit mine and has built a cyanidation plant of 2,000 tons a day nominal capacity for the treatment of the ore mined. A preliminary estimate of the presently drilled-out reserves indicates 11 million tons of ore containing 0.32 ounces of gold per ton. A recovery process has not yet been worked out for a small part of this reserve. Drilling continues and is adding to the reserves.

At a luncheon in Elko, Nev., Newmont President P. Malozemoff said that "this discovery and development of a significant new gold mine in the United States * * * will contribute to the solution of one of our national problems, the shrinkage in our gold reserve." The mine's entire output of over 200,000 fine ounces of gold per year will be shipped to the U.S. mint in San Francisco. Total U.S. mine production of recoverable gold in 1963 (the latest year for which figures are available) was 1.5 million fine ounces.

That there might be gold near Carlin was first recognized by Newmont geologists in late 1961 while studying reports of the U.S. Geological Survey on the Robert Mountain Fault system. They concluded that further exploration of the area known as the Lynn Creek mining district was indicated, where sporadic small lode and placer mining operations were conducted since 1900.

Teams of Newmont geologists began exploratory drilling in July 1962. The third hole yielded evidence of gold. In all, hundreds of holes, totaling a half million feet, were drilled.

Last spring a contract to construct the cyanidation plant was awarded to the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco, while the Isbell Construction Co., of Reno, was assigned the task of removing 2,350,000 tons of overburden to uncover part of the main ore body for mining. The entire preproduction mine preparation and construction were completed within 11 months.

OPEN-PIT MINING

Carlin's gold ore is removed by shallow, open-pit mining. Gold occurs in its natural state in the form of tiny particles unseen by the naked eye, enclosed in the otherwise worthless rock. The ore as mined is trucked to the crushing plant, reduced to about 1 inch in size, then ground to a fine sand in a large ball mill. Cyanide solution is added to dissolve the gold, a process conducted in four agitator tanks.

The "pulp," a mixture of suspended solids and solution is piped to five large thickener tanks, where the cyanide solution containing dissolved gold is separated from the waste solids called tailings. After passing through clarifying filters, oxygen is removed from the gold-bearing solution, and small quantities of zinc dust are introduced to precipitate gold in the form of a black sludge. The gold sludge is collected in large precipitate presses, from which it is removed once a week, mixed with suitable fluxes and melted in a small furnace. The recovery process concludes with the pouring of molten gold into 1,200-ounce ingots, which are stored in the mine's vault and ultimately airfreighted to the San Francisco Mint.

With its combination of low operating costs and high productivity, the Carlin property has been described by Mr. Malozemoff as "a miner's dream."

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—NEVADA COUNTY COOPERATION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last year, Congress enacted the Classification and Multiple Use Act which had as its principal purpose improving the way in which public lands of the West are used for the benefit of the Nation.

Even before the act was passed, the Bureau of Land Management, working closely with the American Municipal Association and the National Association of Counties, was developing prototype areas for studies of ways to increase local cooperation in charting a course for public land development.

Clark County in the Las Vegas Valley area is one of the pilot project areas. There are additional study areas in Oregon, California, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado.

I am pleased to place in the RECORD a brief article entitled "Pattern for Land-Use Planning," which describes the cooperative work underway with the commissioners of Clark County and the Bureau of Land Management. This article aptly shows what can be done and what is being done when local and Federal officials work together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

PATTERN FOR LAND-USE PLANNING

(By Robert E. Wilber, resource utilization specialist, Reno, Nev.)

Spanish explorers called it Las Vegas, meaning the meadows. Tourists have called it "the entertainment capital of the world." But Bureau of Land Management officials have called it communities in quandaries because of its fantastic growth and past lack of land-use planning.

The population of Clark County's Las Vegas Valley has been increasing at phenomenal rates, sometimes as high as 85 percent in a year. In addition, more than 13 million people visit the area each year. Schools, parks, hospitals, and other public facilities are overloaded. Urbanization invades the flat desert plain like a tropical jungle taking over a clearing—and with about the same lack of order.

Communities in the valley are typical of many growing metropolitan areas in the West. They are surrounded by a sea of public lands—lands which have remained in the public domain because they are unsuitable for agricultural land settlement. Under various public land laws, fragments of these "satellite lands" have been disposed of for a multitude of uses; but, until recently, little regard was given to the orderly growth and development of the area.

In 1963, the Bureau began discussions with the American Municipal Association (now the National League of Cities) and the U.S. conference of mayors about the growth crisis in western cities. They arrived at two main conclusions: (1) Greater coordination between BLM and municipal

authorities was essential; and (2) a pilot study should be made to explore means of achieving this vital coordination.

PILOT STUDY LAUNCHED

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall agreed with both points and, in October of 1963, a Las Vegas pilot project was launched. Later, the National Association of Counties conferred with municipal representatives and worked with BLM to establish six more prototype studies in five States—California, Oregon, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado.

First, the Las Vegas study teams traced Clark County's long and turbulent growth, which began about 1905. In that year, the Los Angeles-Salt Lake Railroad (now part of the Union Pacific Railroad system) was completed. The Las Vegas area grew in population from 800 people to nearly 2,300 by 1920. After 1930, the area expanded further after construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River.

Early in World War II, army camps and training centers came to the valley. The town of Henderson was built in conjunction with the basic magnesium project, which was designed to produce vitally needed magnesium from low grade ores.

Storage and testing areas for nuclear materials in southern Nevada brought further expansion after the war. However, the really significant growth period coincides with the development of the gambling and entertainment industry from the late 1940's up to the present time. The population of Clark County is now more than 230,000.

Land promoters and speculators began to take an interest in the area early in the 1950's, capitalizing on the valley's abundant sunshine and year-round mild temperatures. They also capitalized on the public's lack of knowledge of the public lands and public land laws. Promoters and so-called land locaters advertised all over the country about 5-acre lots near Las Vegas, offering to file applications for a fee.

FLOOD OF APPLICATIONS

Thousands of applications for small tracts of Federal land poured into BLM's Reno land office. In 1954, the office received more than 6,000. The following year the figure practically doubled, with more than 90 percent of them coming from out-of-State residents. Most of the applicants knew nothing about the lands, including the fact that water and public services were unavailable or very expensive to obtain.

Similar promotional schemes were carried out under the mining laws. Las Vegas Valley was blanketed with sand and gravel mining claims in the early 1950's. Some of the claims went into sand and gravel production, but many were located merely to acquire lands for subdivision and sale as home and business sites.

To further complicate the picture, mining claims and small tract applications were often filed for the same tract of land.

In order to curb activities of unscrupulous operators, the Secretary of the Interior closed southern Nevada to the filing of small tract applications in 1955. The same year, Congress passed a law that removed sand, gravel, and other similar common materials from location under the mining laws.

But the damage had been done. The landownership pattern near Las Vegas was fragmented, and much of the land was unavailable for development because it was being held for speculation. It became painfully apparent to both the Federal and local governments that the public land laws were not adequate to cope with the land-use problems of growing communities.

Various attempts had been made to help the situation in Clark County. One approach was special acts of Congress. In 1956, Congress passed a law conveying 6,859 acres of public land at fair market value to the city of Henderson. A similar act in 1963 gave Henderson the right to purchase an additional 16,000 acres for urban expansion.

BLM made an offer to provide for some of the valley's land needs for public use by transfers under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. Secretary Udall made this easier by authorizing the sale of lands for school and recreation sites to State and local governments for $2.50 per acre. BLM has sold 2,341 acres under this act and leased another 3,455 acres to local government agencies in the valley.

These, of course, were only piecemeal approaches to the land problems. The full solution, it is hoped, will come from pilot studies now underway.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

Since the Las Vegas project started, State Director Russell Penny and District Manager Dennis Hess have held dozens of meetings with city administrators and planners, county commissioners, school officials, public works directors, city and county engineers, local recreation planners and directors, various civic organizations, and other groups. At these meetings, it is stressed that people of Las Vegas Valley now have an opportunity to determine their own future by working out a comprehensive land-use plan.

When this is completed, BLM will coordinate its program of land transfers with the valley's plans.

There are several indications that this approach to land-use planning has captured the fancy of local officials. Clark County is making a comprehensive plan for the entire 7 million acres comprising the county, and is serving as the coordinating agency for land-use planning. Meanwhile, local agencies have formed the Las Vegas Valley Area Planning Council, which is serving as a clearinghouse for information and coordinating local efforts.

Citizen groups are helping in many areas, including outdoor recreation. When the several thousand acres of desert area at Spring Mountain near Las Vegas was identified as a recreation area by BLM, many groups became interested. To form a plan for developing the area, community leaders formed a recreation subcommittee, including local and State planning and recreation agencies, the League of Women Voters, Sierra Club, scouting organizations, and many others. They have worked on a plan which includes a natural amphitheater, several miles of scenic one-way drives and picnic grounds intermingled with areas of archeological interest. This past April, they organized a "war on junk" and began a cleanup campaign in the area.

To aid the planning groups, BLM has prepared land status maps of the valley which show landownership and some of the prospective values and uses of the lands. As local agencies determine their present and future land needs, this information is correlated with other known local interests and the lands are identified for a potential use, such as a school site or an industrial park.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED

Already, the Las Vegas and other prototype studies have led to six important conclusions in public land planning:

1. Creative federalism will work in land planning and management.

2. Bureau programs are more effective when citizens take part in the decisionmaking.

3. County government is willing and able to serve as a central planning body.

4. Local government should take the lead in planning for use of Federal lands to be transferred out of Federal ownership.

5. BLM should take the lead in planning for management of public lands to be retained in Federal ownership.

6. Communities can plan adequately for much of their open space and other public needs through effective use of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

"We are greatly encouraged by the reception these pilot studies have received," says Charles H. Stoddard, Director of BLM. "Commissioners of Clark County, as well as other public officials, have seized the initiative since the very beginning of the Las Vegas project. And on a wider front, the National Association of Counties featured the pilot studies recently at its Public Land Management Conference in Reno.

"With the West's population booming, the public domain land adjacent to population centers is under tremendous pressure from urban and industrial expansion, recreation, and other uses. We feel that local governments and organizations should participate in discussions concerning the future of this land."

Stoddard points out that such projects are the very essence of President Johnson's program of "creative federalism," calling for new concepts of cooperation between the Federal Government and local leaders.

"This approach to land use planning requires foresight and political courage," Stoddard said, "but it will lead to better communities and a better America."

VARIATION OF THE 40-HOUR WORKWEEK OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 297, S. 1495.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1495) to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, according to the description given on the bill on the calendar, the inference might be drawn that the bill contemplates changing the 40-hour workweek under Federal law. There is in progress a movement to establish by law a 35-hour week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me quickly inform the Senator that this bill would not do that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is, Would the bill in any manner change the present law fixing what the workweek shall be of Federal employees?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in any manner, shape, or form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 604(a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(a)), is amended by adding a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, the head of each such department, establishment, or agency and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia may establish special tours of duty (of not less than forty hours) without regard to the requirements of such paragraph in order to enable officers and employees to take courses in nearby colleges, universities, or other educational institutions which will equip them for more effective work in the agency. No premium compensation shall be paid to any officer or employee solely because his special tour of duty established pursuant to this paragraph results in his working on a day or at a time of day for which premium compensation is otherwise authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 310), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

STATEMENT

This bill is an administration request to provide discretionary authority to establish special tours of duty for certain employees of the Federal Government for educational purposes.

Present law (5 U.S.C. 944(a)(2)) sets out the general rule to be followed in establishing the Federal employment workweek. The head of each department or agency establishes a 5-day workweek, preferably Monday through Friday, consisting of 8 hours not to be interrupted by more than 1 hour (lunch hour) during the workday.

The Government Employees Training Act of 1958 (5 U.S.C. 2301) permits employees to attend schools as an official part of their prescribed duties when such training is directly related to their work. This authority does not extend to permit employees to attend school for general educational purposes, however, even though such training will generally improve efficiency for their positions.

The present bill will provide discretionary authority for the head of any agency to establish special tours of duty so that an employee may attend school at his own expense in order to improve education and professional qualifications for employment. Some Federal employees, particularly scientists and engineers, can substantially improve their usefulness and proficiency by taking courses at nearby colleges or universities. The school attendance will not be considered part of his official tour of duty and he will in all cases be required to perform at least 40 hours' work in each workweek.

The purpose of the bill is merely to authorize arranging the employee's work schedule so that he can conveniently schedule classes if the head of the agency determines that such training will be in the best interests of the employee and the agency.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE AND THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, in the Navy and Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TOO MANY GENERALS AND ADMIRALS IN TOP CIVILIAN JOBS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam, is in Washington for consultation. He is one of the very highest paid officials of our Government. His salary as Ambassador, combined with his retirement pay as a general of our Army, ranges between $35,859 and $39,859. In other words, in the executive and legislative branches of our Government his salary is exceeded only by the salaries we pay to the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States.

I cite this fact to indicate the high salaries paid to retired officers of our Armed Forces, who have been appointed, for example, as ambassadors, or who serve in other high offices in the executive branch of our Government.

Another example is Gen. Herbert B. Powell, our Ambassador to New Zealand—and New Zealand is not a very critical area—who receives a combined yearly salary that ranges between $35,000 and $39,000.

Should the nomination of Gen. William F. McKee as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency be confirmed by the Senate and should the bill that is now on the calendar be enacted, to waive the requirement that only a civilian may hold this position, General McKee will be the highest salaried official in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, with the exception of the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States. It is my hope that I shall have an opportunity to vote on a yea and nay vote against the confirmation of the nomination of General McKee.

I have previously voiced in this Chamber my view that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor was a bad choice to be our Ambassador to South Vietnam. The situation there has gone from bad to worse. It appears to me that Averell Harriman, our Ambassador at Large, would be an ideal representative of our Government as Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary to this troubed area of southeast Asia. Our Founding Fathers, who were the architects of the Constitution, wisely provided that in the United States civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. It appears to me—and I say it regretfully, as a Senator who desires to support the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson—that this administration has become topheavy with officials who are former generals and admirals and who are recipients of high retirement pay in addition to their civilian pay.

Appendix B of the report and minority views of the Committee on Commerce on the appointment of General McKee sets forth the retired regular generals and admirals reported to the Civil Service Commission as employed as Federal civilians.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

APPENDIX B

Retired Regular officers, grades O–7 through O–10, reported to Civil Service Commission as employed as Federal civilians

EMPLOYED ON NOV. 30, 1964

	Agency	Position	Civilian salary	Gross retired pay [1]	Combined pay [2]
Taylor, Gen. Maxwell D. (Army)	State	Ambassador to Vietnam	$26,000.00–$30,000.00	$17,719	$35,859–$39,859
Powell, Gen. Herbert B. (Army)	do	Ambassador to New Zealand	26,000.00– 30,000.00	16,065	35,033– 39,033
Haislip, Gen. Wade H. (Army)	Soldiers' Home	Governor	18,935.00	[3] 15,300	34,235
O'Connell, Lt. Gen. James D. (Army)	OEP	Assistant Director	26,000.00	14,175	34,088
McNinch, Maj. Gen. Joseph H. (Army)	VA	Chief Medical Director	28,500.00	12,758	35,879
Ryan, Maj. Gen. Cornelius E. (Army)	Defense	Director, Infrastructure Division	22,500.00	12,150	29,575
Hinds, Brig. Gen. Sidney R. (Army)	do	Inspector General Administrator	15,150.00	[4] 9,518	24,668
McKee, Gen. William F. (Air Force)	NASA	Assistant Administrator for Management Development.	24,500.00	[5] 16,065	40,565
Barnes, Lt. Gen. Earl W. (Air Force)	CIA	Member, Board of National Estimates	24,000.00	13,500	31,750
McClelland, Maj. Gen. Harold M. (Air Force)	do	Director of communications	24,500.00	12,150	31,575
Holzman, Brig. Gen. Benjamin G. (Air Force)	NASA	Assistant to Associate Administrator	22,000.00	11,394	28,697
Hull, Brig. Gen. Harris B. (Air Force)	NASA	Special Assistant to Administrator	20,500.00	11,115	27,058
Mundy, Lt Gen. George W. (Air Force)	Army	Special Assistant to Director of Civil Defense	21,445.00	[4] 14,175	35,620
Curts, Adm. Maurice E. (Navy)	Defense	Director, Telecommunications Policy	23,695.00	[4] 16,065	39,760
Wright, Adm. Jerauld (Navy)	State	Ambassador to China	26,000.00–30,000.00	16,065	35,033–39,033
Boone, Adm. Walter F. (Navy)	NASA	Deputy Associate Administrator	24,500.00	[5] 16,065	40,565
Rose, Vice Adm. Rufus E. (Navy)	NASA	Director, Policy Planning Division	23,000.00	[5] 14,175	37,175
Anderson, Adm. George W., Jr. (Navy)	State	Ambassador to Portugal	26,000.00–30,000.00	17,719	35,859–39,859
Harllee, Rear Adm. John (Navy) [6]	Maritime Commission.	Chairman	28,500.00	7,166	33,083
McMillan, Brig. Gen. Hoyt ((Marines) [7]	Post Office	Postmaster	8,625.00	6,279	12,765
Fojt, Brig. Gen. Robert E. (Marines) [7]	Interior	Public utilities specialist	12,495.00	[4] 8,688	21,183
Nelson, Maj. Gen. Ralph T. (Army)	Army	Consultant (w.o.c.)		[8] 12,758	12,758
Lansdale, Maj. Gen. Edward G. (Air Force)	Agriculture	do		[3] 12,150	12,150
Nichols, Maj. Gen. Kenneth (Army)	Defense	Consultant (w.a.e.)	[9] 94.24	9,720	
DeCoursey, Maj. Gen. Elbert (Army)	Army	do	[9] 50.00	[3] 12,758	
Simon, Maj. Gen. Leslie E. (Army)	Defense and Army	Consultant (w.a.e.) (3 positions)	[9] 68.00 [9] 83.04 [9] 94.24	12,150	
Lindquist, Maj. Gen. Roy E. (Army)	Defense	Consultant (w.a.e.)	[9] 50.00	[3] 12,758	
Morris, Maj. Gen. Sewell I. (Army)	do	do	[9] 50.00	12,780	
Fenn, Brig. Gen. Clarence C. (Army)	Army	do	[9] 83.04	10,575	
Mattingly, Brig. Gen. Thomas W. (Army)	do	do	[9] 50.00	11,104	
Samford, Lt. Gen. John A. (Air Force)	CIA	do	[9] 94.24	14,175	
O'Hara, Maj. Gen. John J. (Air Force)	Defense	do	[9] 50.00	[3] 12,758	
Summerfelt, Brig. Gen. Milton F. (Air Force)	State	do	[9] 78.64	11,115	
Witherington, Rear Adm. Frederic S. (Navy)	Army	Advisory Board member (w.a.e.)	[9] 74.16	12,758	
Colclough, Rear Adm. Oswald S. (Navy)	AEC	Member, AE Labor and Management (w.a.e.)	[9] 100.00	12,150	

APPOINTED SINCE NOV. 30, 1964

Shaw, Brig. Gen. Samuel R. (Marines)	U.S. Senate	Professional staff member	$15,000.00	$11,115	$26,115
Raborn, Vice Adm. W. F. (Navy)	CIA	Director	30,000.00	14,175	38,088
Tyson, Brig. Gen. Robert N. (Army)	VA	Program planning specialist	16,460.00	11,115	23,018
Grantham, Rear Adm. Elonzo B., Jr. (Navy)	State	Senior evaluation officer	21,020.00	13,100	28,570
Beardsley, Vice Adm. George F. (Navy)	Navy	Consultant (w.a.e.)	[9] 83.00	14,175	
Bogart, Lt. Gen. Frank (Air Force)	NASA	Special Assistant to Associate Administrator	23,000.00	[5] 14,529	37,529

[1] Except as indicated in footnotes 3, 4, 5, 8, retired pay is subject to reduction under sec. 201(a) of the Dual Compensation Act.

[2] Annual civilian salary plus gross annual retired pay, reduced where appropriate under sec. 201(a) of the Dual Compensation Act. Does not allow for reductions from gross pay for survivorship benefits, etc.

[3] Elected to remain under exemption from 1932 Dual Compensation Act.

[4] Exempt from reduction in retired pay because of combat disability.

[5] Exempted from reduction in retired pay, NASA action under sec. 201(e) of the Dual Compensation Act.

[6] Honorary rank under 10 U.S.C. 6150, retired pay based on active duty rank of captain.

[7] Honorary rank under 10 U.S.C. 6150, retired pay based on active duty rank of colonel.

[8] Not subject to reduction.

[9] Per day.

Source: Prepared by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the military should have such great influence and be in so many high positions in civilian agencies of the Federal Government. It is to be regretted. I hope I shall have an opportunity this week or next week, along with other Senators, to vote against the confirmation of the nomination of General McKee.

PROGRESS BEING MADE BY REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post an excellent editorial column by Roscoe Drummond concerning the great progress being made in the Republic of Israel.

As Mr. Drummond so appropriately states, the Israelis "are intent on building the promising land," and the remarkable achievements which already have been accomplished indicate that they are well on their way to the attainment of expanding economic prosperity.

Despite aggressive policies directed against Israel by the Arab nation, the Israeli people have continued to grow and prosper. As Mr. Drummond concludes:

The Israelis have performed an economic and social miracle in half a generation—and more is in the making.

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

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

VISIT TO ISRAEL: A DREAM COME TO FRUITION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

JERUSALEM.—Now I can see why 100 million Arabs feel afraid of 2½ million Israelis.

I am convinced that they have no valid reason to be fearful.

The reason: The Israelis have performed an economic and social miracle in half a generation—and more is in the making.

They have transformed the most sterile and resource-poor tiny slice of the Middle East into a promising land.

Israel is here to stay. President Habib Bourguiba, of Tunisia, now dares say this openly and other Arab leaders may be saying the same thing before long.

Israel is a threat to none of its neighbors, if the Arabs wish to live in peace—and let Israel live in peace. Israel has too much to do to make war on its neighbors and is doing it too successfully to do so. This is the strongest reason why the Arab nations have no valid cause to be fearful.

The Israelis are unquestionably tough and strong, tenacious and determined. It would be unsafe to molest them and I suspect that President Gamal Abdel Nasser knows it just as well as President Bourguiba.

And Israel is not going to molest anybody else. They are intent on building the promising land.

It is only 17 years since the United Nations put the scepter of rulership in the hands of these modern Jewish pioneers and they, like Moses, have built on faith—plus work and wit and will.

The Israelis were given a barren soil woefully short of water and in 15 years increased their arable land by 360 percent.

They have generated a dynamic economy which has had an average growth rate of 10 percent per year—never under 8 percent, never over 12. This has outdistanced Japan, the European Common Market, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

These achievements would have been impossible without extensive capital from abroad—large annual contributions from the affluent Jewish community of the United States and elsewhere, German reparations ($800 million) and restitution, and foreign investment. This flow is tapering off and Israel is now covering 60 percent of its imports with its expanding trade and tourism.

Israel is today a dream come to fruition at a breathless pace—and there is no evidence that it is slowing down.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 102d legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has properly assumed responsibility for construction of a national system of interstate and defense highways as vital to its economy and security; and

Whereas the existing program terminating in 1972 was planned in years past; and

Whereas it is now evident that U.S. Interstate 95 as now programed will not serve adequately the County of Washington, State of Maine; and

Whereas in the interests of a common defense by the United States and Canada a primary highway system should link the two nations; and

Whereas the economy of Washington County, Maine, has long been recognized as demanding a stimulus; and

Whereas there is need for a short, direct route from the center of the State of Maine to the western boundary of New Brunswick—connecting thereby with St. John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, Nova Scotia, and being the logical interchange between defense bases in Labrador and Newfoundland in Canada; and Cutler Naval Station, the world's largest radio defense system, Bucks Harbor, the vital Air Force Radar Defense Installation, and Dow Field, Bangor, in the United States; and

Whereas the county of Washington desperately needs an expeditious access route to serve its industrial and recreational components in order that the region shall not be isolated from the mainstream of such business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States, in order to promote the defense of the Nation and upgrade the economy of the depressed areas of Washington County, Maine, that appropriate action be taken to require the Department of Commerce, through its Bureau of Public Roads, to locate, plan, and construct as a part of Interstate System 95 a highway suitable for defense and economic requirements through Washington County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

In senate chamber: Read and adopted; sent down for concurrence, May 27, 1965.

EDWIN H. PERT,
Secretary.

House of representatives: Read and adopted in conference, May 28, 1965.

JEROME G. PLANTE,
Clerk.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT ST. OLAF'S COLLEGE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on May 30, 1965, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY delivered a memorable commencement address at St. Olaf's College, in Northfield, Minn. In that speech, Vice President HUMPHREY eloquently argued the case for education and its importance in our society. I am reminded by his speech of something that Alfred North Whitehead said in 1916, and it is no less true today—that we face a solemn challenge:

In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. * * * There will be no appeal from the judgment which will be pronounced on the uneducated.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Vice President HUMPHREY's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ST. OLAF'S COLLEGE, MAY 30, 1965

Last week, in Minneapolis, I participated in a television program. As I spoke, my voice and my image were transmitted simultaneously to living rooms of men and women on the European continent.

There was a time-lag of only a split-second in that communication.

Two months ago, at Cape Kennedy, I watched as two men left earth in a space capsule. They knew their course and their destination far better—and were, I might add, in less danger—than Columbus and his men when they ventured west a relatively short time before in history.

And, on that occasion at Cape Kennedy, I observed too that it had been only some 61 years before that Wilbur and Orville Wright had kept their 170-pound aircraft aloft for 12 seconds over a distance of 120 feet.

Read the advertising headlines:

"Language Barriers Are No Longer a Business Problem."

"New Capabilities To Make You Forget the Old Ones."

"Cut Seat Reservation Time From 2 Minutes to 34 Seconds."

"Never Before So Many Instant Answers Available to So Many."

"Is Man Obsolete?"

And only 30 years ago the most exciting then of human experiences was described by Carl Sandburg:

"* * * riding on a limited express, one of the crack trains of the nation * * * hurtling across the prairie into blue haze and dark air go 15 all-steel coaches holding a thousand people.

"* * * I ask a man in the smoker where he is going and he answers 'Omaha'."

Thirty years ago man's aspiration was Omaha. Today it is the moon.

I have heard it said that the everyday life of the average man has changed more in the last 65 years than in the 2,000 years before. If you examine these changes, it becomes clear that they rest on new transportation and communication, sources of power, new knowledge—almost all connected with the growth of modern technology.

There are more scientists and engineers alive today than all previous scientists and engineers taken together. (And I sometimes think they all live in Washington.)

And, in this technological society, we have almost invented the technique of invention. Today, being able to clearly state a technological problem or define a technological need is almost tantamount to a solution to that problem or that need.

The fact is that our knowledge is becoming so extensive that its very size and complexity can cause problems. We almost know too much. In some fields today it is easier to rediscover something than to search existing literature to find it.

Americans of all people are known for their technological efficiency. In fact, we are often criticized as being so materialistic that we spend all our time and energy in pursuit and manufacture of objects.

I think the great part of that criticism is unjustified. But, in midst of our technological progress, we must ask questions:

Is technology desirable for its own sake?

What changes is it creating in our society?

How do we harness it?

As the advertising headline says, "Is Man Obsolete?"

I personally have no intention whatever of becoming obsolete.

Technology has brought us tremendous good. It has made life longer and better for millions of men and women.

But, in recognizing technology's benefits, we must not allow it to become our master.

We must recognize technology's effect on our society and insure that it continues to serve us, and not itself.

There is only one certain way we can achieve this. It is through education. Technology has made education the central need of 20th-century America.

Curriculums have changed from grade school through graduate school. Changing technology has, in fact, made it a necessity that all of us make education a lifelong activity. What was true yesterday may not be true tomorrow.

This administration has recognized this necessity for educational excellence. And this Congress is passing historic legislation which makes long-range investments in that excellence.

But no amount of government investment will be enough if all of us as citizens do not recognize our responsibility to make education—in our own homes, in our children's schools, in our libraries—our first priority.

In this age, what kind of education shall it be?

First of all, there is of course the need to educate people to utilize and develop technology per se.

It is a reality that, if we expect to benefit from technology, there must be those who can operate it.

In the past 10 years, for instance, a new industry has come into being in the United States: the computer industry.

This industry requires those who can design, develop, manufacture, maintain, and use its products. Over 20,000 general-purpose computers are now installed in the United States alone. By 1970, another 500,000 additional computer programers will be needed in this country. That number will multiply many times over during your lifetime. Computers are multiplying and so is the need for people trained to use them.

Secondly, we must educate people so that they may find useful work in life.

It is quite apparent that, in this age of technology, the man with little skill has difficulty finding a job. Only 5 percent of the entire American labor force is unskilled. But even 5 percent is too much.

Today, one out of every three unemployed never went beyond grade school. Two out of three unemployed do not have a high school diploma. Jobs for the unskilled are disappearing. They will continue to disappear.

Then, we must recognize that technology—beyond reducing the need for the unskilled worker—has made basic changes in our patterns of employment.

Today, workers in the service-producing industries number 10 million more than workers producing goods. And the white-collar worker is far more numerous than the blue-collar worker. This pattern will perpetuate itself.

In the future it will not be enough, then, even to possess a skill—if that skill is not needed in great number. There were thousands of bankrupt carriage shops and unemployed blacksmiths when we entered the automobile age.

Yes, we need education to provide the people who can operate the instruments of technology. We also need education to prepare people for the changing occupational patterns which technology has thrust upon us.

But finally—and most importantly—we need men and women who can look beyond technology.

We need education to produce those who can indeed see more than the pursuit and manufacture of goods and objects.

There are those today who worry because many of our schools and universities still carry such a high percentage of liberal arts in their curriculums.

Why, they say, study literature or language? Why study ancient history? Why a major in the theater arts? Haven't you heard, this is the new technological world? It is the world of plastics, heat-shields, solid-state, and the Great God Transistor.

To these, I give my answer: Let us not confuse means and ends.

What do we seek for man on this planet? Human dignity, personal expression and fulfillment, freedom, and justice.

Technology in itself is not the end of our aspirations.

No, I am not among the Luddites—those who in past times destroyed technology so as to remove a threat they did not understand.

I say that we, as a nation, must continue to develop a technology second to none in the world. We must offer the best possible education in technology and for technology.

But those who lead technology are the first to say that it is no more than a tool.

The value of that tool depends on the intelligence, judgment and creativity of man himself.

The value of that tool depends on the resources of intellect and spirit of our Nation and its citizens.

These resources can only be developed by education which involves man in ideas as well as things, in ethics as well as engineering.

Technology, despite its achievements, is today only coming into early maturity.

If we are prepared to engage it wisely, it can indeed help us toward our ultimate ends.

Physical well-being will not make all men philosopher kings.

More rapid communication will not make men more wisely communicate.

But these things can someday ease man's everyday burden so that he may one day lift himself beyond his search for food, shelter, and material comfort.

John Stuart Mill said the worth of a nation "Is the worth of the individuals composing it."

Let us then, today, in this generation produce men and women who, as individuals, will build a society of compassion as well as comfort, of humanism as well as hardware, of freedom as well as Frigidaire.

REPORT ON MIGRATORY LABOR BY ASSOCIATION OF BAR OF CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has recently issued a report strongly supporting additional legislation in the migratory labor field. Much of this proposed legislation is now pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the ranking minority member; and I have cosponsored some of the pending bills, including one to extend to agricultural laborers the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the association's report be printed in the RECORD.

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

REPORT ON MIGRATORY LABOR, THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Migratory agricultural workers are one of America's most depressed groups. They have not shared in the progress of recent decades achieved by others in our society. They are excluded from the elementary protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act and other protective Federal and State legislation. It is little wonder that the status of this group has in recent years become a subject of increasing concern.

We recommend amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to eliminate the existing exclusion of agricultural labor (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(6)) and to provide for phased increases in an agricultural minimum wage, applicable at least to larger farm employers, reaching the level of the industrial minimum wage over a 4-year period.

We further recommended amendment of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the existing exclusion of agricultural labor (29 U.S.C. 152(3)) and further study to determine whether other amendments to the Act and special procedures are necessary for meaningful protection under the law.

Finally, we recommend further intensive study of the problems of migratory labor, including coverage under unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and Social Security, provisions for better housing, health, safety and education, and extension of the franchise by limitation of residence requirements for voting.

We support the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in these respects (S. Rept. No. 115, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 8, 1965).

In making these recommendations, we act both on the basis of the demands flowing from our traditions of equal justice under law, and on the basis of the demands of our conscience as citizens in the face of the conditions of migratory labor.

I. GENERAL FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The 400,000 to 500,000 of our fellow citizens who work as migratory farm laborers comprise one of America's disadvantaged groups.[1]

In the United States today there are approximately 1,400,000 unemployed farmworkers.[2] The migrants are drawn in significant part from the ranks of these unemployed farmworkers. Unemployment among farmworkers is caused in great measure by the failure of smaller farms to survive the competition of the larger more modern mechanized farms.[3] But even the most mechanized farm requires the work of farm laborers for short periods of time each year.

Starting in the spring of each year, three groups of migratory workers seek to fill this need.[4] The first group starts in Florida and wends its way through the old South, the Middle Atlantic States and ends up bringing in the late harvest in the northeastern section of our country. The second group starts from Texas and works its way through the heartland of the United States. The third group starts in California and moves through that State, Oregon and Washington. When winter comes and there is no work for the migrant he generally returns to the starting point for his group.

The risks of the migrant farmworker

As discussed in greater detail below, the average income of the migrant farmworker is far below minimum standards.[5] Many workers migrate to obtain farm employment without having a definite job commitment. If, for any reason the work does not materialize, the migrant may be stranded without funds or any means of returning home. So also there is a loss of earning opportunities when there is delay in the need for the migratory farmworker. The causes of delay or total failure in obtaining work are numerous. They include weather conditions which can destroy a crop or unexpectedly accelerate or retard its ripening; a transportation breakdown on route; inaccurate information or no information as to where and when employment opportunities exist.[6]

The farmer who engages a migratory laborer is also susceptible to risk. There is the uncertainty whether enough workers will be available to harvest his crops and, even if sufficient workers are available, the labor turnover is often high and the farmer cannot be sure of retaining an adequate work force until the harvest is completed. His efforts to assure sufficient labor by advancing transportation expenses are sometimes insufficient but they also involve the risk of financial loss if the workers do not arrive or do not stay on the job long enough to earn or repay the amounts advanced.[7] To lessen some of these risks to the farmer and the migratory laborer, there has evolved a system of "farm labor contractors" or crew leaders.

The role of the crew leader

The individual migrant cannot individually contract for work throughout the area

---

[1] The Bureau of Census, 1959 report, enumerates approximately 500,000 migrant farmworkers. The number of farmworkers has consistently dropped since that period. ("Farm Labor Market Developments," U.S. Department of Labor, January 1964.) The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor now estimates that there are about 400,000 migrant farm laborers (S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963).

[2] S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 17.

[3] "Farm Labor Market Developments," U.S. Department of Labor, January 1964.

[4] Levine, "The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy," 12 Labor Law Journal, 622, 626 (1961).

[5] In 1959 migratory workers averaged only $710 income per year. (The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy, supra, at p. 627). In 1961 the average annual wage was estimated at $902. U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Advance Report: The Hired Farm Working Force of 1961" (1962). See also S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), p. 25.

[6] S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 17.

[7] S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 16.

in which he travels. The contracts of labor are made generally by a crew leader who recruits, transports, supervises and handles pay arrangements for the migratory worker and otherwise acts as an intermediary between the worker and the farmer.

Many of the crew leaders are fair and responsible; however, because of their dependency on the crew leader, the migratory workers are particularly vulnerable to exploitation and abuse at the hands of an unscrupulous crew leader. The abuses most frequently attributed to crew leaders as reported by the Department of Labor are as follows:

"(1) Overcharging workers for transportation advances, collecting for travel expenses from both employers and workers, collecting advances from employer and failing to report to work or reporting with a crew smaller than for whom travel advances had been made;

"(2) Underpaying workers by giving them a short count or short weight on units produced and overcharging employers by giving them inflated production figures on piece rate activities;

"(3) Abandoning workers without paying them; failing to pay agreed upon wage rate, wages earned, or bonus collected from employers, and making improper deductions from workers' earnings;

"(4) Overcharging for meals, groceries, and crew leaders' services; and

"(5) Illegal sale of liquor and dope, gambling and similar illegal activities." [8]

In an attempt to curb these abuses, eight states and Puerto Rico have enacted laws requiring the registration of farm labor contractors or crew leaders.[9] Basically, the state laws applying to crew leaders include requirements for payment of wages when due and prohibitions against certain undesirable employment practices such as giving false information relating to the terms, conditions or expenses of employment. An additional state, Texas, has a law which is primarily designed to control the recruitment activities of agents and also includes requirements for agents who recruit agricultural workers for out-of-state use.[10]

The Congress, effective January 1, 1965, enacted and on September 7, 1964, the President approved the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963.[11] The Act prohibits acting as a crew leader without first obtaining a certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor and maintaining it in full force and effect. In order to qualify for a certificate, a crew leader must satisfy the Secretary of Labor that he is financially responsible or insured against damages arising out of ownership or operation of vehicles for the transportation of migrant workers; must file a set of his fingerprints with the Secretary; must not have given false or misleading information to migrant workers concerning the terms, conditions or existence of agricultural employment; must not have unjustifiably failed to perform agreements with farm operators or migrant workers; must not have recruited or used the services of anyone he knows to be violating the provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws; must not have been convicted of certain named crimes under state or federal law; must have complied with the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission applicable to his activities in interstate commerce; and must have complied with all the provisions of the Act or any regulations issued by the Secretary under it.

A crew leader is required by the Act to carry his certificate of registration with him at all times while engaging in crew leader activities and exhibit it to those he intends dealing with; must disclose to each worker at the time he is recruited the area of employment, the crops and operations on which he may be employed, the transportation, housing and insurance to be provided him, the wage rates to be paid him and the charges to be made by the crew leader for his services; must post at each place of employment a written statement of the terms and conditions of employment; must post the terms and conditions of occupancy of any housing facilities he controls; and, if he pays migrant workers on his own behalf or as an agent, must keep payroll records and give the migrant worker a statement of sums paid him and withheld from him.

Employees of crew leaders are required to have in their possession identification furnished by the Secretary showing them to be employees of a registered crew leader, and crew leaders may not knowingly employ persons who do not meet the conditions (other than those of financial responsibility and filing fingerprints) of certification as a crew leader.

Crew leaders and their employees who willingly and knowingly violate any provision of the Act or regulation under it are subject to a fine of not more than $500.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to issue regulations under the Act and did so on December 22, 1964.

The Act recites that it is not intended to excuse compliance with appropriate state law and regulation.

Those opposed to the legislation argued principally that federal regulation was unnecessary as a supplement to state controls; that growers' associations hiring workers for employment by their own members, on whose part there was little or no evidence of abuse, might to some extent be covered by the Act; and that a broad interpretation of the Act by the Department of Labor might result in a reduction in work opportunities for migratory workers.

With the Act having been in effect only since January 1, 1965, it is too early to determine the degree to which it is effective in curbing the abuses which prompted its passage or the degree to which it will have the consequences feared by its opponents.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has also established certain requirements with respect to the transportation of migratory farm workers. These requirements apply to the carriers in the case of transportation of migratory workers for a total distance of more than seventy-five miles or across the boundary line of any state. The regulations list qualifications of the drivers of the vehicles and place a limitation on the drivers' hours of work. They also require protection of passengers from cold, meal stops at least every six hours and rest stops.[12]

Housing

After the migratory workers arrive at a farm they often find substandard housing for themselves and their families. Often this housing is merely tar paper shacks. Housing, whether used for one week, one month, six months or year-round is costly and agricultural income is low, thus forcing some farmers to meet only the minimum standards for housing migrants.[13]

Because of this thirty states have enacted mandatory laws and regulations that apply to labor camps used by migratory agricultural workers.[14] This, however, has only acerbated the financial dilemma of some farmers. To help the farmer finance adequate housing Federal legislation has been proposed to amend the Federal Housing Act so as to guarantee commercial loans for these purposes and to directly grant low-interest loans.[15]

Health and sanitation

Directly connected with the need for adequate housing is the need for proper sanitary facilities. If a third of our rural homes do not have complete sanitary facilities [16] it follows that an even greater percentage of housing for migratory farm workers lack proper sanitary facilities. The migrant worker is faced with inadequate water supplies, poor toilet and privy facilities, and inadequate sewage disposal.[17]

Many states have sanitation codes which should cover this problem but often they are inadequately enforced. An example given by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor will suffice to prove this:

"Minnesota, for example, has an excellent code, but only 1 sanitarian to inspect 1,000 camps. In 1959, this inspector was able to check only 118 camps; yet in those he found 729 violations." [18]

This is in marked contrast to the enforcement of its law by New York State where in 1962 the State health department and the State police conducted over 7,000 inspections of health and housing facilities at the 1,000 labor camps which house migratory farmworkers in that State.[19]

But the fact remains that sanitary facilities at most migratory farm labor camps are far below any minimum safe standards. This lack of proper sanitary facilities is one of the major reasons for the disease and disability of the migrant farmworkers. The repeated serious outbreaks of diarrhea among the children of migratory farm workers is caused in part by this lack of sanitary conditions.

Farm work is inherently dangerous. Of the 13,800 workers killed on the job in all industries in 1960, 3,300, or approximately one-quarter of the total were engaged in farm labor.[20] The constant interstate movement of migratory farm laborers and their families prevents them from utilizing public health services generally available to other citizens. The community services migrants receive are not planned with their needs in mind and are not coordinated with the services they may receive elsewhere.[21]

The migrants generally also have little knowledge of good dietary and food handling

---

[8] S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, at p. 11. See also U.S. Department of Labor "Survey of Farm Labor Crew Leaders Practices" (1960).

[9] U.S. Department of Labor "Coverage of Agricultural Workers under State and Federal Laws," Bulletin 264 (1964).

[10] Ibid.

[11] 7 U.S.C.A. 2041 et seq.

[12] U.S. Department of Labor "Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws" (1964).

[13] Williams, Proposed Legislation for Migratory Workers, 12 Labor Law Journal 630 (1961). Typically, the migrant worker lives by the side of the road in "Grapes of Wrath" style or in wretched farm labor camps such as the one found at Indio in the Coachella Valley in southern California. Operated by a county housing authority, it consists of several acres of thin-walled, one-room shacks dating to World War II. The New York Times, Sunday, Jan. 17, 1965, p. 77.

[14] U.S. Department of Labor, "Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws" (1964).

[15] S. Rept. No. 934, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964), p. 48 et seq.

[16] Ibid., p. 49; see also message of President Johnson accompanying the administration's housing program, Jan. 27, 1964.

[17] U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor "Interim Report on the Status of Program Activities Under the Migrant Health Act." See also S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965), pp. 6–11.

[18] S. Rept. No. 167, 88th Cong., 1st sess. 1963, p. 15.

[19] New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Farm and Food Processing Labor "A Helping Hand" (1963), p. 5.

[20] U.S. S. Rept. No. 167, supra, at p. 26.

[21] U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, "Interim Report on the Status of Program Activities Under the Migrant Health Act" (1964), pp. 1–2.

practices. They also lack understanding of health needs, or proper health maintenance practices.[22]

These conditions brought about the enactment of the Federal Migrant Health Act of 1962.[23] The act authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants to public or nonprofit agencies to pay part of the cost of establishing and operating family health service clinics, and other special projects to improve health services and conditions of domestic agricultural migratory workers and their families. The Public Health Service is also authorized to encourage and cooperate in programs aimed at improving migrant health services and conditions.

Many of the migrants health and sanitary problems could be alleviated by proper education but the migrant generally lacks any educational opportunities.

Education

The educational opportunities for migratory farmworkers are low. They have been called the most educationally deprived group in our Nation.[24] A 1961 study of migratory children in Colorado found that out of 345 children ages 6 through 11, 67 percent were retarded. Thirty-six percent of these children were retarded by two years or more. These figures typify the results of many surveys.[25]

The low educational attainment of migrant children is directly related to the large number of these children who do not attend school on a full time basis during the regular school year. Many of the migratory children enter school in November and leave in the spring, four to six weeks before school closes. There are few, because of constantly shifting from area to area, who stay in any one school for more than brief periods of six to eight weeks. While all states have mandatory school attendance laws, these laws appear to be laxly enforced, if at all, with relation to the children of the migratory farmer. It is highly impracticable to expect rural communities to provide adequate education for children of transient, low income families who do not contribute to the local tax system or otherwise help to defray the cost of educating their children.

This lack of educational opportunities is tending to repeat the cycle whereby the children of migratory farmers are trapped to a life of poverty the same as their parents.

In short, the depressed status of the migrants is beyond question.[26] Public awareness of it, while not widespread, has been increasing, thanks to such efforts as that of CBS Reports' Harvest of Shame, narrated by Edward R. Murrow and broadcast on November 25, 1960.[27] Lack of additional action to remedy the plight of the migrants to date may stem both from insufficient public awareness of the conditions they face and from their lack of effective political representation, resulting from inability to vote under existing residence requirements for exercise of the franchise.

II. THE IMPLICATIONS OF DISENFRANCHISEMENT

The obligation to assure fairness to our migratory workers is particularly compelling because they are generally barred from voting by residence requirements,[28] and hence can exercise little political influence on their own behalf. The disenfranchisement of the migrants was specifically alluded to by the Supreme Court in *Edwards* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 160, 174 (1941), striking down a State law prohibiting the entrance of migrants with insufficient funds into the State as violative of the commerce clause. The Court said:

"* * * The * * * nonresidents who are the real victims of the statute are deprived of the opportunity to exert political pressures upon the * * * legislature in order to obtain a change in policy * * *."

The importance of such an opportunity to exert political pressure in our structure of Government was recognized by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1, 195–96 (1824) when he said of the Federal commerce power:

"The wisdom and discretion of Congress, their identity with the people, and the influence which their constituents possess at elections, are, in this, as in many other instances * * * the sole restraints on which they have relief to secure them from its abuse * * *." See also *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 433–34 (1819). For this reason, "other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined." *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 17 (1964). And see *Williamson* v. *Lee Optical Inc.*, 348 U.S. 483, 488 (1955) quoting *Munn* v. *Illinois*, 94 U.S. 113, 134 (1876); Stone J. dissenting in *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1, 78 (1936); Dowling, *The Methods of Mr. Justice Stone in Constitutional Cases*, 41 Colum. L. Rev. 1160 (1941).

Where such restraints have been absent, as in the case of State regulation affecting interests beyond the State, the courts have recognized the profound difference in circumstances:

"To the extent that the burden of State regulation falls on interests outside the State, it is unlikely to be alleviated by the operation of those political restraints normally exerted when interests within the State are affected." *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *Arizona*, 325 U.S. 761, 767–68 n. 2 (1945); see also *Nippert* v. *City of Richmond*, 327 U.S. 416, 434 (1946); *McGoldrick* v. *Berwind-White Coal Mining Co.*, 309 U.S. 33, 46 n. 2 (1940); *South Carolina State Highway Dep't* v. *Barnwell Bros.*, 303 U.S. 177, 184–85 n. 2 (1936); Givens, Chief Justice Stone and the Developing Functions of Judicial Review, 47 V. L. Rev. 1321 (1961).

These reasons for exacting scrutiny of the fairness of legal distinctions against the disenfranchised, pointed out by the courts in cases where relevant to judicial decision, are applicable to us as citizens as well. It is the duty of each of us to do what we can to assure that those who are unable to vote for any reason are not subjected to what has been called in another context "* * * irrelevant and invidious * * *" distinctions. *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, 323 U.S. 192, 203 (1944).

In this spirit, we must approach the task of remedying the legal disadvantages suffered by our migratory workers.

III. COVERAGE UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The Fair Labor Standards Act was originally passed in 1938 and provided for minimum hourly wage rates for employees of employers engaged in interstate commerce. Title 29, United States Code, Section 213, provided certain exemptions to the overall minimum wage legislation. Included in the 15 exemptions, number 6 is directed towards the committee's problem and reads in part as follows:

"(a)(6). Any employee employed in agriculture * * *".

Even from the very beginning of legislation looking towards a minimum wage, President Roosevelt called for such legislation to cover both "* * * those who toil in factory and on farm." Since 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act has been extended to numerous other workers not originally covered. Nonetheless, farm employees have never been included in this legislation. S. 528 of the 88th Congress would have amended the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for minimum wages for agricultural employees. This bill, over a 4-year period, would bring the wages of agricultural workers in line with those of other employees covered by the Act. The wage paid to an agricultural employee would include the reasonable costs as determined by the Secretary of Labor of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished the employees. In addition, the piece rate system would be protected by a provision approving any piece rate that yields, for at least 90 percent of the employees working at such piece rate, actual wages equal to the minimum hourly wage.

Coverage under the bill would extend to all employees performing hired farm labor for an employer who used more than 560 man-days of hired farm labor in any one of the four preceding calendar quarters.

Exempted from the minimum wage requirement would be members of employers' immediate families, sharecroppers, or members of sharecroppers' immediate families working on or in connection with the sharecroppers' tracts of land. An identical bill was introduced in the House (H.R. 4521).

The Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended a similar proposal in the present Congress (S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965), p. 25). Although this legislation may not solve all the migratory worker's problems, which include poor housing ofttimes proffered by the employer, and the fact that some small farms might use less than the 560 man-day minimum—especially where migratory workers are employed for a day or two to harvest a fruit crop—nonetheless, it is a step forward which should be taken by Congress.

The low compensation of the migratory worker has become increasingly evident to the American people since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Some of the pertinent statistics bear repetition. Of the approximately two million individuals who worked in agriculture 25 days or more during 1962, the average income amounted only to $1,164 during the entire year. Migrants who were employed over 25 days during 1962 earned $874, for an average of 116 days of work. They averaged $249 from their off-farm work for total earnings of $1,123, for the entire year. Moreover, migrants generally must pay their own transportation expenses and their living costs are higher while working away from home.

In 1963, the average cash hourly wage of all domestic farmworkers, including the 25 percent who operate machines often re-

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] 42 U.S.C.A. 242h.

[24] U.S. S. Rept. No. 167, supra, at p. 7; S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess (1965), p. 11.

[25] Ibid. at pp. 7 and 8.

[26] See generally, S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1955); Migratory Labor in American Agriculture: Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor (1951); Report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor 3–4 (1960); First Progress Report (1956); Hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1085 (1959); Report on Farm Labor: Public Hearings on the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor (1959); Levine, "The Migratory Worker in the Farm Economy," 12 Labor L. J. 622 (1961); Greene, "The Education of Migrant Children (1954); Sutton, "Knowing and Teaching the Migrant Child" (1962); Lowry, "They Starve That We May Eat: Migrants of the Crops" (Council of Women for Home Missions, 1940). For historical background, see, e.g., "Interstate Migration," H. Rept. No. 369, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941); Neuberger, "Refugees From the Dust Bowl," 50 Current History 32 (1939).

[27] Transcripts, not for reproduction, may be obtained from CBS.

[28] See generally hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); Schmidhauser, Residency Requirements for Voting and the Tensions of a Mobile Society, 61 Mich. L. Rev. 823 (1963); Note, 77 Harv. L. Rev. 574 (1964).

quiring substantial skill, was less than 90 cents per hour.

The lowest average pay—68 cents per hour—prevailed in the South where more than half the farm workers are employed and the greatest surplus exists. The highest rate—an average of $1.30 per hour—was paid in the Pacific Coast States. It is noteworthy that, even if these most fortunate farmworkers were lucky enough to be hired year-round, their average annual earnings would have been less than $3,000.

In hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (86th Cong., 1st sess. on S. 1085 (1959)), the committee heard from representatives of organizations opposed to this kind of legislation. Basically, their objections were as follows:

1. No consideration was made in the legislation for the high costs borne by the employer of furnishing housing, recruiting, transportation expenses, and various insurance policies peculiar to migrant workers. (It should be noted that some of these objections are avoided by the currently proposed bill which provides that the cost to the employer of lodging and other facilities can be deducted.)

2. Minimum wage rates eliminate incentive payments for production which would, therefore, result in lower efficiency. (The current legislation also obviates this objection by preserving the piece rate system.)

3. Such legislation was also objected to on the grounds that it would put the Federal Government in a position of preempting what ought to be a power reserved to the States, force farmers to mechanize and do away with this source of income for the many migrant workers who depend upon it for their livelihood, and would create undue hardships for employers when the weather was bad, because in inclement weather the farmer would have to pay a minimum wage regardless of whether or not the migrant workers could perform their services.

Despite these objections, it would seem that the legislation is much needed and worthy of enactment.

We do not consider at this time whether the hours provisions of the Act should be extended to cover agricultural labor, or whether additional child labor restrictions are needed, confining ourselves to the recommendation as to the minimum wage for the present.[29]

IV. COVERAGE UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The migratory agricultural worker is subjected to impersonal, brief and transitory periods of employment at below subsistence level wages. His condition has, as might have been expected, produced serious labor disputes in our agricultural economy in recent years. Yet neither Federal or State laws provide meaningful collective bargaining rights for the nation's agricultural labor force.[30]

Section 2(3) of the National Labor Relations Act specifically exempts agricultural labor from coverage. Conditions, however, have changed since the exclusion was originally included in the N.L.R.A. in 1935. Collective bargaining is no longer new and experimental as part of our national labor policy. And conditions in farming have changed, with greater mechanization and the use of large farms employing many persons. Thus, while the characteristics of our nation's modern industrialized agricultural economy and the plight of the agricultural worker require the development of mutually beneficial collective bargaining our national labor policy lags behind. The need for corrective legislation is manifest.

Bills to amend the N.L.R.A. to make its provisions applicable to agriculture were introduced into the 87th and 88th Congresses. S. 529 was introduced in the 1st Session of the 88th Congress by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey for himself and other sponsors.[31] It is similar to S. 1128 introduced into the 87th Congress. A companion bill to S. 529 (H.R. 4516) was introduced in the House by Representative J. COHELAN, of California.

Here also the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended such legislation in the present Congress (S. Rept. No. 155, 89th Cong., 1st sess. (1965) p. 34).

The Senate bills would amend the N.L.R.A. to make its provisions applicable to agricultural workers. They also take account of the seasonal nature of agricultural labor by according to this class of workers the same privileges regarding, among other things, precontract representational status and union security arrangements now applicable to workers in the building and construction industry under Section 8(f) of the Act.

We strongly recommend amendment of the N.L.R.A. to extend the coverage to agricultural labor, including migrants. It may also be necessary to develop special jurisdictional standards and other procedures under the Act to meet the special problems of agriculture.

CONCLUSION

In order to assist in dealing with the urgent problems faced by migratory workers, a depressed and dispossessed group in our society, we recommend:

1. Extension of the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural, including migratory, labor.

2. Extension of the National Labor Relations Act to cover agricultural, including migratory, labor.

3. Continuing study of the problems of migrant labor, including additional protections under the National Labor Relations Act, coverage under unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and Social Security; better provisions for housing, health, safety, and education, and extension of the franchise by limitation of residence requirements for voting.

Respectfully submitted.

William J. Isaacson, Chairman, Jerome H. Adler, Albert X. Bader, Harold Baer, Jr., Aaron Benenson, Laurence G. Bodkin, Jr., William Joseph Brennan, III, Samuel J. Cohen, Kevin T. Duffy, Richard A. Givens, Alex J. Glauberman, Bernard D. Gold, Robert C. Isaacs, Isadore Katz, Samuel M. Kaynard, Arthur Mermin, Francis A. O'Connell, Jr., Herbert Semmel, Michael I. Sovern, Burton B. Turkus, Stephen C. Vladeck, John W. Whittlesey, Benjamin Wyle, William A. Ziegler, Jr., Max Zimmy.

[29] See generally Kantor, Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers (U.S. Department of Labor 1960).

[30] A description of labor disputes affecting the agricultural labor force and coverage of these workers under State collective bargaining statutes is set forth in the Third Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate made by its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor pursuant to S. Res. 273, as amended, p. 20 (1963). S. Rept. No. 167, supra.

[31] The bill was also sponsored by Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, METCALF, INOUYE, MCCARTHY and YOUNG.

THE BOBBY BAKER REPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Backs Down Six Democrats—WILLIAMS Gets Way on Baker Report," and an editorial entitled "After the Dirty Work Was Done." They were published on June 10, 1965, in the Chicago Tribune.

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

BACKS DOWN SIX DEMOCRATS—WILLIAMS GETS WAY ON BAKER REPORT

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, backed down the six Democrats of the Senate Rules Committee today. They yielded to his demand that they keep all derogatory comments about him from their report on the committee's investigation of the Bobby Baker scandal.

WILLIAMS has been accusing the Democrats in Senate speeches for days of smearing him in a secret report, and challenging them to repeat their accusations against him in the presence of the Senate or publicly repudiate them.

With a few exceptions, the Democrats have absented themselves while WILLIAMS has spoken, or sat mute while he told them that where he comes from men "put up or shut up" when confronted with accusations they have made.

DEFENDS THEIR RIGHTS

He has gone further—defended their right to refuse to talk, and then infuriated them by defending the right of witnesses to invoke the fifth amendment. The fifth amendment plea is that truthful answers to questions might tend to incriminate.

With WILLIAMS ready for weeks more of challenges, the Democrats approved today a report that the Republicans conceded does not attack WILLIAMS' character, veracity, or judgment, as the Republicans said the first report did.

The three Republicans of the committee nevertheless refused to endorse the report, which they charged does not make a true representation of Baker's outside dealings while he was secretary to the Senate Democratic majority and the protege of President Johnson.

PROMISE THE TRUTH

The Republicans promised to tell the truth about Baker and Don B. Reynolds in a minority report. Reynolds is the agent who sold Johnson $200,000 worth of life insurance before falling from grace with Baker when Baker was exposed and Reynolds began telling of the dealings of Democratic higher-ups.

The Republicans charge that the new Democratic report, like the old one, is an effort to destroy the credibility of Reynolds.

Reynolds was riding high as insurance agent to Johnson, as business partner of Baker, and as friend of Matthew McCloskey until it became known that Baker had made $2 million from outside dealings while a Senate employee.

WILLIAMS STARTED PROBE

WILLIAMS, who is not a member of the committee, instituted the investigation and persuaded Reynolds to talk. Reynolds charged that McCloskey, former Democratic national treasurer, made him a $35,000 overpayment, of which $25,000 was earmarked for the Kennedy-Johnson campaign of 1960.

The overpayment, which has been called a payoff, was for the performance bond on the $20 million District of Columbia athletic stadium, which McCloskey's construction firm built. Reynolds had arranged the bond.

As fears arose that Reynolds might involve more Democratic big-wigs, the administration agencies began leaking to the press derogatory information about Reynolds.

WILLIAMS charges that the administration also set out to destroy him, with such ammunition as the first Rules Committee report, which like the slurs on Reynolds was leaked.

AFTER THE DIRTY WORK WAS DONE

Democrats of the Senate Rules Committee yesterday buried the Bobby Baker scandal with a perfunctory report which Republican minority members promptly said was inadequate and left most questions unanswered. The Democrats shelved a longer report written by their partisan counsel, Lennox McLendon, but as its substance had been previously leaked, they could fancy they were having the best of two worlds.

The McLendon document, a slanderous attack upon Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, a Republican whose diligence uncovered Baker's lucrative moonlighting activities when he was occupying the influential post of secretary to the Senate Democratic majority, was an attempt to discredit WILLIAMS and the witnesses and documents he produced.

It is an old courtroom trick that when the defense lawyer has no case, he tries the prosecutor, and that was what McLendon sought to do. Senator WILLIAMS properly termed this insulting brief the "most damnable attempt at character assassination ever witnessed in the Senate." Nevertheless, the Democrats and their kept lawyer would probably have persisted in releasing the McLendon screed as an official document had it not been for the widespread and outraged reaction of the press to this transparent coverup. This newspaper, for one, expressed its indignation.

But, having reaped the benefits of the smear, the Democrats now proceed to brush Baker's kinky operations aside with an innocuous statement attesting their virtue and the virtue of their party and its leaders. There has never been the slightest doubt from the beginning of the committee's hearings that the Democrats were determined to put the lid on the truth in the interest of self-preservation.

A Democratic President, Lyndon Johnson, was no peripheral figure in the Baker scandal. He was Baker's sponsor and mentor. When Johnson took out life insurance, the policy was written by Baker's partner in the insurance business. Baker persuaded his associate, Don B. Reynolds, to give Johnson an expensive hi-fi set as a kickback out of the commission, and Johnson's administrative assistant, Walter Jenkins, pressured Reynolds into buying $1,200 worth of time on the Johnson family television station in Austin, Tex. With his business in Washington, Reynolds could gain no advantage advertising himself in Austin.

There was also testimony that a Democratic bigwig, Matt McCloskey, a contractor and former treasurer of the Democratic national committee, had Jenkins write his performance bond for construction of the $20 million District of Columbia Stadium, and thereafter concealed $25,000 in the commission as a kickback which passed through Baker's hands and into the Kennedy-Johnson campaign fund in 1960.

But, despite all this and the fact that Baker cashed in through his connections to the tune of more than $2 million, he is viewed as a rose by his party protectors. The fact that in two appearances before the committee he took the fifth amendment 163 times on a plea that to tell the truth would incriminate him is swept under the rug.

We trust that the Republican members of the Rules Committee will tell the people bluntly what a deadly offense against public morality has been committed by their Democratic colleagues.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEROY COLLINS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in an article published on June 9 in the Washington Star, Max Freedman wrote some worthwhile things about the steps needed in order to eliminate discrimination against Negro-Americans in our northern cities.

In the article, Mr. Freedman pointed out:

An absolutely indispensable contribution is being made by the Community Relations Service, under the leadership of former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent 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:

[From the Washington Star, June 9, 1965]

ENDING THE NORTHERN NEGRO GHETTOS

(By Max Freedman)

All of us have been taught in recent months by the civil rights movement that the struggle for equal rights, for rights that are more than a pallid promise on parchment, must be waged in our northern cities as well as in our Southern States.

If you take a map and stick pins in it to represent the concentration of Negro neighborhoods in northern and southern cities, you will be surprised by the results. In Boston, for example, the Negro ghettos are far worse than in Atlanta; and that is generally true in any comparison between northern and southern cities. There are large areas in southern cities where Negroes have congregated, but this is less common than is usually supposed.

It is in fact rather easier to grapple with the southern racial problem than with the northern problem. The President and Congress and the Supreme Court have all been able to do something about second-class citizenship. The difficulties were dramatic and easy to define—segregation in the schools, separate and unequal facilities, public accommodation, equal voting rights. We have still a long and difficult journey to complete before all these grievances and injustices are removed but at least we are on our way.

In the North, however, most of the problems are invisible. White people, unless they are doctors or social welfare workers or policemen or rent collectors, rarely see the northern Negro ghettos. The great mass of citizens try to forget that these slums even exist. If they saw these horrible conditions every day, they would do something to end this festering poverty, this wreckage of human lives, this tragic denial of hope to children caught in a repulsive web of suffering and illiteracy. But we do not see these tragedies and so we forget about them.

All the same, we are paying heavy bills every day for the conditions we have tolerated too long in these slums and ghettos. We are paying for them in the relief rolls, in juvenile delinquency, in spreading crimes of violence, in dope addicts, in the broken vicious lives spawned by the slums.

The first and most urgent task, in dealing with these northern slums, is to awaken the generous but indifferent majority to the realization that these tragic and explosive ghettos do in fact exist and are growing worse all the time. The next and almost equally important task is to persuade the young people in the slums that they do not have to possess rare and memorable gifts in order to make their way to a more abundant life. Banishment of apathy in the general community, the awakening of some hope of better things in the slums—these are the twin methods for breaking down the cruel imprisoning walls of the Negro ghettos.

A major effort to destory these walls is being made, as we all know, by the poverty program under the direction of Sargent Shriver. But poverty in our northern cities is deepened and embittered by racial prejudice and discrimination. In meeting these problems, and in forestalling grievances which might explode in violence and the most serious disorders, an absolutely indispensable contribution is being made by the Community Relations Service under the leadership of former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida.

Without any self-seeking on his part, the work of Collins and his staff in promoting a spirit of compliance in the South has become widely known and respected. Yet they are giving equal prominence to their work this summer and the following months to the challenge of the northern ghettos.

Once again they are avoiding the mistake of parading the power of the Federal Government or of posing as experts on human rights.

They are trying to enlist the most generous instincts of northern communities in a cooperative effort to bring the problems of the ghettos before civic leaders so that united action of a remedial kind can be taken. Since these problems have been allowed to accumulate for decades, and the spirit of protest is now rising visibly and ominously, there is a degree of urgency to this whole effort far surpassing anything previously done in this field.

We are fortunate, indeed, in having the leadership in this campaign directed by a man like Collins, who has instilled his own sense of instructed idealism and responsibility among the members of his staff. And they will need all the help they can get from the rest of us.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I take this time to salute a great man, a great public servant, and a distinguished gentleman, David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

On June 12, Mr. Bell will have the distinction of serving in that post longer than any of his predecessors. By all he has done, he has earned the respect and the confidence of this Congress in one of the world's most difficult and most thankless jobs.

The task of running the foreign assistance program is indeed a challenging one. Its friends are often retiring and its foes are always vociferous. Snipers wait around every corner, those who would absolve our country of responsibility, and risk the security of our shores.

For this reason, the position is also a dangerous one for a young man in the midpoint of a successful career. But David Bell has never run from challenge. He has accepted responsibility and turned adversity to advantage. In 1942, with a master's degree from Harvard behind him, he chose to enlist as a private in the Marine Corps. His calmness and intelligence won him a commission and a place in the intelligence section of the corps.

Again, in 1954, after serving President Truman as an aide and assistant for 4 years, Mr. Bell went off to Pakistan as head of an advisory group recruited by Harvard and financed by the Ford Foundation. For 3 years his group assisted in mapping the economic future of Pakistan.

Today Pakistan is rapidly shucking the adjective "underdeveloped" while David Bell is still taking on mammoth problems.

He had just barely been installed as head of the Bureau of the Budget, when President Kennedy tapped him for the top position in AID.

Today, 2 years, 5 months and 22 days later, AID's operations bear the Bell brand. They are pragmatic and intelligent. They are calmly calculated to do a job.

The foreign aid program is challenging countries to help themselves, challenging them to do everything in their power to bring a better life to their people. Our goal is to make these countries strong and stable and reduce the refuse in which communism breeds.

Today the Agency for International Development is a taut ship. It reflects the eye of an economist who wants results. More than two-thirds of our aid today is in loans not grants. And much of our aid goes to stimulate the private sectors—the businesses, cooperatives, trade unions—which will give these countries a broader base of power.

The task of foreign aid in the days of the Marshall plan was a relatively more simple one than what faces this Nation today. Then our goal was to reconstruct countries that already had the most important resource—educated and trained leadership.

The task today is a longer and more difficult one—to build up the economies of countries that do not as yet have even the leadership necessary for success. But, if we value our heritage and accept the responsibilities of power we cannot shirk this duty to ourselves and our fellow man.

Today the initials AID are better known in distant villages overseas than in our prosperous American suburbs. These are villages beginning to come alive with hope, villages where death is no longer a daily ration or disease a constant companion, villages where people have just a little more and cleaner water or a little more food.

We are indeed fortunate to have a man of the caliber and the ability of David Bell administering the program for this Nation. In my opinion, David Bell fits closely with the words of George Washington when he said:

> It is in the trying circumstances * * * that the virtues of a great mind are displayed in their brightest luster.

NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA—PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Austin C. Wehrwein, of the New York Times, recently reported the rising tide of optimism that is now surging across northeastern Minnesota, as that section of my State emerges from the darkest decade in its history. He correctly pointed out that from a peak employment of 10,200 jobs in 1954, in Hibbing, Minn., employment fell to only 4,500, with the exhaustion of the high-grade iron ore, once so plentiful in northeastern Minnesota.

Today, technology permits us to utilize low-grade iron ore, by converting it into taconite pellets, composed of 60 to 70 percent iron ore.

Over $1 billion in investments have been committed, or soon will be, to the construction and expansion of taconite facilities in northeastern Minnesota. Already four new plants are being built, and an existing one is in the process of expansion; and we have high hopes that additional plants will be constructed in coming years.

I commend Mr. Wehrwein's report to the attention of the Senate, and request unanimous consent that his 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:

NEW BOOM IN ORE STIRS MINNESOTA—INVESTMENTS AND JOBS RISE IN TACONITE INDUSTRY

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

HIBBING, MINN., May 21.—After a decade of decline, optimism is rising in the Minnesota iron ranges. The optimism is based on three factors: taconite, new technology, and taxes.

Technological advance has made it possible to process taconite, a gray, very hard magnetic rock that is ground to the fineness of cake flour and rolled into small black lumps the size of a schoolboy's marble.

The processed taconite pellets consist of 60 to 70 percent iron.

The development of taconite has come as the area slumped through a decline in natural ore.

The tax factor was the passage last November of a long-debated State constitutional amendment that prohibits for 25 years the assessing of the taconite mining industry at a level higher than that imposed on other businesses. As soon as it was passed the expansion began in earnest.

UNRESTRAINED OPTIMISM

James Abate, president of the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce, described the mood as one of "unrestricted optimism."

The more cautious persons are looking ahead to the period after the construction boom and predicting a leveling off. They foresee better payrolls than those of the bad years, but they expect a drop below the peak of 1953, when 80 million tons of ore were shipped.

Last year the ore shipment totaled just under 50 million tons, of which 30 million tons was natural ore. The decline came because the high grade natural ore, of which Minnesota once had a monopoly, had dwindled.

Within the next 3 years it is expected that taconite capacity will reach 30 million tons and in the next 15 years there are signs it could reach 54 million tons.

ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN INVESTMENTS

Already investments totaling more than $1 billion have been made or committed. Four new taconite plants are under construction and a fifth is being expanded. Another plant is likely to be built within 3 years.

Even the least optimistic concede that one substantial benefit will be year-round employment in the plants, which are essentially manufacturing operations. In the natural iron mines, employment is seasonal.

Hibbing is in the heart of the Mesabi Range, the largest source of Minnesota ore. Near Hibbing is the largest open pit mine in the world—3 miles long and a mile wide.

Both iron ore and taconite are dug out of the ground rather than being mined in shafts. As a result, huge gaping open pits that resemble canyons in the Far West have been scooped out of the forested countryside.

Because there was no hard rock above the ore here it was simple to strip the sand, clay, and boulders from the surface. This material in turn has been piled into great heaps so that there are both canyons below the surface and manmade hills above.

PLEASANT COUNTRYSIDE

Away from the pits and piles, the country is as pleasant as any in the North, heavily forested, with some farms in the clearings.

The range itself is not in the vacation area, but in the summer it shares the good sleeping nights enjoyed by the northern resort areas. In winter, while it is not the coldest place in Minnesota, a temperature of —40° F. is not unknown.

Just north of the iron range country the Superior National Forest begins, and to the northeast in that forest lies the canoe area, the only wilderness of any size east of the Rockies.

The Hibbing region is linked by road to Ely, the jumping-off place for the wilderness.

There are more people working than there were a year ago. They are buying more, and real estate is rising in value. Rental property is unavailable.

A shortage of skilled construction labor is already reported and at the peak of the construction period a payroll of more than 8,000 workers is expected at plant construction sites alone.

In 1954 when the going was good there were 10,200 jobs in Hibbing. At the bottom this fell to 4,500. Now there are hopes that it will rise from the present level of 5,200 to 7,500 this year.

Not everybody is benefiting; older unskilled workers continue to face a bleak future. The mining companies, however, are retraining some employees for the more skilled work in the taconite plants, where 75 percent of the work is, in effect, maintenance.

The expansion of the steel industry in the Chicago-Gary region promises a sustained and growing market for taconite pellets. Although it is more expensive to produce the pellets than to mine natural ore, the pellets make blast furnaces at least twice as efficient.

PAST SUCCESS POINTS TO PRESENT NEED FOR NEW GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict proved to be the most successful education legislation ever enacted by Congress. The American economy has received billions of dollars in return for our investment in the intellectual development of the millions of capable men and women who served their country with dedication and devotion to the ideal of liberty for mankind. Renewal of this highly beneficial program of educational assistance is needed now, if our Nation is to cope with the demands and complications of the future. It is the duty of Congress to pass promptly the cold war GI education bill, S. 9.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the June 1965 issue of VFW magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD. The article, entitled "GI Bill Finishes School With Honors," skillfully indicates the successful precedent for enactment of a new GI bill.

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

GI BILL FINISHES SCHOOL WITH HONORS—AFTER 20 YEARS, EDUCATORS CALL IT "FINEST INVESTMENT THE GOVERNMENT EVER MADE"

On February 1, 8,798 former servicemen sharpened pencils and took another searching look at their budgets.

Midnight had wiped away educational and training benefits under Public Law

550—the popularly termed Korean GI bill. The students could continue in college—but at their own expense. Except for January checks, no further benefits would come from the Veterans' Administration, which directed this program since its inception in September 1952.

The cutoff, however, did not affect 1,574 veterans who sustained wartime disabilities and were still in training. Congress set a more liberal limitation to fit them for taking their places in the American economy.

Termination of Korean readjustment training was no surprise to the trainees who had been apprised of the deadline when they entered school. As a whole, the closeout also affected only a comparative handful of the total who profited.

As the time for cutting off these benefits neared, the VA received some inquiries on why the program ended when it did.

VA's answer has been that the temporary nature of the educational benefits were consistent with the purposes of the law—to provide readjustment assistance immediately following wartime service.

Korean servicemen normally received a discharge soon enough to complete their educational program if they began schooling promptly. However, when a veteran elected to remain in the service longer, or chose first to enter the Nation's work force, it was assumed that he was not in need of readjustment assistance.

In the more than 12 years while these benefits were effective, 2,390,700 veterans entered the program. This was approximately one-third the number who went to college or learned technical skills under the predecessor World War II GI bill, which established a new national concept of federally sponsored education to compensate for opportunities lost in wartime.

The total cost of direct benefits to Korean veterans will approximate $4,521 billion.

The Korean bill reached its crest in March 1957, with 764,200 veterans enrolled.

A number completed 20 years or more active military service—in both World War II and in the Korean conflict—and came late into the program, using the Korean benefits to set the foundation for the new careers.

A 41-year-old retired Army major is typical. He receives $297 monthly from military retirement, but will miss the $160 educational benefits check. The GI bill paid his monthly rent and tuition.

One veterans' adviser explained that remaining students had no problems other than financial, and all who chose could stay in school.

"We'll take care of them on loan programs," he said, adding that many would be eligible under the National Defense Act.

Veterans interviewed about expiration of benefits agreed on one point. All felt that the GI bill is one of the finest investments the Government has made.

Reports from college officials expressed similar viewpoints.

Some veterans enrolled and dropped out because of increased responsibilities, said Gene Monson, assistant coordinator at the University of Utah. Yet enough stayed and completed their education to make it evident the program was a good investment.

"Not only have the individuals and their families benefited," observed Monson, "but the community and the country have benefited and will continue to do so. Thousands who would not otherwise have received an education have been trained and prepared to assume more responsibility in our society."

The Korean veterans were generally above the average of nonveterans scholastically on the University of Hawaii campus, pointed out Edward F. Green, veterans' counselor.

Green cited a 12-year veteran of the Air Force who had the highest average in the 1963 graduating class, received a Phi Beta Kappa key for his distinction, and now is teaching in the College of Guam.

Some who started earlier with partial college-level training now occupy top positions in education, business and science across the Nation.

Dr. Frank Lakin, administrative assistant to the president of Colorado State College, fought with the 1st Marine Division in Korea. Discharged in 1953, he finished his 2 years of undergraduate work, then acquired a master's degree and doctorate under the GI bill.

Another 1st Division marine is dean of students at Colorado State. He is Dr. Norman T. Oppelt, who received a disability discharge in 1952 after being injured in battle and received the Bronze Star. He completed his last 2 years of undergraduate work and finished academic training under Public Law 894, applying to service-disabled veterans.

Oberlin, Ohio, College reported that most of its arts and sciences veterans received degrees in business; its conservatory graduated more college professors of music than any area and ministers outnumbered others in the graduate school of theology.

Oberlin followed up some of its veterans and their post college successes. One graduate is a member of the board of directors of a New England insurance agency. Another is the feature editor of a widely circulated magazine. Another is a college history professor in Kentucky and a fourth is a psychologist.

The Korean bill closeout marked the end of a federally sponsored mass education program that began with the signing of the original GI bill of 1944.

W. B. Gundlach, associate director of VA's Compensation, Pension, and Education Service, looked back and appraised nearly 21 years of veterans' assistance.

The 1944 GI bill, he said, was particularly timely in providing more, well-trained professional and skilled workers. The VA Administrator pointed out that 20 percent of World War II veterans and 9 percent Korean soldiers had 8 years or less of school experience when they enrolled.

Calling attention to the apprehension which had greeted each proposal for Federal participation in education, he summed up the last 20 years of joint responsibility:

"I feel that representatives of States and we in the VA, as representatives of the Federal Government, have demonstrated dramatically, cooperative Federal-State relationships that have risen above petty bickering. We have truly fulfilled the purposes of the GI bills.

"Interested persons in the Federal Government and organizations and agencies outside it view our 20 years' experiences together as a classic illustration of success," he concluded, "in what was originally viewed with great apprehension."

SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 1993, TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY AND UNREASONABLE RESTRICTIONS TO THE FREE FLOW OF MILK PRODUCTS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I introduced Senate bill 1993, designed to eliminate unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions to the free flow of milk products in interstate commerce.

Some days ago, I was extremely pleased to receive a thoughtful letter of support for this proposed legislation from Stanley Olson, vice president of the General Drivers, Helpers, and Truck Terminal Employees, a trade association directly involved in the interstate traffic in dairy products.

I request unanimous consent that Mr. Olson's letter be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

GENERAL DRIVERS, HELPERS AND TRUCK TERMINAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL UNION NO. 120,
St. Paul, Minn., May 20, 1965.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are highly in favor of your bill to guarantee free movement of milk in interstate commerce and congratulate you for taking the initiative on this much overdue legislation.

Our organization has been aware of the restrictions placed on the Minnesota dairy farmers by present policies.

Your bill will result in greater utilization of the milk-producing potential of this area thereby creating more jobs and raising the income of our dairy farmers who have suffered great financial loss because of the unreasonable boycott of their products.

We are also writing to other members of the Minnesota delegation to express our interest in this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

STAN OLSON,
Vice President.

JUSTICE GOLDBERG'S UNITED NATIONS ADDRESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on May 2, Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, of the U.S. Supreme Court, delivered an excellent speech at the inaugural dinner of the Jewish Center for the United Nations, in New York City. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

I am very much pleased to participate this evening in the inaugural dinner for the Jewish Center for the United Nations. This dinner appropriately takes place on the 60th anniversary of the Sutton Place Synagogue. Thus it both commemorates the Sutton Place Synagogue's venerable history of religious service and marks the extension of that worthy tradition through the creation of a center, which will serve both local and international Jewish communities.

On an occasion such as this one, it is fitting to renew our dedication to the United Nations. The United Nations quest for peace has been based upon the theory that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." I, together with millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of men and women throughout the world, would restate our conviction that the United Nations is not only a useful but also a necessary tool for building those defenses of peace, and that the United Nations is today and will be throughout the centuries to come the world's best hope for a lasting peace.

The crises—both diplomatic and financial—currently faced by the United Nations hover like a specter over the arena of international politics. Before giving way to pessimism, however, we should remember the numerous achievements of the United Nations in the 20 short years since its foundation. Only 2 years after its creation, the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran was arranged through the United Nations. It played a part in the creation of Israel. Ag-

gression was contained in Korea by the United States working through the United Nations. Within the past few years we have seen potential sparks that in other times might well have set off major conflicts extinguished by United Nations activity in Suez, the Congo, and Cyprus. And, we have witnessed the unprecedented transfer of political power from European nations to newly independent states—a transfer that could hardly have taken place so peacefully, had the United Nations not been in existence. Moreover, the work of the United Nations in providing economic aid and technical assistance to the emerging nations, its role in facilitating international cooperation in such areas as the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and its undertakings to assure greater respect for human rights are all well known.

The failures which have resulted in the crises through which the organization is now passing are not those of the United Nations. The United Nations is not responsible for the consistent exercise of the veto by the Soviet Union in the Security Council, which has so often paralyzed effective peacekeeping action. The United Nations is not responsible for its members who refuse to pay the assessments which legally and morally they owe. Rather member states of the United Nations, not the organization itself, are at fault. Sir Alexander Cadogan once pointed out that "a Stradivarius violin is nothing more than an assemblage of wood and catgut. It takes a musician to get harmony out of it. But if the player is at fault, there is no sense in blaming the instrument—still less in smashing it to pieces." I believe that the problems facing the United Nations can be overcome provided that each member nation, and its citizens, base their actions upon a patriotism in the best sense of that word—this, as Lord Cecil once remarked, is "the patriotism by which a man instinctively sets the highest standard for his nation's conduct. The new patriotism will not be different in kind from the old, but it will be larger and more free from the sordid jealousies and suspicion which now defile international life." As we enter into International Cooperation Year we must rededicate ourselves both to support of the United Nations and to this ideal of a patriotism that will allow the United Nations to attain its goal of a lasting peace.

The Jewish Center for the United Nations, like the Catholic and Protestant centers, is itself a reaffirmation of faith in the United Nations. Moreover, it is a reaffirmation of confidence in religious liberty, tolerance and that freedom of the human spirit which the United Nations organization, as well as its Secretaries General, continually seek. We have learned that religious tolerance is the touchstone of all freedom, for freedom of body means little without freedom of the mind and soul. It is no accident that the first amendment to our Constitution—an amendment that was necessary to obtain the Constitution's ratification—guarantees the free exercise of religion. The founders of our Nation were victims of discrimination and religious oppression and were determined in the New World not to repeat the errors of the Old.

America is indeed a shining example of the benefits of religious liberty and tolerance. Under our Constitution there is a wholesome neutrality by the Government toward all religions; the ideal of our Constitution as to religious freedom is one of absolute equality before the law of all religious opinions and sects; the Government, while protecting all, prefers none, and its disparages none; our constitutional policy does not deny the value or necessity for religious training, teaching or observance; rather it secures their full exercise without helping or hindering any particular religion. The recent spirit of the Ecumenical Council of which so much is heard in fact reflects the spirit of our Constitution: freedom for all religions, preferment of none.

It is appropriate to note that the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights expresses a similar ideal. Article 18, adopted by the General Assembly on December 10, 1958, states:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance."

It is significant that freedom of religion is given a prominent position in this Declaration of Human Rights—a declaration which Dag Hammarskjold called "the universal expression in the field of human rights of the aims of our world today, a world where the memory is still fresh of some of the worst infringements of human rights ever experienced in history, and a world which is also facing the problem of human rights in new and increasingly complicated form."

As a reading of any newspaper amply shows, today the attention of the world is focused upon denials of racial equality. My remarks this evening emphasize religious liberty, not because I would denigrate the importance of racial equality, but because of the nature of this occasion, and because I believe that the ideals of religious liberty and racial equality are equally important. Both ideals spring directly from enlightenment concepts of the natural rights of man. Both of these ideals must be energetically and consistently pursued if they are not to be lost. In a world made up of people of all races, and religions, a harmonious and peaceful world society is impossible so long as men are ill treated either because of their race or their religion.

For these reasons I believe it most important that the United Nations adopt the draft declaration on religious intolerance currently being considered by the Human Rights Commission. I am particularly pleased that the United States, along with India and the United Kingdom, played a major role in the drafting of this convention, and urging its adoption.

The adoption of this convention is, in my view, particularly important because of the unhappy fact that religious discrimination exists in many parts of the new world. This discrimination is partcularly notable in the Soviet Union, where hostility to Jews has reached the point where it might be classified as an openly anti-Semitic campaign. The American delegates to the Human Rights Commission, obviously referring to the Soviet Union, stated the following:

"Since the defeat of Nazi Germany no state has pursued an overt and declared policy of genocide against an ethnic group. But we must recognize that some states where laws forbid discrimination in the most forceful terms nevertheless carry on policies which are designed to have the effect of obliterating an ethnic group. The biological differences of race cannot be exterminated by cultural deprivations, but ethnic differences, and sometimes nationality differences, are absolutely dependent on language, schools, publications, and other cultural institutions in order to survive. Cut an ethnic or national tradition off from these, and it will die, however nourished the body of the citizen is by food, clothing, and shelter.

"We must deal with anti-Semitism even when it takes the forms of deprivation of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. We should make it clear that a state which makes provision for German language schools for that ethnic group should not deny Yiddish or Hebrew schools to its Jews; that a state which can permit national and regional organizations of some ethnic groups should, under the principle of nondiscrimination, permit the same for Jews; that a state which permits recognized leaders of every other group to travel abroad to conferences and holy places should not be able to deny that right to Jewish leaders; that a state that finds facilities to publish textual materials in the language and traditions of some groups should not be able to deny this right to Jewish groups; that a state which is able to tolerate the differences in 100 nationalities should have no right whatever to extinguish those differences in the 101st."

The Soviet Union has consistently denied the Jews are mistreated or discriminated against within its borders. I believe that if the Soviet Government is sincere in its professed desire to eliminate anti-Semitism, it surely ought to vote for the convention on the elimination of religious intolerance; it ought not to slow down consideration of this convention and hinder its adoption. Moreover, I should like to see the Soviet Union adopt the proposal of Mr. Morris Abrams, the U.S. expert member of the Human Rights Commission, that a subcommission be formed, which would meet in various parts of the world, including the Soviet Union, to "check fact against claim and hope against reality" in determining the extent to which religious discrimination exists. Such a subcommission, of course, would deal with discrimination against any minority and would meet in any part of the world where discrimination was alleged. By providing such a neutral factfinding body, the United Nations might well destroy much discrimination by exposing it to the cold light of world public opinion.

Lord Acton, in the last century, said that "the most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." In my opinion there can be no more worthwhile task for the United Nations, or for us, its supporters, than to work for an end to discrimination of all sorts and complete security for all minorities in every part of the world. Only by providing a world environment in which differences are tolerated and such security is provided can we hope to provide the world with a foundation for a lasting peace.

In the meantime all men of good will should endorse and support the adoption by the United Nations of convention on religious liberty. The existence of a Jewish Center for the United Nations and its counterparts will exist as an important symbol of the value to all men everywhere of freedom of religious exercise. Bringing religion to bear upon moral and ethical problems means helping all nations go forward realizing the just society and the better world which is the hope and aspiration of all men everywhere.

SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, CONSERVATIONIST

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, those of us who serve with him in committees and engage in debate with him on the Senate floor appreciate the immense contributions and the incisive opinions of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The people who sent him to the Senate to represent them also recognize Senator CHURCH's talents.

One of them, Mrs. Ethel Kimball, recorded her impressions of Senator CHURCH at work on conservation matters in the State. Her comments appeared in a June 6, 1965, column in the Salmon Recorder-Herald.

Speaking also for her husband—and for many other Idahoans—Mrs. Kimball wrote:

Neither Frank nor I vote a straight ticket—we vote for the man we think most capable of handling the job. But both of us are mighty glad that Idaho has a man like Senator FRANK CHURCH to represent it.

Those of us who have watched Senator CHURCH guide the wilderness bill and other important conservation measures through the Senate would add: We agree, and we are pleased that Senator CHURCH's diligent and careful work is appreciated back home.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Kimball's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Salmon (Idaho) Recorder-Herald, June 6, 1965]

(By Ethel Kimball)

They say if you have a tough problem that you badly need help with, don't take it to someone with lots of time on their hands—take it to the busiest person you know because they are the ones that get things done. And that's just what I did when I wrote to Senator FRANK CHURCH and asked if he would meet with members of the Save the Upper Selway Committee while he was in our area this past week.

Promptly and very courteously he wrote back that he regretted he wouldn't be able to get to Salmon this trip, but that he had arranged with Mrs. Kathleen Markle to have us meet with him in her home at Challis. He was scheduled to address the Challis graduation class the night of May 21, and would try to arrive early so he could talk to us that afternoon.

Now, that in itself doesn't sound like much of a feat, but consider the rest of his itinerary—he drove to Challis from Boise where he had been conducting public hearings on the wild rivers bill; was to speak at Challis Friday night; had two separate speeches to deliver the next afternoon on the campus at Pocatello, and was slated to address the Idaho Falls graduating class the night after that. Actually, he barely had traveling time to get from one place to another—but, by golly, he squeezed us in.

WARM WELCOME

What's more, when Frank and I, Mrs. Doris Milner, who is chairman of the committee; her husband, and Mr. and Mrs. G. M. Brandborg (all from Hamilton, Mont.) arrived, we got a warm welcome. There was none of this furtive, bored, well-if-I-have-to-let's-get-it-over-with stuff. He was genuinely friendly; honestly interested—and so was his lovely wife, Bethene. To top it off, Mrs. Markle graciously served us coffee and the best homemade cookies you ever ate; put everyone at ease, and really set the scene for a relaxed discussion.

The Hamilton people have worked long and hard to save this beautiful section of the Selway. They also know the country like the backs of their hands—in fact, Mr. Brandborg was supervisor of the Bitterroot National Forest for 20 years prior to his retirement. They were equipped with pictures, maps, letters, and heads full of information; ready to present many aspects that had heretofore been obscured by bureaucratic redtape.

And I'm glad they were, because I sure wasn't much help. I got so engrossed watching the man they were talking to that I almost forgot to hear the project they were talking to him about. He was concentrating so intensely on the map; comparing pictures with landmarks; firing questions; appraising answers. Occasionally his dark eyes would glance up and lock with those of whatever person was speaking at the time, and I had a feeling that it was a good thing we were sincere because he would surely have penetrated and discovered any subterfuge. There was certainly no nonsense about this man, nor was there any doubting his sincere interest in the issue.

But even more than that, there was a certain quality about him that made a deep impression on me, as I'm sure it did the rest of our delegation. It's hard to describe, but maybe "quiet humility" would come close to it. There was none of the high-handed, arrogant, superiority complex thing that you find in so many political figures and government officials today.

NO QUESTIONS LEFT

The interview didn't end until the Senator was certain he fully understood each point the delegation was making. And then he didn't make any rash, high-sounding promises. He simply stated that he really appreciated learning these details of their protests; that it would be a rough go to stop the program now, but that he felt their cause was worthwhile and would do his best to help.

And that was all the committee wanted. They—like us—have the utmost confidence in this Senator from Idaho. If anyone can help, he is the man.

Now, if you think I'm just a dyed-in-the-wool Democratic climbing on a soap box to hit the campaign trial for the party's choice, you are dead wrong. Neither Frank nor I vote a straight ticket—we vote for the man we think most capable of handling the job. But both of us are mighty glad that Idaho has a man like Senator FRANK CHURCH to represent it.

We also think that saving the upper Selway is very important, even though at first glance it may seem strange that we asked Montana people to present a problem to an Idaho Senator. It is much bigger than that. A State boundary line doesn't mean much when a section of land lies in two States. Montana mills would get whatever timber was taken from the area, (and there isn't enough timber to pay for the roads to get at it) but Idaho would get the gutted stumps; the tangled slash; the road-scarred land, and the erosion. And the whole Nation would be footing the bill for this terrific project, which plans to include an entirely new ranger station to help the Forest Service with their empire building program. That Nation also would lose a fabulous section of wilderness that had been set aside for 27 years before the big ideas began to rear their heads.

Conservation is becoming more than important—it is essential. The need is well-expressed by the closing statement of Senator CHURCH on the wild rivers bill before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He quoted from the words of Sigurd F. Olson, Minnesota woodsman and author, on why we need wilderness and wild rivers.

"Because man's subconscious is steeped in the primitive, looking to the wilderness actually means a coming home, a moving into the ancient grooves of human and prehuman experience."

It may well be—that the wilderness we can hold will become the final bastions of the spirit of man. Unless we can preserve places where the endless spiritual needs of man can be fulfilled and nourished, we will destroy our culture and ourselves.

MINNESOTA'S SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the recent award, in my State, of Minnesota's Small Businessman of the Year. This award, made by the Small Business Administration, and presented by Minnesota's Gov. Karl Rolvaag, designated John C. Enblom, of Rochester, Minn., as having contributed much to the economic well-being of that city and our State.

The Nation's 4.7 million small business firms have brought to their respective communities a great fund of knowledge. They have increased employment, and have insured the continued growth of our Nation's economy. I salute Mr. Enblom and his firm, Crenlo, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Rochester Post-Bulletin of May 27 be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

[From the Rochester (Minn.) Post-Bulletin, May 27, 1965]

ENBLOM NAMED TOP SMALL BUSINESSMAN IN STATE FOR 1965

John C. Enblom, 53, president of Crenlo, Inc., of Rochester, has been named Minnesota's Small Businessman of the Year by the Small Business Administration.

He will be awarded a citation tonight by Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag in the Governor's office in St. Paul.

The honor comes to the Rochester businessman during Small Business Week, proclaimed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in honor of the Nation's 4.7 million small business firms.

Mayor Alex Smekta also has urged the citizens of the community to honor the city's small business firms which have contributed so much to the economy of the city.

Enblom was born in Minneapolis and was graduated from the University of Minnesota. Before coming to Rochester in 1951 as one of four men who formed Crenlo, he was president and general manager of the Donaldson Co., Inc., a firm with which he became associated after his graduation from college.

In the 14 years since Crenlo's founding, the firm's sales have increased 20 times to the present level of $4.5 million a year. Crenlo sells its products to some of America's leading companies such as Caterpillar Tractor Co., IBM, Deere & Co., and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. The firm employs some 350 persons.

The company manufactures cabs and other components for tractors and heavy-duty equipment, air filters, business machine and prescription file cabinets, tanks, Fiberglas components, and other assorted metal specialties.

Other founders of the company besides Enblom were Roger Cresswell, present executive vice president; Stuart Haessly, vice president-engineering; and William Lowther, who left the firm in 1953.

Since the inception of Crenlo Inc., Enblom has served as president, treasurer, and board chairman of the firm. Active in community affairs, he has held directorships in the United Fund, Junior Achievement, Industrial Opportunities, Inc., Rotary Club and the Echo Corp. of Rochester. He also is a member of the YMCA, Zumbro Lutheran Church, and the Society of Automotive Engineers. He is married and has four children. The family resides at 612 10th Avenue SW.

Upon learning of the award Enblom stated, "It is indeed an honor to be selected as the outstanding small businessman in Minnesota. However, the credit should rather go to my family, business associates, Crenlo employees and people in the community who have been so helpful in meeting the problems of a small business.

"Crenlo, Inc., was formed as a Minnesota corporation in 1951 by four men who had some ideas, a lot of desire, and limited capital. We quickly discovered that an un-

tried business venture does not qualify for usual credit accommodations. Through our association with the Olmsted County Bank, we were able to learn about the Small Business Administration in providing long-term business loans for just such a situation as ours.

"Now some years later, we have reached the maturity and stability that enables us to finance our expanding operation through private sources. But the financial assistance and management guidance received from the SBA was an important factor in bringing us to this point. We feel sure that the economic contribution that Crenlo, Inc., makes to the city of Rochester and the State of Minnesota speaks well for the SBA program," Enblom concluded.

PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENT OF CAREER EMPLOYEES LAUDED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, President Johnson and the highly able Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, John Macy, have done a fine job in finding competent career employees for top Federal jobs. The fact that a great many of these persons are already working for the Federal Government has too often been ignored. I am glad this administration is considering and choosing such persons, and that this fact was recognized in an editorial published on June 9 in the Washington Star. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, June 9, 1965]

Every new President pays lipservice as a matter of course to the qualities of the civil servant. Lyndon Johnson has gone much further than that. More than any Chief Executive in recent years, he has looked to career employees to fill high Federal posts. And it must come as something of a shock to him to hear that some critics are now condemning him for it.

Their argument, as the Wall Street Journal's Alan Otten noted in an article the other day, is that Mr. Johnson is overdoing the career bit—to the point that the administration soon may lack "the constantly needed infusion of new ideas and new talent from the outside world."

It is not, the critics say, that career people who move up the ladder are not able, conscientious administrators. The problem, they say, is that these people, who are the products of the system they grew up in, are all too apt to lack a fresh approach, to be unimaginative, to refrain from speaking their minds, to stay in the old ruts rather than to blaze new trails.

Well, it is an interesting argument, and in an academic debate, we suppose, one could make at least a respectable defense on this side of the question.

But it is certainly not the side we would choose to defend. The best personnel policy is to select top-drawer Federal employees from a variety of sources, and this is precisely what Mr. Johnson has done. According to John Macy, the President's personal recruiter, the major Johnson appointments have been almost equally divided between career employees and those from "outside." This assures an adequate supply of fresh blood. But more important, in our opinion, it makes the proper use, in about the proper proportions, of a rich reservoir of vigorous, articulate men and women of demonstrated ability who already know their way around the Federal Establishment. Experience is no disadvantage to holding high Government office; it is a tremendous asset. Nor are the career "veterans" tapped from this pool hidebound old fogies—of the type who so often rise to power under the seniority system in Congress.

The critics of the President's admitted "bias in favor of the career service" also overlook another point. For the fact is that the Federal service has been undergoing some important changes in recent years. Much of the emphasis today is aimed at making the Government competitive enough with private enterprise to attract bright young people at all levels—and to hold them. This can be done partly through pay scales which are competitive with industry. But it is no less important to recognize merit, and to reward it with the opportunity for advancement.

Looking over the career workers, Mr. Johnson has promoted from the ranks, it is very doubtful that he could have done better by going "outside."

"THE RIGHT TO WORK"

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by my warm friend and valued constituent, Hon. Edward H. Lane, chairman of the board of the Lane Co., Inc., of Altavista, Va., opposing the repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

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

STATEMENT BY EDWARD H. LANE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE LANE CO., INC., OF ALTAVISTA, VA., OPPOSING THE REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

When Senator Taft and Congressman Hartley proposed the Taft-Hartley Act to the Congress, they and their supporters realized that the pendulum of power had swung too far toward giving the labor unions greater power than they should have. Congress over the years had been trying to create a fair balance between the powers of the labor unions and the powers of the employers, and the Taft-Hartley Act was designed to bring about a better balance. This was conceived as much for the protection of the members of the union against power mad, and in many cases unscrupulous, union leaders as it was to protect the general American public.

Our Federal Union was founded on the theory that the Federal Government would be one of delegated powers, and all other powers not so delegated to the Central Government or prohibited to the States should be reserved to the States.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will be another serious blow to States rights and, in my judgment, would be ruled unconstitutional by any fairminded court or courts.

I do not know of anything that has been proposed in recent years more completely un-American than to withdraw from the free workers of this country their right to choose a union or not choose a union. This will be just another step in taking away from the people of this country one of their freedoms, for which they have fought so hard.

The heads of the labor unions today already have too much power. The balance of power between the unions and employers is swinging very heavily in favor of the labor union leaders, and I think if the Congress of the United States should repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act they would be taking away from the people of this country another one of their precious freedoms, the right to work.

Nationwide polls conducted on compulsory unionism (including one by the Gallup organization) show that 67 percent of the people of the United States are opposed to compulsory unionism.

No leading Western World democratic government has yet seen fit to adopt a national policy of compulsory unionism. The consequences of such a policy are clear—it would be a terrible and tragic mistake for our country. The individual—the little man—would have no choice under compulsory unionism, and would lose any and all effective control over his union organization.

I prayerfully hope that there will be sufficient Members of the Congress of the United States who recognize that this is another grab for power by the labor union leaders, and that they already have too much power for the good of their members and the people of this country.

Respectfully submitted.

E. H. LANE.

STUDY OF FEASIBILITY OF ADOPTING METRIC SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Joining the Metric Club," published on May 31 in the Washington Evening Star, noted the recent announcement by the British Government that Great Britain officially planned to convert to the metric system. The editorial called attention to the proposed legislation—sponsored by Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, and myself—advocating a study of the feasibility of adopting the metric system in this country.

I recognize that some persons have doubts about adoption of the metric system in the United States; but I can conceive of no clearer means of resolving such doubts than a comprehensive study which will show us the advantages and the disadvantages that adoption will engender. Those who fear studies, apparently fear the truth. Representative MILLER and I merely want to ascertain the facts; and Britain's action makes this all the more imperative.

I am informed that the Canadian Government plans to initiate such a study soon. To my mind, this makes a conclusive case for action on our part. I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, May 31, 1965]

JOINING THE METRIC CLUB

Britain's announcement of plans to convert to the metric system is a long step forward in that insular nation's effort to integrate with the European economy.

Though the changeover will not be completed for a decade, the thought of England abandoning her ancient yards and pints and stones—some of the terms dating back to Roman times—is startling news on both sides of the Atlantic.

The development has generated new interest in Washington in a long-contemplated study of metric conversion by the United

States. Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, and Representative MILLER, of California, have been reintroducing identical bills for years to prepare the way for this, and surely the time has come to give their proposal a fair shake.

The Pell-Miller legislation would merely be exploratory, authorizing a 3-year study by the Commerce Department to determine the feasibility of a changeover to metric measurements.

More than 90 percent of the world now operates on the metric system, as do certain American industries. Dr. Edward Teller has warned that the Soviet Union, which adopted it in 1927, is talking a common language of measurements with neutral nations while we remain in splendid isolation.

It is of historic interest that both Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams advocated such a simplified decimal system a century and a half ago. It is now of economic and political importance that we get in step with the rest of the world.

No one argues the change will be easy. France had to threaten her citizens with prison sentences back in 1840 to force a switch. Japan required from 1921 to 1958 to complete her transition from other measurements.

But there is surely no excuse for Congress to stall any longer on a formal study of the matter.

USE OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FUNDS UNDER THE AID PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as I have done for the past 3 years, I report on the overall manner in which our foreign aid funds are spent under the Alliance for Progress. As in the past, my concern is to monitor the degree to which our assistance is used to invest in productive, long-range development, and not be squandered on short-range, stopgap support to plug local budgetary deficiencies.

I am happy to report that the trend continues to be favorable, with increasing emphasis on long-range development assistance. Balance-of-payments assistance, which in 1962 stood at 33 percent of our total commitment under the Alliance, is scheduled to reflect a drop to 3 percent in the fiscal year 1965—the lowest level since the Alliance was brought into being. Similarly, direct budget support, which in 1961 stood at 12 percent of the total commitment, is scheduled to drop to 1 percent in the fiscal year 1965—again the lowest level in the history of the Alliance.

On the other hand, our commitments for long-range development assistance indicate a shift toward loans keyed to long-range development programs. Commitments under this category increased from $115 million, or 18 percent of the total, in the fiscal year 1964 to $230 million, or 41 percent of the total, in the fiscal year 1965. Two major commitments accounted for this total: $150 million to Brazil and $80 million to Chile.

Assistance to separate projects not necessarily tied to long-range development programs dropped, in the fiscal year 1964, from $465.9 million, or 72 percent of the total, to $305.2 million, or 55 percent of the total in the current fiscal year. In part, this apparently reflected an absolute reduction in our overall commitment to the Alliance from $641.3 million in the fiscal year 1964 to $558.7 million in the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is encouraging evidence of good stewardship by the Alliance, and I congratulate AID for its continuing good work in this regard. I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation, prepared by AID, reflecting these trends be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AID assistance to Latin America, by function, fiscal years 1959–65

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Fiscal year 1959		Fiscal year 1960		Fiscal year 1961		Fiscal year 1962		Fiscal year 1963		Fiscal year 1964		Projected, fiscal year 1965	
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
Development project assistance	$103.5	84	$87.2	83	$210.6	83	[1] 300.0	63	[1] $383.0	68	[1] $465.9	72	[1] $305.2	55
Development program assistance— Loans under long-range plans									[2] 95.0	17	[3] 115.0	18	230.0	41
Balance-of-payments assistance	7.3	6	8.4	8	11.6	5	154.7	33	[4] 70.8	12	50.3	8	15.2	3
Direct budget support	12.2	10	9.5	9	31.5	12	19.5	4	17.4	3	10.1	2	8.3	1
Total	123.0	100	105.1	100	253.7	100	474.2	100	566.2	100	641.3	100	558.7	100

[1] Includes Alliance for Progress funds for nonregional projects directly benefiting Latin American countries, and the amount of grants to Trinidad in exchange for base rights.

[2] $60,000,000 to Colombia and $35,000,000 to Chile.

[3] $60,000,000 to Colombia and $55,000,000 to Chile.

[4] Including $23,750,000 grant to Dominican Republic.

SENATOR NELSON PROPOSES HIKING TRAILS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the matchless conservation record of Senator GAYLORD NELSON springs naturally out of his intimate knowledge of beautiful Wisconsin. He has hiked over many of the still uncluttered miles of his lake-studded State; and it is perhaps from this experience that he has focused attention on one neglected aspect of our resource conservation: a hiking-trail system. While other nations long ago turned hiking into a national pastime, we have often let only concrete and asphalt pathways carry us past much that is superbly worthwhile.

Today, Senator NELSON says:

Hiking, camping, sightseeing, and nature study attract broader interest than any other outdoor activity; yet there has been very little coordinated development of hiking trails.

For that reason, he has proposed an exciting, 3,000-mile network of hiking trails for Wisconsin.

At a recent forestry and forest recreation land use conference in Madison, Senator NELSON set out a proposal which could serve as a model for other States, and perhaps even for the National Government. I, for one, hope the conservation-minded State of Wisconsin will follow his lead.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator NELSON's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON AT THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ON FORESTRY AND FOREST RECREATION LAND USE IN MADISON, WIS., MAY 14, 1965

The topic of this conference is forestry and forest recreation land use. It is a timely subject. Wisconsin's general share of lake and woodland and her location near this Nation's center of population make possible a very bright future for forest recreation in the State.

But if the development of outdoor recreation in Wisconsin is to be successful it must be wisely and imaginatively planned. We have already made important strides in this direction. We must continue to move. This conference, certainly, is a recognition of the need.

Today I want to suggest to this conference what I think is an exciting proposal—a 3,000-mile Wisconsin hiking and camping trail system. It will match the famous Appalachian Trail that runs from Maine to Georgia in the scope and variety of the recreation opportunity it affords.

It is a trail system that would take us from the mouth of the Brule at Lake Superior all the way to the headwaters of the Brule and the St. Croix, and then down the St. Croix to the Mississippi and along the Great River Road, all the way to the Wisconsin-Iowa line; it would take us up the shores of Lake Michigan and across northern Wisconsin through the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests; it's a trail that would show us our forests and hills, the beautiful watersheds and shorelines of our finest rivers and lakes and the lovely terrain of the ice age reserve.

Almost everyone in our State would live within less than an hour's reach of some part of the trail system. It will offer a far greater opportunity for varied recreation for many more people than any other comparable investment we could make.

The opportunity is here now and so is the need. As our resource base is rapidly diminishing, so is our population pressure rapidly increasing against that resource base. Within 35 years our population will double. What

we fail to do now we will be unable to do then.

The history of resource conservation has proved again and again that little steps made too late have tragically failed to meet tomorrow's needs.

As we glance over the map of Wisconsin, the opportunities for trails, long ones and short ones, fairly shout their claims for recognition.

Without the expenditure of any moneys for acquisition, we could plan and develop several hundred miles of trails and campsites on lands already in public ownership—Federal, State, and county.

The State, for example, already owns both sides of the magnificent Brule River from Lake Superior to its headwaters near Solon Springs. If the St. Croix River bill passes Congress, that will afford the opportunity for a hiking and camping trail over 200 miles long from Lake Superior to St. Croix Falls. Numerous other opportunities abound on public lands all over the State.

The U.S. Forest Service with 2.4 million acres in the Chequamegon and Nicolet National Forests is prepared to cooperate in the development of a comprehensive Wisconsin trail system.

I have discussed at length the idea of a statewide system of hiking trails in the State with the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. He was most enthusiastic. Let me quote a little from his letter to me some 3 months ago on February 18.

"In response to our conversations in the last 2 months I want to assure you we will be pleased to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the planning and development of a comprehensive hiking trail plan for your State.

"I am requesting the Forest Service to cooperate with your conservation department in the development and implementation of a trail plan."

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Building the trails need not be expensive. On a cold weekend last October, I hiked over a fine new trail running through the Chequamegon National Forest that had been built by undergraduates from Stevens Point College. A 7-mile stretch of trail cost less than $40 in out-of-pocket expenses.

Groups that would be eager to help construct or maintain a trail include:

1. Job Corps conservation camp boys: Secretary Freeman goes on to say in his letter that the young men to be assigned to the camp near Clam Lake in the Chequamegon will cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the development of a trail system. Boys going to the camp near Blackwell in the Nicolet can work on the trail through that forest. Anywhere that a hiking trail runs through publicly owned land, Job Corpsmen will provide excellent help. Besides the two camps already announced, we expect that Wisconsin will be assigned at least two more.

2. Young people working at the Wisconsin State conservation camps will provide another source of help.

3. Volunteer workers of many sorts: Youth groups like the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, college hiking and outdoor clubs, adult conservation and social clubs would be eager to help. The 40-year success of private clubs in maintaining the 2,000 miles of the Appalachian Trail demonstrates the soundness of the concept of private group volunteer work. People are eager to find practical ways to serve the conservation movement. Maintenance of a hiking trail system would generate tremendous support and enthusiasm at the grassroots. I have no doubt that local groups would quickly volunteer to maintain their section of the trail just as local volunteer clubs maintain their section of the Appalachian Trail and take great pride in it. I can think of no way to secure broader public participation in resource education and preservation; no way to provide a more fruitful opportunity for old and young alike to make a useful and satisfying contribution to the public welfare.

THE PROPOSED WISCONSIN HIKING TRAIL SYSTEM

The system includes the following proposed trails:

The Great River Road and Mississippi Ridgeline Trail along the State's western boundary.

A trail along the eastern shore and up around the shoreline of Door County.

The St. Croix and Brule River trail along the ancient route of the fur traders.

A tristate trail across Wisconsin's northernmost tier of counties.

The Apostle Loop route around the Bayfield Peninsula and the proposed Apostle Island National Park.

River trails along the Wisconsin, the Wolf, the Chippewa, the Fox, the Baraboo, and the Flambeau.

The Kettle Moraine State forests—north and south—through the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

These trails need be only a partial listing, only a beginning. Wherever there is a bit of publicly owned land there ought to be a limited access hiking trail, carefully laid out, planned and maintained, especially on bits of wild land within easy access of metropolitan areas.

In order to complete a statewide trail plan it will be necessary to acquire easements on private holdings much in the same way we have acquired them along the Great River Road.

KINDS OF TRAILS

The Wisconsin hiking trail system would provide a great variety of trails. Trails designed to bring the delight of the wild world close to every citizen would be constructed.

Long hiking trails—like the trail from the mouth of the Brule to the great portage at Solon Springs and on down the St. Croix—would appeal to the hardy outdoorsman and to Scouting groups. The trail would require campsites every 7 miles or so, as on the Appalachian Trail, with campsites or lean-to shelters for spending the night.

Short trails, perhaps of only 4 or 5 miles, within easy access of our great cities where weekend family groups and church groups can get away from the city for a few hours to the calming solitude of the woods.

Very short trails in and near our urban areas to make hiking trails readily available to schoolchildren. Large tracts of public land are not necessary. Preserving, and using, small pieces of land near great concentrations of population is important.

Nature study trails. The most obvious candidate for such a trail is the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve that will include the Kettle Moraine State forests. The reserve will boast outstanding glacial formations in the Nation.

Small, especially planted groves of trees—with every variety of tree in Wisconsin represented, would be helpful in nature study for children. The Forest Service has worked out very attractive ways of arranging nature study trails so that young people—and older students of nature as well—are led to a deeper understanding of the natural environment.

Trails designed with the motorist in mind would provide Wisconsin with a singular attraction and a new dimension for pleasure driving, the single most popular outdoor recreation in the country. Well marked and publicized trails would provide an opportunity to leave the dust and fumes of the highway for a more than just visual acquaintance with the natural world.

TELLING ABOUT THE TRAILS

To be a success it is necessary that the trails be widely known.

Brochures, pamphlets, and detailed maps should be available wherever tourists seek information.

The detailed maps should include contours as do the Appalachian trail maps, and include relevant geological and historical background information.

CONCLUSION

Wisconsin is well prepared to go ahead now with the detailed planning for the trail system. We are nearing completion of the finest comprehensive recreation plan in the Nation.

The unique job of identifying "corridors of quality" in Wisconsin done by Phil Lewis, Jr., professor, landscape architecture at the University of Wisconsin, is earning him a richly deserved national reputation. It also gives us in Wisconsin a unique knowledge of the resources and potentials of our countryside.

A 5-year plan for the completion of the trail system ought to be our goal.

When the trail has been designed it will not be a serious problem to get it built. The help of the boys in the conservation camps, and on the campuses, the help of the scouting and conservation groups will not only make the hiking trail system a success, but the system will provide a focus for these groups that can enrich their activities.

Hiking, camping, sightseeing and nature study appeal to all who seek outdoor recreation.

The Wisconsin trail system will give us a tourist attraction and a recreation asset unmatched by any other State.

SMALL COAL MINES MUST REMAIN OPEN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have vigorously opposed, in committee and on the floor of the Senate, proposed amendments of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act which would place title I mines—those employing 14 or fewer men—under the jurisdiction of that act and of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board.

In the 85th and the 86th Congresses, after hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I was then a member, the committee and the Senate refused to take action which would have caused the great majority of these small mines to close without careful reason.

The proposed amendment of the act is not truly a safety bill, but it is one which would place a terrible and unnecessary economic burden on these little mines and could drive them out of business. The provisions that would be applied to title I mines under proposed amendments are inapplicable to small mines, because the measures which would be required are those needed for the larger, deeper, and highly mechanized type of mines which employ more than 14 men.

The record shows that overall safety conditions in the small mines of this country are better than in the larger, highly mechanized coal mines. If small mines are driven out of business under this guise, not only will the operators shut down their mines, but thousands of men who work to support many thousands of families will be thrown out of work. The amendment of the act to include title I mines under its jurisdiction would be another step toward destroying the economy of eastern Kentucky and of other similar areas throughout regions to which much attention has been directed.

On Sunday of this week, in the June 6, 1965, edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal, there appeared an editorial about the effect which this so-called safety bill would have on our small mines. The editorial expresses the situation accurately and fairly, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SAFETY BILL SHOULDN'T RUIN SMALLER MINES

The mine safety bill just passed by the House is better than most of its predecessors, but its effect would be about the same. It would, in the long run, put most small mines out of business, and for this reason Kentuckians must regard it with the gravest reservations. The welfare of small mines is of utmost importance to the depressed economy of eastern Kentucky.

Briefly, the bill would extend Federal safety regulations and inspection to small mines having fewer than 15 employees, mines now exempt from Federal standards, and would in return give small-mine operators two representatives on the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board. It would require small mines to install the same equipment and abide by the same safety regulations as large mines because, as one administration witness put it, small mines have not been "outstanding for safety practices."

The trouble is that Federal inspectors are oriented to the big, well-financed mines with modern, costly safety equipment, and naturally would want to require the same equipment in small mines. But the small mine extending only a few hundred feet under a hill does not often need the safety installations of a big mine. And the small family mine that yields a few tons of coal a day can't afford the safety equipment that is not only desirable but necessary in a large mechanized operation.

This does not mean that the small mine is necessarily the deathtrap that sponsors of safety legislation describe. It is true, as administration witnesses pointed out before the House, that on the basis of coal tonnage produced, small mines have more accidents and more fatal accidents than large mines. But this reflects the fact that these unmechanized mines produce far less coal per employee than do the large mechanized operations.

On the other hand, on the basis of manhours worked, the small mines have a decidedly better safety record than do the large ones. And it is an ironic fact that agitation for the current legislation began when a series of accidents, killing 37 men in Pennsylvania, 22 in West Virginia, and 30 in Utah, took place—all in mines employing more than 15 men.

There are convincing arguments why the small mines should be put of business. Most hire a few men at low wages, work them under harsh conditions, and produce little wealth for their region. The big mines pay better, provide better working conditions and still make more profit. It would probably be better for the national economy if only the big mines survived.

But for Kentucky, where the small mines provide between 55 and 65 percent of all mining jobs, the death of the small mines would be a real calamity. And unless the Federal Government is ready to expand its relief and public works programs radically to take care of the hundreds of thousands of people thus affected, and to make up with an expanded Appalachian program for the economic blow that the mountain counties would suffer, it had better go slow with any safety bill that would wreck the small mine.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I submit for the record a resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island memorializing Congress in relation to the closing of Veterans' Administration facilities and commending Congress on our decision to postpone the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals and regional offices.

Mr. President, I am completely in sympathy with this action of Congress. It has been factually demonstrated that more of our veterans are in need of medical and hospital services and that to close down some of these facilities and consolidate others would not only greatly limit services, but in many cases place an undue burden on our veterans and their families.

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

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

A RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS IN RELATION TO THE CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES AND COMMENDING THEM ON THEIR DECISION TO POSTPONE CLOSING VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS AND REGIONAL OFFICES

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital system in the United States provides hospitalization for patients with both acute and chronic illnesses; and

Whereas there is now a 125,000 hospital bed limit in the United States under which the Veterans' Administration operates; and

Whereas studies of Congress have stated that there is a need for these and other facilities to care for our veterans; and

Whereas the average daily patient load of the 168 Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the Nation is 110,000; and

Whereas other Veterans' Administration regional facilities are undoubtedly necessary to provide services to our veterans; and

Whereas there are approximately 132,000 veterans in Rhode Island: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby commended on their decision to postpone the closing of certain Veterans' Administration facilities and respectfully requested to indefinitely postpone any such action; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable action taken by Congress upon this special matter.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Arts and Humanities Foundation bill which was passed by the Senate yesterday will, if passed by the other body, become one of the very real monuments of this Congress and of the administration.

I rise to say quite publicly that without the immense help, imagination, attention to detail, hard work, and continuous touching of bases of my special assistant and old friend, Livingston L. Biddle, I do not believe that this legislation would have come to fruition at this time. I am grateful to him and commend him in this regard.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID BELL, ADMINISTRATOR OF AID

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. On June 12, Mr. Bell will have held his critically important position for a longer time than any other Administrator of the Agency, and under his leadership the foreign aid program has progressively gained the high regard of the people of this Nation and the people of the world.

I, for one, salute Mr. Bell, realizing the problems that he has faced, and conquered, since coming into office.

Our foreign aid program has had a profusion of names. Counting only the formal names given the program, we ran through a good many of the letters of the alphabet, with ECA, MSA, FOA, ICA, and now AID.

But David Bell put firm hands on the wheel of the AID ship, and has navigated with skill through a lot of craggy rocks and shoals.

When Mr. Bell took office, President Kennedy sent him the following telegram:

I'm sure my troubles with AID are over, and I hope that yours will never begin.

David Bell has had troubles, but nothing he cannot handle. His has been called a case of David's taming the AID Goliath.

When David Bell was sworn into office on December 21, 1962, he accepted his new responsibility with words worth recalling. His comments could have been confined to pretty phrases; but in the light of what has happened, three points which he made on that day bear repeating now.

He said:

Any assistance from outside has meaning and significance and can achieve results only if the people of the country and its leaders have the desire and the willingness to commit themselves and their energies to make the sacrifices necessary to reach their goals.

Out of this observation, there came the present-day rule of no aid to nations that choose to make their own development a minor concern, and waste substance badly needed for the welfare of their own people. David Bell was saying that we will not help nations who refuse to help themselves; and the AID record proves that he meant it.

He said, on the day when he took office:

In order to conduct effective programs of U.S. assistance to the growing strength and security of other free countries, we must engage the wisdom, resources, and the talents of agencies throughout the Federal Government and of institutions throughout our country.

Under David Bell, reservoirs of skill and know-how throughout the Nation

have been tapped. Today American colleges, universities, and business and professional firms have contracts for technical assistance work in 76 countries. Private American engineering and construction firms are now at work in over 50 countries, supervising the building of irrigation systems, power dams, factories, and other worthwhile capital projects. Under David Bell, emphasis on the development of cooperatives and thrift institutions overseas has increased sharply. Through more extensive contracts with land-grant universities and broader use of Department of Agriculture experts, AID is increasing emphasis on agricultural development throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

On the day when he was sworn in, Dave Bell said:

> Any enterprise of the Federal Government, involving the use of public funds, ought to be managed with the highest prudence and frugality.

Since then, the money requests from AID have been steadily reduced. Decisions were reached to tighten up some programs and to terminate others. Cuts and consolidations have been the order of the day. A higher proportion of AID funds is going to fewer countries. Many countries receive some kind of aid; but 95 percent is going to 31 countries, and half of our economic aid and two-thirds of our development assistance are going to just 7 countries. This year's aid budget is the lowest in history, a product of the prudent frugality encouraged by Dave Bell since the day when he took office.

While Dave Bell has been leading the attack on poverty, hunger, disease, and despair in the poorer nations, he has unfortunately been subject to the counsel of despair from some who feel that the job can never be finished. Some persons have argued that self-sustaining economic growth is impossible in many of the less developed countries.

David Bell does not agree. He has seen how a determined nation can build itself up from poverty to thriving prosperity. Taiwan is an example. Fifteen years ago, Taiwan looked as though it would be permanently dependent on economic support from the United States. Today, the Taiwanese are off and running toward a dynamic economy. U.S. assistance—which made this possible—ends this month.

David Bell is soft spoken, but hardheaded. He has never tried to deceive Congress about his purposes or his method of doing business. He has never said the AID program is a recipe for instant paradise. He has concentrated on doing a good, thorough, thoughtful job; and I, for one, hope he is around for many years to come.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently this body passed, without amendment of any kind whatsoever, what has been hailed by the administration as a milestone in educational legislation. I refer specifically to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which we debated all too briefly in the Senate in April.

As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which considered the measure, I participated actively in the hearings held by that subcommittee. During both the subcommittee hearings and the meetings later held by the full committee, both of which I attended faithfully, I joined some of my colleagues in repeatedly trying to make constructive changes, so that the bill might more nearly fulfill the object for which it was designed.

When the measure came to the floor of the Senate, I joined, once again, in the conscientious effort of many Senators to bring this act more nearly into line with its stated purpose, which was to provide educational assistance to those classified in the poverty category. These efforts were in no way willy-nilly, partisan approaches, nor were they designed to kill, dilute, or impede the provisions of the act. As a matter of fact, the principal amendment for which I fought so hard would have increased the total cost of the bill by some $133 million.

Yet, the leadership was having no amendments of any sort, regardless of their logic, need, importance, or effect. Word had come from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue that the Senate must give its unquestioned, unqualified, and unamended, rubberstamp approval to the measure as passed by the House. We were told, in effect, that while we were obliged to fulfill the letter of our constitutional role as a legislative body in approving the act, we were not competent to pass judgment upon the merits of proposed legislation bottled and packaged by the executive branch.

Mr. President, I bring up this matter today because of an interesting and ironical twist of fate that has just come to light in connection with this act. It appears that in their haste to steamroller the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 through Congress, its engineers had forgotten a valuable piece of cargo. They had been very careful to provide Texas with more than two and one-half times as much money as Mississippi, even though Texas has less than twice as many children falling into the poverty category. They also managed, somehow or other—and this, in itself, was a major achievement—to provide for the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation more funds than for those of the poorest counties, having almost exactly the same number of poverty-stricken children. And, of course, they provided a precedent-shattering, open-ended bill authorizing the Federal Government to assist, if not actually direct, in the evaluation of many of the programs sponsored by the bill, thereby setting the stage for eventual full-scale intervention into our traditionally locally controlled elementary and secondary school systems.

What, then, did they leave behind? Surely no one can accuse this administration of consciously leaving any group out of a spending program. The simple fact of the matter is that they left the most eligible of all Americans out of the act—the one group that claims no nationality outside the United States; the one group that has had the longest claim on the natural resources and riches of this Nation: the American Indian. Yes, in their haste to ram this act through without so much as a "by your leave, sir," they left the Indians sitting at the station. If any group ever deserved the title of the forgotten American, this amazing blunder has cinched the case for the American Indian—forgotten, not because the administration is reluctant to include them, but because in their haste the engineers of the bill refused to consider any additions, changes, or deletions, regardless of their individual or collective merits.

Here is a classic example of government by fiat. Here we see a classic example of the true arrogance of power. Here is what happens when one branch of government dictates to another, which has apparently grown weary of performing its constitutional obligations to legislate, or leery of invoking the wrath of Lyndon Johnson. Here is a chilling vignette of what happens when opposition is forcibly muted by a power elite.

I remind Senators that each one of us is held accountable to the citizens of our constituencies, not to the faceless power elite operating out of the White House.

Small recompense though it may be, it is pleasant to know that we shall have a chance to rectify the exclusion of the American Indian, at least in this instance. The opportunity will present itself when the Senate votes on House bill 5874, which amends the lower education act before the latter has even had time to go into effect.

I hope the President will not prevent us from amending what had heretofore been touted as unamendable. I think the American Indian deserves the same educational assistance that any other citizen does; and I regret only that the American Indian has been so rudely overlooked.

There is no telling how many other errors, loopholes, inadequacies, and shortcomings in this act may one day come to light.

Perhaps if we in Congress would put a little more emphasis on the merits of specific proposed legislation before us, and a little less on abdicating our responsibilities to the executive and judicial branches, many of these problems could be nipped in the bud. At least, the American Indian would not be left behind, in the mad dash to the Great Society.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, two recent developments in higher education at Purdue University deserve special mention. Last month the Krannert Graduate School of Industrial Administration was dedicated. This impressive new facility, which was made possible mainly by the generous contributions of Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert, of Indianapolis, will permit a greatly enlarged and improved program of instruction in industrial management.

The second noteworthy achievement is in the field of methodology. A novel audio-tutorial system of instruction in botany has proved to be extremely successful. This three-stage system fosters individual initiative and study, even with sizable classes, yet requires less laboratory space than do regular techniques. The results over the last 3 years have been most encouraging.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles describing these important achievements in higher education. The articles were published in the Indianapolis Star Sunday Magazine of May 2 and the Indianapolis Times of June 3.

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

[From the Indianapolis Star Sunday Magazine, May 2, 1965]

NEW ERA IN TRAINING INDUSTRIAL EXECUTIVES

(By Edward W. Cotton)

A new landmark on the Purdue University campus, a stately, high-rise tribute to the institution's past and a gleaming, stone and steel pledge to an even more illustrious future, will be dedicated this week.

Ceremonies celebrating completion of the Krannert Graduate School of Industrial Administration, a $5 million, nine-story structure, will be held Thursday afternoon, but a special series of dedicatory programs will continue for the next 12 months.

Designated as the "year of emphasis" programs, the special series of events not only will honor the Hoosier philanthropist for whom the new building and the graduate school itself are named, but promise to launch a new era of educational strength and leadership on the West Lafayette campus.

Long top rated in the fields of engineering, agriculture, and home economics, the additional classroom, study and research facilities for both graduate and undergraduate students will enable the university to achieve full recognition for its work in the industrial world.

Until now, both the school of industrial management, established in 1958 for undergraduate students of economics and industrial management, and the Krannert Graduate School of Industrial Administration, formally organized in 1962, have been handicapped by the lack of space and facilities.

The new home of the two schools, a principal feature of which is one floor of behavioral laboratories, augmented with an elaborate computer control system, offers almost unlimited opportunity for exploration, experimentation, and expansion.

Space in the towering 160,000 square feet of building, seven floors above the ground and two below, provides a total of 244 faculty and administrative offices, 81 rooms for study, conference, research and laboratory use; 13 classrooms, the combination of which can seat more than 650 students at one time; two floors of library facilities; some 7,100 square feet of lounge area, and a 150-seat auditorium, all air conditioned and tailor designed for their specific purpose.

The behavior laboratories alone termed by Dr. Emanuel T. Weiler, dean of the Krannert School, "the finest in the country," represents 3 years of planning.

Dean Weiler, who has headed both the undergraduate and graduate schools since they were organized, also points out that the libraries, one a general facility and the other offering open-stack access to the books, is "one of the best social science libraries in the world."

The new, ultramodern, totally functional school headquarters was made possible by the intensive interest and generous contributions of Indianpolis industrialist Herman C. Krannert and his wife, Mrs. Ellnora D. Krannert.

In addition to being the founder and chairman of the board of Inland Container Corp., a firm he developed from a small, Hoosier-based box company, largely serving Midwest industry, into the third largest manufacturer of corrugated shipping containers in the world, Krannert is a visiting professor at the school which bears his name. He will maintain an office in the newly completed building to visit with both students and faculty members.

The monetary gifts of Mr. and Mrs. Krannert, together with grants from the National Science Foundation and contributions made by other interested donors, erected and equipped the new building without cost to the State's taxpayers.

The Krannerts' purpose in making the largest single donation was twofold: "To further the development of technically and scientifically trained talent for management level positions in business or for advanced teaching careers, and to give the industrial Midwest another outstanding center of technically oriented management research and knowledge."

It was a previous contribution from Mr. and Mrs. Krannert that led to the founding of the graduate industrial administration school, at first only an extension of the undergraduate school, 3 years ago.

Although there will be a reception following Thursday's dedication ceremonies, the occasion will not be the first public view of the new building. The graduate and undergraduate schools, plus the School of Agriculture's department of agricultural economics which will share a portion of the structure, began moving in during spring vacation, March 28 to April 5.

There also have been conducted tours of the new facilities and an open house was held Friday, in conjunction with Purdue's annual gala week.

Touring the building from bottom to top: The basement floor (second underground level) contains seven group study rooms, a spacious audiovisual workshop and a student lounge, equipped with vending machines and game tables.

The 13 classrooms, 6 of which are of arena, "discussion core" type for up to 59 students, as well as smaller, standard classrooms and a 134-seat lecture hall, are located on the ground floor (first underground level).

This floor connects directly with an underground walkway to the university's new Graduate House, immediately to the rear of the Krannert School, and both the Memorial Union building and a new self-parking garage, across the street from the main entrance.

Pointing out that students are seated in the large classrooms (a modification of facilities at Harvard University's School of Business) at three U-shaped tiers of tables, with the instructor standing at the lowest level, Associate Dean John S. Day explains, "This arrangement, with swivel chairs so students can talk with each other, provides three-way communication—student to student, student to teacher and teacher to student."

Both Dr. Day and Dean Weiler say, "We can handle 59 here with more personal attention than 25 to 30 in a standard classroom."

The dean calls the large, comfortable, decorative lounge, which is the front, street-floor entrance, "the center of our home." He says it's the place "where students and faculty can mix—we need more of this."

In addition to giving a casual visitor his first impression of the building, the lounge also is the major area for welcoming and entertaining large groups of businessmen and industrial leaders who will hold seminars or be special guests of the graduate and undergraduate schools.

The lounge, trimmed in a light blue, which is the basic interior decor, has large windows looking across State Street toward the Memorial Union and across the landscaped courtyard toward the Graduate House.

On the same floor is an administrative suite of offices, which includes accommodations for the dean, associate dean, R. B. Stewart, former university treasurer who now is a professor of finance, and Krannert.

The school's libraries occupy the second and third floors, the second-floor service desk being accessible either from a spiral staircase in the lounge or by one of three automatic elevators. Special features of the third-floor stacks are study stalls, glass-enclosed study booths, with sound-conditioning for typewriter use, and 51 study carrels (small rooms for individual study).

Faculty offices and small and large conference facilities are on the next three, above-ground floors. Most of these offices are in groups of four to six, arranged around a central bay so that one secretary-receptionist can aid several professors simultaneously.

Although there are a few offices on the top level, the so-called seventh floor principally is devoted to the 2,900 square feet of human behavior laboratories, which Dean Weiler calls "our working floor." It has a series of various sized rooms for research into individual and group decisionmaking behavior.

The group behavior layout is centered around a one-way, glass-enclosed observation deck from which experimenters and observers can watch and hear, through stereophonic sound systems, groups ranging from 14- to 44-person experimental groups.

There also are 12 booths, some separated by sliding partitions, available for studies of individual behavior. Plans call for eventual closed-circuit television observation.

The elaborate electronic control system, due to be completed yet this year, will permit feeding of instructions and information to participants in an experiment and then processing of decisions fed back. The computer not only will be capable of transmitting, receiving, and processing information, but it can be used as the mechanical partner of a person in an experiment.

Some anticipated experiments of the laboratories are "business games," decisionmaking for hypothetical firms; interaction patterns in problemsolving groups; price movements in competitive markets, and how personalities affect decisions in international affairs.

Associate Dean Day announces, "Already we have demands for the laboratory. This will be university research space, useful not only for our schools, but also for psychology, sociology, political science, and agricultural economics departments."

In describing the two schools, which he heads, Dean Weiler calls the School of Industrial Management one of the most difficult undergraduate programs in the country.

"It is a broad, exacting type of business education which requires 14 of the 18 hours of the basic mathematics required by Purdue's engineering schools," he points out. "The program is a bridge from Purdue skills in other schools to the apprenticeship period in business."

Of the graduate school program, the dean says "we seek to prepare men for eventual top management jobs, stressing broad management concepts instead of narrow specialization."

This is done in two ways, a combination of business education concepts, according to Dean Weiler.

1. "We stress the trend toward statistical, quantitative methods, using computers as

aids in mathematical and economic problems, such as the Carnegie Tech and Massachusetts Institute of Technology business schools."

2. "Through business policy courses, we use the case method, as at Harvard, in developing a businessman's intuition, his capacity to step up to a decision and make it, even when some of the facts are not available. Machines can't make some of these decisions, but the machine-man link can provide the analytical approach to them."

Some examples of research already underway at the industrial schools include that of Dr. John M. Dutton, seeking to find out how humans solve a problem and then duplicating their solutions in a computer, and the study of Dr. Stanley Reiter, who uses the opposite approach and sets up a theoretical model and then applies it to specific problems, using a computer.

Those are only samples of current research projects, carried on mostly under foundation grants.

The present enrollment of the undergraduate school, which opened 7 years ago with a mere 10 students, is 1,262. Of the 235 students in the still younger graduate school, 85 are studying for Ph. D. degrees, 50 in economics, 25 in industrial administration, and 10 in industrial relations.

This is one of the largest Ph. D. programs in the Nation.

Purdue, even in the short time that it has been in the business school "science" and despite cramped quarters and lack of facilities, has built a national reputation.

An independent newspaper survey, in 1962, for example, classed the university within the top 10 best, based on a consensus of educators and successful alumni. A national business magazine, in 1963, compared both the school, its dean, Dr. Weiler, and his staff, to the educational goals of more famous schools and faculties.

Those appraisals were made while graduate work still was an extension of the undergraduate school.

Some 20 deans of business schools, including all of the other Big Ten universities, have accepted invitations to attend the dedication program, at 2:30 p.m. next Thursday. They, together with an impressive list of nationally known industrialists, will participate the following day, Friday, in a symposium on "Modern Entrepreneurship."

The list of distinguished guests at the latter program includes Edwin P. Vanderwicken, vice president of Motorola Corp.; Donald E. McKee, vice president of International Business Machines Corp.; Lyle H. Fisher, vice president of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; James G. Miles, vice president of Control Data Corp.; Roy L. Ash, president of Litton Industries; James A. Singmaster, vice president of Monsanto Chemical Co., and Edward G. Uhl, president of Fairchild Hiller Corp.

Dean George Baker of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration will give the keynote address, "Business Education in America."

Then, after turning over the keys to the new building to Purdue President Frederick L. Hovde, Krannert will make his fourth annual lecture to faculty and students of the Krannert School.

That will mark the beginning of a year of emphasis, a year in which Purdue seeks to inform the Nation of its new program of "engineering managerial entrepreneurship with industrial technology."

[From the Indianapolis Times, June 3, 1965]

SENATE COMMITTEE HEARS HOW THEY LEARN BETTER AT PURDUE

(By John V. Wilson)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Freshman botany students at Purdue University are learning more and making better grades in a novel learning laboratory program.

Dr. Samuel N. Postlethwait described his audiotutorial system and its results to the Senate Education Subcommittee yesterday.

Postlethwait said the "new dimension to learning" is one answer to the problem of mass education as more and more students flood college campuses.

The three-stage program, relying heavily on the student's initiative, involves general class sessions, smaller instruction groups and individual study in a learning center.

A key result of the pilot program, begun in the fall of 1962, has been a rise in grades "at all levels," Postlethwait reported.

Under the new system, 20 to 25 percent of the students are making "A" grades and 6 percent or less are failing freshman botany.

Under the conventional method of mass lectures and laboratory periods, only 7 percent of the students made "A's" and 18 to 20 percent failed.

Morecver, Postlethwait said, students are receiving 50 percent more information and saving an average of an hour and a half in the classroom.

An additional—and important—benefit to schools facing major building programs, Postlethwait added, has been space saving.

The audiotutorial system requires only one laboratory for 500 students instead of two under the conventional method.

"Most important of all," Postlethwait said, "we now have meaningful contact with our students and instructors are freed of such routine."

Because freshmen vary greatly in background, interest, and capacity, and conventional teaching methods offer little opportunity for the individual, Postlethwait said he decided to totally restructure his botany course.

What he came up with was a general assembly session of 500 students, where the senior instructor sets the intellectual tone and guest lecturers and films are used.

The class divides into groups of 30 students, where they can ask questions, identify with an instructor, take quizzes and take part in research projects.

The third stage presents individual study in a learning laboratory of 28 to 30 booths. It is open from 7:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. and the student goes when he wishes.

Each booth is equipped with a tape player, film projector, microscope, live specimens and other materials of the week's work.

"Since the student has full control of the rate of study, he is able to spend his time in the classroom actually learning the material rather than 'information collecting' for future learning," Postlethwait explained.

More than 90 percent of the 2,500 who have been taught by the new method "have indicated a preference for this approach over the conventional system," the professor said.

Postlethwait said the learning system has the potential of being packaged and offered to other schools.

He participated in a panel discussion of the 1965 higher education bill, which may offer more Federal aid for teaching devices and laboratories.

Participants said the bill is fine as far as it goes.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, the subcommittee chairman, and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, expressed keen interest in the Purdue botany program and praised Postlethwait's presentation.

MISSOURI RIVER NAVIGATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers has recently completed studies on the feasibility of extending Missouri River navigation from Sioux City northward to Yankton, S. Dak., and has filed a favorable report on this important project. It is presently before the Rivers and Harbors Review Board, awaiting confirmation.

Some indication of the importance of completing this important navigation link can be found in the attitude expressed in a recent editorial published in the Sioux City Journal, of Sioux City, Iowa. We look forward optimistically to winning congressional support for this addition to our national transportation system. I ask unanimous consent to have this encouraging and informative editorial from the Sioux City Journal printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

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

RESERVOIR PAYOFF

Missouri River Basin residents have become so used to observing at first hand, and reading and hearing about, the progressive steps toward flood protection that the significance of that reality may have escaped many of them in a season when devastation could have broken all previous records.

Successful harnessing of the third largest and longest river in the Nation has become possible by reliance on the tremendous holding power of six main stem dams, the last completed in 1963. These dams currently are providing reservoir insurance for a record volume of water, 49,608,000 acre-feet, the potential for destruction shuddering to contemplate.

In this major flood threat year, the buttoned-up Missouri provides sharp contrast with the recent conduct of the Mississippi River when havoc prevailed from St. Paul, Minn., to Hannibal, Mo. And the current record water impoundment in dams built and operated by the Army Corps of Engineers is only the beginning of the holding action story for this season. Late runoff promises a June total approaching 60 million acre-feet in the basin reservoirs.

History, topography and the complexities of civilization gave to the Missouri River Basin first honors and a pilot project role in total river control. The Mississippi River, committed to major navigational use at an early stage in the Nation's development, and coursing through heavily populated regions in a basin less adaptable to the building of dams, remains a flood threat while the major river of America's frontier has been subdued.

Reflection on the irony of progress now, in the wake of Mississippi devastation and Missouri passiveness, should also include grateful recognition of massive engineering vision and the good fortune of living in the Missouri Basin.

MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an important study of the educational attainment of American workers appears in the May 1965 Monthly Labor Review. The study shows that impressive gains have been made since 1940. The proportion of workers age 18 to 64 who have completed 4 years of high school or more has risen from 32 to 57 percent, while the percentage for those with 4 years of college or more has advanced from below 6 percent to over 11 percent.

Gains have been especially impressive among nonwhites. The percentage of nonwhites 25 to 29 years of age with at

least 4 years of high school has quadrupled during the period, while the proportion finishing at least 1 year of college has more than tripled. The increases among whites have been 76 and 88 percent, respectively.

Nevertheless, despite these impressive gains, the study shows that much remains to be done. A large percentage of American workers still have little schooling, and the gap between whites and nonwhites remains large. As of March 1964, about 25 percent of the white workingmen 18 years of age and older, and nearly half of the nonwhites, had completed no more than 8 years of school. At the upper end of the scale, only 13 percent of white males and 6 percent of nonwhite males had completed 4 years or more of college.

The picture painted by this report is a fervent argument for increasing the resources devoted to education. It reveals that more needs to be done at all levels of education. The one proposal presently before Congress which will accomplish this goal of aiding education at all levels is the GI education bill, S. 9. The GI education bill is tailored to the needs of the individual. If he needs to finish high school, it will enable him to finish high school. If he needs to go to college, it will assist him in doing so. If his need is for a trade school or a community college, he may attend either.

Senate bill 9 is now on the Senate Calendar, after having been reported favorably from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I urge early consideration of this vital measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Educational Attainment of Workers, March 1964" written by Denis F. Johnston and published in the March 1965 Monthly Labor Review, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF WORKERS, MARCH 1964

(By Denis F. Johnston, Division of Population and Labor Force Studies, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

The continuing increase in the educational attainment of American workers reflects both the growing supply of better educated entrants into the labor force and the rising demand for workers with high levels of technical skill and training.

This article is an account of the educational level of American workers as reported in March 1964, together with a description of postwar trends in their education in relation to their employment status and occupational distribution. The report includes some analysis of the relation between education and labor force participation and between education and income.[1]

[1] This article is based primarily on information from supplementary questions in the March 1964 monthly survey of the labor force, conducted for the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Bureau of the Census through its Current Population Survey. The data relate to the civilian noninstitutional population 18 years old and over (unless otherwise specified) in the calendar week ending March 14, 1964. Data for 1959 and earlier years exclude Alaska and Hawaii.

Previous survey findings were published in the Monthly Labor Review for February 1960, pp. 113–122, and May 1963, pp. 504–515. These reports were also reprinted with additional tabular material and explanatory notes as Special Labor Force Reports Nos. 1 and 30. Reprints of all articles in the series are available while the supply lasts upon request to the Bureau or any of its regional offices.

The results of earlier surveys on this subject were published by the Bureau of the Census in its Current Population Reports, Series P–50, Nos. 14, 49, and 78. Data on the educational attainment of the population in 1959 and 1962 appeared in Current Population Reports, Series P–20, Nos. 99 and 121. Similar data for March 1964 will be published in a forthcoming issue in the same series.

TRENDS IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Impressive gains have been made in the educational attainment of workers since 1940. The proportion of workers age 18 to 64 who have completed 4 years of high school or more has risen from 32 to 57 percent, while the proportion with 4 years of college or more has increased from below 6 to over 11 percent (table 1). These gains have not been restricted to the younger workers; every age-sex group has shared in the general educational upgrading that has taken place during this period.

TABLE 1.—*Educational attainment of the civilian labor force 18 to 64 years old, by age and sex, selected years, 1940–64*

Age group and year	Percent completing 4 years of high school or more			Percent completing 4 years of college or more		
	Both sexes	Male	Female	Both sexes	Male	Female
18 to 64 years:						
March 1964	57.3	54.8	61.9	11.2	12.1	9.5
March 1962	54.9	51.9	60.6	11.1	11.9	9.7
March 1959	50.9	47.8	57.0	9.7	10.5	8.2
March 1957	48.5	45.3	55.0	9.2	9.6	8.4
October 1952	44.5	41.2	51.4	8.1	8.3	7.7
April 1940	32.0	27.8	44.0	5.7	5.4	6.6
18 to 34 years:						
March 1964	68.6	65.9	73.5	11.5	12.5	9.7
March 1962	66.1	63.0	72.0	11.7	12.8	9.5
March 1959	61.9	58.3	69.2	10.2	11.5	7.4
October 1952	55.8	51.5	63.8	8.1	8.7	7.1
April 1940	40.5	35.5	51.3	5.4	5.2	5.9
35 to 44 years:						
March 1964	58.7	57.4	61.3	13.1	15.3	8.6
March 1962	57.4	55.4	61.4	12.7	14.4	9.5
March 1959	53.6	52.0	57.0	10.4	11.4	8.5
October 1952	46.0	44.4	49.4	8.8	9.0	8.4
April 1940	27.3	24.6	36.3	6.7	6.4	7.9
45 to 64 years:						
March 1964	45.6	42.5	51.2	9.7	9.7	9.8
March 1962	42.6	39.1	49.2	9.6	9.3	10.0
March 1959	38.0	34.5	44.9	8.9	8.9	8.8
October 1952	30.5	28.2	36.0	7.5	7.3	8.0
April 1940	21.6	19.5	30.8	5.5	5.1	7.2

Most recently, however, there has been evidence that the upgrading in education may be leveling off to some extent among women. Although the proportion of women completing 4 years of high school or more has continued to rise, the proportion with 4 years of college or more did not change significantly between March 1962 and March 1964. The recent slowing of the pace of educational upgrading among women workers may reflect the changing pattern of labor force participation of adult women. In the postwar period, the continuing rise in the number of college-educated workingwomen has been overshadowed by the even greater increase in the number of less-educated women workers, so that the overall educational level of working women has shown little change. This stability, together with the continuing rise in the educational levels of working men, has meant that the educational attainment of male workers has been approaching that of the women. Between 1940 and 1964, the proportion of workers with at least 4 years of high school nearly doubled among the men, while increasing by only about 40 percent among the women.

Young adults

In March 1964, two-thirds of the younger working men (age 18 to 34 years old) and nearly three-fourths of the younger working women had completed at least 4 years of high school. Further increases in these proportions can be anticipated in view of the greatly expanded efforts aimed at encouraging high school students to continue in school until graduation.

This upgrading reflects the long-term increases in the educational attainment of young adults in the population as a whole. In 1940, only two-fifths of the white population 25 to 29 years old had completed 4 years of high school or more, and only 14 percent had completed at least 1 year of college. By 1964, the former proportion had risen to nearly three-fourths, and the latter had nearly doubled. Even more rapid than the overall change has been the increase in the educational level of white men, who, in the 1940–64 period, increased their lead over white women in the proportion with some college education by a substantial margin. The men have also had sharper gains in the proportion completing at least 4 years of high school, so that the two sexes were about equal in this respect by 1964.

White and nonwhite workers

The gains in education have been even more striking among nonwhites. The proportion of nonwhites 25 to 29 years old completing at least 4 years of high school has quadrupled during the 1940–64 period, while the proportion completing at least 1 year of college has more than tripled. The corresponding increases among whites have been about 76 and 88 percent, respectively.

As impressive as these percentage gains may be, they should not obscure the fact that large numbers of American workers still have very limited amounts of formal schooling, and that the differences between whites and nonwhites in this respect are still large. In March 1964, about one-fourth of the white working men 18 years old and over and nearly half of the nonwhite working men had completed no more than 8 years of school. Among working women, the corresponding proportions were less than one-fifth among the white women and over one-

third among the nonwhites (table 2). The disparity between whites and nonwhites was equally great at the upper end of the educational scale. Among the whites, 13 percent of the male workers and 10 percent of the females had completed 4 years or more of college. The corresponding proportions among the nonwhite workers were only 6 and 5 percent, respectively.

TABLE 2.—*Educational attainment of the civilian labor force 18 years old and over, by color and sex, selected years, 1952–64*

[In percent]

Years of school completed and year	Both sexes			Male			Female		
	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite
Elementary—8 years or less: [1]									
March 1964	24.5	22.6	40.8	26.9	24.8	44.7	20.2	18.1	35.1
March 1962	27.0	24.7	45.2	29.6	27.2	50.5	21.8	19.5	37.6
March 1959	30.5	27.7	53.8	33.2	30.4	58.1	24.9	21.7	47.1
March 1957	33.4	30.5	57.6	[2]					[2]
October 1952	37.9	34.9	66.5	41.2	38.7	69.5	31.0	26.5	62.3
High school—4 years or more:									
March 1964	56.2	58.9	34.6	53.7	56.2	30.8	61.0	64.2	39.7
March 1962	53.8	56.6	31.5	50.8	53.5	27.3	59.4	62.7	37.6
March 1959	49.8	52.6	25.0	46.6	49.4	21.7	55.9	59.8	29.9
March 1957	47.3	50.1	22.7	[2]					[2]
October 1952	43.3	46.1	17.4	39.9	42.1	15.1	50.6	55.1	20.4
College—4 years or more:									
March 1964	11.1	11.8	5.8	12.1	12.7	6.0	9.5	10.1	5.2
March 1962	11.0	11.8	4.8	11.7	12.6	3.6	9.5	10.0	6.7
March 1959	9.7	10.3	4.0	10.5	11.2	3.6	8.0	8.6	4.7
March 1957	9.1	9.8	3.5	[2]					[2]
October 1952	8.0	8.6	2.6	8.1	8.6	1.9	7.7	8.3	3.6

[1] Includes persons reporting no school years completed.
[2] Not available.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P–50, Nos. 49 and 78 for 1952 and 1957 data, respectively; Special Labor Force Reports Nos. 1 and 30 for 1959 and 1962 data, respectively.

TABLE 3.—*Median years of school completed by the population 18 years old and over, by employment status and sex, selected years, 1952–64*

Month and year	Both sexes					Male					Female				
	Population	Labor force			Not in labor force	Population	Labor force			Not in labor force	Population	Labor force			Not in labor force
		Total	Employed	Unemployed			Total	Employed	Unemployed			Total	Employed	Unemployed	
March 1964	12.0	12.2	12.2	10.9	10.9	12.0	12.1	12.1	10.3	8.7	12.1	12.3	12.3	11.9	11.5
March 1962	11.9	12.1	12.1	10.6	10.7	11.6	12.0	12.1	10.0	8.7	12.0	12.2	12.3	11.5	11.2
March 1959	11.4	12.0	12.0	9.9	10.5	11.1	11.5	11.7	9.5	8.5	11.7	12.2	12.2	10.7	10.9
March 1957	11.0	11.6	11.7	9.4	10.2	10.7	11.1	11.2	8.9	8.5	11.4	12.1	12.1	10.4	10.7
October 1952	10.6	10.9	10.9	10.1	10.0	10.1	10.4	10.4	8.8	8.5	11.0	12.0	12.0	11.5	10.4

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Between October 1952 and March 1964, the median years of school completed by men in the civilian labor force rose from 10.4 to 12.1 (table 3 above). In the same period, the median for men who were not in the labor force failed to rise significantly, and remained below 9 years. This growing disparity reflects the retirement of older workers, among whom are concentrated a higher proportion of the less-educated workers.

The trends among women are the reverse of those among the men. As noted earlier, growing numbers of less-educated women have been entering the labor force during the postwar period. This inflow has been sufficient to hold the average educational attainment of all working women at a nearly stable level between 1952, when the median was 12.0 years, and 1964, when it was 12.3 years. In contrast, the median rose by about 1 year among all women in the population and also among those women who were not in the labor force. Thus, by 1964, the educational level of working women was not very much higher than that of women who were not in the labor force.

The educational gap between whites and nonwhites, as shown in the rise in median years of school completed, has narrowed perceptibly among males both in and out of the labor force, and among workingwomen. However, among women not in the labor force, the difference between the two races was about as large in 1964 as in 1952.

The disparity between the employed and the unemployed with respect to the median years of school completed has not shown an even trend. It rose sharply between 1952 and 1957 and since has narrowed perceptibly. A similar movement can be observed among both men and women workers. This trend cannot be interpreted fully without considering changes in the characteristics, and composition of the employed and the unemployed, particularly their age and educational distribution. Nevertheless, it is apparent that since 1957 the average increase in the educational attainment of the unemployed group has been sharper than that of the employed. One factor in this rise is the growing number of unemployed younger workers who would tend to have more schooling than their older counterparts. However, among the men at least, it is also possible that growing numbers of older unemployed workers with minimal amounts of education have been withdrawing from the labor force.

An examination of recent changes in the educational distribution of the employed and the unemployed sheds light on this question. Among white males, the educational distribution of the employed and the unemployed has remained practically unchanged between 1962 and 1964. Nearly 60 percent of the employed had completed at least 4 years of high school, while less than 40 percent of the unemployed had this much schooling (table 4).

A similar pattern is seen among white women; two-thirds of the employed and only about half of the unemployed had completed at least 4 years of high school. However, a noticeable increase is apparent between 1962 and 1964 in the proportion of unemployed white women who have had some college education.

Among nonwhite workers, the difference in education between the employed and the unemployed is not nearly so pronounced as among the whites. Only one-fourth of the unemployed nonwhite males had completed 4 years of high school or more in 1964, and the corresponding proportion among the employed was not much higher, barely one-third. The proportion with 8 years or less of elementary schooling was about the same for both employed and unemployed nonwhite males, and was actually higher among employed nonwhite females than among the unemployed. These findings suggest that the risks of unemployment are not reduced as sharply with rising educational levels among nonwhites as they are among whites.

It has been commonly recognized that unemployment declines as the level of education rises. In 1964, this pattern was clearly evident among white workers of each sex; the unemployment rate among college graduates was only about one-sixth as high as among those with less than 8 years of schooling (table 5). A similar pattern prevailed among white workers in all age groups. Among nonwhites, however, the rates of unemployment are generally found to be as high or higher among workers with intermediate amounts of formal schooling (i.e., 1 to 3 years of high school) as they are among the least educated. One of the reasons for this is that workers with somewhat more education may feel dissatisfied with unskilled and semiskilled occupations, but experience difficulty in finding and qualifying for more desirable work.

TABLE 4.—*Educational attainment of employed and unemployed persons 18 years old and over, by color and sex, March 1962 and 1964*

[Percent distribution]

Years of school completed and sex	White				Nonwhite			
	Employed		Unemployed		Employed		Unemployed	
	1964	1962	1964	1962	1964	1962	1964	1962
MALE								
Total:								
Number (thousands)	39,086	38,397	1,944	2,106	4,143	3,935	427	573
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 4 years of high school	42.9	45.6	61.7	63.9	68.5	71.7	75.1	79.6
Elementary:								
Less than 8 years	10.8	12.5	19.1	20.6	33.0	38.2	32.4	35.1
8 years	13.5	14.1	19.0	18.5	11.6	12.3	13.3	15.5
High school: 1 to 3 years	18.6	19.0	23.6	24.8	23.9	21.2	29.4	29.0
4 years of high school or more	57.1	54.4	38.3	36.1	31.5	28.3	24.9	20.4
High school: 4 years	32.7	30.2	26.2	24.5	19.3	18.6	17.7	16.9
College: 1 year or more	24.4	24.2	12.1	11.5	12.3	9.8	7.2	3.5
1 to 3 years	11.2	11.1	8.5	8.2	5.9	5.8	4.4	2.8
4 years or more	13.2	13.1	3.6	3.4	6.4	4.0	2.8	.7
FEMALE								
Total:								
Number (thousands)	20,034	18,916	1,148	1,032	2,802	2,691	342	338
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 4 years of high school	35.2	36.5	47.5	51.9	60.0	62.3	62.4	62.4
Elementary:								
Less than 8 years	6.9	7.7	11.6	11.0	24.6	27.1	21.2	19.8
8 years	10.8	11.5	11.9	12.2	11.4	11.1	7.9	12.4
High school: 1 to 3 years	17.5	17.3	24.0	28.7	24.0	24.1	33.2	30.2
4 years of high school or more	64.8	63.5	52.5	48.1	40.0	37.7	37.6	37.6
High school: 4 years	43.2	40.8	40.3	39.6	26.4	24.3	28.5	29.3
College: 1 year or more	21.6	22.6	12.2	8.4	13.6	13.3	9.1	8.3
1 to 3 years	11.1	12.3	9.0	6.2	7.7	6.1	9.1	5.3
4 years or more	10.5	10.4	3.2	2.2	5.9	7.2	----	3.0

TABLE 5.—*Unemployment rates of persons 18 years old and over, by age, color, sex, and years of school completed, March 1962 and 1964*

Color, sex, and years of school completed	Total, 18 and over		18 to 24 years		25 to 34 years		35 to 44 years		45 years and over	
	1964	1962	1964	1962	1964	1962	1964	1962	1964	1962
WHITE MALE										
Total	4.7	5.2	10.4	11.2	3.6	4.9	3.5	3.9	4.3	4.5
Elementary:										
8 years or less [1]	7.2	7.5	19.4	18.6	9.0	9.8	6.8	6.9	6.1	6.4
Less than 8 years [1]	8.1	8.3	16.8	21.0	9.5	10.1	8.4	7.7	7.0	7.2
8 years	6.5	6.7	21.4	16.7	8.6	9.5	5.4	6.2	5.4	5.5
High school:										
1 to 3 years	5.9	6.7	11.3	15.3	4.5	6.5	5.1	5.7	5.1	4.4
4 years or more	3.2	3.5	8.8	8.5	2.4	3.3	1.8	2.1	2.4	2.6
4 years	3.8	4.3	9.0	9.9	3.0	4.0	2.6	2.3	2.6	3.1
College:										
1 to 3 years	3.6	3.9	8.8	6.0	2.3	4.5	1.5	3.2	3.1	2.7
4 years or more	1.3	1.4	8.0	5.0	1.2	1.2	.6	1.0	1.1	1.4
WHITE FEMALE										
Total	5.4	5.2	8.6	9.2	6.1	5.6	5.2	4.7	4.0	3.6
Elementary:										
8 years or less [1]	7.1	6.2	16.0	17.4	7.8	8.4	10.6	6.7	5.3	5.0
Less than 8 years [1]	8.9	7.2	[2]	[2]	8.1	10.2	15.4	4.0	6.2	6.7
8 years	6.0	5.5	14.2	13.9	7.6	7.0	7.3	8.4	4.7	3.9
High school:										
1 to 3 years	7.3	8.3	17.0	17.3	7.4	9.2	7.4	7.5	3.9	5.1
4 years or more	4.5	4.0	6.6	7.0	5.6	4.3	3.2	3.5	3.3	2.2
4 years	5.1	5.0	7.2	8.2	6.4	5.2	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.2
College:										
1 to 3 years	4.5	2.7	6.8	5.5	5.8	3.7	3.1	1.8	3.1	1.4
4 years or more	1.7	1.2	2.3	.9	2.5	1.8	1.2	2.6	1.4	.1
NONWHITE MALE										
Total	9.4	12.7	15.1	18.3	9.8	11.2	8.3	12.5	7.3	11.6
Elementary: 8 years or less [1]	9.6	12.8	16.3	19.2	12.7	7.5	10.3	13.4	7.5	13.0
High school: 1 to 3 years	11.3	16.6	22.0	23.4	11.5	19.2	4.6	14.1	7.8	8.6
4 years of high school or more	7.6	9.5	8.8	12.7	6.9	8.0	8.5	9.9	6.3	8.0
NONWHITE FEMALE										
Total	10.8	11.2	25.8	24.0	11.3	12.0	6.8	8.9	6.1	6.0
Elementary: 8 years or less [1]	8.9	9.6	[2]	[2]	12.8	13.6	9.2	10.0	6.7	5.1
High school: 1 to 3 years	14.4	13.6	31.9	26.7	13.5	15.4	8.4	10.2	7.3	5.1
4 years of high school or more	10.2	11.1	23.2	19.2	9.6	9.2	3.6	6.8	3.8	9.3

[1] Includes persons reporting no school years completed.

[2] Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

There is no clearly discernible trend in the persistent gap between the unemployment rates of white and nonwhite workers. The nonwhite rates are about twice as high as the white rates for each sex, in most age groups, and at most educational levels. On the whole, both white and nonwhite male workers had some reduction in unemployment between 1962 and 1964. The sharp decline in the unemployment rate of nonwhite male high school graduates 18 to 24 years old was not matched in the corresponding group of whites. It is apparent that employment opportunities for the better educated young nonwhite males are improving. The employment situation has been less encouraging among women workers. The fluctuation in their rates of unemployment between 1962 and 1964 does not reveal any significant improvement, and the overall rates for both white and nonwhite women showed little change.

EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION

The workers in every major occupation group have shared in the substantial upgrading in educational levels which occurred in the 1952–64 period. Furthermore, the changes observed in the brief 1962–64 period suggest that this pervasive upgrading is continuing at present. In general, the proportion of employed male workers with 8 years of elementary school of less has declined from about 41 to 26 percent in the 12-year period, while the corresponding decline among employed women has been from 31 to 20 percent (table 6).

By March 1964, a majority of the workers employed in every major occupation group had completed at least 9 years of school, with the sole exception of those in farm occupations, where a slight majority had completed only 8 years or less. Workers in the farm occupations were also unique in showing a slight decrease in their educational attainment between 1962 and 1964. The continuing decline in the number of farm workers is undoubtedly a factor in this downturn, since movement off the farms occurs more frequently among younger, more highly educated workers.

TABLE 6.—*Educational attainment of employed persons 18 years old and over, by sex and major occupation group, October 1952 and March 1962 and 1964*

Major occupation group	Male						Major occupation group	Female					
	Percent completing 8 years of elementary school or less [1]			Percent completing 4 years of high school or more				Percent completing 8 years of elementary school or less [1]			Percent completing 4 years of high school or more		
	March 1964 [2]	March 1962 [2]	October 1952 [2]	March 1964 [2]	March 1962 [2]	October 1952 [2]		March 1964 [2]	March 1962 [2]	October 1952 [2]	March 1964 [2]	March 1962 [2]	October 1952 [2]
All occupations	26.2	28.8	41.0	54.7	52.0	40.1	All occupations	19.9	21.7	31.2	61.8	60.3	50.8
Professional and managerial workers	9.7	10.9	16.5	81.4	78.4	71.1	Professional and managerial workers	5.3	6.6	10.4	87.8	86.0	81.3
Clerical and sales workers	10.9	11.7	17.2	75.1	74.2	65.8	Clerical workers	4.2	5.4	5.9	84.6	81.9	80.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	29.0	31.3	41.3	46.1	43.4	34.0	Sales workers	16.4	20.8	23.1	60.1	55.0	53.1
Operatives and kindred workers	33.5	38.7	50.4	37.8	33.5	24.3	Manual occupations [5]	39.6	40.8	46.2	31.2	30.3	26.3
Service workers [3]	38.3	39.7	53.3	40.0	37.2	27.3	Service workers [3]	37.2	40.2	53.9	35.5	34.5	25.1
Laborers, except farm and mine	47.4	51.5	67.4	26.5	25.0	16.6	Farm occupations [4]	50.5	52.5	71.7	28.9	30.4	14.6
Farm occupations [4]	57.9	57.8	67.1	26.5	27.7	20.7							

[1] Including persons reporting no school years completed.
[2] Data for 1952 include only persons 18 years old and over reporting on years of school completed; in 1962 and 1964, data for persons not reporting years of school completed were imputed according to the pattern for similar individuals who reported on this item.
[3] Including private household workers.
[4] Includes farmers, and managers, foremen, and laborers on farms.
[5] Includes craftsmen, operatives, nonfarm laborers, and kindred workers.

The increase between March 1959 and March 1964 in the general educational level of white male workers is evident in all broad occupation groups, with the greatest relative gain occurring in the service occupations (table 7). On the other hand, among nonwhite males, the increase in the proportion of workers with 4 years of high school or more was heavily concentrated in the blue-collar occupations, where it nearly doubled in this brief period. The proportion of nonwhite males with this much education has actually declined in both the service and farm occupations, and has risen only slightly in the white-collar occupations.

Among white women, the proportion of workers with 4 years of high school or more has increased in all broad occupation groups except farming, with the sharpest rise occurring in the service occupations. Among nonwhite women, the overall increase in the proportion of high school graduates was relatively greater than among the white women, and was spread among all of the broad occupation groups.

The nonwhite males are still at a considerable educational disadvantage in all of the broad occupation groups as compared with white males. In contrast, white and nonwhite women workers in white-collar occupations have about the same proportions with at least 4 years of high school. In the blue-collar occupations, nonwhite women are substantially ahead of white women in this respect, while lagging behind only in the service occupations.

Although the proportion of workers with relatively little schooling (8 years or less) is declining rapidly in all occupation groups except the farm occupations, these less-educated workers are still widely distributed among all of the broad occupation groups. Between 1959 and 1964, there was little change in the occupational distribution of white male workers with 8 years or less of schooling. About three-fifths of these workers were in blue-collar occupations in both years. The proportion of nonwhite males in the service occupations with 8 years or less of schooling increased substantially, while declining in the blue-collar occupations.

TABLE 7.—*Employed persons 18 years old and over, by color, sex, occupation group, and years of school completed, March 1959 and 1964*

[Percent distribution]

Color, sex, and years of school completed	Total employed		White-collar occupations [1]		Blue-collar occupations [2]		Service occupations [3]		Farm occupations [4]	
	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]
WHITE MALE										
Total:										
Number (in thousands)	39,086	37,230	16,600	14,793	17,524	16,941	2,372	2,034	2,590	3,462
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	24.3	29.7	9.8	13.0	32.1	37.4	34.6	40.3	55.3	57.5
High school:										
1 to 3 years	18.6	19.9	10.3	12.4	26.6	26.9	20.9	23.2	15.5	15.8
4 years or more	57.1	50.4	79.9	74.7	41.4	35.7	44.5	36.4	29.2	26.8
NONWHITE MALE										
Total:										
Number (in thousands)	4,143	3,597	700	453	2,395	2,150	685	495	363	499
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	44.5	58.3	17.0	19.9	45.9	64.3	51.1	45.6	76.3	79.7
High school:										
1 to 3 years	24.0	19.7	14.4	12.8	27.7	22.0	24.5	23.8	16.5	11.8
4 years or more	31.4	22.1	68.5	67.3	26.4	13.8	24.4	30.7	7.2	8.4

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Employed persons 18 years old and over, by color, sex, occupation group, and years of school completed, March 1959 and 1964*—Continued

[Percent distribution]

Color, sex, and years of school completed	Total employed		White-collar occupations [1]		Blue-collar occupations [2]		Service occupations [3]		Farm occupations [4]	
	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]	1964	1959 [5]
WHITE FEMALE										
Total:										
Number (in thousands)	20,034	17,539	12,550	10,764	3,437	3,004	3,618	3,212	429	559
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	17.7	21.2	6.0	7.9	39.9	41.5	33.3	41.3	47.1	52.6
High school:										
1 to 3 years	17.5	17.9	11.4	12.2	29.8	30.3	26.6	25.6	21.2	15.9
4 years or more	64.8	60.9	82.6	79.8	30.3	28.2	40.0	33.0	31.6	31.6
NONWHITE FEMALE										
Total:										
Number (in thousands)	2,802	2,426	613	431	439	358	1,701	1,553	49	84
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	(7)	(7)
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	35.8	47.3	5.9	13.2	36.4	44.7	45.2	55.2	----------	----------
High school:										
1 to 3 years	24.1	22.1	10.3	9.5	24.8	29.6	29.2	24.5	----------	----------
4 years or more	40.0	30.6	83.9	77.2	38.8	25.7	25.5	20.3	----------	----------

	March 1964					March 1959 [5]				
	Total employed	White-collar occupations [1]	Blue-collar occupations [2]	Service occupations [3]	Farm occupations [4]	Total employed	White-collar occupations [1]	Blue-collar occupations [2]	Service occupations [3]	Farm occupations [4]
WHITE MALE										
Total	100.0	42.5	44.8	6.1	6.6	100.0	39.8	45.4	5.5	9.3
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	100.0	17.1	59.1	8.7	15.1	100.0	17.4	57.1	7.5	18.0
High school:										
1 to 3 years	100.0	23.5	64.2	6.8	5.5	100.0	24.8	61.4	6.4	7.4
4 years or more	100.0	59.4	32.5	4.7	3.4	100.0	58.9	32.2	4.0	4.9
NONWHITE MALE										
Total	100.0	16.9	57.8	16.5	8.8	100.0	12.5	59.6	13.8	14.2
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	100.0	6.4	59.6	19.0	15.0	100.0	4.2	64.7	10.6	20.5
High school:										
1 to 3 years	100.0	10.2	66.9	16.9	6.0	100.0	8.3	68.3	17.1	6.4
4 years or more	100.0	36.8	48.4	12.8	2.0	100.0	38.7	37.9	19.6	3.8
WHITE FEMALE										
Total	100.0	62.6	17.2	18.1	2.1	100.0	61.3	17.1	18.4	3.2
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	100.0	21.5	38.8	34.1	5.7	100.0	22.9	33.5	35.7	7.9
High school:										
1 to 3 years	100.0	40.7	29.2	27.5	2.6	100.0	42.0	29.0	26.2	2.8
4 years or more	100.0	79.8	8.0	11.2	1.0	100.0	80.5	7.9	10.0	1.6
NONWHITE FEMALE										
Total	100.0	21.9	15.7	60.7	1.7	100.0	17.7	14.6	64.2	3.5
Elementary: 8 years or less [6]	100.0	3.6	15.9	76.5	4.0	100.0	5.0	13.8	75.1	6.1
High school:										
1 to 3 years	100.0	9.3	16.1	73.5	1.0	100.0	7.6	19.4	70.9	2.0
4 years or more	100.0	45.8	15.2	38.9	.2	100.0	44.6	12.3	42.6	.5

[1] Includes professional, technical, managerial, clerical, and sales workers.
[2] Includes craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and laborers, except farm and mine.
[3] Includes private household workers.
[4] Includes farmers and farm managers, foremen, and laborers.
[5] Excludes persons not reporting years of school completed.
[6] Includes persons reporting no school years completed.
[7] Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

The chief differences in the occupational distribution of less-educated workers are seen among women workers. About three-fourths of the nonwhite women with 8 years or less of schooling were concentrated in the service occupations in 1964. In contrast, only about one-third of the white women with this much schooling were in service occupations, while nearly two-fifths were in blue-collar occupations. One-fifth of the white women were in white-collar occupations, as compared with only 4 percent of the nonwhite women with this much schooling.

The most important changes in the last 5 years in the occupational distribution of the better educated workers (those with 4 years of high school or more) have occurred among nonwhite workers, particularly the men, where the proportion of high school graduates in the service occupations has declined sharply, while rising very sharply in the blue-collar occupations. As a result of these movements, the difference in educational distribution between white and nonwhite workingmen has been reduced considerably in the blue-collar occupations, whereas it has increased in the service occupations and remained about the same in the white-collar occupations.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

The increased labor force participation of women has been a major factor in reshaping the composition of the labor force in the years since World War II. Between 1947 and 1964, the number of men 14 years old and over in the total labor force increased by about 15 percent, while the corresponding gain among women amounted to over 50 percent. In numerical terms, a net gain of 6.4 million male workers was accompanied by an increase of 8.9 million workingwomen.

Between 1959 and 1964, the increases in women's labor force participation rates have been concentrated among the married group, where gains have occurred at every educational level. The highest rates of labor force participation are found among single women (never married) followed by women of other marital status (widowed, divorced, or separated), with married women (with husband present) having the lowest rates. The increased participation of the married women, together with the slight reduction in the rates for women in the other marital status categories, has reduced these differences somewhat, particularly among the less-educated women.

At the same time, some divergence is apparent in the participation rates of women who are at opposite ends of the educational scale. This is most apparent among women in the "other marital status" group where the rates for the least educated declined by 6 percentage points and those of the most educated rose by 3 points between 1959 and 1964. Since the less-educated women in this group would tend to be older, the decline in their labor force participation may be a reflection of normal patterns of retirement.

The rise in the participation rates of the "married—husband present" group may reflect in part the growing expenses related to

the education of children approaching high school and college age.

Recent trends in the labor force participation rates of white married women (with husband present) suggest the importance of such factors as presence and age of children, husband's income, and wife's education in promoting or inhibiting labor force activity. (See table 8.) The presence of children under 6 is clearly an inhibiting factor, regardless of the wife's education or her husband's income. However, the better educated mothers are more likely to enter the labor force if the husband's income is low, despite the presence of young children. This would occur, for example, when the husband is still in school. Higher labor force activity is also generally associated with greater education among married women at all income levels. This association is weaker where the husband's income is relatively high ($6,000 and over) and children under 18 are present. The husband's income appears to exert a significant downward pull on the labor force participation of the wife, unless there are no children under 18.

TABLE 8.—*Percent of white married couples with wife in paid labor force, by presence and age of own children, husband's income in preceding year, and education of wife, March 1959 and 1964*

Presence and age of children and husband's income in preceding year	Education of wife					
	Elementary, 8 years or less [1]		High school, 1 to 4 years		College, 1 year or more	
	1964	1959	1964	1959	1964	1959
No children of their own under 18 years:						
Less than $3,000	13.6	19.3	37.4	41.5	50.0	49.7
$3,000 to $5,999	24.7	29.0	43.9	49.4	56.6	55.1
$6,000 and over	21.9	16.7	40.8	34.0	47.0	34.7
Children of their own 6 to 17 years only:						
Less than $3,000	29.8	39.1	48.8	54.3	(2)	(2)
$3,000 to $5,999	41.6	31.2	45.6	45.8	60.9	60.8
$6,000 and over	26.8	27.2	35.1	28.3	35.3	30.8
Some children of their own under 6 years:						
Less than $3,000	19.4	17.4	24.5	26.3	37.4	(2)
$3,000 to $5,999	25.6	12.7	23.9	18.1	29.1	27.7
$6,000 and over	15.4	6.2	14.2	11.2	18.0	11.8

[1] Includes wives reporting no years of school completed.
[2] Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

The major change which has taken place in the working activity of the men has been the continuing decline in labor force participation among older men. Some withdrawal of older men from the labor force is particularly apparent among the less educated between 1957 and 1964. The rates of labor force participation have declined among the less-educated men 45 to 64 years old, while remaining constant among the more-educated men in this age group. The rates among men 65 years old and over have declined markedly at all educational levels, suggesting that the overall drop in their labor force rates cannot be attributed to educational deficiencies alone. But in this group also, the sharpest decline in rates occurred among the least educated. The rate for those with less than 5 years of schooling declined by 13 percentage points, while the decline among the college graduate group was only 6 percentage points from 1957 to 1964.

Very different trends are apparent in the labor force rates of women. Among older adult women (45 to 64 years old), the substantial increase in labor force participation has extended throughout the educational spectrum, with the notable exception of women with less than 5 years of schooling.

However, the increase among women with 5 to 8 years of schooling has been much less impressive than the gains among women with more schooling. It is too early to determine whether the leveling of the rate between 1962 and 1964 for college graduate women in this age group represents a temporary stabilization or an approach toward a relatively fixed upper limit, determined by the competition of continuing household responsibilities and other noneconomic interests which many of the women in this age group share. The rates for women 65 years old and over have fluctuated near the 10-percent level throughout most of the postwar period without showing any significant trends.

In summary, there is some evidence that persons with minimal amounts of schooling have been withdrawing from the labor force during the 1952–64 and 1957–64 periods; however, the bulk of these withdrawals has been concentrated among older males, where the operation of other factors, such as disability and voluntary retirement, must also be given weight.

EDUCATION AND INCOME

Recent trends in the median annual income of persons with different amounts of schooling indicate the very wide range of monetary reward that is associated with educational differences. In both 1958 and 1963, the median income of males with less than 8 years of schooling amounted to only 33 percent of the median for males with 1 year or more of college (table 9). A similar ratio can be observed among women workers, although the less-educated women appear to have made a slight improvement relative to the more educated women during the 1958–63 period.[2]

The position of the less-educated white male worker did not change significantly between 1958 and 1963 relative to the more educated white. Both groups showed about the same rise in income. Among nonwhites, however, the least educated group registered a slight gain relative to the most educated. Among women workers, an opposite trend is evident: the percentage increase in income for less-educated white women was greater than for the most educated, but among nonwhite women, the opposite was true.

The median income of nonwhite males, expressed as a percentage of the medians for white males with corresponding amounts of formal schooling, shows little change between 1958 and 1963. Nonwhites had about two-thirds as much income as whites, on the average, in both 1958 and 1963.

There is no discernible pattern to these white-nonwhite income differentials; their fluctuation does not reveal any clear-cut tendency for the relative income of nonwhites to improve either over time or at higher levels of education.[3]

TABLE 9.—*Median income of males 14 years old and over with income, by color and years of school completed, 1958 and 1963*

Color and year	Years of school completed				
	Elementary		High school		College, 1 year or more
	Less than 8 years [1]	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	
Total:					
1958	$1,905	$3,214	$3,594	$4,548	$5,702
1963	$2,194	$3,610	$3,902	$5,482	$6,674
Percent change, 1958–63	15.2	12.3	8.6	20.5	17.0
White:					
1958	$2,076	$3,276	$3,774	$4,654	$5,810
1963	$2,408	$3,749	$4,150	$5,600	$6,829
Percent change, 1958–63	16.0	14.4	10.0	20.3	17.5
Nonwhite					
1958	$1,447	$2,328	$2,224	$2,994	$3,679
1963	$1,731	$2,740	$2,459	$3,821	$4,070
Percent change, 1958–63	19.6	17.7	10.6	27.6	10.6
Nonwhite as a percent of white:					
1958	69.7	71.1	58.9	64.3	63.3
1963	71.9	73.1	59.3	68.2	59.6

[1] Includes persons reporting no school years completed.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," Series P-60, No. 33 (1960), table 26 and No. 43 (1964), table 21. All income data are expressed in current dollars.

Data from the 1960 Census of Population permit a closer look at these differentials. The median earnings of white and nonwhite males in six selected age-education-occupation categories are shown in table 10. These comparisons show that the median earnings of nonwhite males appear to average close to 70 percent of the white medians. However, the relative position of nonwhites is again quite similar at different levels of education and age, and only approaches the white level among the older clerical group, where the number of men is quite small. The lower relative earnings of older nonwhites in the professional and technical occupations may reflect the greater concentration of these men in the less remunerative occupations, such as social work, teaching, and the ministry.[4] In general, these comparisons suggest that education exerts a strong upward force on the earnings of both nonwhites and whites, but it does not reduce the gap between the two color groups. In absolute dollars, this gap widens from about $700 among younger laborers to about $1,600 among younger professional and technical workers, and from $1,000 to $3,000 among older workers in the same occupation groups.

[2] The estimated lifetime earnings of men display a similar range, from $143,000 for a man with less than 8 years of schooling to $247,000 for the high school graduate, and $417,000 for the man completing 4 years or more of college. See Herman P. Miller, "Education: An Advantage for a Lifetime," Occupational Outlook Quarterly, December 1963, pp. 1–4. Cf. Miller's article in Economics of Higher Education (U.S. Office of Education, 1962), ch. 9, pp. 129–146. The limitations of this kind of estimate are aptly summarized in H. S. Houthakker, "Education and Income," Review of Economics and Statistics, February 1959, pp. 24–28.

[3] These comparisons must be viewed with caution, because they reflect a host of factors whose influence is indeterminate. These would include differences in hours worked, in the amount of income other than earnings, to age and job experience, in the quality of schooling received, plus individual differences in ability, motivation, and the like. A recent study of the significance of same of these factors in explaining observed income differences between whites and Negroes is Alan B. Batchelder, "Decline in the Relative Income of Negro Men," Quarterly Journal of Economics, November 1964, pp. 525–548.

[4] In 1960, 35 percent of the nonwhite male professional, technical, and kindred workers in the experienced civilian labor force were clergymen, social workers, or teachers below the college level, compared with 16 percent among the corresponding white males.

TABLE 10.—*Median earnings of men in the experienced civilian labor force, by color, for selected ages, occupation groups, and levels of educational attainment, 1959*

Occupation group and educational attainment	25 to 34 years			45 to 54 years		
	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as percent of white	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as percent of white
Professional, technical, and kindred workers with 1 year of college or more	$6,209	$4,573	73.7	$8,877	$5,725	64.5
Clerical and kindred workers with 4 years of high school	5,071	4,117	81.2	5,689	4,969	87.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers with 4 years of high school	5,715	4,174	73.0	6,072	4,412	72.7
Operatives and kindred workers with 1 to 3 years of high school	4,736	3,339	70.5	5,169	3,886	75.2
Service workers, including private household, with 8 years of elementary school	3,659	2,434	66.5	3,964	2,924	73.8
Laborers, except farm and mine, with less than 8 years of elementary school	2,878	2,164	75.2	3,340	2,395	71.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, "Educational Attainment," PC(2)-5B, tables 9 and 10.

EDUCATION AND LABOR DEMAND

The impressive rise in the educational attainment of American workers in the postwar period has been accompanied by a rise in the demand for highly skilled workers and less demand for the least skilled and educated. This has given rise to considerable speculation as to the relation between the supply of educated workers and demand factors. One approach to this question has been to determine whether the overall rise in educational attainment has been uniform in all major occupation groups, or whether it has been concentrated in those occupations which require the highest levels of training. In their study of employed white males 35 to 44 years old, Nam and Folger found strong evidence in support of the view that the increases have been widely distributed among the several occupations.[5] It was estimated that about 85 percent of the rise in the educational attainment of these workers between 1940 and 1960 occurred within occupations, while only 15 percent reflected a movement of workers into occupations requiring more formal schooling. This finding suggests that much of the upgrading in workers' education has been a reflection of rising educational levels in the population as a whole. Although anticipated demand for highly skilled workers in specific occupations undoubtedly motivates many students and adults to undertake special courses of study, the major impact of mass education is exerted on the population prior to particular career choices.

Whether or not the changing demand for workers has provided impetus and direction to the pursuit of education, the tremendous rise in educational levels has had a profound effect upon our educational expectations. According to Nam and Folger, the proportion of men with 4 years or more of college in 1960 was nearly as large as the proportion with 4 years of high school or more in 1910. It is difficult to gage this change in expectations, but it is apparent in the increased proportions of young people who remain in school through high school and in the rapid rise in the proportions of high school students who express a desire to pursue higher education.[6]

The possibility that this change in expectations is affecting the labor market gives rise to a further question: To what extent does the rising demand for highly educated workers reflect growing needs for specific skills, and to what extent does it reflect a general upgrading of standards apart from specific job performance requirements? The evidence bearing on this question is far from conclusive; one careful study of occupational trends in the 1950 decade suggests that the college-educated males are tending toward a greater concentration in the professions while those with less schooling are being more widely dispersed among nonprofessional white-collar and blue-collar occupations.[7] Although the magnitude of these shifts is generally quite small, they suggest that the educational expectations of employers may be rising with the general upgrading of educational levels. Given a growing supply of better educated workers, employers may adjust their own expectations upward.

An estimate of the actual need for additional highly educated workers resulting from shifting occupational demands during the 1940 decade was made by R. S. Eckaus. While the author is keenly aware of the limitations of the data available for this kind of study, he estimated that the rise in the proportion of college graduates in that decade about kept pace with the growing need for workers with that much education, but the proportion with 4 years of high school or more increased considerably faster than the actual need for workers with that amount of schooling.[8]

These strands of evidence suggest that an individual's job prospects, assuming that he possesses some basic minimum of formal education, depend more upon his relative educational attainment than upon his absolute level of schooling. The high school dropout may encounter difficulty in finding a job not because the job he seeks requires the training implied in the completion of high school, but because a growing proportion of his fellow jobseekers have their high school diplomas in hand.[9] To the extent that the rise in educational levels is accompanied by a parallel rise in educational expectations, the plight of the less-educated unemployed workers is bound to worsen.

[5] John K. Folger and Charles B. Nam, "Trends in Education in Relation to the Occupational Structure," Sociology of Education, fall 1964, pp. 19–33.

[6] Some of the implications of this revolution in educational expectations are traced in Martin Trow, "The Democratization of Higher Education in America," to be published in a forthcoming issue of the European Journal of Sociology.

[7] James A. Davis, "Higher Education: Selection and Opportunity," the School Review, autumn 1963, pp. 249–265.

[8] R. S. Eckaus, "Economic Criteria for Education and Training," the Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1964, pp. 181–190.

[9] A brief discussion of the impact of professionalization on the educational expectations of personnel managers, and its effect on employment opportunities, is Oscar Ornati, "Affluence and the Risk of Poverty," Social Research, autumn 1964, pp. 333–346.

JOHN DEMPSEY, GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday the New York Times published a biographical profile of Connecticut's able and effective Governor, John Dempsey.

The Times headlined its article "Jovial Governor." John Dempsey is that; but he is far more. I have known Governor Dempsey for many years. I have worked closely with him, during his many years of public service. He has always been deeply concerned with the people of Connecticut and their problems. Governor Dempsey is a warm and friendly man, dedicated to the welfare of Connecticut and its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article, entitled "Jovial Governor—John Noel Dempsey," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOVIAL GOVERNOR—JOHN NOEL DEMPSEY

A few days ago, Gov. John Noel Dempsey, of Connecticut, commented that a friend had told him he was moving from a small town in the southeastern corner of the State to Stamford to take a job as an assistant vice president at $41,000 a year. "Gee," said the Governor, "I didn't know they paid salaries like that in plants around here." The statement was typical in its openness and its mild naivete and good humor of the 50-year-old Democrat's easy way of talking. The preface is one of his favorite terms—"Gee."

But apart from that, the sentiment of the remark may have come straight from the hip pocket, which is where the Governor keeps his wallet.

In the eyes of many that wallet has not been oversupplied by the State. But yesterday, the State assembly voted a raise in the Governor's pay, from $15,000 to $35,000 a year, effective January 1, 1967. Mr. Dempsey signed the bill, but he will have to win another term to get the money.

Then, to take one step up politically, he took three steps down financially. Governor RIBICOFF asked him to run for Lieutenant Governor. He did, and won, and his reward was a $10,000 a year pay cut. The Lieutenant Governor's salary was $5,000 a year.

The chief key to Mr. Dempsey's personality and manner seems to be that he is a man who likes to be liked fully as ardently as he despises to be disliked.

"He is a worrier," one capital observer said. "He doesn't want to make people unhappy, and he worries when things are controversial."

At his plainly furnished office, the Governor sits with his back to a high window, looking across his desk and over a conference table with seven leather chairs just in front of his desk.

MARK TWAIN ADVICE

In one corner of the office there is a bust of John F. Kennedy on a pedestal. On Mr. Dempsey's desk there is a small, gold-lettered plaque bearing 14 words of advice by Mark Twain:

"Always do right," it reads. "This will astound some of the people and gratify the rest."

Mr. Dempsey is a warm, very outgoing, sometimes self-effacing man. He stands 5 feet 10 and looks robust at 178 pounds. He has dark hair, hazel eyes, and a strongly figured countenance that suggests his Irish origin. He was born January 3, 1915, in the

town of Cahir in County Tipperary. He went to Putnam, Conn., as a boy of 10.

There is a bit of Irish jocularity in him yet, and aids say that no matter how much tension and pressure are on him, he is always able to lighten it with a quip, usually something extraneous to the matter at hand.

One observer says he is never crochety, never angry, and about like a "friendly parish priest type." He is a work-at-it Roman Catholic who attends mass at the Cathedral of St. Joseph in Hartford and likes to take strolls with his wife, Mary, after the service. His oldest son, Edward, 23, is a seminarian in his last year at St. Sultice Seminary in Issy, just outside Paris, France, studying for priestly orders. His daughter, Margaret, 18, graduated last night from the Northwest Catholic High School. The Governor likes to go duckpin bowling with his two younger boys, John, 19, and Levin, 16.

Mr. Dempsey has a long-time interest in the Boy Scouts. His father, the late Edward Dempsey, was a sergeant major in the British Army in the Boer War under the command of Lord Baden-Powell, founder of the Boy Scout movement, and he kept in touch with the founder after his Army service. On 1 busy week during the legislative session that ended yesterday, Mr. Dempsey went out and made speeches at two Boy Scout functions.

The Governor attended public schools in Putnam, Conn., but did not finish the bachelor's course at Providence College, choosing instead to run for alderman when he was 22 years old. He won and was reelected four times. In 1947 he became mayor of Putnam, a small manufacturing city in the northeastern part of the State, and was elected six times.

He played baseball, football, and soccer in school and later played semiprofessional basketball and professional soccer. For years he kept in shape by running up and down court as a referee at high school basketball games. In 1959 he injured a leg when he attempted to play the game again and hobbled through most of the legislative session that year.

END OF A GREAT AGE—FAREWELL TO 327 YEARS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to read an article with a special flavor that catches a time, an era, or an event. This is very well demonstrated in an article written by Jack Zaiman, one of Connecticut's leading political reporters, and published in the Hartford Courant, of June 10, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent 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:

END OF A GREAT AGE—FAREWELL TO 327 YEARS

(By Jack Zaiman)

There was a touch of Auld Lang Syne, of remembrances of things past, of the glories of a great colonial era, as a memorable age came to an end at the State capitol Wednesday night.

As the 294 members of the house of representatives, amid scenes of emotion, nostalgia, and goodbyes, walked out of the huge, high-ceilinged, steaming hot chamber, out with them, hand in hand, went the end of the oldest form of continuing government in the United States and perhaps the world.

This was the last regular session of the general assembly under a system that began in 1638 with the writing of the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the first constitution written by freemen anywhere in the world.

OLDTIMERS AGHAST

No wonder, then, that history looked on as town-by-town representation in the assembly which started with the fundamental orders in the three original towns of Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield, came to a dramatic end. It was no wonder that oldtimers, and even young-timers, just stood around and looked as if they had lost their world. For they had.

The towns are out, and the districts are in. The king is dead—long live the king. The 294 representatives from the towns are being reduced to 177 representatives from districts. Many of those who left the capitol Wednesday night walked away, not only from their seats, but from politics and government. They are through, reapportioned out of existence by the U.S. Supreme Court.

"How can you miss not having a sense of nostalgia?" asked State Representative L. Richard Belden, of West Hartford, who has been on the scene for 35 years. He was executive secretary to the late Gov. James L. McConaughy, and former Gov. James C. Shannon, back in 1947 and 1948.

In 1931 Attorney Joseph P. Cooney was a State senator. He, too, was filled with memories as he marched up and down the capitol corridors. He was sorry to see the 327-year system go. "Grassroots democracy is at an end," he said. "The representatives now will be far removed from representing their neighbors and friends."

So it went up and down the old capitol building.

There were oldtimers like Representative Morris Hogan, of Burlington, the crusty, sharp-tongued spokesman for the small towns. And Representative Benjamin L. Barringer, of New Milford, another of the smalltown leaders. Representative Claude Watrous, of Chester. Representative Rubin Cohen, of Colchester. It made no difference whether they were Republicans or Democrats. They all felt the same.

WHO WILL SURVIVE

What would the new era be like? Who would come back? Who would survive when the 294 fell to 177? How strange would be a house of representatives controlled regularly by Democrats, as is possible under the new system?

Who would be the new leaders? For the top men on both sides of the house are not expected to be running again. The men as well as the system are changing.

In the senate, things weren't as bad as downstairs in the house. But nostalgia crept all over the upper chamber, too. Who would survive in the changing of the 36 district lines? Hartford's three senators would become two. Who was out?

John M. Bailey, the Democratic State and National chairman who has been on the legislative scene since the early 1930's talked about old times, too.

Bailey refers to politics as a "ball game."

Again he used the term Wednesday night as he watched, and had a hand in, in the windup.

"It's a new ball game," he said.

They were in no hurry Wednesday night to adjourn the house and the senate.

They were exhausted, perspiring, emotional, sad, talkative, reticent, tearful, unhappy. Take your pick. Each had his own private world.

Tired and worn as the lawmakers were, they were going through a great mass experience as the legislative windup came. They were all in this together, and together they were going down. The obituary was being written, but they were dying hard.

"If I don't see you," said one of the tear-stained women lawmakers, "I'll see you some time."

It didn't make sense, but everybody knew what she meant.

So came the end of 317 straight years of Connecticut's smalltown system of house representation. The gavels came down, as they always do at the end of a legislative session. This time they came down to end not only a session, but a system, an era, and an age, 1638–1965.

GILL ROBB WILSON HONORED IN WEST VIRGINIA—WOOD COUNTY AIRPORT DEDICATED TO ONE OF AMERICA'S FINEST AIRMEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Gill Robb Wilson is a West Virginian who has devoted his entire life to the field of aviation. For 40 years he has been at the forefront of those who seek to extend man's dominion over the skies and space. Today at the age of 72 he continues to be a significant factor in the development of aviation thought and policy, and is a successful and respected member of the business community.

Now editor and publisher of Flying magazine, Gill Robb Wilson flew with the famous Escadrille 66 during World War I, and later with U.S. Second Army Day Bombardment.

As a close friend of Gen. Billy Mitchell, he shared the belief that airpower was to be the key to future military success. He has pursued that belief during subsequent years of challenge and growth.

A brief glance at his achievements reveals a man of boundless energy and amazing capacity.

He chaired the first aeronautics committee of the American Legion; sparked the first national airport survey; was four times president of the National Aeronautics Association; a member of the committee that formed the civil pilot training program; a cofounder of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association; member of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board; founder and organizer of the Civil Air Patrol. He has delivered more than 4,000 lectures on airpower in the United States and abroad. His participation in special missions and projects, both military and civil, are multitudinous. He has been consultant to the Air Force, to the Department of Commerce, and he was State director of aviation of New Jersey for 15 years.

Gill served as World War II correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune covering every area of conflict from Europe and Africa to Australia and New Guinea. He has worked in 67 different countries and has friendships with airmen throughout the world.

Mr. Wilson has served as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Air University, as president and chairman of the board of the Air Force Association, and vice president of the Air Force Historical Foundation. He is one of two permanent lecturers at the Air Command and Staff School, and is chairman of the board of the Space Education Foundation.

Among awards and citations, Mr. Wilson holds the French Croixe de Guerre, the Distinguished Service Medals of the States of New Jersey and West Virginia; the Distinguished Service Award of the Air University and the Exceptional Service Award of the Air Force.

Mr. President, I am gratified to report that on Wednesday, June 2, 1965, the citizens of Parkersburg, W. Va., gave appropriate recognition to the contributions of

a true aviation pioneer by rededicating the Wood County Airport as Gill Robb Wilson Field. It is my distinct privilege to deliver the principal address and to join with others in a tribute to one who has achieved much for aviation in the United States and the world.

The invocation was offered on that date by Robert I. Baker, associate minister of the First United Presbyterian Church, who, in his prayer, said:

Almighty God, in an age when we can fly hundreds of miles per hour, we would remember that You have created the very time in which we live. At a period of history when we are performing spectacular and incredible feats in space, we need to remind ourselves that You have constructed the entire universe and are not limited in any way by the phenomenon which we call space. In a day when we are so impressed by human accomplishments, we need to realize that You have fashioned man himself from the dust of the earth by a power which makes our largest rockets seem utterly feeble by comparison.

Master of ceremonies at the dedication was the chamber of commerce president, Richard S. Cotterman, who introduced the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, Governor of West Virginia. In his official welcome of the guests to Parkersburg and to West Virginia, Governor Smith said in part:

The citizens of Parkersburg and Wood County could have chosen no finer tribute than to name this airfield after one of our own pioneers in aviation.

And there could be no more appropriate time for us to see the meaning of this occasion than today * * * as this country stands on the eve of another venture into the sea of space above us.

Gill Wilson's active leadership in aviation covers a span from the time men like his friend, Billy Mitchell, had to fight to get others to even consider the potential of aircraft * * * to today's times, when all men are eagerly awaiting the next achievement of this Nation's spacecraft.

His belief in the future of aviation is matched only by his lifetime of deeds supporting that belief.

America is fortunate in having Gill Robb Wilson * * * and men like him * * * always in the cockpit of progress, looking in new directions and piloting new achievements for all of us.

Following an eloquent introduction by Mr. Cotterman, Gill Robb Wilson gave a moving response to those who were gathered in his honor. He said:

This is a very nostalgic moment for me. I came as a boy into this State; home is where the heart is, so I have come home.

Mr. Wilson continued:

This honor is very dear to me because of the investment of a lifetime my father and mother made in this community and in West Virginia. I was never able to pry them away to join me in my travels over the face of the earth; they wanted to stay here.

I feel that I have met and known people all over the world but have not had friends and neighbors; to be called a "home-town" boy and be given a welcome like this touches me very deeply, Wilson said.

Wherever we have been, our hearts and minds turn back to Parkersburg, Wood County, and West Virginia. God bless you for this confidence.

Also present at the dedication were former aviatrix Jacqueline Cochran, Col. S. K. Everest, second man to safely fly through the sound barrier; and Joe Walker, chief pilot of the X–15 rocket. Colonel Everest is a native of Fairmont, W. Va.

Mr. President, it was then my pleasant responsibility to speak regarding the importance of the aviation industry in today's changing world, and to pay homage to my cherished friend of many years, Gill Robb Wilson.

I pointed out that more and more individuals, businesses, and communities have come to be dependent on speedy and economical transportation in order to keep pace in a highly competitive society.

As Justice Cardozo once said:

The city that is without the foresight to build the ports for the new traffic may soon be left behind in the race of competition. Chalcedon was called the city of the blind because its founders rejected the nobler site by Byzantium lying at their feet. The need for vision of the future in the governance of cities has not lessened with the years. The dweller within the gates, even more than the stranger from afar, will pay the price of blindness.

During the course of my remarks I stressed the following:

The Parkersburg-Marietta area needs the stimulus of a fully modernized airport facility to insure that it redeems its promise of growth in the space age. This admonition in no way detracts from the very significant progress made since work began August 8, 1940 under the WPA project and continued through September 1, 1944, when the old Civil Aeronautics Administration took it over as a national defense project. A cost tag of $5 million was set on completion.

Additional improvements included a $375,000 instrument runway extension in 1960, a $55,000 high intensity runway lighting system in 1962, and a $58,000 taxiway extension in 1964.

I recall that the first commercial carrier to utilize this airport was American Airlines as of September 1, 1946, followed by Allegheny Airlines in May of 1949, Piedmont Airlines in March 1955, and Lake Central Airlines on March 1, 1961.

The present terminal building was completed in 1952 and is used by three scheduled airlines and the restaurant. The Federal Aviation Agency Flight Service Station utilizes part of the hangar annex building, as do fixed base operations, Rambar Aviation, the pilots' lounge, and the airport manager's office.

An important aspect of this airport is that it is relatively self-supporting. Funds furnished by the Wood County Court are for capital improvements only, either directly on a small project basis or on a participating basis under Federal Aviation Agency airport aid for large projects.

Your efficient airport manager, Wallace Bennon, has told me that projects for this year include improved runway lighting, air conditioning of the terminal building, complete lighting of the ramp and terminal area with mercury vapor lights, construction of a new building for airport equipment, and effectuation of a resealing of the runway joints and a painting of the instrument runway.

This facility is 186th out of 946 civil and military airports in the Nation for instrument approaches.

Our commercial carriers provide 16 daily flights. Total air carrier operations in 1963 equalled 10,084—400 more than in 1964. Both enplaned and deplaned passenger volumes during the first 4 months of this year are substantially better than they were for the same periods of both 1963 and 1964.

Meanwhile, civil transient, military transient, and local operations utilization in 1964 gained substantially over the 1963 totals, and the same categories, excepting possibly air express, were well ahead of prior volumes in January through April 1965.

These are manifestations of airport utilization and they are signs of the improved economic development of this valley of the future—served by this vital facility.

In concluding my address, I quoted the following lines from the poem "No Words Are Born," by Inez George Gridley:

Beyond the parapets of outer space
Some young Magellon of the future skies
Will steer a course in that incredible voyage
Past doldrum seas of purple nothingness
While constellations flare and new suns rise.
His canvas filled with opalescent flame
Will ride the hurricane, the cosmic fire
To unimaginable lands without a name.
Vasco da Gama, straining eyes to see
The first faint line of thin and wind-lashed coast.
Was dauntless kin to this explorer, who
Will bring his brave and battered hull to rest
In that far harbor, on that chartless sea,
In worlds so foreign that no words are born
Lucid enough to tell the tale to me.

Mr. President, that evening Gill Robb Wilson was the guest of honor at the 56th annual meeting of the Greater Parkersburg Chamber of Commerce. A loyal friend of aviation and an outstanding personality of the entertainment world was to have introduced Gill. Unfortunately, Arthur Godfrey was unable to appear.

Mr. Godfrey has sent me the text of his speech prepared for the occasion. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his comments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF MR. GODFREY

As editor of Flying magazine, Gill Robb Wilson has faithfully recorded the progress of personal, commercial and military aviation through the years.

Through his genius Gill firmly established this great periodical as the entertaining, informative and authoritative chronicle it is today, and for which we all have great respect. As a contributor of inspired eloquence, however, he has succeeded not only in capturing the quintessence of the beauty and the thrill and the art and the science of flying, but also, he thus affords us, his friends, a privileged, intimate glimpse of the true depth of his own soul.

No one need speak for Gill Robb Wilson. He speaks for us—all of us who fly. For years I have called him the poet laureate of aviation.

It is altogether fitting, even if coincidental, that we should be honoring Gill on this the eve of the Gemini flight. Had it not been for men like him, there would have been no orbiting astronauts—nay, not even in Russia. For Gill is one of the true pioneers of powered flight, giving the word "pioneer" Webster's full definition: "One of those who first settle or explore a region, thus opening it for occupation and development by others." Those words surely describe the man we honor tonight. Were it not for his ilk, Gemini would still be just one of the signs of the zodiac, and the flight itself probably just a wild dream in some Jules Verne novel. It is a great privi-

lege to give recognition to the man who has done so much to help make that dream a reality—Gill Robb Wilson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 264

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment (No. 264) and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "20" and insert "12".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the figure "12" as now written in the amendment be changed to "15."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his own amendment. The figure "12" is changed to "15."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment embodies practically the identical issue that was involved in the Gruening amendment, which was adjudged on the floor of the Senate yesterday to be unacceptable. The Gruening amendment contemplated reducing the amount of the loan fund which the administration would be allowed to use from 20 percent to 10 percent. My amendment contemplates reducing the 20 percent to a new level of 15 percent. The arguments that were made in support of the Gruening amendment are equally applicable to mine.

I can very briefly state why I believe the amendment is sound and ought to be adopted.

For a period of about 5 years, I would say, constant efforts were made on the floor of the Senate and in the Foreign Relations Committee to impose restrictions upon the State Department in the allocation of moneys to the recipient nations of the world under the foreign assistance program. Repeatedly we had brought before us instances of money being given or loaned to foreign countries under circumstances which on their very face seemed to be objectionable and not supported by reason. As a consequence of those repeated experiences, there came into development an approach that would place restrictions in the foreign assistance program on how, when, and under what conditions the grants and loans might be made.

To illustrate, the property of American citizens was being confiscated by various nations of the world. The beginning of the confiscation occurred in Cuba. Castro decided to seize the property of American citizens without tendering due compensation for the property taken. Our country was supposedly helpless to do anything about it. Castro conceived the very generous and bountiful idea that as payment for the property expropriated, he would give bonds payable in 25 or 30 years.

Manifestly that proposal was highly unacceptable. I do not know whether anything was done by the Cuban Government even as a gesture to compensate for the confiscation of the property of American citizens.

When Castro got away with his expropriation—his theft of property of American citizens—other nations began to do the same thing. The other nations include the ones that were the beneficiaries of our bounty under the Foreign Assistance Act. I can well understand the thoughts that ran through their minds: "Castro did it and got by with it. Why can we not follow the same course? Take the property without due compensation, and we shall thus improve our economy and our life."

The confiscation of property is justified neither by morality nor by international law.

It is theft of the worst type. It is of the worst type because it is taken by duly constituted governments, which ought to adhere to ethics and to international law. This problem faced Congress.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] conceived the principle that at least in one field we could help in stopping the expropriation. He offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which provided that if and when a beneficiary of the Foreign Assistance Act unlawfully confiscated property without making due compensation within a reasonable time, that country would be barred from further help under the Foreign Assistance Act.

The amendment of the Senator from Iowa was adopted and is now a part of the law of the land. The House Members and the Senate Members declared the principle under which the Senator from Iowa moved to be sound. That is example No. 1 of the imposition of restrictions upon the State Department in the granting of aid.

We now come to the second instance. Under the loan program operations of AID, our Government was lending to foreign nations money at three-fourths percent, frequently without any repayment being required for a period of 35 years. In the making of those loans, the United States, of course, had to borrow from its citizens and was paying them up to 4 percent interest. The loans made by AID were known as soft loans. But they did not produce for our country the good that was anticipated. When we made such a loan, it had the attributes, practically, of a gift.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that loans should be made—if and when the amendment were adopted—on the basis of 2 percent interest, with a grace period of 10 years, as I recall, in which no payments had to be made either of principal or interest; and thereafter, each year, the borrower had to begin to pay interest on the principal. That amendment was adopted by the Senate and the House, and rightfully so, on the basis that some aspect of sound business principles ought to be applied when the loans were made.

A third instance of restrictions placed upon the State Department in the management of the foreign assistance program is in the shipment of goods to Cuba. It was provided in one of the laws—I am not certain that it was in the Foreign Assistance Act—that denials shall be made of consideration by the U.S. Government of countries that deal with Cuba.

A further provision was made in another field. All shipments of goods under the Foreign Assistance Act had to be divided on the basis that at least 50 percent of such shipments would be in American bottoms. That is, the shipper of foreign aid goods was not allowed to hire the cheap services of foreign navigation companies, but was obliged to hire American bottoms, even though the cost was much more.

A further restriction was imposed upon the State Department with respect to the amount of money that would be allowed to be loaned to those foreign companies. The restriction was that when we lent money, a condition had to be attached to the loan to require the borrower to spend the money in the United States for the buying of materials and labor. That was a good provision. It was intended to keep our workers employed.

There may be other situations in which we have tried to impose restrictions, but I believe that I have identified the main ones.

When those amendments were adopted, the State Department, in my judgment, felt itself tied up. It wanted to be emancipated from the restraints that we had imposed upon it. It conceived the idea that it could get around the restrictions by having our money go to a multilateral agency and to have that multilateral agency make the loans. A number of multilateral agencies are in existence. The principal one is the World Bank. Its membership is made up of all nations—perhaps not all, but practically all. They contribute to the capital fund of the institution, and that institution then makes its loans. But it does not impose any tie-in restrictions which require the borrower to spend the borrowed money in the United States. Our

money that goes to the World Bank can be lent to Yugoslavia, for instance, and Yugoslavia can buy goods with that money wherever she wills. She can buy in Cuba. She can buy in China or in Russia, if she wishes.

Under the restrictions that I previously mentioned, the money which the United States lends directly under the Foreign Assistance Act must be spent in this country. The bill as it is pending before the Senate, and as the President well understands, contemplates allowing the administration to send 20 percent of the $780 million allocated for loan purposes to the multilateral agencies, where complete emancipation will be enjoyed with respect to restrictions which we impose upon the use of that money.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] yesterday sought to reduce the 20 percent to 10 percent. My amendment contemplates reducing the amount from 20 to 15 percent. I have made that change in my amendment.

I believe that the proposal is sound. I shall now give my main reason for the predicate of my sponsorship of the bill.

One of our gravest problems is the outflow of American gold into foreign countries. We look upon that problem indifferently. Warnings have been given to us. However, the citizen pays little attention to it, and many Members of Congress pay still less attention.

The gold reserves are dwindling every day. They may soon reach the point at which they will not be adequate to support the paper dollars that are outstanding in our Nation. Three months ago, we had to modify the gold reserve law and remove the gold which supported the deposits in the Federal Reserve system and make it available to meet the demands of our foreign creditors.

I believe that we have approximately $12.5 billion in gold reserves. Five years ago we had $25 billion. Of that gold reserve, $8.5 billion is needed to support the paper dollars which every citizen may have in his pocket. We have approximately $25 billion of claims of foreign creditors against a balance of $4 billion.

If anyone were to try to tell me that foreign creditors, the moment they believe that our condition is shaky, would not demand payment of their debts in gold, I would be shocked.

The proposal contained in the pending bill contemplates loosening the ability of the gold of our Nation to flow into other countries. Twenty percent of $780 million would be $156 million, which would be freed for spending in Cuba, China, Russia, or any other country in the world.

When we spend money in other countries, they have our paper dollars. They would be able to say to the U.S. Government: "We do not want your paper dollars. We are afraid that they will depreciate in value. We want glittering yellow gold."

The time may come—and I have a feeling that it will come, unless something is done about it—when the nations of the world which, as I have said, have $25 billion of claims against us will say: "We want payment in gold."

What does my amendment propose? It contemplates, in a measure, insuring that the money which we loan to foreign countries for the purchase of material and goods shall be spent in the United States. It would make it certain that the money would be spent in the United States if the amendment were adopted. If the amendment were rejected, the money might be spent in the United States, but not with any certainty.

The argument is made, and was made, against the Gruening amendment, that "It is only a small amount. It does not mean much."

Twenty percent of $780 million is $156 million. That means a great deal in connection with the gold problem that confronts our country.

I have heard that argument before, Mr. President. "It does not mean much. It is an inconsequential wrong. It is trivial. Pay no attention to it." However, an accumulation of inconsequential and trivial wrongs finally create huge problems. Those huge problems have already developed and confront our country on the basis of many trivial and inconsequential wrongs.

In my judgment, and if it were within my power, I would direct my attention now, fully and wholly, to protecting the gold reserves of our country. The bill, as now drawn, is indifferent to that problem. It proposes to do nothing about it. That can only produce harm.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio for his effort to bring additional sanity and restraint into some aspects of our foreign aid bill.

Does the Senator feel that, for any reason, a standard of three-fourths of 1-percent interest rate, with no repayment of principal for 10 years, and a 50-year period for payment can be considered a loan?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am grateful to the Senator from Alaska for reminding me of that situation. That is the soft loan window of the World Bank.

It is my understanding that if this money were to go to that institution, it could make a 50-year loan at three-fourths of 1 percent, with a 10-year period of grace during which there would not have to be any payments on principal. I do not believe that is sound. That is one of the things that we tried to protect against in the Lausche-Mundt amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator believe that the American people realize that concealed in the so-called loans is a substantial grant by which during the years of no repayment, and, indeed, during the entire life of the loan, the American people are being taxed on the difference between what they must pay for money, at the rate of approximately 4 or 5 percent, and the negligible three-fourths of 1-percent interest which we allege that we will collect from the borrower?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Alaska was not present when I discussed the reasons for adopting the Mundt-Lausche amendment. The amendment was adopted because we believed that the procedure which the Senator has mentioned is not sound. It did not contribute to the betterment of relations with foreign countries when we made these loans on the basis, and under the name, of a loan, when, in fact, they were practically a gift.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, does the Senator recall what became of the Mundt-Lausche-Morse amendment after it had passed the Senate by a very substantial vote?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator will have to refresh my memory.

Mr. GRUENING. It was taken out in conference. That is so frequently the fate of good amendments which have been agreed to by a substantial vote in the Senate.

It strikes me as one of the undemocratic aspects of Congress, by which procedure, a small group of men disregard the mandate of an overwhelming vote of one of the two bodies of Congress and work their own will in a closed conference.

I believe that is one of the undemocratic aspects of our congressional procedure. It would seem to me that the confereees should have respect for and pay some substantial attention to the wishes of the body which they represent in conference. However, that unfortunately is often not the case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my recollection is that the Lausche-Mundt amendment provided for a 2.5-percent interest rate, with a less than 10-year period of grace, and with an earlier time within which payments had to be begun.

The conference committee cut it down to 2 percent, and I think gave a 10-year period of grace and a longer time of maturity in the repayment of the debt.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the total allocation 30 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; 30 minutes to each side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield the floor. I hope the opponents of the amendment will not make the argument that it is only a small matter, that it is inconsequential, and therefore no attention should be paid to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio wish a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are not enough Senators present at the moment to order the yeas and nays. I wonder if we had not better ask for a quorum.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on a procedural matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it ought to be understood that as the one who helped produce the time limitation, I proposed it on the understanding that there would be record votes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what we are doing.

Mr. MORSE. I understand. On that basis, a time limitation was imposed. Of course, the understanding was that if Senators desire yea-and-nay votes, they should have them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum so that more Senators will be present?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Let us get them on the floor and have the yeas and nays ordered, and I will speak only a few moments, because I spoke on the same issue just recently.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. If we get enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered, we shall be ready to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the time for the quorum call taken out of his time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes on the amendment. It involves exactly the same principle on which the Senate voted the other day on the Gruening amendment. If the Senate followed the rule of substance rather than form, the amendment would be subject to a point of order, but since the Senate does not follow the rule of substance, it is not subject to a point of order.

The only difference between this amendment and the Gruening amendment is that the Gruening amendment deleted the full increase of the 10 percent. The pending amendment deletes half of it. Precisely the same principle is involved.

The Senate was entirely correct the other day in voting to reject the Gruening amendment. I see no reason for it to change its vote on this amendment. The principle involved is whether the funds should be available; it is not mandatory. Under the action of the Appropriations Committee, nothing has been done under the 10 percent power of allocation.

I am not at all sure or sanguine that it will be done, but the principle involved is a matter of policy on the part of the Senate that we should move toward greater utilization of the international organizations affiliated with the Bank.

One last word about AID and the Bank itself. The Bank has perhaps stricter standards for making loans than does the AID agency. It will never make a loan to a country which is in default on loans. It has refused to lend to Greece because that country has been in default on a relatively small loan contracted in 1929.

So I do not believe there should be any question with regard to the matter of confiscation. In my opinion the bank will be as careful as, if not more careful than, AID, in the discouragement of any kind of confiscation.

If the Senator is willing to yield back his time, I will yield back my time, and the Senate can vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield back my time——

Mr. LAUSCHE. The only thing I wish to say is that I look with dismay upon the shortness of time taken by the Senator from Arkansas, because it indicates that he attaches such little strength to the cause of my argument that no further debate on his part is necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. We debated the same principle the other day. It is exactly the same. I see no reason to expect that the Senate will vote differently or for me to speak longer on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds for a comment? The Senator from Ohio has a great misunderstanding of the position of the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Arkansas happens to stand in a position where he has the votes, so why talk?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I have confidence that the Senate is not going to change its stand on principle within 3 days. It is usually consistent for a week, at least.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the other hand, the shortness of the comments of the Senator from Arkansas is subject to the interpretation that he does not have enough confidence in the argument to do more talking.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. As a former college president, does not the Senator believe in the value of education? Does not the Senator believe it is of benefit?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not particularly in the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment (No. 264), as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for himself and other Senators.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 117 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Aiken	Fannin	Russell, S.C.
Allott	Gore	Russell, Ga.
Bartlett	Gruening	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Simpson
Bible	Hill	Smith
Boggs	Holland	Stennis
Cannon	Hruska	Symington
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dodd	Lausche	Tower
Dominick	Morse	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Mundt	Yarborough
Ellender	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Robertson	Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Anderson	Jackson	Monroney
Bayh	Javits	Montoya
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Moss
Case	Kuchel	Nelson
Church	Long, La.	Pastore
Clark	Mansfield	Pell
Cooper	McCarthy	Proxmire
Douglas	McGee	Randolph
Fulbright	McGovern	Ribicoff
Hart	McIntyre	Scott
Hartke	Metcalf	Smathers
Inouye	Mondale	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Hayden	Muskie
Brewster	Long, Mo.	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Pearson
Carlson	McClellan	Sparkman
Curtis	McNamara	Tydings
Fong	Miller	
Harris	Murphy	

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment as modified (No. 264) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 4, strike out the period and in lieu thereof insert a comma and the following:

Provided, That with respect to any dollars herein authorized the voting power of the United States shall be exercised for the purpose of disapproving any loan by the Association for any project, enterprise, or activity in any country, during any period for which the President has suspended assistance to the government of such country because of any action taken on or after January 1, 1962, by the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country as specified in paragraph (A), (B), or (C), of subsection (e)(1) of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the failure of such country within a reasonable time to take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations or provide relief in accordance with the provisions of such subsection.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during the last 2 days, in connection with the increased authority which would be given to the President to transfer U.S. dollars to the International Development Bank, there has been considerable discussion of the fact that through this device Development Loan Fund dollars transferred to the IDA escape the restrictions which the Congress has written into the Foreign Assistance Act.

One of those restrictions is the so-called Hickenlooper amendment, which provides that no aid shall be furnished to nations found by the President to have expropriated U.S.-owned property.

During the consideration earlier this year of a bill authorizing an increase in funds for the Inter-American Bank, the Congress adopted an amendment offered by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] instructing the U.S. representative on that Bank to vote against any loan to any nation found by the President to have expropriated U.S.-owned property.

The amendment which I now offer would do exactly the same thing with respect to loans by the International Development Association.

Both the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association should be treated alike. The Congress has already decided that the Inter-American Development Bank should be subject to the restrictions of the Hickenlooper amendment. The International Development Association should be subject to the same restrictions.

That is all my amendment would do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have studied the amendment. I am prepared to take it to conference. It is a direction to our representative on the International Development Association to comply with the same regulations that apply to the Inter-American Development Bank. I am willing to take the amendment to conference. I believe it is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRUENING. I also yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back and has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 244

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, lines 20 to 22, strike out "and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is one of my minor amendments, but nevertheless an amendment of significance and import. I shall not take anywhere near my 30 minutes on the amendment. The amendment would strike from the bill the language "and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries."

This deals with what is commonly called civic action programs.

Nowhere does the law define what is meant by civil action. The sentence I amend states that the military may be used to construct public works, and then there follows some interesting verbiage which might give rise, in my judgment, to great abuses in th exercise of unchecked discretionary power on the part of the administrator of the program.

My amendment would strike out the words "and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries." My amendment would leave the words "public works," and eliminate the remainder as being civic action.

Who knows what might be done in activities helpful to the economic and social development of a country? Who will determine it? What will be the standards or guidelines?

This is a good example of how a sleeper clause can get into Federal legislation to permit unchecked power by way of exercise of discretion.

There is no effective check in this language on those who will proceed to spend money in accordance with their discretion and judgment as to what will be helpful to the economic and social development of a given country.

Who knows what the military junta in Bolivia, for example, will consider to be in the interest of the economic and social development of their country?

They might consider the planning of a coup, the rigging of an election, the raiding of religious institutions or anything else which, in accordance with their discretion, would be in the interests, as they see it, of the economic and social development of the country.

When I think of the exact language that we require for the expenditure of Federal funds in our own country in connection with the operations of the Army Engineers, I am at a loss as to why we are willing to give unchecked power to a military junta or, for that matter, the military of any other country.

We have a pretty clear idea of public works, but we are in the domain of the unknown when we start talking about giving discretionary power to those in charge of the military power in some other country and in which the recipients of the military aid determine what is in the economic and social interest of the country. There will be plenty of public works that will keep those military forces busy for a long time in any one of the underdeveloped countries to which American aid goes.

Senators would never vote to permit the use of the military forces in the United States "to engage in activities helpful to the economic and social development of the United States." That is one way in which we are turning over more and more control of U.S. assistance to military personnel at home and abroad. It is loose, blank-check language of that kind that is always getting us into trouble in the administration of our foreign aid program.

While I do not intend to discuss the subject in connection with the present amendment, I shall do so at some length in connection with another.

I have on my desk the devastating reports of the Comptroller General of the United States in regard to the shocking waste and inefficiency of the foreign aid group in the administration of our foreign aid program. I cannot read those reports without recognizing that some of that waste could have been prevented administratively if we had tied down with some clear definitions of authority the extent to which discretion could be used by those in charge of the program.

Until Congress makes up its mind what exactly is to be done under "civic action," the term should be restricted to public works.

Note what we are doing. The existing language encouraging the use of military aid for "public works and other activities helpful to economic development" is stricken from the committee bill and even more vague language is substituted.

I close by saying that all I am asking to do is to put the period at the end of "public works." For years in connection with my work in Latin America I have urged that we try to encourage our Latin American countries to follow the example of the U.S. Army Engineers in using their military forces for the building of dams, for the building of roads, for the building of flood control projects, and reclamation projects. They are all subject to specific identification. No question of ambiguity develops over the application of the words "public works."

What I wish to stress to the Senate is that we would not possibly, if we devoted all of our money by way of aid to any Latin American country to be used for the construction of public works, have

enough money. We do not have to have this ambiguous, undefinable language added to the bill at this point. All I am doing by the amendment is to put a period after "public works." That would be a great incentive to those groups to develop the kind of program that we have in the United States for our Army Engineers.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the Senator be good enough to give me an example of the type of abuse that the Senator seeks to eliminate by his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. As I said in my statement, when we leave it up to the military and the government—and many of these are military junta governments or dictatorships—to make use of the money as they see fit to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic and social development of friendly countries, we give them too broad a scope. What would they use it for? They might spend money in connection with rigging an election or in connection with carrying on a controversy with a group in their country that is challenging them. That is in the public interest and would be for the social development of the country. I do not want the money used for any other purpose under that part of the bill than the construction of public works. I do not want them to use their army for political purposes. I do not want them to be able to use the money, directly or indirectly, to build up military power in the administration of a government.

They might say that that is for the social and economic development of their country. I do not believe the American taxpayer should help to finance such a program. But I am for spending money on public works through their army because that would develop what the Senator from Connecticut has heard me say so many times. That would develop, in spite of themselves, seedbeds of economic freedom in that country. Every dam, every road, and every public works ends by strengthening the cause of economic freedom in a country.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, would the Senator consider under the definition of what he seeks to achieve a schoolhouse or a health facility?

Mr. MORSE. Public works. Certainly. A schoolhouse is a public work; a hospital is a public work; a city hall is a public work; a public building is a public work.

I wish to tie it down to a concept of a physical body; namely, a dam, a hospital, a school, a road. We do not have enough money to go around for all that they would like to do. If we encourage that type of action, from the standpoint of the charges that are made, that we are pouring out a great deal of military aid in some countries to build up a military oligarchy, they would be reduced.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the Senator believe that his amendment would eliminate a considerable amount of waste in the utilization of foreign aid?

Mr. MORSE. I believe it would eliminate the temptation to waste. No one knows yet what is to be done under this language, because we are authorizing utilization of military aid for civic action for the first time. I merely want to see the language of the authorization confined to known elements.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. MORSE. That is all I have to say on the amendment.

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

I believe the Senator is unduly concerned when he says that these things might happen. I do not believe he is able to provide any instances in which those countries have used the money to rig an election. Many things might happen to any of the programs if the people administering them pay no attention to them and do not supervise them. The waste I am familiar with has been with regard to the supplying of military hardware. I have seen no report which stated that the countries have wasted money on the rigging of an election. Nonmilitary activities resulting in civic progress have been accomplished at our instigation. We have urged the military forces in a number of countries to go into that field in the hope that we could keep their minds off coups, the rigging of elections, or anything of that kind. We desire to encourage them.

I am for public works, but the activities are broader than that and include such things as establishing dispensaries for mobile medical units and providing facilities for technical training. Many of those best qualified to train people are in the military. Many of them have had that kind of training.

These programs include assistance during epidemics; and not only epidemics, but action that may be required for the prevention of epidemics. If an epidemic should occur, it seems to me that it would be perfectly proper that the help of the army should be enlisted. If the army is properly organized, it can move in. It could use modern medicines, perhaps, better than many other agencies.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is the key to the colloquy in which I engaged with the senior Senator from Oregon. It becomes important in the interpretation of "public works." I am inclined to favor what the Senator from Oregon is trying to do, yet I recognize that in the case of an epidemic or an earthquake in many countries, only the army could come in and give temporary relief.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The army is trained to do that.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is what I have been trying to have clarified in the colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not object. The major part would be classified as public works. I see no point in trying to tie hands. That always raises doubt as to whether the army could function; as to whether or not the interpretation of "public works" includes a particular activity.

Our own people work with those people. We have been trying to encourage them to do something besides sitting around the barracks, plotting to overthrow the government. Because of the experience of our own Army Engineers, our own Government has been encouraged in the belief that the armies of other countries could enter into such activities in the hope that it would have a more civilizing effect upon their armies.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the Senator from Arkansas be good enough to give me information about or to explain some of the projects that are being developed and to tell how some of the money is being spent and for what type of projects outside the definition of public works that the Senator believes the Senator from Oregon has mentioned?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not anticipate this specific question. Many projects could be carried on under the existing provisions of the law, such as forestry service projects, mapping, coastal surveys, education, sanitation, and hygiene, assistance during epidemics, assistance to medical schools, and assistance during earthquakes.

I was thinking of one possibility. A barge might be supplied to the naval forces of an area. That barge could be used, under the existing language, perhaps for a ferry, which would not be a public work.

I see no point in trying to restrict the army, unless it is assumed that the administration of the program be in a conspiracy to defraud the American people or to do something that would be entirely out of order.

This is the kind of discretion that is entirely proper for the military people. I think it is good for the military itself; it gives it a sense of participation in peacetime activity and enables it to make a contribution to the welfare of the country.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Would the Senator be so good as to explain the amount of funds involved that the amendment seeks to restrict?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That has never been broken down. A specific appropriation is not provided. It is merely a limitation upon assistance to the defense or military forces which we support. We might supply them with a barge to use for the movement of people or livestock. It might be used in a broader way than purely as a public work. Some discretion would be given. There is no breakdown, so far as I know, in dollars as to this activity. We merely provide we may supply certain equipment and assistance to the forces we support.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe I understand what the Senator from Oregon is driving at, and I sympathize with his motive. The dilemma in which I find myself is that the limitation on public works might include items like transportation of agricultural products, mapping, coastal survey, forestry service, dispensary, mobile medical units, education, sanitation, and hygiene—assistance needed during epidemics.

I am wondering whether an amendment could not be drawn to achieve what the Senator says the funds should be used for and as to which the distinguished Senator from Oregon seeks to restrict their use.

I recognize that "public works" is a broad term, one that might very well

not include assistance in time of epidemic or disaster. That is what bothers me. Otherwise I think I would be inclined to support the Senator from Oregon.

In the light of the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I am wondering if they could not establish their meaning with respect to the use of these funds, so that U.S. authorities who have to do with the dispensing of the funds would be in a position to make certain that they are restricted for public works in the wider sense and not the narrower sense of merely using them for roads, dams, and such works.

That is the dilemma with which I find myself faced as I listen to the discussion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. There really is no dilemma at all. The point that is being overlooked is that there is nothing to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred—epidemics, health programs, sound social welfare programs—which would not continue to be done under the bill, if the country wished to develop that kind of ability. That goes with the economic aid program in the bill. In time of emergency or epidemic, the civilian government can make use of the military forces, as a matter of national security and assistance.

My amendment would make perfectly clear that we will not give discretion to the military, under the bill, to proceed to carry out programs for which, in accordance with its judgment, it wishes to use the military forces. If my amendment were adopted, there would be nothing to stop the military junta government of Bolivia or the free government of Venezuela from engaging in a social welfare program of the type the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] have been talking about.

I merely say that so far as the military aid sections of the bill are concerned, over and above the hardware features, and the supplying of weapons, to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred, there are a number of ways that these other programs will be carried out by the government of the country.

Take any country as an example. Suppose an epidemic should break out. The economic aid program contains a fund for health. Any group of the country's citizenry could come to the country's aid. The amendment does not mean that the army could not be used. I am merely trying to limit the operations of the military in those countries to defense matters, internally and externally, and have them used as the Army Engineers are used in this country for the development of public works.

I want to try to clear up this point of confusion. I am not trying to stop a country, by my amendment, from engaging in hospital or health programs. I merely say that we should not give the authority to the army; we should give it to the civilian government. One of our great problems under our military aid program is that we are building military oligarchies and military authorities in various countries, oligarchies which, in my judgment, are making Communists rather than free men and women.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, would the Senator consider adding to his amendment, "public works or projects having to do with health and conservation"?

What I have in mind is that back in 1955, during the period of floods in Connecticut, when I was Governor, the Army Engineers did outstanding work. The Army Engineers were there not only to construct dams, but also to help the State of Connecticut with health and conservation facilities.

I believe that what the Senator is seeking to accomplish would be a good end, but I understand the feeling of the distinguished chairman that we should not have soldiers sitting around in barracks or in village squares with nothing to do.

I can well imagine the reports in the press at a time of earthquakes, tidal waves, floods, or any of the problems which come to many of these countries in Africa, Asia, or in South America. At such times the Army could probably do the best job with health and conservation.

I would just as soon see some of these funds used for those purposes.

If the distinguished Senator would consider adding those few phrases to the amendment, I should be pleased to vote in support of his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. In time of emergency, my language would not stop the government from using its army for those very purposes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is a question of using the funds. They may have some funds for economic growth problems, whereas the military aid funds would be available for this purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make certain that it is the government, and not the military, that directs the expenditure.

I would be inclined to accept the amendment, "public works," or "government declared public emergency." I would be willing to accept that language, if that were acceptable. Otherwise, I shall leave it as it is.

Surely Senators do not believe the United States commands these armies. We do not. They can be ordered to do anything their government wants them to do.

They can even work on something financed from U.S. economic aid funds. But the language I am concerned about are the military aid funds. I think it is shocking that we should be using military aid now for "economic and social development" as determined by the Pentagon, because that is what the committee amendment provides.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator cannot modify his amendment without unanimous consent. He has already asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that it is very important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it is very important. I believe that it is too bad that we are attempting to restrict what I thought was one of the civilizing efforts that we were trying to accomplish.

Mr. MORSE. There is no government restriction, but there is restriction on the military. I am seeking to stop strengthening the control by the military in the underdeveloped parts of the world. We have plenty of means by which to help the government do the thing that the Senator from Connecticut has in mind. However, I shall not support a bill which has the effect of weakening government control over the military.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 71, as follows:

[No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Clark	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	Morse	Thurmond
Ellender	Ribicoff	
Gruening	Stennis	

NAYS—71

Aiken	Church	Hickenlooper
Allott	Cooper	Hill
Anderson	Dirksen	Holland
Bartlett	Dodd	Hruska
Bayh	Dominick	Inouye
Bennett	Douglas	Jackson
Bible	Eastland	Javits
Boggs	Ervin	Jordan, N.C.
Burdick	Fannin	Jordan, Idaho
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Kennedy, Mass.
Cannon	Gore	Kennedy, N.Y.
Case	Hart	Kuchel

Long, La.	Moss	Scott
Mansfield	Mundt	Simpson
McGee	Nelson	Smathers
McGovern	Pastore	Smith
McIntyre	Pell	Symington
McNamara	Prouty	Tower
Metcalf	Proxmire	Williams, N.J.
Miller	Randolph	Williams, Del.
Mondale	Robertson	Yarborough
Monroney	Russell, S.C.	Young, N. Dak.
Montoya	Russell, Ga.	Young, Ohio
Morton	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Hartke	Muskie
Brewster	Hayden	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Pearson
Carlson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Curtis	McCarthy	Tydings
Fong	McClellan	
Harris	Murphy	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment (No. 244) was rejected.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RULE XXII—CLOTURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is a matter of clarification under the Civil Rights Act——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a matter of clarification under the Civil Rights Act, which should be settled, because of certain confusion at the other end of the avenue. To that end, I yield 10 minutes under the bill to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have just finished our work on the voting bill which again involved a decision by the Senate to invoke cloture. Fortunately, there were comparatively few amendments to be voted on, after cloture, and they could be handled in an orderly manner. The fact that they were, reminded me of the completely different situation that prevailed when the Senate a year ago was voting, after cloture, on amendments to the civil rights bill.

On 2 days, June 16 and 17, 1964, there were 56 rollcall votes on amendments which were properly before the Senate. Those 56 votes proceeded in an atmosphere of complete chaos because most of the Senators offering amendments had already used up so much of their allotted hour of debate that there was barely time available to call up many of the amendments and no time to discuss them. This resulted in action by the Senate without the creation of any legislative history. Thus, the Senate failed in its responsibility to give sufficient guidance to those in the executive branch and elsewhere to those who must interpret and apply the amendments adopted.

As an example of what has occurred because of the confusion and near chaos that prevailed on those days, I find myself today under the necessity of trying to create legislative history that should have been created then.

I offered an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 before cloture was invoked, but when I called up my amendment after cloture the Senate was driving toward final passage of the bill. Though my amendment was acceptable both to the Senator in charge of the bill, the then Senator from Minnesota, and to the minority leader, I was urged by these gentlemen not to take any time to explain the amendment. I followed their recommendations, the amendment was adopted, and now my purpose is being questioned.

That part of the bill represented by my amendment was the subject of a law review article which questioned the intent of the amendment. That article contains this statement:

> Neither title VII nor its legislative history sheds any light on this problem.

Now I find myself, nearly a year later, with the responsibility of clearing up the confusion thus inadvertently created.

In order to do that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD both the appropriate excerpt from the law review article, which raises the question, and a brief prepared by my staff which contains an explanation that should have been made last June.

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

EXCERPT FROM "EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964," 31 BROOKLYN LAW REVIEW 62

(By Richard K. Berg, Esq.)

The final provision of section 703(h) does appear to effect a substantive change in the title. It provides: "It shall not be an unlawful employment practice under this title for any employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of the wages or compensation paid or to be paid to employees of such employer if such differentiation is authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206 (d))."

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act was added to that act by the Equal Pay Act of 1963, 77 Stat. 56, prohibiting discrimination in wages on account of sex. The quoted provision of section 703(h) was added by amendment on the Senate floor for the purpose of providing "that in the event of conflicts, the provisions of the Equal Pay Act shall not be nullified." This purpose seems reasonable enough. However, it is not clear exactly what conflicts Senator BENNETT, the sponsor of the amendment, intended to resolve. The Equal Pay Act does not affirmatively authorize any differentiation in compensation on the basis of sex. It does contain exceptions for differences in compensation based on a seniority system, a merit system, a system measuring earnings by quantity or quality of production, or any other factor other than sex. This is merely clarifying language similar to that which was already in section 703(h). If the Bennett amendment was simply intended to incorporate by reference these exceptions into subsection (h), the amendment would have no substantive effect.

Another interpretation of the Bennett amendment seems more plausible. The Equal Pay Act was an amendment to section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and its coverage is dependent on that of section 6. The provisions of section 6 are applicable to employees "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" and to employees of certain enterprises which are "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce." These are narrower concepts than an "industry affecting commerce," the standard for title VII, *Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling*, 316 U.S. 517, 520–23 (1942). In addition, section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. 213, contains numerous specific exemptions from the coverage of section 6, some involving significant numbers of employees. Consequently, there are numerous employers covered by title VII who are wholly or partially exempt from the coverage of the Equal Pay Act. This is the only significant conflict which appears to exist between the two, and if the Bennett amendment is to be given any effect, it must be interpreted to mean that discrimination in compensation on account of sex does not violate title VII unless it also violates the Equal Pay Act.

This creates an anomalous situation with respect to employers affected by the Bennett amendment. They may not refuse to hire a person because of his (or her) sex, but they may discriminate with respect to compensation. Suppose the difference in compensation is so great as to make the job undesirable to members of the sex discriminated against. Arguably, this could be considered a constructive refusal to hire and not covered by the Bennett amendment. Neither title VII nor its legislative history sheds any light on this problem.

RELATION OF TITLE VII TO THE EQUAL PAY ACT: AN EXPLANATION OF THE BENNETT AMENDMENT

Section 703(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "It shall not be an unlawful employment practice under this title for any employer to differentiate upon the basis of sex in determining the amount of the wages or compensation paid or to be paid to employees of such employer if such differentiation is authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 206(d))."

The amendment speaks in terms of a "differentiation * * * authorized by the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

Section 6(d) authorizes two things:

1. Wage differentials as between exempt male and female employees doing the same work; and

2. Wage differentials on equal jobs made pursuant to (i) a senority system; (ii) a merit system; (iii) a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or (iv) a differential based on any other factor other than sex.

The amendment therefore means that it is not an unlawful employment practice; (a) to differentiate on the basis of sex in determining the compensation of white collar and other employees who are exempt under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; or (b) to have different standards of compensation for nonexempt employees, where such differentiation is not prohibited by the equal pay amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Simply stated, the amendment means that discrimination in compensation on account of sex does not violate title VII unless it also violates the Equal Pay Act.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, to prevent this kind of situation occurring in the future, I send to the desk a resolution proposing an amendment to Senate rule XXII. It provides that each Senator who calls up an amendment after cloture and in addition to the 1 hour overall that he now has under rule XXII, the author of the amendment shall have up to an additional 5 minutes to explain that amendment. In addition, the majority leader or another Senator designated by him shall also have an additional 5 minutes

to speak in opposition to each amendment called up.

This proposed change in rule XXII will not change the requirement that any amendments may be introduced after the cloture vote is taken and to prevent the use of this additional time for dilatory purposes my proposed amendment includes this language:

No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order.

Admittedly, this language is not a complete answer to possible delays, but I believe that it is better to err on the side of sound legislative procedure than to operate under a rule which permits and, under some circumstances, even recognizes amendments to be voted on by the Senate with no possibility of any discussion on the proposals of the amendment or its merit or lack of it.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate Rules Committee will take early and favorable action on this proposed amendment to rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 114

Resolved, That the last paragraph of clause 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, except that each Senator who offers any amendment to the same which has been presented and read before the vote to bring the debate to a close shall have five additional minutes to explain that amendment and the Majority Leader or another Senator designated by him shall have five additional minutes in which to speak in opposition to that amendment. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is any time left, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes remain to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without commenting on the proposal to modify rule XXII, I am somewhat surprised that the question arose with respect to the amendment.

First, it was carefully examined by me, and also by my staff, whom I deem to be competent and quite schooled in the entire 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Second, it was submitted and carefully examined by the then Senator from Minnesota and now the Vice President of the United States. We accepted it as indicated, on the basis of the intent which was in the mind of the Senator from Utah when he submitted the amendment.

I trust that that will suffice to clear up in the minds of anyone, whether in the Department of Justice or elsewhere, what the Senate intended when that amendment was accepted.

Of course, we were under great pressure at the time to try to complete action on the bill and to get it over to the other body.

I hope that the Senator from Utah will understand why we showed what might be regarded as unseemly haste, but at the time I thought it had to be done.

However, let me emphasize and pinpoint the fact that we had in mind precisely the point made by the Senator from Utah when the amendment was submitted, and I believe that the language speaks for itself.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my intention is represented by the statement I have inserted again in the RECORD today.

I thank the minority leader for giving me this opportunity to try to straighten out the situation, even if it is 1 year late.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course it is not strange that questions with respect to the intent of Congress arise from time to time. I examined a court decision, not too long ago, from one of the Circuit Courts of Appeals, which started out, I believe, with the statement, "The intent of Congress is a fiction."

Congress intends "what the court says it intends," and unless we make it abundantly clear on the floor of the Senate, and do provide legislative history from time to time, I can readily understand how the judicial branch will get so wide of the mark that we should be a little more careful. Not even speed, under the circumstances recited with respect to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, will quite condone our haste and the oversight in making legislative history.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Illinois for assisting me in making the record clear today.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to strike out "$1,170,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,055,000,000."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the time for the quorum come from the time of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. The time may be charged to me from the time allotted on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and 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 rescinded.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield myself such time as I may require within my limitation.

I have prepared, for the convenience of Senators, a brief summary of the amendment. I do not intend to speak at length on it. It is perfectly clear what is intended by the amendment. Simply stated, it would hold the level of military assistance at $1.055 billion, which is the present level of the military assistance program. It would strike out the proposed increase of $115 million, which is now contained in the bill.

I would emphasize, first of all, that the amendment really has no effect on Vietnam. In the first place, the bill contains an allocation of money for Vietnam; the reduction involved in the amendment can be easily absorbed elsewhere in the overall program. Fifty-eight countries are scheduled to receive grant military assistance in fiscal 1966 under the projected program covered by the bill.

In the second place, Congress has amply demonstrated its willingness to vote whatever the President may request for the war in Vietnam, such as the extra $700 million appropriation recently approved for military operations in that country; and the extra $89 million which the Senate has added to the pending bill for economic development along the Mekong River. Vietnam is not really affected by the amendment.

In addition, I might point out, by way of further evidence, that if, in the future, the President should determine that more money is required for Vietnam, the bill contains two provisions by which the President could divert additional money into southeast Asia. The first provision is the President's own contingency fund, which he may use for this purpose; the second provision is the $300 million annual transfer authority by which Defense Department stocks can be drawn upon to enlarge military assistance to any country above authorized limits, when the President finds such action "vital to the security of the United

States." For these several reasons, Vietnam is not an issue here.

The purpose of the amendment is twofold. First of all, it seeks to avoid new increases in routine military assistance to countries where the existing programs are subject to serious question.

For example, the bill, as it now stands, would enlarge military assistance to both Greece and Turkey, although both countries have been on the verge of going to war with each other for the past year in the crisis over Cyprus. The bill would provide increased sums to enlarge our military assistance to both India and Pakistan, although both of those countries are now engaged in border skirmishes against each other, and the problem of a serious war between them is very imminent and real.

These countries have been using American-supplied arms and equipment, in direct contradiction of their pledges to the United States not to use American-furnished arms for purposes other than resisting Communist aggression.

Yet, despite the fact that these countries are poised on the point of war with one another, despite the fact that American equipment is .being used in direct violation of pledges to the United States, we propose not only to sustain the program of arms assistance supplied to both sides, but to reward the offenders by increasing the size of the military aid we propose to give them.

How can this kind of action possibly serve the best interests of the United States?

To avoid it, to hold the program at its present level, and to preclude any reward being conferred upon countries that have violated their pledge in the use of this equipment, by increasing the program in the coming year—these constitute the first reason for the amendment.

Second, and more generally, the amendment, if adopted, would help to hold the line against the trend toward an ever-larger foreign aid expenditure by the United States. It is commonly believed that the aid program is diminishing by virtue of certain cuts that the Congress has effected in the bill in recent years. But the bill forms only part of our aid. It is a smaller part of the total program than is generally understood. So, in order to get some idea of what the overall trend has been, embracing all forms of aid given by this country, I asked the members of the Foreign Relations Committee to gather the totals for the most recent years for which the complete figures are available. Those years turned out to be fiscal years 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. If Senators will refer to the table that they will find on their desks, they will observe that the total aid program has been going up from $5.2 billion in 1960 to $5.8 billion in 1961, to $6.6 billion in 1962, to nearly $7 billion in 1963.

So, the second effect of the amendment would be to stem the trend toward a continually increasing general expenditure for foreign aid by the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table prepared for me by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. assistance—Net obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal years 1960–63

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	Fiscal year—			
	1960	1961	1962	1963
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	1,866	2,012	2,508	2,296
Social Progress Trust Fund			224	125
Food for peace	1,106	1,325	1,576	1,790
Export-Import Bank	305	962	535	572
Other economic programs [2]	97	88	234	363
Military	1,845	1,462	1,526	1,834
Total	5,219	5,850	6,603	6,980

[1] Includes escapees and refugees, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, ocean freight, voluntary relief agencies, strategic materials, American schools abroad, U.N. technical assistance, U.N. Relief Works Agency, U.N. Children's Fund, Indus Basin Development Fund, U.N. Emergency Forces, malaria eradication (WHO), North Atlantic Treaty Organization, U.N. for Congo (technical assistance), International Atomic Energy Agency, medical research (WHO), FAO world food program, community water supply (WHO).

[2] Includes civilian supplies, United Nations loans, Inter-American and related highways, Peace Corps, Philippine war damage claims, development and support (trust territories), Libyan special purpose funds, administrative area development, migration and refugee assistance, European Atomic Energy Commission, IDA, Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. CHURCH. That, briefly, represents the argument for the amendment. I point out that it was carefully considered in the committee. It was once adopted in the committee. Then, after considerable pressure from downtown, the question was brought up for reconsideration, and in a very tight vote, the committee rejected the amendment. As I recall, the vote was 10 to 8, but it is fair to say that in that vote the majority of Senators who actually heard the testimony offered in justification of increasing the military assistance program in such places as India, Pakistan, Greece, and Turkey, voted in support of the amendment. It was finally defeated only on the strength of some proxy votes which were cast for Senators who had not had the full benefit of the testimony.

I believe the amendment is a good amendment. I hope that it will be adopted. I urge it upon the Senate with all the vigor and conviction that I possess.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the $300 million annual transfer authority which the Senator mentioned in the third paragraph of his memorandum in the military assistance program, in the foreign aid program, or in the general defense appropriation? I am not sure.

Mr. CHURCH. I shall check to be certain, but my impression is that the provision is contained in the foreign aid bill, for it permits an enlargement of military assistance over and above the limits of the bill, to the extent of $300 million, which can be taken from the stocks of the Defense Department, whenever the President determines that such additional money is vital to the security of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is in the foreign aid bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I rise to support the amendment. My only reservation about it is that the amount it seeks to cut is much too small. It is positively shocking that when we have been ladling out vast sums of money, for the proper purpose of aiding nations along the boundaries of Communist Russia and Communist China to resist any possible aggression that may come from those Communist nations, they are using those moneys and arms to fight each other.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho has mentioned the case of Pakistan and India—a very flagrant case. About a year ago, when it was apparent that at that time, at least, none of the nations in the Southeast Treaty Organization were coming to our assistance in Vietnam, I called attention in a Senate speech to the fact that Pakistan, which is one of the seven allies associated with us in the Southeast Treaty Organization, had received $800 million in military aid, to say nothing about $800 million in economic aid. After I had put the speech in the RECORD, I received a letter from the Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States. He wrote me in part as follows:

> You must be aware of the danger of our security posed by India, particularly as a consequence of recent developments. India is, as it has always been in the last 16 years, in an aggressive mood. Recently her military buildup has proceeded at an alarming rate. The pretext for this, as proclaimed by India, is the possibility of a clash in the future with China, even though the chances of such a clash are now regarded as negligible by all competent observers.

The Ambassador went on to say that the money which we are giving his country as a safeguard against aggression from a Communist country would necessarily be used to protect his country from possible aggression from India. At the same time we are giving India similar military aid. Since that letter was written, clashes between Pakistan and India have actually broken out. There is fighting on the border between India and Pakistan with our U.S.-supplied arms. Yet the bill would commit the folly of increasing the military allowance to both countries.

We saw a similar situation in the case of Greece and Turkey, which are likewise lined up geographically against the Communist bloc, and presumably are to use our military aid to repel communism. The bill now before us requires it. Yet when they got into a fight over Cyprus, they were using the U.S.-supplied arms against each other.

Recently, in a third case, we increased our military aid to Jordan, which at one time not so long ago was considered to be a sort of buffer state designed to soften the tension between the Arab States and Israel and not completely in the Arab bloc. But since that time Jordan has committed acts of aggression against the friendly nation of Israel.

I believe by all means that the modest reduction proposed, which would merely return the amount of military aid to the present level, should be adopted.

I also approve the comments of the senior Senator from Idaho on the fact that the overall amount of aid is steadily increasing. We were told last year and we are told again this year that the bill be a "barebones" bill. On that basis we are not supposed to cut a dollar from it. But as the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, though the amount authorized by the bill before us is $3.3 billion, we see that as recently as 1963 a total of foreign assistance of virtually $7 billion was authorized through various other agencies and that amount is now even larger. There are listed in the memorandum which the Senator has presented a number of additional agencies through which aid is funneled through additional spigots in our foreign aid program.

The distinguished senior Senator from Idaho has not listed all of the kinds of aid. I know it is rather difficult to find all of it.

Mr. CHURCH. We have made a conscientious effort to list all of it, and I am somewhat appalled that we fell short of the mark.

Mr. GRUENING. I assure the Senator that as I study the foreign aid program, I am constantly discovering new spigots previously not apprehended. I hope that the amendment will be adopted. What we should do to those nations is to serve peremptory notice on them that if they use the arms furnished to resist Communist aggression, against each other again, aid to them will be cut off completely That would be kind of vigorous, appropriate action requested in the circumstances.

So the Senator's amendment, while very helpful and one which I am happy to support, is only a slight tap on the wrist to the offending nations.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator. I am only attempting to hold the line against further increases in programs which at best, are very dubious.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared on the Church amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Section 505 of the Foreign Assistance Act defines the utilization of military assistance. It may be used for: "(a) Military assistance to any country shall be furnished solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security."

Certain provisos that follow restrict military aid in Latin America and authorize military aid to countries for so-called civic action purposes.

Section 506 outlines conditions of eligibility. (a)(1)(C) says they shall not use or permit the use of such articles for purposes other than those for which furnished; and (a)(3) requires that the recipient "will, as the President may require, permit continuous observation and review by, and furnish necessary information to, representatives of the United States Government with regard to the use of such articles."

And finally section 506(d) states: "Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any predecessor foreign assistance act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this chapter or any agreements entered into pursuant to any of such acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance."

The world knows that Pakistan and Turkey are in violation of section 505(a), which was added to the law in 1963. Under section 506(d) they are no longer eligible for military assistance. Pakistan has and is using American military aid in its border war with India; Turkey has and is using American military aid in its hostilities over Cyprus. Under the law, both countries must permit American review and observation of their use of our equipment and services.

Instead of enforcing the law, the Pentagon chooses to even matters up by arming the other side. So we send more military equipment to Greece and to India. I cannot understand why this administration and the Congress proceed to arm these countries in violation of our own laws.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has stated accurately what occurred in the Committee on Foreign Relations. The amendment was adopted by an overwhelming vote in the first instance. Then the Pentagon went to work with its lobbying activities. Senators who are members of the committee were visited by the "brass," and subsequently there was some change of viewpoint on the part of some Senators. On the second vote in committee, the amendment was rejected by a vote of 10 to 8.

However, in my judgment, the lobbying impression has worn off, and I believe that if we were to vote on this matter in the Committee on Foreign Relations now, the vote would be overwhelming in support of the Church amendment. I voted for the amendment then; I shall be pleased to vote for it in the Senate. I supported a similar amendment last year, as the Senator from Idaho knows. I agree with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I wish the cut were greater than it is.

Mr. President, I wish to read three paragraphs from the statement I just placed in the RECORD. I wish to speak a moment about the eligibility for military aid under the law, a law which is being winked at by our Government in place after place around the world.

Section 506(d) states:

"Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1964, as amended, at any predecessor foreign assistance act, in substantial violation of the provisions of this chapter or any agreements entered into pursuant to any of such acts shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance."

The world knows that Pakistan and Turkey are in violation of section 505(a), which was added to the law in 1963. Under section 506(d) they are no longer eligible for military assistance. Pakistan has and is using American military aid in its border war with India; Turkey has and is using American military aid in its hostilities over Cyprus. Under the law, both countries must permit American review and observation of their use of our equipment and services.

But do not worry; such permission will not be granted, and we shall again wink at a violation of the law.

Instead of enforcing the law, the Pentagon chooses to even matters up by arming the other side. So we send more military equipment to Greece and to India. I cannot understand why this administration and the Congress proceed to arm these countries in violation of our own laws.

I wanted to cite these examples of clear violations of the law in regard to military aid, violations which I think give support to the desirability of our going at least as far as the Senator from Idaho would go. I consider it to be a most inadequate saving, but at least it would be some saving. It might set a precedent that could be used at a later date in really doing the foreign aid job that needs to be done.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I heartily support the amendment. It would cut $115 million from the military assistance provisions of the bill. It has been curious to me that whereas Congress has indicated for many years—several years, anyway—that it wanted to phase out a large part of military assistance, we find the Pentagon, under cover of the Vietnamese crisis, and with the approval of the administration, which has absolutely nothing to do with this amendment, seeking to increase military aid by $115 million over the amount which was asked for and received last year. The excuse is that the reduction was greater than the amount that was approved last year.

Having heard all the testimony that was brought before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am unable to agree with that contention.

As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] says, we are giving Greece money to fight Turkey; Turkey, money to fight Greece; Pakistan, money to fight India; and India, money to fight Pakistan. I cannot approve of that. Any increases in amounts under this program should be in the economic portions, not the military. So I shall support the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I reserve the rest of my time, so that Senators who are opposed to the amendment may state their case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

Mr. CHURCH. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whose time is the quorum call to be charged?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senate that the committee went into the military assistance program in great detail during its hearings and markup sessions.

The committee rejected a motion to cut military assistance by this amount, or approximately this amount. At one point the committee did agree to cut military assistance to $1,055 million, the amount authorized last year, the amount which the Senator from Idaho seeks to have as the amount this year. However, upon reconsideration and after urgent representations by the Secretary of Defense, the committee voted to restore the cut.

Unfortunately, it is necessary that much of the detailed information concerning this program is classified. But, if any Senator is interested, that information is available in the transcript now in the Foreign Relations Committee room downstairs.

There are a few general points to be made.

First. Of the total amount, more than half is proposed for only five countries—Vietnam, Korea, Turkey, Nationalist China, and Greece. A substantial cut of the total program would almost certainly have to be reflected in one of those countries, or, as an alternative, the fund would have to be transferred to other countries in order to take up the slack.

Second. The amount proposed by the amendment is equal to the lowest annual appropriation that has been made for military assistance since the program began.

In fiscal year 1964, the appropriation was also $1 billion. This accounts, in part, for the increased request this year, because it made it necessary to postpone meeting several requirements. Certainly the world is no more stable now than it was last year or 2 years ago.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the time that this amendment was proposed in the committee, the committee had agreed to the cut.

Representation was then made to the committee members by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and very strenuous recommendation was made by Under Secretary George Ball—because, at that time, Secretary Rusk was out of the country—as to the essentiality of placing this money back into the program.

They pointed out that if 85 percent of this particular money were to go to countries in the periphery of the Communist empire, if at this particular stage we were to begin cutting our military program with respect to Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, and India, what we would have to do, in effect, would be to increase our own military effort sooner or later. Certainly this is no time for us to say that the world is quieting down. This is no time for us to say to the Communists "We are not on the move." This is no time for us to say logically that we should decrease our own military forces or the forces of any other friendly nation.

With that kind of representation made, as I say, by Mr. McNamara, and by Under Secretary George Ball, the committee voted to restore this amount of money.

I had hoped and expected to get by this time certain statistical information which I have not thus far received.

I am no longer a member of the committee. Therefore, I have not given to the matter the same continued interest or support that I naturally could have been expected to give had I remained on the committee. However, I well remember when the leaders of this Nation said:

> This is not the time to cut our military efforts. This is not the time to cut aid to Greece, Turkey, or Pakistan.

Every one of us thoroughly understands that if we have received any threat from the Communists up to and including the past few years, it is at this point greater than it has ever been before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes so that I may yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has listened attentively to what the distinguished Senator from Florida has said. I agree with him. We need Turkey, Greece, Pakistan, and India. But, are we not deluding ourselves a little when we presume to say that if Turkey is to fight Greece or Cyprus, they will all join hands to fight the Russians?

That is logic that I cannot quite understand. If Pakistan is going to fight India, are they going to join hands and fight Russia or China?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, does the Senator want an answer?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. The answer is very simple. It is "No." We cannot expect that two nations warring against each other will join hands because there is a threat from a third party, which party seems to be the main threat to the United States.

The only fault that I find with the amendment——

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is talking on my time. Does he want to ask me a question?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator gave me the time. It is my time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did the Senator already have the answer to the question, or did he want to ask me a question? I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment. I do not believe it would accomplish the purposes it seeks to accomplish.

If this were an amendment providing that we do not intend to increase aid to nations within an alliance that are fighting one another, I should vote for the amendment. But this is an overall cut.

In the kind of world in which we live today, how can we say now, on this day in June 1965, what the situation will be 4 or 5 months from now?

We would be making a horrible mistake which would endanger our own security if we were to begin to cut down on military aid. It is a meat-ax cut. There is nothing to prevent the Defense Department from putting in all the money for this purpose, up to the tune of the cut, for Greece, Turkey, or Pakistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

There is nothing that would prevent this money from going to Pakistan or India. If this measure were amended to read that in no instance would we increase military aid to nations or alliances that are fighting one another, I should vote for the amendment. But to cut it down promiscuously—and I use that word advisedly, not knowing what the threat is going to be tomorrow—I could not support the proposal.

I hope that if my distinguished friend from Florida—if I may have his attention—disagrees with what I said, he will give me the answer.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would dislike to yield 5 minutes to the Senator to hear his speech again, but I regret to say to him that I did not hear what he said.

Mr. PASTORE. I said it loud enough.

Mr. SMATHERS. When the Senator from Rhode Island said he was going to vote against the cut, I thought that whatever he had to say after that was superfluous, that he was on the right side, and that he would make the right choice.

Regrettably, Senators who believe that this is no time to cut this particular military budget were caught a little off guard. As I said, I am no longer on the committee. The amendment came up and I was alerted while I was having lunch downstairs. I made the motion to restore the cut in committee, for the reason which the Senator from Rhode Island well expressed. He did not particularly like some of the arguments I made, but he finally got around to agreeing with me, which again proves the great judgment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

In any event, I recall very well the great concern expressed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State with respect to this cut. This was one cut they did not want, because, as the able Senator from Rhode Island has said, this was not the time to cut. If ever our Nation has been threatened, if ever the world was in turmoil, it is now.

If we bring about a sizable cut of this particular nature, all it means is that the United States will have to increase demands on its own young men. It would have to increase its own military expenditures.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. In order to vote intelligently on the amendment, I would like to get some information as to what the pipeline consists of. A $115 million cut is involved. Only 10 years ago, as I recall, back in about 1954, there was about $6 billion in the pipeline, and it has gone down to about a billion and a quarter dollars.

It is called the pipeline. It means military goods that are on order or under shipment, and so forth.

If the pipeline were substantially large, this cut would represent a relatively small percentage. However, if the pipeline were down to a minimum, because we had appropriated relatively nothing in the past 2 or 3 years, I would be inclined to vote against the amendment.

Can the Senator from Florida enlighten me as to the pipeline situation?

Mr. SMATHERS. Only to the extent that when the Secretary of Defense appeared, apparently he thought the pipeline was not good because of the fact that we have been engaged in activities in South Vietnam. The pipeline, therefore, has been depleted to a major degree. But he was sure that if we followed this particular cut, it would, in time, and apparently sometime in the near future, require the United States to make an additional request to use its own manpower and ask for additional sums of money for ourselves.

Mr. MORTON. I appreciate the reply of the able Senator.

Will the Senator from Idaho yield some time to me for elaboration of this subject?

Mr. CHURCH. I have only 4 minutes left.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the Senator some time.

Mr. CHURCH. May I answer the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky?

As the Senator knows, there are many figures that appear in this document that are secret, but I understand the total is not. As I read the total in the pipeline, to which this bill would add additional money, the amount is just under $2 billion.

Mr. MORTON. What was it a year ago? Is that figure available?

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be glad to check again and supply the figure.

Mr. MORTON. In 1954, as I recall, there was $6 billion in the pipeline. During the next 3 or 4 years it was reduced to a total of $2 billion. During those years the administration asked for fewer funds because it was using the pipeline. If the pipeline has been reduced to an irreducible minimum, I would be inclined to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. The pipeline has been running in the $2 billion plus range since 1960. I show the Senator the exact figures. The Senator can review them for himself.

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the totals are not secret. Apparently these totals are available. In 1961 the pipeline had $2,597 million. Next year it was $2,784 million. Then it was $2,421 million. The latest figure is $1,922 million. That is not too much of a drop, but it is a decided drop from what it was, because when the figure of $2 billion is reached, to me the amount is irreducible, and I shall be constrained to vote against the amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to read from the statement which came from the Defense Department. Let me read just two sentences:

> Thus, a cut in military assistance would result in severe reductions in Turkey and in other major countries on the Sino-Soviet periphery. Very simply, in order to maintain the vital support of our efforts in South Vietnam at the proposed level, the United States would be forced to reduce military aid to such countries as Taiwan, Pakistan, Greece, and Turkey to unacceptable levels.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This statement was made before the committee while we were appropriating with enthusiasm $700 million to pursue the war in Vietnam.

In committee I voted for this figure, which maintains it at the current level. The Senator from Rhode Island said he would be inclined not to grant military assistance to countries that were fighting each other. One of the principal reasons I voted for it in the committee was that such a cut, except in emergencies, would be assessed against those countries. That was what influenced me and some of my colleagues. It seemed rather futile to increase appropriations to countries which are more interested in fighting themselves than others. That is a part of the reason I did it.

All the turmoil around the world is not attributable to the paucity of our military appropriations. If anything, the reverse might be true. I am not convinced that it does not contribute to the turmoil.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly the point I make. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree that if we make the proposed cut, there is nothing under the law that would prevent the Department of Defense from putting the money wherever it might be needed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are certain restrictions. It would not affect aid for Latin America. But in the overall military assistance program, which is given to us in secret—and I think there are good reasons for that—it is not set out in the law how much each country receives. That has never been the practice. There is good reason for it. But in the presentation books, they tell us how much is intended for these countries. They would be forced, it seems to me, to make a choice. Perhaps they could shift between Turkey and Greece, India and Pakistan. I am not at all sure that I am in a position to say that any certain number of dollars must come from one or the other country. All of it is in the form of a cut. I am not too particular whether it should be one or the other. There is great dissension among these countries—much jealousy among them that one country is getting more than the other. I would not tie our hands on each country. It would be bad precedent, but I would like to maintain it at approximately what it is now.

They never have lacked for military money. If they needed more, they would probably come and get another $1 billion before the end of July.

Mr. PASTORE. I am one of those who believe in the military program. I am one of those who because they are unfamiliar with the intimate facts involved must leave it to the administrators of the Government to cope with the problem. I hope that they are giving us information which is trustworthy. I am perfectly willing to accept whatever figure they suggest. I quite agree with the argument made by my distinguished colleague who is sponsoring the amendment that I believe it is absolutely fallacious in every way for us to be giving money to two nations who are warring against one another. It is idiotic.

All I am saying is that if we could write that specifically into the law, I could subscribe to it, but I cannot subscribe, at the same time, to an overall cut of a program in which I believe. All I am saying is that if we do make the cut today, there is absolutely nothing to prevent the Defense Department from allotting whatever money it wishes, either in Turkey, Greece, in Pakistan, or in India, no matter what they have been saying.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They cannot do it all. They have to make some choices. About half of the reports from the General Accounting Office relate to waste and maladministration of the military hardware part of the program. The most distressing reports from the General Accounting Office have been those reports setting out the facts where we have supplied a substantial amount of hardware to countries which are not equipped to use them. The equipment just sits in their warehouses. It is never used. It is this kind of thing which has influenced my opinion as to whether they could absorb some reasonable cut. Anyway, it is not really a cut, it is continuing the same level as this year. It is only a cut from the increase.

Mr. GRUENING and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Three minutes remain to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], as I pointed out a few moments ago that Pakistan and Turkey are already in violatior. of the law itself. They are not entitled to anything, if the Government would enforce it, because they are using their military aid for purposes that are prohibited under law and so the issue that the Church amendment, I believe, takes for granted, is that it will strengthen at least the determination of our Government to take the money from Turkey and Pakistan.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the basic fact is that Pakistan and India have been using money given them for defense against Communist invasion and aggression to fight each other. They have expended ammunition and used up machinery. It would seem to me not only would this cut be a distinct warning to them, but a useful instrument to deter them from military combat. We should say to them, "Look here, you have got to stop fighting each other or we are not going to give you the additional money which is intended for another purpose."

That is why I believe the amendment is extremely important and should be enacted.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to point out that the provisions for which the Senator from Rhode Island has made such an eloquent plea, already exist in the law under section 620(i) in the present foreign aid bill. There is now a prohibition against giving military assistance to any country engaging in aggression, and a Presidential determination is required in that regard. The language is perfectly clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this section of the bill be printed here in the RECORD.

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

(i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against (1) the United States, (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the difficulty is that there is no effective way to enforce this kind of provision, because it necessarily must rest upon Presidential discretion. Therefore, if we are to reach this problem, we can only reach it through our control of the purse strings. If we pull back on the purse strings, we force a reassessment of priorities and accomplish our purpose.

The consistent experience of the committee has been one of continuing frustration in attempting to establish standards of the kind the Senator from Rhode Island advocates. These now exist in the law; yet, military assistance goes on.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the law specifically states that none of this money shall be given to any nation which is warring against another nation which is receiving money from the same fund? Does not the Senator believe that enforcement of the law would be an inducement to these nations to bring their aggression to a halt?

Mr. CHURCH. In reply to the Senator from Rhode Island, let me read the law. Section 620(i):

(i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against (1) the United States, (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Idaho has now expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes on the bill to complete my argument.

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

Mr. CHURCH (continuing):

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such miltiary efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

Mr. President, I cannot imagine finding words that would be more definite in expressing the intent of Congress on this question. But words are not enforced. The only way Congress can influence the program is through the purse strings.

All my amendment seeks to do is to hold the military assistance program at its present level, in order to avoid increases to those very countries which are now violating their pledge to the United States by using military equipment which we have supplied to them in warring against one another.

If this does not make sense, I do not know what does.

The only way Congress can reach this matter—as the language of the present law proves—is by cutting down the amount of money available to the program. I believe that the case for my amendment is very good. Those who heard the testimony in the committee, when it came to a final vote, were in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time has now expired——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, is there any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the problem is a little bigger than the sponsor of this amendment has defined it.

What we are trying to prevent is giving an increase to the nations warring in violation of the intent of our aid. If I understand the law, they should be cut off from all funds.

The problem is bigger than what we are stating here. The problem which confronts us is the enforcement of the law.

Someone is derelict in his duty if we are giving out money prohibited by law. Someone positively is in dereliction of his duty if that is so. There is no question in my mind at all that it is a violation of law. I believe that what we should do if we have this problem is to come to grips with it. I do not believe that this amendment is the way to do it. We are making some kind of legislative history in the Senate today that does involve the security of the United States of America. We argue cutting down

these funds. We would not be cutting down funds alone for India, for Pakistan, for Turkey, or for Greece. We would be cutting these funds down for the entire panorama of those who are on our side in our fight against communism.

I believe that it would be wrong to inflict a meat ax cut at this point. If we have a problem of violations, I hope that the Foreign Relations Committee would get together to obtain an inquiry and find out why we are giving money to nations who are violating the law.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Communists have given up their hope of someday taking Greece. I do not believe they have given up their hope of someday taking Turkey. I do not believe that whether or not Greeks or Turks happen to be fighting with each other lessens the Communist interest in taking over either one of them. We started a program in 1947 to let those countries build themselves up to the point where they could at least resist or hold the line against Communist aggression in the event it started. I do not believe that the Communists have given up their desire to take Pakistan or India. It is unfortunate that Pakistan and India are embroiled in some measure with each other. However, if we deprive them of what they need to defend themselves until we can get there if the Communists move against them, we are inviting Communist aggression and are urging them to come in. This was the argument of the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of State before our committee.

Under the conditions as they exist throughout the world today, I believe it would be a most inopportune time to make this cut.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the statement has been made that the adoption of the Church amendment would hold the expenditures in this area of military equipment, supplies and ammunition at present levels. I point out that that statement is not correct. In the past 5 years we have made a reduction in the pipeline of $700 million. This means that the delivery of military goods amounted to the appropriation plus the diminution in the pipeline. The pipeline is at the point where it cannot be cut any more. Therefore this proposal in effect, would be a cut. How much, no one can tell, but it is an actual cut against the present level.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield back whatever time remains to me.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken	Ellender	Nelson
Allott	Ervin	Pell
Anderson	Fulbright	Prouty
Bartlett	Gore	Proxmire
Bayh	Gruening	Randolph
Bennett	Hart	Robertson
Bible	Hruska	Saltonstall
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Simpson
Carlson	Long, La.	Symington
Church	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Clark	Montoya	Yarborough
Cotton	Morse	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Moss	

NAYS—43

Boggs	Javits	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Dirksen	Mansfield	Smathers
Dodd	McCarthy	Smith
Dominick	McGee	Stennis
Eastland	McIntyre	Thurmond
Fannin	McNamara	Tower
Hickenlooper	Metcalf	Tydings
Hill	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Holland	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Inouye	Monroney	
Jackson	Morton	

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Hayden	Neuberger
Brewster	Lausche	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Curtis	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fong	McClellan	Talmadge
Harris	Murphy	
Hartke	Muskie	

So Mr. CHURCH's amendment was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 241, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer a modified version of my amendment No. 241, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. (d) At the end thereof, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 649. LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE IN FISCAL YEARS 1966 AND 1967.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the aggregate of the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for use during each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under this Act shall not exceed $3,000,000,000 for each such year.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as many Senators know, I had planned to propose an amendment that would cut the bill by $500 million. But the Senate added $89 million to the original committee bill, and $2 million in an amendment by Senator PELL. So I have picked the round number of $3 billion, which means that we would cut the bill as amended by the Senate by $443 million. Let me make clear again that instead of $500 million cut as I originally proposed, I am now proposing a cut of $443 million, leaving a round figure of $3 billion as the foreign aid figure.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon what the amount authorized for foreign aid 2 years ago was. What was the total?

Mr. MORSE. The figures are as follows:

Total foreign aid appropriations

	Billions
1963	$3.9
1964	3.0
1965	3.25
1966 (in this bill)	3.44

Comparisons of foreign aid requests, authorizations, and appropriations

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Requested	Authorized	Appropriated
1963	4.78	4.57	3.90
1964	4.53	3.60	3.0
1965	3.52	3.51	3.25

Mr. President, the case for my amendment is found in 11 inches of condensed evidence piled on top of my desk. I know that Senators have not read these reports, but I say most respectfully that I am at a loss to understand how Members of the Senate can vote on a foreign aid bill without familiarizing themselves, at least in general, with the nature of the reports.

These are the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States. They are devastating reports of the watch dog of the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress, by the agency that the Congress has set up to "watch dog" the expenditure of appropriated funds. These reports show the shocking waste, inefficiency, and the cause of corruption of American foreign aid around the globe.

Listen to the testimony of the Comptroller General before the Foreign Relations Committee when asked a question by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. It appears on p. 346 of the hearings:

Senator CLARK. I am not quite sure I know what you mean when you say "you can't compare." Do you mean AID is so much worse?

That is, speaking of AID in comparison with other agencies.

Mr. CAMPBELL (the Comptroller General). I think the AID problem of waste is greater than it is in any other civil agency.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire colloquy of Senator CLARK and Mr. Campbell on this point be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMPARISON OF AID ADMINISTRATION TO OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Senator CLARK. Mr. Campbell, in the course of the very able work done by the very fine people in your agency, you range pretty far and wide across the executive branch of our Federal Government.

I am wondering if you could give us your view as to whether the administration of this AID agency is any worse than the others you audit in terms of waste or inadequate handling of the money which is appropriated to this Agency?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator CLARK, this, of course, is a very unusual program as you know.

Senator CLARK. Fraught with unusual difficulties.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Great difficulties: The program has serious personnel problems and my prediction is that it will have more problems because it is becoming more difficult every day to persuade capable people, in sufficient numbers, to live in the countries in which we are attempting to help out in the economic as well as the military assistance programs.

Senator CLARK. Particularly when they tend to become "whipping boys."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, even with our own staff, we have a great difficulty today in getting young men to live abroad as compared with 10 years ago when foreign assignments were quite popular. This takes me to the answer to your question: As far as I know, let us put Defense agencies aside, in the civil area, in which the economic assistance program would logically fall. I don't think that you can compare the problem of waste in other agencies with the problem in AID.

Senator CLARK. I am not quite sure I know what you mean when you say "you can't compare." Do you mean AID is so much worse?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the AID problem of waste is greater than it is in any other civil agency.

Senator CLARK. Do you mean any other civil agency that you audit?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We see them all, with the exception of a very few which are exempt from our surveillance.

Senator CLARK. How about USIA?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That would generally be comparable to the State Department's problem, as contrasted with AID's problem.

Senator CLARK. You would say, of course, there is an enormous State Department establishment overseas outside of AID. Would it be your opinion that the waste in AID would be substantially greater than the regular State Department activities?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not so sure. I think that from where I sit, the reports coming to me would indicate that the percentage of saving of waste is greater than it is in the State Department proper.

Senator CLARK. Well, they have more money to spend.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There would be more money to spend.

Senator CLARK. I am not trying to press you for an answer you are unwilling to give.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, but——

Senator CLARK. This program has been in the doghouse of the Congress for goodness knows how long. It is awfully easy for individuals to whom the program is unpopular to talk in generalities about waste and inefficiency and ineffective personnel. I am asking for a specific answer to a question which may not be susceptible to a specific answer. In your opinion, is that an Agency that is badly run and which Congress——

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad you said it that way, Senator, because we are talking about waste. You might also be talking about an agency that is well run and in which there could be substantial waste.

Senator CLARK. That is true.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because by the nature of its activity——

Senator CLARK. And because of the individuals with whom they must deal; take the Philippine situation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (continuing). Waste is a fundamental part of it. It may well be. But I say that the AID program is in a class by itself with respect to prospective waste.

Senator CLARK. Is this not equally true of the defense program overseas?

Mr. STOVALL. Except the defense purposes seem to be a little more definable.

Senator CASE. You mean not military assistance?

Senator CLARK. I am not talking about defense support. I am talking about the actual deployment of American troops overseas with all the attendant problems which that raises and which are not so very different from the problems which affect AID. I am seeking an answer from you as to whether you think the Defense Department and the military do a better job in eliminating waste and running an efficient shop than AID does. That is value judgment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In my judgment I would say the military does a better job.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot read to the Senate the confidential reports of the Comptroller General, but Senators can read them. After they leave my desk they will go back to the Foreign Relations Committee and be available to Senators there. I suggest that Senators read those so-called confidential reports. I have checked and found that I am free to read their titles. If Senators will read those confidential reports, they will know why the senior Senator from Oregon for the past several years has been urging Congress to revise and reform the foreign aid program and stop the clipping of American taxpayers out of hundreds of millions of dollars that they ought to be protected in seeing to it that they are not wasted.

Listen to some of these titles: "Inadequate Planning, Programing, and Contracting for a Fixed Communications System for the Government of Indonesia Under the Military Assistance Program." The Comptroller General went into Indonesia and came forth with his findings of shocking waste in connection with that program. Do not forget that these are examples. This is not an exhaustive, all-inclusive survey of the expenditure of hundreds of millions of American taxpayers' dollars. Do not forget that we are dealing with a program which, since 1946, has resulted in the spending of more than $111 billion of American taxpayer largess in the foreign aid program.

Listen to the title of the next secret report: "Report on Review of Military Assistance Provided to the Republic of the Philippines." It is a nice, thick volume, in which the Comptroller General found one waste after another, plus inefficiency, in the administration of the program.

One cannot read these reports and not form, reluctantly, as I have reluctantly and sadly formed, the opinion that the administration of foreign aid is honeycombed with wastrels. The administration of aid is honeycombed with personnel who are given to inefficiency because of shocking incompetency on the part of too many of the people in the administration of foreign aid.

Mr. President, one cannot read these reports of the Comptroller General without concluding that our foreign aid administration is overstaffed in one part of the world after another. The record is against foreign aid, so far as its administration protects the interests of the American taxpayer.

All that the senior Senator from Oregon has been trying to do in the years that he has been pleading for reform of foreign aid is to try to clean out the inefficiency and waste. One cannot read these reports without discovering that the Comptroller General has found out that the way foreign aid has been administered in some areas of the world has led to corruption on the part of the foreign governments that we are aiding.

It is sad to relate that the word "secret" appears on every one of these reports. In a free society, which we call a democracy, the American taxpayers, who pay the bill, ought to have this information by way of a full public disclosure. Why in the world should the American taxpayers be denied access to the evidence of the shocking inefficiency and waste of a branch of their Government called the foreign aid administration? Why should they not be told the ugly facts that exist in the administration of foreign aid? We ought to clean house with respect to foreign aid. That is all I have been asking for.

Mr. President, there is no reason why the American taxpayers should have concealed from them such vital facts as are brought out by the Comptroller General. Do we really believe in government by secrecy? Does Congress really want to support government by concealment? I say, most respectfully, that this is the way to establish a government of executive supremacy. This is the way to break down our system of checks and balances, constitutionally guaranteed to the American people, a system of three

coordinate, coequal branches of government.

I know that some Senators do not like to hear what I am relating; but I say, most respectfully, that so long as Congress puts its stamp of approval upon the device of operating the Government by secrecy, the American people will lose their freedom to the extent that they are denied the protection to which they are entitled; namely, in a democracy, a full public disclosure of the public's business. So long as Congress supports the doctrine of government by secrecy, we who are in the minority have our lips sealed, because we all know that we cannot violate the doctrine of secrecy and not find ourselves in violation of the rules that are binding upon us as Senators.

I will tell the American people where they can correct this situation. They can correct it in the voting booths. They ought to start correcting it in 1966 and finish the job in 1968.

I say to the American people: You ought to make clear between now and the election of 1966 and the election of 1968 that you want government by secrecy in this country stopped, and that, therefore, you will hold to an accounting those who ask that you place your trust in them, and see whether or not they will join with those of us who want government by secrecy in this country stopped.

Let me read another title: "Waste of Funds in Construction of Shahabad Depot in Iran Under Military Assistance Program." I ask Senators to read that report and then tell me if they are so sure they were right when they voted against the motion of the senior Senator from Oregon to try to do something to reduce the amount for military aid. So many millions of dollars are being wasted in the military aid program that it is shocking that we cannot bring about the type of cuts that the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Alaska, and other Senators have been trying to get in connection with the foreign aid program.

Let me read another title: "Inadequate Consideration Given to Utilizing Reserve Fleet Ships in Lieu of Providing New Ships to Iran Under the Military Assistance Program." If Senators will read that report, they will find another devastating report against the administration of the American foreign aid program.

Let me read another title: "Review of Military Assistance Program for a Far East Country." They will not even mention the name of the country in this one. It is awful. Read it. They even keep the name of the country a secret in the title of the document.

I am not privileged to name the country. I am privileged only to name the titles of the report. This is another example of the shocking waste of American taxpayers' dollars in connection with that report, found by our own watchdog, our own agent.

For the past several years Congress has been walking out on one of the most dedicated public spirited servants we have ever had—the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Campbell. In committee and on platforms across the country, I have praised him. I praise him again on the floor of the Senate. Here is a man who dares to speak the facts as he finds them. Here is a courageous public servant.

We have treated him in a very shabby fashion. Congress ought to be thanking him and not, in effect, repudiating him. That is what we are doing when we refuse to adopt amendments that would bring about reforms that he finds are called for.

Listen to the next title. "Deficiencies in the Military Assistance Program for the Spanish Army." Read it and one will have a hard time to justify our failure to vote for the necessary cuts in military aid and the clearing up of the foreign aid program.

"Review of Military Assistance Program for Indonesia." We cannot even get stopped the foreign aid program for that little military tyrant in Indonesia without putting a so-called presidential escape clause in it. When I think of the millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money that Congress has wasted by supporting that reprehensible character, the head of the Indonesian Government, I am at a loss to understand why we have not cut out, with no escape clause at all, but as a matter of principle, further aid to that tyrant.

Listen to the next title. "Furnishing of Military Assistance to Ethiopia in Excess of the Country's Ability To Effectively Utilize the Equipment." Read it and one will find a great waste of the American taxpayers' money that we have been guilty of in connection with our foreign aid in Ethiopia as to its military weapons.

Listen to the next title. "Inefficient Utilization of Personnel To Administer the Military Assistance Program in Advanced Western European Countries." Our European allies would not like to hear that one. However, for some years I have pointed out that we have been throwing away American taxpayers' money in connection with NATO.

Listen to the title of the next one. "Unnecessary or Premature Procurement of Sidewinder Missile Training Systems and Their Delivery to Foreign Countries Under the Military Assistance Program." Read it. It represents another shocking waste of the taxpayers' money.

Listen to the title of the next one: "Inadequate Administration of Military Budget Support Funds Provided to Pakistan Under the Foreign Assistance Program." Read it, and one will find again that we have been pouring down the rathole of waste millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money. And yet some Senators plead to clean house on foreign aid. We plead to try to stop the shocking waste. What are we faced with? The waving of the flag into tatters. The argument is, "This is not the time."

Let me say for those apologists that the time will never be appropriate, for they will always find an alibi and rationalization for not proceeding to protect the American taxpayers in connection with the foreign aid program.

That is why the Senator from Oregon has been trying to bring to an end the entire program by means of the Morse amendment, the amendment that came from the committee, and other means. I would be less than honest if I were to say that I am not the most surprised man that it survived the committee, and I hope that it survives in the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, how much would the amendment reduce the aggregate authorization for the fiscal year 1965–66?

Mr. MORSE. $443 million. That is my revised amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. There would be a figure of $3 billion?

Mr. MORSE. $3 billion. That would involve a saving of $443 million.

The Senator from Maryland knows that I previously stated that I would try to cut the bill by $500 million. However, that was before the Senate added another $89 million. I thought I had better take a round figure of $3 billion. That would make a saving, as I said, of $443 million.

I am glad that the Senator asked the question. I have tried to be fair to the administration and leave it to their discretion as to where to make the cut. They will not have any difficulty. They will have no difficulty making a cut of $443 million. If they take only 10 percent of the Comptroller General's findings they will find that they can save many times $443 million within that 10 percent.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I call attention to an individual case which I think reflects on the administration, or rather the mechanics, of foreign aid. I am not sure of the answer, and perhaps my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has comment on the following distressing development in distribution of food in Latin America under our aid program.

I have a friend who part time lives in Iquitos, in the country of Peru. My distinguished colleagues, Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS, who are in the Chamber, should know that my friend is from the State of Florida. I believe his family is well known to my colleagues.

He has provided me within recent days a card removed from certain foodstuff, which are being given out in that country. On the label it states, "Donated by the people of the United States of America. Not to be sold or exchanged."

This young man points out to me that the natives cannot read English, that they, of course, read Spanish—some of them read Spanish. Many cannot read any language. The label should be in the language of the country. Yet he says that the people there do not know that what we are giving them comes from the United States of America. He states further and indicates that much of our gift material is being sold in Iquitos, Peru.

This is a perplexing problem. I call it to the attention of the Senate today, not to argue for or against the pending amendment, but to caution the citizens of our country that this misuse of our largess should be eliminated.

Mr. MORSE. That goes on all over the world in connection with this program. I cannot mention the country, but one of the reports points out that we made available a large sum of aid money to a country, and they took the money and bought wheat from Australia, while, at the same time, we had wheat rotting in American storage bins in surplus.

Our Government does not like to have the Comptroller General point out those sordid facts, but this dedicated public servant, in report after report, has given the Senate and the House evidence that justifies them in making savings on the foreign aid bill.

But what are we doing? We are yielding to pressure and arm twisting. We are yielding to the greatest lobby in this country; namely, the lobby of the Pentagon, the State Department, and the AID officials. Those are the most important and powerful lobbies in the country, supported by the White House. I put the responsibility where it rests—on the front step of the White House, because it has the responsibility for cleaning up the foreign aid program.

I am at a loss to understand how these devastating reports showing shocking waste in the administration of the foreign aid program could continue to exist and the White House not insist on cleaning it up.

I read the title of the next report:

Ineffective Programing, Delivery, and Utilization of Aircraft and Related Equipment Furnished to the Portuguese Air Force Under the Military Assistance Program.

Read it and tell me how a Senator can justify his vote in opposition to cleaning up the foreign aid program.

The next one:

Ineffective Maintenance and Utilization of Equipment Furnished to Iran Under the Military Assistance Program.

Read it and tell the American people how Senators can justify their votes against efforts seeking to clean up the foreign aid program.

I read the next title:

Inadequate Administration of Military Budget Support Funds Provided to Iran Under the Foreign Assistance Program.

Read that one and tell me how Senators can justify their votes against amendments of the senior Senators from Idaho and Oregon and other Senators, who have been offering amendments in good faith, trying to eliminate some of the shocking waste in the administration of the foreign aid program.

I read the next one:

Ineffective Programing, Delivery and Utilization of Aircraft and Related Equipment Furnished to the Portuguese Air Force Under the Military Assistance Program.

Read that one and tell me if Senators are so sure of the way they voted when they cast votes against amendments trying to save the American taxpayers from the shocking waste in the administration of the military assistance program.

The next one reads:

Review of Programing, Delivery, and Utilization of Selected Missile System Equipment Delivered to European Countries Under the Military Assistance Program.

Read that one and tell me if Senators do not believe they should have done something about supporting amendments that seek to save the American taxpayers from the shocking waste in the administration of the military assistance program.

The next one:

Review of License Fees Being Charged the U.S. Government for the Right To Produce SS–11 Antitank Guided Missile Mutually Developed by France and the United States.

Read that report and tell me how enthusiastic Senators are about having voted against amendments that would have saved taxpayers from some of the shocking waste in the administration of the military assistance program.

The next one:

Review of the Utilization of Army Equipment Furnished Under the Military Assistance Program for Thailand.

Senators know that if they read that one and read the other reports on Thailand they could not justify their refusal to do something about cleaning up the administration of the Foreign Aid Act. Most Senators do not know that we really finance Thailand as far as the military is concerned. We supply her additional funds for supporting assistance, which is nothing more than another military assistance program under an economic label.

I am always amused when I hear the bleeding hearts for freedom talking about freedom in southeast Asia, for in southeast Asia we do not support freedom. We support totalitarianism. In Thailand we are not supporting freedom; we are supporting a monarchy. In Thailand we are not supporting a free society; we are supporting a society that lives under a form of totalitarian government. We are pouring great sums of the American taxpayers' money into it. Yet when a few of us try to clean up the foreign-aid program, we are considered somewhat strange in some quarters for trying to stop some of the shocking waste in the administration of the foreign-aid program.

Let me read the next one:

Review of Payments Made by the United States for Construction of Airfields in France.

Let me read the next one:

Ineffective and Overly Costly Aspects of Military and Economic Assistance Provided to Thailand.

More waste. Let me read the next one:

Unnecessary Dollar Grants to Iran Under the Foreign Assistance Program.

More waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself time under the bill. I expect to use all the time in opposing the bill. I do not believe any other Senator will be opposing the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, there are 4 hours on the bill, which some Senators will be using. I see no reason why the Senator should not use time on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 10 minutes under the bill.

The next report is titled:

Review of Economical Assistance Provided to the Republic of the Philippines for Development Purposes.

That is an account of more waste.

Now we come to a group of reports in blue. They deal with economic matters. They are not secret, but there is no more reason why these should be open to the public than the others.

The title of the first one is:

Overprocurements Resulting from Ineffective Supply Management in Korea Under the Military Assistance Program.

The next one is:

Unofficial Use and Overstated Needs of Commercial Type Vehicles by the Military Assistance Advisory Group and the Headquarters, Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China.

The next one is titled:

Review of the Local Currency Military Budget Support Program for Korea.

The matter of local currencies and the misuse of the objectives of our foreign aid program thereunder is pretty shocking.

The next one is titled:

Questionable Aspects of Budget-Support Loan Made to the Government of Ecuador.

In reading it, Senators will find further evidence of the need to clean up the foreign aid program.

The next one is titled:

Summary of Deficiencies Related to the Inadequate Administration of Military Budget Support Funds Provided to Certain Countries Under the Foreign Assistance Program.

The next one is titled:

Excessive Costs Incurred for Rehabilitating to Original Appearance and Serviceability Military Equipment Donated to Foreign Nations Under the Military Assistance Program, Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, because the reports are all of the same type, that the titles of the remaining reports be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Unnecessary Payment by the United States of Costs Properly Chargeable to Japan for Administrative and Related Expenses of the Military Assistance Program for Japan.

Followup Review of Department of Defense Action To Obtain Reimbursement From Foreign Countries for Administrative Expenses Under the Military Assistance Program.

Followup Review of Department of Defense Action in Canceling Excessive Procurements and Redistributing Aircraft Spare Parts Programed for or Delivered to Portugal Under the Military Assistance Program—Department of Defense.

Summary of Reviews of the Maintenance and Supply Support of Army Equipment Furnished to Far East Countries Under the Military Assistance Program.

Weaknesses Involving Primarily the Disposition of Surplus Nonfat Dry Milk—Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

Unnecessary Costs Resulting From an Inflexible Policy of Donating Flour Instead of

Wheat to Voluntary Relief Agencies for Distribution Abroad Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as Amended—Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development.

Improper Payment of Port Charges on Shipments to Colombia of Food Donated Under Title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Agency for International Development.

Improper Payment of Colombian Port Charges for Surplus Agricultural Commodities Sold Under Title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Commonly Known as Public Law 480)—Department of Agriculture.

Followup Examination on Certain Aspects of U.S. Assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a Rail Link Between Turkey and Iran—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Inadequate Controls for Determining Compliance by Foreign Governments With Restrictions Placed on the Disposition of Agricultural Commodities Made Available Under Title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Commonly Known as Public Law 480)—Department of Agriculture, June 1963.

Understatement of Claims Against the United Arab Republic and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia for Recovery of Excessive Ocean Transportation Costs Financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation Under Title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Commonly Known as Public Law 480)—Department of Agriculture.

Excessive Ocean Transportation Costs Incurred for Shipments Until Title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Department of Agriculture.

Unnecessary Dollar Costs Incurred in Financing Purchases of Commodities Produced in Brazil—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Ineffective Utilization of Excess Personal Property in the Foreign Assistance Program—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Failure to Effectively Utilize Excess U.S.-Owned Foreign Currencies To Pay International Air Travel Ticket Costs Being Paid in Dollars—Department of State, Department of Defense, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, and other Government Agencies.

Improper Retention of Dollar Collections on Loans Made by Corporate Development Loan Fund—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Additional Interest Costs to the United States Because of Premature Releases of Funds to the Social Progress Trust Fund Administered by the Inter-American Development Bank—Treasury Department and Agency for International Development.

Loss of Interest on U.S.-owned Foreign Currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan)—Treasury Department, Department of State, and Agency for International Development.

Review of Certain Problems Relating to Administration of the Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam, 1958–62—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Review of the Administration of Assistance for Financing Commercial Imports and Other Financial Elements Under the Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam, 1958–62—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Turkey—Agency for International Development, Department of State, Fiscal Years 1958–62.

Undercollections of Interest and Principal in Foreign Currencies on Certain Loans to Foreign Governments—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Ineffective Administration of U.S. Assistance to Children's Hospital in Poland—Agency for International Development and the Department of State.

Deficiency in Administration of the Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for Chile—Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Examination of Certain Economic Development Projects for Assistance to Central Treaty Organization, Agency for International Development, Department of State.

Review of Economic Aspects of Loan for Construction of Water Supply System in Saigon, Vietnam, Development Loan Fund (Succeeded by Agency for International Development, Department of State).

Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Korea, International Cooperation Administration (Succeeded by Agency for International Development)—Department of State, Fiscal Years 1957–61, Part I.

Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Korea, International Cooperation Administration (Succeeded by Agency for International Development)—Department of State, Fiscal Years 1957–61, Part II.

Review of Administration and Utilization of U.S.-owned Foreign Currencies in Selected Countries.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I use these titles as my argument. I do not know what more can be said than what I have said for 3 years, year after year, as I have sought in the Senate to provide a cleanup of the foreign aid program. If these reports will not move the Senate, I hope the voters will move the Senate, because that is the only way there will be a cleanup of inefficiency and waste in the Government. But I also hope that if the people who elected us to this office really want it, Senators will take the necessary steps to clean up the waste, inefficiency, and corruption.

I spoke a moment ago about the fact that this year, for the first time, in the Foreign Relations Committee I received favorable consideration of the so-called Morse amendment on foreign aid. It was modified somewhat, but I believe members of the committee at least left the heart of it there and the arteries attached to it.

Accordingly, I accepted the modification. The Morse formula on foreign aid seeks to bring to an end the present program of foreign aid from the beginning of fiscal year 1967, that we start all over with a new foreign aid program.

I am for foreign aid. I know that I am represented across the country as being some kind of neo-isolationist, that I am against all foreign aid, when exactly the opposite is true.

I happen to be for good foreign aid, not corrupt foreign aid. I am for foreign aid that will really help the United States export the greatest weapon for foreign aid it has; namely, the weapon of economic freedom to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Thus, Mr. President, I am glad that the Morse formula is in the Senate bill. I hope that it will stay there. I wish the Senate to know that the second major feature of the Morse formula, if it becomes law, provides for a new foreign aid program at the beginning of fiscal 1967, which would be limited to 50 countries rather than to the 90 countries we are now aiding. We cannot justify spending millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money on 90 nations.

That is the heart of the Morse formula on foreign aid.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I believe I am asking for a bare minimum when I ask for a $443 million cut in the bill, leaving $3 billion, and leaving it up to the President and his assistants to decide where the savings will be made.

I wish the Senator from New Hampshire were in the Chamber, because he and I had a talk a few moments ago concerning the pipeline. I advise Senators not to be fooled by pipeline statistics. The Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He said—and I believe I am quoting him correctly—that he never has been able to get an accurate account of what is really in the pipeline in view of all the confusing language used.

In my judgment, the $3 billion ceiling on this aid would leave, over, and above the $3 billion, so much money for the administration to carry on its foreign assistance program, that I am ultraconservative in asking for only a cut of $443 million, because the total foreign assistance program of this Government is nearer $7 billion than any amount which the administration talks about.

We must take into account all the other foreign aid programs which semantically are not labeled foreign aid. They are labeled foreign assistance of one kind or another. It is all American taxpayers' money. The poor taxpayers are the ones being clipped, sheared, and fleeced. I happen to believe that although it is long overdue, we should start now to carry out what I consider to be our trust, and clean up the foreign aid program—for it is a stinking mess.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the reports, I do not wish the RECORD to stand that the committee gave the Comptroller General shabby treatment, or that we ignored his reports. On the contrary, he appeared for a full day before our committee, and we adopted four or five of his suggestions, which are now incorporated in the bill, to cut down the very kind of abuse—if that is the proper word—which has taken place. We went far in accepting the suggestions of the Comptroller General as to how to deal with the abuses which are recorded in the reports which the Senator from Oregon has described. Therefore, I do not believe it is correct to say that the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, was given shabby treatment and that no one paid any attention to him. We paid a great

deal of attention to him. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee have the greatest respect for him and believe that he is a most outstanding public servant, and has done an excellent job in supervising and trying to keep up with this extremely difficult program all over the world.

Another point I should like to make is that it is generally said—and I have seen the figures before—that $111 billion have been distributed—I believe the Senator says in foreign aid largess, leaving the impression that the foreign aid bill which is now under consideration, and its predecessor bills, have distributed $111 billion.

This is not so. There is nothing like that amount of money, according to the best figures which could be prepared for me by my staff. The AID program and its predecessor agencies—it has had two or three names—have distributed $38.2 billion of which $29.3 was in grants, and $8.8 billion was in loans.

These figures are difficult to break down into clearcut categories, but one explanation of the difference is in the food for peace program under Public Law 480, which is not the AID program which we are dealing with today, which accounts in that $111 billion for $12.1 billion. That is one example of a large item which is not in AID, but comes under the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and has at least a dual role.

One of the principal reasons for that program is to assist domestic agriculture. It was of course, incidentally, very valuable to foreign countries. There is no denying that fact, but that legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Take the Export-Import Bank—included in the $111 billion total—which is $8.7 billion. These are loans made for the promotion of American exports and are repayable in dollars. The Export-Import Bank has been very successful. It has a large surplus.

Then there are such things as the Social Progress Trust Fund, and so forth. Many different items are involved. There are other economic programs, for example, which include some 30 separate programs, such as the British loan and subscriptions to certain international financial organizations.

For example, a subscription to the International Bank is not largess by foreign aid. That bank is extremely successful. It has a surplus of nearly $1 billion in earnings and is making substantial profits every year.

The large total of $111 billion includes all sorts of items in the area of foreign aid. It creates an entirely erroneous impression to use that figure in connection with the pending bill, because the pending bill is only one segment of the overall activities in this field.

Take the Marshall plan, for example. Of the grants of $29.3 billion which I mentioned in the AID and predecessor agencies, $13 billion was for the Marshall plan.

I believe that one clear mistake we made as a matter of policy—and the Senate is as much responsible as anyone—was that entirely too much was in grants, because we were dealing with countries which had already demonstrated their capacity for rehabilitation.

It is well, at least, to keep this general perspective in mind.

For the RECORD, I might mention that of that $111 billion, $33.6 billion consisted of straight military assistance grants, primarily for hardware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Again, this is somewhat like Public Law 480. It also has a dual purpose; that is, it is in the interest of the foreign country, but it has also been presented and justified and offered year after year by the Pentagon's representatives as being in our own interest. Year after year Defense Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff have said that a dollar spent in foreign military assistance for weapons is as important to our own defense here as a dollar spent on our own forces.

Here again there is a mixed motive. It is true that it helps protect the foreign country, but it is also in our own interest.

The one point I make is that there is a large amount in that category; $77.6 billion was for economic aid. Of that $77.6 billion, $47 billion was in grants, and $30 billion has been in loans. There has already been returned, as of the end of the fiscal year, $10.3 billion. This has not all been a "rathole" operation, so to speak, as one would gather from reading the newspapers.

The credits outstanding as of June 30, 1964, were $12.1 billion. It is anticipated, based upon past experience and on what is coming due, that in calendar year 1965, $929 million will be repaid; in 1966, $931 million; 1967, $915 million; in 1968, $860 million.

While this has been a loosely administered program, nevertheless, it is nothing like a $111 billion giveaway program, about which we so often read in the newspapers, as I have said. It is something less than that.

Many other things are involved. I do not need to go into them now. There are contributions to international organizations, and so forth. I believe Senators get the picture.

According to our arithmetic, the Senator from Oregon proposes to cut $441,170,000 across the board, without any allocation as to any item. The previous amendment specifically cut a specific item, and it related to certain programs that were presented in justification of those items by the Defense Department.

The proposed cut is a cut across the board. It is not specified where the cut is to be made. That is left to the administration.

In the first place, this is a very poor way to attempt to deal with a bill as complex as this one is. The senior Senator from Oregon has complained bitterly about Congress abdicating its function. He has told how we are giving up our power to the executive department. Now he comes along and would turn over to the Executive a free rein to cut the program anywhere he wishes to cut it. The Executive could pick out the way to do it. This is not a good amendment. I believe that if he wishes to cut the program, this is not the way to cut it, with a meat-ax approach. That is a poor way to do it. If he wishes to reach this total—I am not suggesting that he do it this way, because I would be against it anyway—but if he wishes to make a cut, he should take so much out of each item. That is what the previous amendment would have done, and I favored it. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the President yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. What troubles me about the bill and the pending amendment is the recent action by the Senate in appropriating $700 million for the war operations in South Vietnam, and then the other day adding another $89 million in authorizations for development of the Mekong Delta.

We have been advocating and requesting and urging our allies to join us in the operations in South Vietnam, and up to this time with very limited success. It seems to me that an argument can be made, so long as we are now involved in a fight for freedom in southeast Asia, and as long as we found it necessary only within the last few weeks to ask the taxpayers of the country to spend $789 million more in that effort, that it would be a good idea to cut back $300 million or $400 million in our foreign aid program for this year, and let our friends know that we are sorry, but since some of them are not joining us in fighting the war in South Vietnam——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. MILLER. Because some are not joining us in the fight in Vietnam, the next best thing they can do is to take a little less foreign aid. I ask the Senator from Arkansas. What is wrong with that argument? Would he respond to that argument? We are in a multimillion-dollar deficit anyway, and this would be one way to help finance the war in South Vietnam without straining our own financial resources too much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator suggest that this ought to be conditioned upon no aid to those who are not helping us in South Vietnam? Is that his argument?

Mr. MILLER. Not necessarily, but it would be one approach.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be a possible approach. Perhaps the Senator could tie his argument to that approach better than to nothing at all; but what we have before us is a proposal of the administration, and it deals with a great many things besides Vietnam. For example, South America is heavily involved.

I do not believe that any of us seriously believes that those countries are capable of making any contribution to the war effort in South Vietnam. We are helping them. Should we say to them, "We will give you $10 million to help yourself, but you must give us back $5 million to help South Vietnam"? That is the kind of situation in which we would find ourselves. I regret that there are not many countries helping us in South Vietnam. What they are doing is merely helping in a token fashion. I do not believe we can tie all these troubles to foreign aid. Foreign aid must stand on its own bottom. It is based on the justification and reasons that have been offered, and it must stand on that justification or on nothing at all. I do not believe we can use it as a lever for extraneous objectives. I have always objected to trying to use the bill as a means of opening the Suez Canal, for example, or to try to make somebody be good. I do not believe in that approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 more minute.

I am sympathetic with the idea that we ought to have more help. Some countries will not help because they question whether we are entirely in the right in South Vietnam. Some countries, like France, have said as much. They think we are in the wrong, and therefore they will not help us. We have had differences of opinion in the the Senate, as the Senator has seen, when votes have shown a 50–50 difference of opinion on some amendments. The Senator will admit that there is argument for a difference of opinion here. There is certainly a good deal of it with respect to South Vietnam.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield I more minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 more minute.

Mr. MILLER. I believe that if the amendment were adopted, it would not be a case of the President saying that all foreign aid to a certain country is terminated. It seems to me that he might say even to Latin American countries that we regret it very much, but due to the war in South Vietnam we shall have to ask them to sacrifice a little along with us. Our boys are dying in South Vietnam; and certain Latin American countries could well get along with a little less foreign aid. That is what he could say to those countries. I believe there would be merit to that approach. I do not understand why there would be objection to such an approach.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is an authorization bill. If the President finds that he does not wish to give a certain amount to any of these countries, because they have not acted right, he has the authority to do so. That is why the bill does not set a specific amount for each country. It leaves that to the President's discretion. He has the discretion to make arrangements. The Senator's proposal would cut the total below what those who presented the facts to us have justified, at least in the judgment of a majority of the committee. All this will come back again and will be gone over again in the Appropriations Committees.

Whether or not the judgment of all the committees and the Congress together is infallible I shall leave for the Senator to answer. I presume there is some room for doubt about that, but that is the best I can do.

Mr. MILLER. I know I am asking the indulgence of my good friend the Senator from Arkansas and his patience, but I should like to ask one further question, and that will be all. I am advised that there is $7,340 million in the foreign aid pipeline. If the Morse amendment should be adopted, would it be the judgment of the Senator from Arkansas that there would necessarily be any particular reduction in foreign aid in the coming year in view of that pipeline?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A moment ago when military assistance was discussed quite a statement was made on that subject. The Senator from Kentucky made an impassioned plea. He said that the pipeline was down to rockbottom, and that the proposal would be taking the very meat out of the bones or the bones out of the meat if we cut that a little more than $100 million.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. That was in relation to military assistance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a third of the program. The Senator has already gone over that, so I shall not do it again. If the Senator will wait a moment, I shall determine what the pipeline is.

The timelag on supply equipment, and so on, is a slippery area. I believe the overall pipeline has been going down. In the economic program, unexpended balances at the end of June are estimated at $3,957,339,000. That is spread over all kinds of items. For example, there are development loans. Often there is a longtime lag between the negotiations and the actual expenditure of funds. Those are the estimated unexpended funds. They may not be unobligated, but the total is the unexpended balance. It is impossible for me to say that there are so many dollars in the pipeline. The amount I have stated is not an unduly large pipeline in view of the history; and I believe it is about as low as it has ever been. This is a very slippery area.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for his response. I recognize that it is not easy to pinpoint something like that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is difficult to say the exact amount.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have time available. I shall be glad to yield my time to the Senator if he desires it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to reply briefly to the Senator from Arkansas. First, I wish to make a correction in the figures stated in my amendment. I said that the amendment would save $459 million. The exact figure is $443 million. I shall make the correction in the RECORD. There has been a great deal of discussion of what is in the pipeline. Before I comment on what the Senator from Arkansas has said, some time ago I received from AID the figures as of March 31. That, of course, was 2½ months ago. We are close now to the end of the fiscal year, so the sum in the pipeline now is probably less.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I hold in my hand be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mutual defense and development programs—Unexpended balances (as of latest dates available)

[In millions of dollars]

	Unliquidated obligations, Feb. 28, 1965	Unobligated balances, Mar. 31, 1965	Total unexpended balance
Economic assistance:			
Development loan	1,826.1	369.4	2,195.5
Technical cooperation and development grants	247.3	111.9	359.2
Alliance for Progress:			
Development loans	784.6	158.6	943.2
Technical cooperation and development grants	[1] 456.0	28.1	[1] 484.1
Supporting assistance	283.3	163.3	446.6
Contingency fund	65.6	[2] 51.8	[2] 117.4
International organizations and programs	32.4	16.8	49.2
American schools and hospitals abroad	13.2	3.3	16.5
Surveys of investment opportunities	.7	1.9	2.6
Administrative expenses, AID	7.8	16.0	23.8
Administrative and other expenses, State	2.1	.6	2.7
Total, economic assistance	3,719.1	921.7	4,640.8
Military assistance: Appropriated funds [3]	2,305.5	195.0	[4] 2,500.5
Total, mutual defense and development programs	6,024.6	1,116.7	7,141.3

[1] Includes $356,700,000 IDB Social Progress Trust Fund.
[2] Excludes $50,000,000 possible transfer to "Military assistance."
[3] Estimated as of Mar. 31, 1965.
[4] Includes $50,000,000 possible transfer from "Contingency fund."

Unexpended balances, foreign assistance program, military and nonmilitary [1] including Alliance for Progress but excluding investment guarantees

[In billions]

1950	$3.5
1951	7.1
1952	9.9
1953	10.1
1954	9.6
1955	7.9
1956	6.4
1957	6.1
1958	5.3
1959	4.8
1960	4.8
1961	6.0
1962	6.6
1963	6.8
1964	6.3
1965 (estimated)	5.9

[1] Excludes $200,000,000 public debt funds and fees for the investment guarantee program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, nothing was said by the chairman that causes me to modify one iota a single word set forth in my previous speech. I stand on every word of it. Since 1946, $111 billion has been made available by the United States around the world for foreign aid and foreign assistance programs. If I correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas, he does not dispute that figure. That also is a staff figure. He points out that the money has been used for a variety of purposes.

A considerable amount of it is in loans. There are two types of loans. I did not hear any discussion from the Senator from Arkansas about the millions of dollars of so-called loans that are not loans at all but are really grants with the word "loan" describing them. They are 40- and 50-year loans at three-quarters of 1 percent interest with 10 years of a grace period in which nothing is to be paid. Then when the obligation is paid, it is to be paid in soft currency.

It is true that in recent years that type of soft loan has been shied away from, but for many years that was the common loan in the undeveloped areas.

I repeat that those loans are 40- to 50-year loans with three-quarters of 1 percent interest and a 10-year grace period with nothing at all to be paid. If payment is ever to be made—and we might as well forget about it; it never will be paid—it would be made in soft currency, which in many instances is not worth the sheets of used paper on my desk.

The chairman has said, "Of course, we made a mistake in connection with the Marshall plan. We granted them many millions of dollars under the Marshall plan without any repayment requirement."

The Senator is correct. I think we made a mistake. That is not what I am pointing out. I am pointing out what we did for our alleged allies and what our alleged allies have no intention of doing for us.

Under the Marshall plan, out of the largess of the taxpayers' money—and some of the reports of the Comptroller General show shocking wastes in that program—we built the greatest steel mills in the world. The greatest steel mills in the world do not exist in the United States today; they exist in Europe. Under that aid program we bought the greatest chemical plants in the world. They no longer exist in the United States; they exist in Europe. Under that program we built the greatest plastic plants in the world. They do not exist in the United States; they exist in Europe. In other places of the world we have built industrial plants now in competition with the United States. I am not begrudging that. But I am highly critical of the attitude of our alleged allies, including not only France, but Great Britain, and including not only France and Great Britain but the lowlands, and including not only the lowlands and France and Great Britain but all of our beneficiaries under the aid program into which we have poured millions of dollars either by way of grants or by way of soft loans or by so-called hard loans—and the hard loans are at a surprisingly low rate of interest.

Where are those allies in this time of crisis? Senators have heard me say many times during the past year that they will avoid us in Asia. They give us words but not help. Where are they in this hour of big crisis in trying to exercise their obligations of leadership to bring to an end the present growing serious threat to the peace of all the world, including themselves if the war in Asia continues unchecked?

No, Mr. President; $111 billion is the figure. Much of that $111 billion was in the form of grants; much of it was in the form of loans. We shall never see a cent of it. It will never come back to the United States.

Take a look at the record of our collection of loans. I believe we shall collect most of our hard loans, but I am talking about the aid that we have provided. I am talking about the benefits we have provided.

The time has come, after we have rehabilitated a good many of those countries, to start drawing the line.

The chairman argues about military hardware. It was to our benefit to provide some military hardware. Without it, those nations would be Communist nations today, because we stood in the way of Russia. Had we not had that courageous fight by the independent from Independence, Mo., and his predecessor, the incomparable Roosevelt, all Europe today would be Communist territory. I am a little disappointed by the short memories of many of our so-called allies in this hour of crisis.

It is all on our side of the ledger, so far as what we have done with $111 billion is concerned. What I am pleading for is that we start to taper off. The American taxpayers have a right to have the program tapered off. They have the right to expect Congress to taper it off to the very small amount of $443 million, as provided by my amendment.

As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has pointed out, this would have a salutary effect on our allies. It would have a salutary effect in demonstrating to the world, at long last, that there is a limit, a bottom, to the pockets of the American taxpayers, and how much we can spend on others in trying to keep communism from their shores.

I shall argue on Monday in connection with Latin American and African programs, as to which I shall offer two amendments. Representatives of African countries have spoken about their right to have foreign aid from the United States. That is what is happening. We had better put a check on that—and quickly. Now is the time to taper off. In its present form, the bill is an increase, and not a tapering off at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I do not wish to delay the vote. I hope I shall not precipitate a longer debate.

I desire to have the RECORD show that these repayments and interest from 1946 to 1964, as carried in the official summary, which I believe to be correct, amount to $11,154 million from the various so-called aid programs.

We are quibbling about what constitutes aid. I do not consider that the Export-Import Bank provides aid. We pay that ourselves. I agree with much of what the Senator from Oregon says; but he paints entirely too black a picture. One thing I detest about the foreign aid bill is that it is always a vehicle for many speeches which I think are grossly insulting to many of our allies. It is the kind of bill to inspire that kind of argument.

I do not believe that our allies are blameless. I regret that they do not agree with us more. But one of the reasons why they may not be enthusiastic about helping us in southeast Asia is that they have listened to the Senator from Oregon state to the world, for months and months, that the United States is entirely in the wrong there; so he has persuaded them that they have no business being there, and they do not take as much interest in that area as they might. But that has not much to do with this particular bill.

The effect of foreign aid would not be nearly so greatly exaggerated if we had a sensible interpretation of what aid is.

I do not consider that it is aid for me if a bank makes me a loan and charges me a reasonable rate of interest. That is what has happened in many cases. The Export-Import Bank does that. What I consider aid might be called is a grant or a soft loan. It is aid that could not be obtained under any other circumstances. It has the element of a gift or a grant or a subsidy, even though it may not be wholly a grant.

I am only trying to keep the picture in perspective. I do not deny that the United States has done more than any other country has. I do not deny that we have received shabby treatment from a few countries—not all, but a few.

That is the only point I wished to make. I am ready to vote. I do not believe the picture should be completely one sided. I do not expect to convince the Senator from Oregon; I merely want the RECORD to show that I do not accept his conclusions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator 30 seconds.

Mr. MORSE. I have not convinced our alleged allies that we are wrong in southeast Asia, but——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has done a mighty good job of it.

Mr. MORSE. I think that our illegal course of action there has convinced them that they have a good opportunity to make further economic cleanings, as is evidenced by the fact that British ships are still going into North Vietnamese ports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would vote "yea."

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

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Allott	Ervin	Simpson
Bible	Gruening	Stennis
Boggs	Hruska	Symington
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Cannon	Miller	Tower
Cotton	Morse	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Robertson	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Montoya
Bartlett	Holland	Morton
Bayh	Inouye	Moss
Bennett	Jackson	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pastore
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Clark	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Dirksen	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Douglas	McCarthy	Smathers
Fannin	McGee	Smith
Fulbright	McGovern	Sparkman
Gore	McIntyre	Tydings
Hart	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Mondale	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—20

Bass	Hartke	Muskie
Brewster	Lausche	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Pearson
Curtis	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Dodd	McClellan	Scott
Fong	Metcalf	Talmadge
Harris	Murphy	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall offer one additional amendment today. On Monday, I shall have a series of money amendments.

I am very much interested in seeing how my colleagues feel about providing money on a country-by-country basis. We have heard talk about doing something on an individual country basis. I might get some support in this way. I shall offer this amendment first because some of my colleagues suggested that if I were to offer to cut off $200 million, they would support it.

REPUBLICANS URGE HEARINGS ON U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY CONTROVERSY

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York under the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, in which I and Representative CURTIS, as ranking minority members of the committee, called for a public hearing by the Joint Economic Committee, to explore the fundamental issues raised by Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve, in his June 1 speech before the Alumni Federation of Columbia University concerning U.S. economic policy under present economic conditions.

This request has been refused for the moment by the chairman, Representative PATMAN. However, we shall press the request further.

I believe that the Senate should be informed as to what has occurred.

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

JUNE 2, 1965.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: William McChesney Martin's speech of June 1 before the alumni of Columbia University has forcefully brought into the open a fundamental disagreement on the future course of economic policy which exists within the executive branch. It is essential to our welfare as a nation that Chairman Martin's informed and timely warning about the economic perils which may lie ahead should be given the careful and thorough consideration which it deserves.

In the present economic context, the disagreement basically arises over whether the administration can continue to push expansionary fiscal and monetary policies without courting the dangers of a serious overheating of the economy marked by inflation and a further weakening in the international position of the dollar. The implication of Mr. Martin's speech is that such a chain of events might well lead to an economic collapse at home and throughout the free world that would be reminiscent of the 1930's.

We believe that the fundamental issues raised by Chairman Martin require immediate consideration by the Joint Economic Committee in pursuit of its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946. Therefore, we urge that you call hearings at the earliest possible time at which Chairman Martin, appropriate members of the administration and private witnesses might testify. We envision that such hearings would explore not only the basic issues raised by Mr. Martin about the differences and similarities between our situation today and in the 1920's, but also the outlook for the economy over the next year and the appropriate policies to deal with it.

You may recall that in August 1962 the minority of the JEC requested similar hearings in the face of mounting interest in a quickie tax cut, which many deemed necessary because of the fear of impending recession. Those hearings served a highly useful purpose in clarifying the issues and in laying to rest proposals for an emergency tax cut, which events proved unnecessary. We believe that hearings today such as we suggest would serve an equally valid and important public purpose.

With the best regards.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Ranking Minority Member.
THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Member of Congress, Ranking House Minority Member.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
June 9, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Your letter of June 2 raises a question that comes up in this committee every year; namely, whether to hold hearings on the economic outlook and

its implications for public policy. Of course, it has the added feature this time that certain issues have risen about the situation through a speech by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve.

As you doubtless know, we have sometimes held hearings either in midyear or in the fall on the economic situation and outlook. When we have not it has been because either hearings were not relevant to immediate legislative purpose, or else because the congressional schedule, including the schedule of our own committee, was so heavy that it was impossible to hold hearings at a time when members could attend.

After studying the situation, it appears to me that the legislative schedule at present is so heavy that it would be extremely difficult to have such hearings in the very near future. You may be sure, however, that the suggestion which you and Congressman CURTIS made will be given further sympathetic consideration as the schedule unfolds and we know a little better whether or not this can be done without interfering with legislative schedules.

Meanwhile, I have instructed the staff to exercise unusual care to keep thoroughly apprised of economic developments and of the opinion of of outside experts so that, should there seem to be developing a strong current of opinion that the economic situation is changing, we can again review the desirability of an inquiry. The staff can apprise the committee of such developments in the situation by memorandum.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I want merely to add that I join the Senator and Representative in calling upon the Joint Economic Committee with reference to this timely and important statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by William McChesney Martin, Jr., entitled "Does Monetary History Repeat Itself?" made at the commencement day luncheon of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University on June 1, 1965, in order that the speech may be available for the full discussion that obviously will take place.

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

DOES MONETARY HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

(Address of William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Commencement Day Luncheon of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, New York City, June 1, 1965)

When economic prospects are at their brightest, the dangers of complacency and recklessness are greatest. As our prosperity proceeds on its record-breaking path, it behooves every one of us to scan the horizon of our national and international economy for danger signals so as to be ready for any storm.

Some eminent observers have recently compared the present with the period preceding the breakdown of the interwar economy, and have warned us of the threats of another great depression. We should take these warnings seriously enough to inquire into their merits and to try to profit in the future from the lessons of the past.

And indeed, we find disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties.

Then, as now, there had been virtually uninterrupted progress for 7 years. And if we disregard some relatively short though severe fluctuations, expansion had been underway for more than a generation—the two longest stretches of that kind since the advent of the industrial age; and each period had been distorted in its passage by an inflationary war and postwar boom.

Then, as now, prosperity had been concentrated in the fully developed countries, and within most of these countries, in the industrialized sectors of the economy.

Then, as now, there was a large increase in private domestic debt; in fact, the expansion in consumer debt arising out of both residential mortgages and instalment purchases has recently been much faster than in the twenties.

Then, as now, the supply of money and bank credit and the turnover of demand deposits had been continuously growing; and while in the late twenties this growth had occurred with little overall change in gold reserves, this time monetary expansion has been superimposed upon a dwindling gold reserve.

Then, as now, the Federal Reserve had been accused of lack of flexibility in its monetary policy: of insufficient ease in times of economic weakness and of insufficient firmness in times of economic strength.

Then, as now, the world had recovered from the wartime disruption of international trade and finance, and convertibility of the major world currencies at fixed par values had been restored for a number of years.

Then, as now, international indebtedness had risen as fast as domestic debt; recently, in fact, American bank credits to foreigners and foreign holdings of short-term dollar assets have increased faster than in the closing years of the earlier period.

Then, as now, the payments position of the main reserve center—Britain then and the United States now—was uneasy, to say the least; but again, our recent cumulative payments deficits have far exceeded Britain's deficits of the late twenties.

Then, as now, some countries had large and persistent payments surpluses and used their net receipts to increase their short-term reserves rather than to invest in foreign countries.

Then, as now, the most important surplus country, France, had just decided to convert its official holdings of foreign exchange into gold, regardless of the effects of its actions on international liquidity.

Then, as now, there were serious doubts about the appropriate levels of some existing exchange rate relationships, leading periodically to speculative movements of volatile short-term funds.

And most importantly, then as now, many Government officials, scholars, and businessmen were convinced that a new economic era had opened, an era in which business fluctuations had become a thing of the past, in which poverty was about to be abolished, and in which perennial economic progress and expansion were assured.

If some of these likenesses seem menacing, we may take comfort in important differences between the present and the interwar situation.

The distribution of our national income now shows less disparity than in the earlier period; in particular, personal incomes, and especially wages and salaries, have kept pace with corporate profits, and this has reduced the danger of investment expanding in excess of consumption needs.

Perhaps related to that better balance, the increase in stock market credit now has been much smaller.

Instead of a gradual decline in wholesale prices and stability in consumer prices, there has now been stability in wholesale prices though consumer prices have been creeping up.

The worst defects in the structure of commercial and investment banking and of business seem to have been corrected—although we are time and again reminded of our failure to eliminate all abuses.

The potentialities of monetary and fiscal policies are, we hope, better understood—although the rise in Government expenditures even in times of advancing prosperity threatens to make it difficult to be still more expansionary should a serious decline in private business activity require it.

In spite of the rise in the international flow of public and private credit and investment, business abroad appears in general to be less dependent upon American funds. The recent restraint on the outflow of U.S. capital has had little effect on business activity abroad, in contrast to the paralyzing effect of the cessation of U.S. capital outflows in the late twenties.

While the cold war makes for sources of friction absent in the twenties, we are no longer suffering from the cancer of reparations and war debts.

We have learned the lessons taught by the failure of trade and exchange restrictions, and of beggar-my-neighbor policies in general, although the temptation to backslide is ever present.

We have become aware of our responsibility for helping those less developed countries that seem willing and able to develop their economies—although the poor countries still are not becoming rich as fast as the rich countries are becoming richer.

The International Monetary Fund has proved to be a valuable aid to a better working of the international payments system.

A network of international, regional and bilateral institutions and arrangements has reduced the danger of lack of international financial communication.

And finally, the experience of the twenties has strengthened the resolution of all responsible leaders, businessmen, and statesmen alike, never again to permit a repetition of the disasters of the great depression.

But while the spirit is willing, the flesh, in the form of concrete policies, has remained weak. With the best intentions, some experts seem resolved to ignore the lessons of the past.

Economic and political scientists still argue about the factors that converted a stock-exchange crash into the worst depression in our history. But on one point they are agreed: the disastrous impact of the destruction of the international payments system that followed the British decision to devalue sterling in September 1931. At that time, sterling was the kingpin of the world payments system, exactly as the dollar is today. While changes in the par values of other peripheral currencies affected mainly or solely the devaluing countries themselves, the fate of sterling shook the entire world.

This is not wisdom of hindsight. Only a few weeks before the fateful decision was taken, the most eminent economist of the day stated that "for a country in the special circumstances of Great Britain the disadvantages [of devaluation] would greatly outweigh the advantages" and he concurred with his colleagues in rejecting the idea. His name was John Maynard Keynes.

And soon afterwards, another great British economist, Lionel Robbins, declared that "no really impartial observer of world events can do other than regard the abandonment of the gold standard by Great Britain as a catastrophe of the first order of magnitude." This was long before the final consequences of that step had become apparent—the political weakening of the West which followed its economic breakdown and which

contributed to the success of the Nazi revolution in Germany, and thus eventually to the outbreak of the Second World War and to the emergence of communism as an imminent threat to world order.

As if neither Keynes, the founder of the anti-classical school of economics, nor Robbins, the leader of the neo-classical school, ever had spoken, some Keynesian and neoclassicist economists—fortunately with little support at home but with encouragement from a few foreign observers—are urging us to follow the British example of 1931 and to act once more in a way that would destroy a payments system based on the fixed gold value of the world's leading currency. In doing so, they not only show that they have have not learned from monetary history; they also impute to our generation even less wisdom than was shown in the interwar period.

The British Government in 1931, and the U.S. administration in 1933, can rightly be accused of underestimating the adverse international effects of the devaluation of the pound and the dollar. But at least they had some plausible domestic grounds for their actions. They were confronted with a degree of unemployment that has hardly ever been experienced either before or after. They were confronted with disastrously falling prices, which made all fixed-interest obligations an intolerable burden on domestic and international commerce. They were confronted with a decline in international liquidity, which seemed to make recovery impossible.

Neither Keynes nor Robbins have denied that, from a purely domestic point of view, there was some sense in devaluation. In the United States of 1933, one worker out of four was unemployed; industrial production was little more than half of normal; farm prices had fallen to less than half of their 1929 level; exports and imports stood at one-third of their 1929 value; capital issues had practically ceased. In such a situation, any remedy, however questionable, seemer better than inaction.

In the Britain of 1931, things were not quite as bleak as in the United States of 1933; but fundamentally, the economic problems were similar. Ever since 1925, the British economy had failed to grow, and by 1931, one out of five workers had become unemployed, exports—far more important for the British economy than for our own—had declined by nearly one-half, and most observers believed that overvaluation of the British pound was largely responsible for all these ills. Can anybody in good faith find any similarity between our position of today and our position of 1933, or even the British position of 1931?

In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to raise commodity prices. Today, a gold price increase is recommended as a means to provide the monetary support for world price stability. In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to combat deflation; today it is recommended in effect as a means to combat inflation. In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended as a desperate cure for national ills regardless of its disintegrating effect on world commerce; today it is recommended as a means to improve integration of international trade and finance. Can there be worse confusion?

True, most advocates of an increase in the price of gold today would prefer action by some international agency or conference to unilateral action of individual countries. But no international agency or conference could prevent gold hoarders from getting windfall profits; could prevent those who hold a devalued currency from suffering corresponding losses; could prevent central banks from feeling defrauded if they had trusted in the repeated declarations of the President of the United States and of the spokesmen of U.S. monetary authorities and kept their reserves in dollars rather than in gold. To this day, the French, Belgian, and Netherlands central banks have not forgotten that the 1931 devaluation of sterling wiped out their capital; and much of the antagonism of those countries against the use of the dollar as an international reserve asset should be traced to the experience of 1931 rather than to anti-American feelings or mere adherence to outdated monetary theories.

But most importantly, no international agency or conference could prevent a sudden large increase in the gold price from having inflationary consequences for those countries that hoarded gold, and deflationary consequences for those that did not. And the gold-holding countries are precisely those whose economies are least in need of an inflationary stimulus since they are most prosperous—not prosperous because they are holding gold, but holding gold because they are prosperous; in contrast, those that do not hold gold are most in need of further expansion. Hence the inflationary and deflationary effects of an increase in the price of gold would be most inequitably and most uneconomically distributed among nations.

If we were to accept another sort of advice given by some experts, we might repeat not the mistakes of 1931–33 but those of earlier years. We are told that a repetition of the disaster of the great depression could be averted only, or at least best, by returning to the principles of the so-called classical gold standards. Not only should all settlements in international transactions between central banks be made in gold, but also the domestic monetary policy of central banks should be oriented exclusively to the payments balance, which means to changes in gold reserves. Whenever gold flows out, monetary policy should be tightened; whenever it flows in, it should be eased.

This is not the place to discuss whether this pure form of gold standard theory has ever been translated into practice. I doubt that any central bank has ever completely neglected domestic considerations in its monetary policy. And conversely, we do not need to adhere to an idealized version of the gold standard in order to agree that considerations of international payments balance need to play a large role in monetary policy decisions. But even strict adherence to gold standard principles would not guarantee international payments equilibrium. As a great American economist, John H. Williams, put it in 1937:

"For capital movements, the gold standard is not a reliable corrective mechanism. * * * With capital the most volatile item in the balance of payments, it is apt to dominate and to nullify any corrective effects which might otherwise result from the gold standard process of adjustment. * * * It is surely not a coincidence that most booms and depressions, in the 19th century as well as in the 20th, had international capital movements as one of their most prominent features."

Even countries that advocate a return to gold standard practices do not practice what they preach. Gold reserves of some continental European countries have been rising strongly and continuously for many years, and according to the rules, these countries should follow a clearly expansionary policy. But in order to offset inflationary pressures, they have done exactly the opposite—and who is there to blame a country that wishes to assure domestic financial stability even at the expense of endangering equilibrium in international payments?

But obviously, if we permit one country to violate the rules of the gold standard in order to avert domestic inflation, we must also permit another country to violate those rules in order to avert domestic deflation and unemployment. In other words, we must agree that a country may be justified in avoiding or at least modifying a tightening of monetary policy even though its gold reserves are declining, if otherwise it were to risk precipitating or magnifying a business recession.

True, this deviation from gold-standard rules could be carried too far. Domestic developments might be taken as a pretext to avoid an unpopular monetary move, although the payments situation would seem to demand it and although the action would be unlikely to be damaging to the domestic economy. But the possibility of abuse and error is inherent in all human decision, and just as no sane observer would ascribe infallibility to the decisions of central bankers, neither should he ascribe infallibility to a set of rules. Few experts today would want to argue that it was right for the German Reichsbank in 1931, in the middle of the greatest depression that ever hit Germany, to follow the gold-standard rules by raising its discount rate to 7 percent merely in order to stem an outflow of gold; or that it was right for our own Federal Reserve to take similar restrictive action, for the same reason, in the fall of 1931.

And just as the success of monetary policy cannot be guaranteed by an abdication of discretion in favor of preconceived gold-standard rules, it cannot be guaranteed by following the advice of those who would shift the focus of policy from national agencies to an international institution. Surely, international cooperation should be encouraged and improved whenever possible. And the functions of the International Monetary Fund might well be enlarged so as to reinforce its ability to act as an international lender of last resort and as an arbiter of international good behavior.

But no institutional change can exclude the possibility of conflicts between national and international interests in specific circumstances. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that such conflicts would necessarily be resolved more wisely, more speedily, and with less rancor and dissent if they were fought out in the governing body of some supranational bank of issue rather than by discussion and negotiation among national authorities.

It is true that such discussion and negotiation may prove fruitless and that inconsistent decisions may be taken on the national level. But similarly, lack of consensus within a supranational agency may result in a paralysis of its functions, and the effects of such paralysis could well be worse than those of inconsistent national actions.

If then we doubt the wisdom of the three most fashionable recent proposals—to increase the dollar price of gold, to return to pure gold-standard principles, or to delegate monetary policy to an international agency—what should be our position? And what is the outlook for solving present and future difficulties in international monetary relations, and thus for avoiding a repetition of the disasters of 1929–33?

In my judgment, it is less fruitful to look for institutional changes or for a semiautomatic mechanism that would guarantee perennial prosperity than to draw from interwar experience some simple lessons that could save us from repeating our worst mistakes.

First, most observers agree that to a large extent the disaster of 1929–33 was a consequence of maladjustments born of the boom of the twenties. Hence, we must continuously be on the alert to prevent a recurrence of maladjustments—even at the risk of being falsely accused of failing to realize the benefits of unbounded expansion. Actually, those of us who warn against speculative and inflationary dangers should return the charge: our common goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power can be realized only if we are willing and able to

prevent orderly expansion from turning into disorderly boom.

Second, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was largely due to the absence of prompt antirecession measures. In part, the necessary tools for this were not then available nor were their potentialities fully understood. Today it is easy to understand where observers went wrong 35 years ago. But it is less easy to avoid a repetition of the same mistake; we always prefer to believe what we want to be true rather than what we should know to be true. Here again, we need most of all eternal vigilance. But we must also be ready to admit errors in past judgments and forecasts, and have the courage to express dissenting even though unpopular views, and to advocate necessary remedies.

Third, and most importantly, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was due largely to the lack of understanding of the international implications of national events and policies. Even today, we are more apt to judge and condemn the worldwide implications of nationalistic actions taken by others than to apply the same criteria to our own decisions.

Recognition of the close ties among the individual economies of the free world leads to recognition of the need to maintain freedom of international commerce. This means not only that we must avoid the direct controls of trade and exchange that were characteristic of the time of the great depression. It means also that we must avoid any impairment of the value and status of the dollar, which today acts—just as sterling did until its devaluation in 1931—as a universal means of international payment between central banks as well as among individual merchants, bankers, and investors.

If the dollar is to continue to play its role in international commerce, world confidence in its stability must be fully maintained; the world must be convinced that we are resolved to eliminate the long-persistent deficit in our balance of international payments. The measures taken in accordance with the President's program of February 10, 1965, have so far been highly successful. But some of these measures are of a temporary character, and these include the efforts of the financial community to restrain voluntarily the expansion of credit to foreigners. We should not permit the initial success of these efforts to blind us against the need of permanent cure.

Some observers believe that our responsibility for maintaining the international function of the dollar puts an intolerably heavy burden on our monetary policy; that this responsibility prevents us from taking monetary measures which might be considered appropriate for solving domestic problems. I happen to disagree with that view. I believe that the interests of our national economy are in harmony with those of the international community. A stable dollar is, indeed, the keystone of international trade and finance; but it is also, in my judgment, the keystone of economic growth and prosperity at home.

Yet even if I were wrong in this judgment, and if, indeed, an occasion arose when we could preserve the international role of the dollar only at the expense of modifying our favored domestic policies—even then we would need to pay attention to the international repercussions of our actions. We must consider these international effects not because of devotion to the ideal of human brotherhood, not because we value the well-being of our neighbors more than our own. We must do so because any harm that would come to international commerce and hence to the rest of the world as a result of the displacement of the dollar would fall back on our own heads. In the present stage of economic development we could not preserve our own prosperity if the rest of the world were caught in the web of depression. Recognition of this interdependence gave rise to the Marshall plan—in my judgment the greatest achievement of our postwar economic policy.

It should not have taken the great depression to bring these simple truths home to us. Today, as we approach the goal of the Great Society—to make each of our citizens a self-reliant and productive member of a healthy and progressive economic system—we can disregard these truths even less than we could a generation ago. By heeding them instead, we will have a good chance to avoid another such disaster. If monetary history were to repeat itself, it would be nobody's fault but our own.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wonder if we could avoid conferences in front of the Vice President's rostrum so we can hear what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please return to their seats.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) At the end thereof add the following new subsection:

"SEC. 649. Limitation on aggregate authorization for use in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the aggregate of the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for use during each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under this Act shall not exceed $3,243,000,000 for each such year."

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

Mr. MORSE. Such time as I need, within my time limitation.

First, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what this amendment does is to reduce the amount of money to be authorized by $200 million from not only the figure sent to the floor by the Foreign Relations Committee but the figure modified by the additional $89 million and the $2 million that the Senate voted the other day. So it is a reduction of $200 million.

Every argument I used in support of my other proposed cut this afternoon is equally applicable to this proposal.

One could take almost any one of the major Comptroller General's reports and find evidence of shocking waste in individual countries. This amendment would effect a saving of more than $200 million.

In view of the figures we have been shown involved in the pipeline, plus the report of the Comptroller General's Office, showing great waste in the administration of the foreign aid program, it is almost impossible for me to believe that the Senate would not want to join me in saving $200 million.

I rest my case.

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

This amendment is exactly the same as the other except as to the amount. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has quite fully discussed the merits and demerits of the amendment, as has the Senator from Oregon. I see no need for protracted debate. Therefore, if the Senator will yield back his time, I will yield back my time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

All time has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG],

and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

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

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 121 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hill	Ribicoff
Allott	Holland	Russell, S.C.
Bartlett	Hruska	Simpson
Bible	Jackson	Stennis
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Symington
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Carlson	McIntyre	Tower
Church	Miller	Tydings
Cooper	Morse	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Mundt	Yarborough
Eastland	Nelson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Prouty	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Proxmire	
Gruening	Randolph	

NAYS—35

Anderson	Inouye	Monroney
Bayh	Javits	Montoya
Bennett	Kennedy, Mass.	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Moss
Case	Kuchel	Pastore
Clark	Long, La.	Pell
Dirksen	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Douglas	McCarthy	Smathers
Fannin	McGovern	Smith
Fulbright	McNamara	Sparkman
Hart	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Hickenlooper	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—25

Bass	Harris	Muskie
Brewster	Hartke	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Pearson
Cannon	Lausche	Robertson
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Dodd	Magnuson	Scott
Dominick	McClellan	Talmadge
Fong	McGee	
Gore	Murphy	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and I ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, after line 2, insert the following:

CHAPTER 6—FOOD AND NUTRITION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 110. The sum of $50,000,000 annually is authorized to be appropriated to provide (a) $15,000,000 for protein supplements and fortification of foods, and (b) $35,000,000, for the purchase of domestically produced beef, poultry and other meats and meat products, dairy products, fish and fish products, rice and other high protein foods, in adequate supply in the United States, for donation to school lunch and similar programs in foreign countries eligible for assistance under this Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments to explain the amendment. Before I do so, however, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added as cosponsors of the amendment the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE and Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is germane to the bill. We made exceptions for only two amendments, and I do not believe that his is one of them.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, my amendment relates to the condition of high protein foods to our overseas school lunch programs, and I believe that it relates to the general subject matter of the pending bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will reserve the point.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say to the able minority leader that the Senator from South Dakota offered this same amendment last year in the foreign aid bill, and it was accepted by the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That does not make it germane, however.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought perhaps it would soften the objection of my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be in a moment of generosity to let it go over, or to overlook it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, my amendment is the same amendment which was adopted by the Senate last year in its deliberations on the foreign assistance bill.

The amendment would add authorizations for the expenditure of $50 million for the purchase of high protein foods which can be utilized in our overseas school lunch programs, and in other food programs of that kind.

At the present time, the United States is feeding some 40 million school children—boys and girls—every day in school lunch programs in approximately 80 countries.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I do not believe there is any single part of our overseas aid program which has returned greater dividends than the overseas school lunch efforts. The great limitation in the program to date has been in the shortage of high protein foods. We have ample supplies of cereals in our food for peace operations, and in our overseas aid programs, but there has been a critical shortage of bodybuilding foods such as beef, poultry, meat, dairy products, fish and fish products, rice, and other commodities of that kind which are included in the terms of my amendment.

Consequently, while the school lunch programs have been effective, they could be considerably more effective with the expenditure of this modest sum of money to purchase the high protein items which are available in this country and which could be made a part of our overseas school lunch effort.

Let me say again that last year the Senate adopted this amendment——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last year we adopted a similar amendment without any controversy. It was lost in conference. We are hopeful, on the basis of a strong showing on the yea-and-nay vote, that the Senate conferees will be able to retain it this year in the subsequent conference.

Therefore, I strongly urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Would the Senator's amendment increase the authorization of the amount to be appropriated by $50 million?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes. It would have the effect of increasing the total authorization by $50 million. The funds would be expended in this country for the purchase of farm commodities which we have in great excess. The Senator knows that while there is a great humanitarian motive behind the amendment, it would also be of great value to our farm producers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall be brief, and would associate myself with all that has been said by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, a true expert in the field of agriculture. Anyone who is worried about the balance-of-payments problem, based on where beef purchases abroad are normally made, or anyone interested in the disposal of surplus agricultural products—aside from the appealing humanitarian aspects of the bill—would be in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to me that the adoption of the amendment

would serve humanitarian purposes as well as several other objectives.

I recall that approximately 2 years ago, with the acquiescence of the committee, fish was added to the food for peace program, and is now a part of the Foreign Aid Act. Fish furnishes protein that is badly needed in many places, in a highly concentrated form.

Regrettably there has been no implementation of that addition to the foreign aid law for reasons that are completely beyond me. The Bureau of the Budget has refused adamantly to make the amendment effective.

I recall that last year the Senator from Alabama and I engaged in a discussion on the floor on this subject, and he expressed, on behalf of the committee, the very strong hope that the Bureau of the Budget would clear away the barriers which have stood in the way of implementing the program and to make it effective.

This has not been done yet. I hope that soon it will be. In the meantime, because I believe that this is a very desirable and useful proposal in every way, I renew my assurance to the Senator from South Dakota that I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota, and I support him. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that yesterday I introduced a bill of which the Senator from South Dakota is a cosponsor. It would do something for the hungry children of the United States.

At the present time our school lunch program is in effect for 9 months of the year. However, the children are hungry during the 3 months when the schools are in recess, as well as when the schools are in session. Approximately 1,600,000 youngsters get free lunch programs in the schools of our Nation for 9 months, but do not get them during the summer months.

Therefore, while we are voting $50 million for this program, it should be remembered that for a great deal less we can do something for our own youngsters, and it would, therefore, be my hope that Senators who give consideration to the amendment will also give consideration to my proposal. While we make this food available for children overseas, we should also do something for the youngsters in our own country. We can supply this additional free lunch program through recreational areas and day camps in the United States. I hope that I shall have the support of the Senator, and that other Senators and the Committee on Agriculture will give consideration to my proposal to feed the poor children in the United States as well as the children abroad.

Mr. McGOVERN. I commend the Senator for the initiative he displayed yesterday in trying to extend our school lunch program to 12 months of the year. There is a provision in the existing law to the effect that no food can be offered overseas under any of these programs until we have met all requests at home for domestic requirements. Therefore, in addition to being on sound legal grounds, the Senator is on sound moral grounds in wanting to take care of our youngsters at home. I agree that we should take care of them on a priority basis. I am happy to join him in that effort.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is not a question of a condition. We have so much food that we cannot only feed our youngsters here at home, but also do something for those who are engaged in agriculture.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that anyone who is concerned about the long-range human development recognizes that protein shortages, particularly in the case of young children, do irreparable damage, both physically and mentally. Once that takes place, there is nothing that can be done to restore the youngsters to a normal mental and physical condition. They are permanently injured, and frequently must depend on aid from other sources. The school lunch programs, with balanced diets, in my opinion, will do more to strengthen the developing countries and the underdeveloped youngsters at home than anything else that we can do. It has the additional merit of doing something of value to our own farm producers here in the United States.

Therefore, I hope that the amendment will be adopted. I hope that the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut will be approved.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Would the $50 million be in addition to the sum now authorized in the bill?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes; it would be an addition.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe this is a very worthy project. I shall support it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself some time on the bill.

The Senator from South Dakota is making a worthy proposal, but he is making it at the wrong time and at the wrong place. The State Department is not in the least qualified to determine whether we have a surplus of a particular food, an adequate supply, or a shortage. This proposal would leave that determination to the wrong department. It should be left to the Department of Agriculture to determine the quantities of the various kinds of food that we have in this country, not to the State Department.

If the Senator from South Dakota were to make his proposal as an amendment to Public Law 480, when that comes before the Senate again, it would certainly have some merit and would be worthy of our consideration. However, it is unthinkable to leave it to the State Department to determine what is an adequate amount of food of each kind for our own requirements in this country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will yield. We do not leave the amount to the State Department. The Congress stipulates $50 million for excess foods surplus in the United States, to be used abroad.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not thinking of the $50 million I am thinking of transfering the work of the Department of Agriculture to the State Department.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The amendment states $50 million set by the Congress; and it would all be surplus agricultural products.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would permit the State Department to buy foods which are in adequate supply in this country. It would, as I read the amendment, give to the State Department authority to determine what foods are in adequate supply. I am sorry that no copies of the amendment are available to Senators, but I have been to the desk twice to read the amendment. As I read it, the State Department would determine what foods are in adequate supply. I realize that they would have good intentions. Perhaps, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, their intentions might be too good. We do not wish to take a chance. For example, we have been running into a shortage of powdered milk for the school lunch program. We have been running into a shortage of butter for the school lunch program. The shortage has been such that, since the 16th of March to the 2d of June, five carloads of oleomargarine have been shipped into the State of Vermont—at a time when we have been producing a surplus of butter in the State. I do not like that at all. The State Department might say that butter is needed for foreign countries. The Senator from Arkansas is happy about that movement of oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is good for people; it makes them strong and healthy.

Mr. AIKEN. The State Department is not qualified in any way to make a decision as to what foods are in adequate or surplus supply. We do not wish to take any steps that will remove the handling of Public Law 480 from the Department of Agriculture and turn it over to some agency that is so unqualified as is the State Department.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Would the Senator find the amendment more acceptable if we could obtain unanimous consent to add the words "adequate supply as determined in consultation with the Department of Agriculture?"

Mr. AIKEN. That language would certainly improve the amendment a great deal. But I would dislike to take the step of transferring to the State Department the task of determining surplus foods or foods said to be in adequate supply from the Department of Agriculture. I had thought of the wording which the Senator from South Dakota has suggested. It would certainly improve the amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to read, after the words "in adequate supply," "in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather that the words be "as agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture." "The words "in consultation" are bad words. I do not like them at all.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would accept the language proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not proposing any language.

Mr. McGOVERN. I propose that the amendment be so modified. I had assumed that even with the existing language no foreign aid administrator would try to determine whether a commodity was in adequate supply without a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture. But I believe the language I have stated should be added if it would give further reassurance.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposal would modify the amendment, but I do not like the idea of giving authority to the State Department to do something after consultation with the Department of Agriculture, because such action would give the State Department the whip hand, and that Department should not have it when it comes to the handling of the food commodities of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] how much time I may have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not object, because I wish the amendment to have whatever form the Senator from South Dakota desires it to have. But I strongly protest against the adoption of the amendment. The committee of which I happen to be a longtime member, though not the chairman—and I speak only because the chairman does not happen to be on the floor of the Senate—has jurisdiction over the school lunch program and the special school milk program, both of which are involved in the particular question under discussion. The subcommittee of which I happen to be the chairman, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, has jurisdiction over appropriations related to those programs. We have just completed long and exhaustive hearings. We have not yet marked up the bill. We would never think of giving any jurisdiction of either of those programs to the Department of State. A long time ago we attempted it under Public Law 480. I shall cite a specific example. The question involved was rice for Japan. Serious trouble arose because of objections that the Department of State made to the completion of the contract for the supply of rice to Japan. There was a long continuing conflict which blocked the operation of Public Law 480 for a good long time.

I served on the committee which evolved Public Law 480 and on the conference committee which worked out the final form of the law. The amendment would go far to destroy the framework of Public Law 480 and the policy established by that law. I hope that the Senator will not insist upon enlarging the foreign aid program by an additional $50 million to put into it something which in effect would amend Public Law 480, delivering a most important program, which is a part of the Public Law 480 program, to the Department of State or one of its agencies—AID—for administration.

I have already said that I shall not object to the request of the distinguished Senator for a modification of his amendment, a modification which would permit the Department of Agriculture to come in as an adviser. That is a very different thing from having a program, as in every other feature of Public Law 480, and all the things in connection with it, as well as the school lunch program and the school milk program, a part of the agricultural program of this Nation.

I do not believe that this is the right time, the right place or the right bill for the injection of such an amendment. For that reason I strongly protest against the addition of the amendment to the bill on the floor of the Senate, an amendment which in effect, whether so worded or not, would amend Public Law 480, and take jurisdiction from the Department of Agriculture, which we have carefully provided for, and which controlling interest has proven highly desirable in many fields, and place it under the jurisdiction of the Department of State.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated. I withdraw my objection to the amendment requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota to modify his amendment?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the bill I yield 2 minutes or 3 minutes, whichever the Senator desires.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not desire 3 minutes. I require only a half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for one-half minute.

The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to know what is being requested. After prolonged colloquy, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota asked unanimous consent to insert language into the amendment. What language is proposed to be inserted in the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The words "as agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture." That is the requested modification of the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Chair. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed modification of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota? There being no objection, the modification is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware under the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have been reading the amendment. It does not seem to me that it is germane to the bill which is now before the Senate. I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will explain his position on the germaneness of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe that the Chair will find that under the unanimous-consent agreement the amendment must be germane. I do not recall anything in the bill dealing with this particular subject. That is the reason I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to be heard on the point of order?

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to be heard, not so much on the point of order, but to point out that yesterday when unanimous consent was agreed to, two exceptions were made for the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I would hope that that agreement will be taken into consideration at this late moment.

Of course, if we had known about it yesterday, we could have made an exception; but we did not know about it at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard. I cannot think of anything that comes more squarely within the field of foreign assistance than help for hungry children in underdeveloped countries, and of making available urgently needed food for undernourished children overseas. If that is not germane to the purposes of the bill, then I fail to understand the meaning of foreign aid.

I believe the amendment comes squarely within the context of the overall purpose of the proposed legislation. It makes a contribution to the development of human beings, which is the ultimate resource and is the most important resource in any country.

If we are truly interested in helping countries to get on their feet and move ahead, we ought to support the kind of language contained in my amendment. I believe it is entirely germane to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not question the intent of the amendment. It has merit. But it should be considered by the committee. It was not before the committee. It contemplates an entirely new program which has had no consideration whatsoever. It relates to a subject that has not been dealt with in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule.

In view of the unanimous-consent agreement requiring that no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received, except the two amendments to be offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]; and in view of the further fact that the bill under consideration is S. 1837, the title of which

is "To amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes," including its different parts and chapters—chapter 1—Policy; chapter 2—Development Assistance, title 1 of which relates to the Development Loan Fund; title 2, to Technical Cooperation and Development Grants; and title 3, to Investment Guaranties; chapter 3—International Organizations and Programs; chapter 4—Supporting Assistance; chapter 5—Contingency Fund; part II, chapter 2—Military Assistance; part III, chapter 1—General Provisions, which does not encompass any of the subject matter of the amendment; chapter 2—Administrative Provisions; chapter 3—Miscellaneous Provisions; part IV, Programs for Fiscal Years Beginning After June 30, 1967, including Termination of Existing Programs and Proposals for Future Programs, none of which relates to any subject closely akin to the subject of the amendment—the Chair is compelled to rule, reluctantly, that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I do not oppose the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. It is meritorious. However, I oppose the transfer of the distribution and handling of food products in this country from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of State. In my opinion, the Department of State is completely unqualified to carry on this work. Public Law 480 is administered by the Department of Agriculture. I believe it has done an effective job. I am not in a mood to agree to the transfer of the adminstration of that act to the Department of State, because it does not have the personnel or any other qualification that is required to do this work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield before he makes his appeal? I should like to make a statement that may have a bearing on what the Senator is about to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from South Dakota. I have no understanding with him at all, but I give to him this assurance. Although the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is not in the Chamber, but since I am the chairman of the subcommittee which would consider such proposed legislation, I have told the Senator from South Dakota that if he will offer his proposal as an amendment to Public Law 480, I will assure him of an early hearing so far as the Senate committee is concerned. I feel certain that the Senator from Louisiana will stand back of my assurance given on the floor of the Senate.

I hope that the regular way of handling this proposal will appeal to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota as being the preferable manner, rather than to try to force the amendment into this bill in such a way as to be, in effect, an amendment of Public Law 480. I do not believe such an amendment would be proper in a bill of this kind because it has not been considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

I thank the majority leader for yielding time to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I very much favor the amendment. Last year I took a similar amendment to conference, it was impossible to hold the amendment in conference.

I think it is a fine amendment. I would hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would consider and favorably report such an amendment. It is entirely appropriate and ought to be included in Public Law 480.

I would have been glad to handle this kind of amendment, and I had hoped the Senate might be able to approve it. But in view of the Chair's ruling sustaining the point of order, I assume that the Senate would not approve the amendment at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I observe in the Chamber the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is also the ranking member of the subcommittee to which I have referred. I am sure that he, too, would cooperate in arranging an early hearing if the amendment were offered in the form I have suggested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had considered appealing from the ruling of the Chair, not because I disagreed with what the Chair had ruled—he is on solid ground; not because I disagree with the objective of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, because I agree with him 100 percent; not because I disagree with what the senior Republican in this body said as to where the responsibility for the disposition of surplus products should lie, whether in the Department of State or the Department of Agriculture. I think it should be in the Department of Agriculture, so there is no argument in that respect.

I would hope, on the basis of assurances made, that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota would consider the possibilities of having his worthwhile proposal attached to Public Law 480 when it comes before the Senate. I think that on the basis of the case he has made, he could expect, without doubt, support from both sides of the aisle, because most of the statements made were not against the idea advanced, but against the peculiar and particular circumstances in which it was encased.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in my opinion, it will not be necessary, for the Senator from South Dakota to wait until Public Law 480 expires next year in order to make his proposal. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will start hearings next Wednesday on general agricultural legislation. The hearings will probably continue for 2 weeks. There is no reason why the Senator from South Dakota cannot make his proposal before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which he is a member. I am sure that some of us, at least, will give his proposal a sympathetic hearing.

I do not want to start the business of transferring agricultural work and the disposal of agricultural commodities to the tender mercies of the Department of State. Perhaps that Department is good intentioned; but I feel certain that it lacks the qualifications which the Department of Agriculture has.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I appreciate the assurances of counsel for the majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I also appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with regard to his indication that early consideration can be given to the proposal. I appreciate, further, the consideration of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I am sure that my cosponsors will agree that, in view of the peculiar parliamentary limitations that we are facing, we should not appeal the ruling of the Chair. We shall proceed to secure consideration through other channels.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further action taken on amendments tonight.

It is the hope of the leadership that it will be possible to complete consideration of this measure on Monday, and, if it is at all possible and means staying a little late, I would advise Senators to be prepared for such a possibility.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN SCHOOL FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN IN PUERTO RICO, WAKE ISLAND, GUAM, OR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business (S. 1837) be laid temporarily aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 298, H.R. 5874.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5874) to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had

been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 2, after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The fourth sentence of section 6(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 241 (a)) is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of providing such comparable education, personnel may be employed and the compensation, tenure, leave, hours of work, and other incidents of the employment relationship may be fixed without regard to the Civil Service Act and rules (5 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) and the following: (1) the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.); (2) the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2061 et seq.); (3) the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 901 et seq.); (4) the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 851 et seq.); and (5) the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.)."

And, on page 3, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The last sentence of section 203(a)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, is repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education, to amend section 6(a) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, relating to conditions of employment of teachers in dependents' schools, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 311, explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, AS AMENDED

H.R. 5874 passed the House of Representatives on March 15, 1965. It was considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 8, 1965, and ordered reported favorably to the Senate with two amendments. Section 1 of the reported bill contains unchanged the language of H.R. 5874 as it passed the House of Representatives. The committee-added amendments, discussed below, appear as sections 2 and 3 in the reported bill.

Section 1, if enacted, would permit the Commissioner of Education to construct minimum school facilities necessary for the education of children residing with a parent employed by the United States, though not residing on Federal property in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, under certain conditions. These conditions are, that the Commissioner determine, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the construction or provision of such facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act (Public Law 81-815), (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, and (3) that English is not the primary language of instruction in schools in the locality. Section 1 of H.R. 5874 would therefore amend section 10 of Public Law 81-815.

CONSOLIDATION OF TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business (S. 1837) be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 292, S. 1620.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1620) to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment is as follows: Beginning with line 3 on page 5, strike out through line 13 on page 6 and substitute the following:

SEC. 3. When the term of office of either the United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina or the United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, holding office on the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, the President is authorized to appoint a United States attorney for the district of South Carolina as provided by section 501 of title 28 of the United States Code. Until the United States attorney for the district of South Carolina has been appointed as herein authorized and has qualified, the United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States attorney and to perform the duties of such office in the Charleston, Columbia, Orangeburg, Florence, and Aiken divisions of the district of South Carolina, and the United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States attorney and to perform the duties of such office in the Greenville, Rock Hill, Greenwood, Spartanburg, and Anderson divisions of the district of South Carolina. In the event a vacancy, other than a vacancy resulting from expiration of term, arises in either of such offices prior to the appointment as herein authorized, and qualification of a United States attorney for the district of South Carolina, the incumbent of the other such office shall also perform the duties of the office in which the vacancy occurs until such appointment and qualification.

SEC. 4. When the term of office of either the United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina or the United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina, holding office on the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, the President is authorized to appoint a United States marshal for the district of South Carolina as provided by section 541(a) of title 28 of the United States Code. Until the United States marshal for the district of South Carolina has been appointed as herein authorized and has qualified the United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Charleston, Columbia, Orangeburg, Florence, and Aiken divisions of the district of South Carolina, and the United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Greenville, Rock Hill, Greenwood, Spartanburg, and Anderson divisions of the district of South Carolina. In the event a vacancy, other than a vacancy resulting from expiration of term, arises in either of such offices prior to the appointment as herein authorized and qualification of a United States marshal for the district of South Carolina the incumbent of the other such office shall also perform the duties of the office in which the vacancy occurs until such appointment and qualification.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1620

An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 121. SOUTH CAROLINA

"South Carolina constitutes one judicial district comprising ten divisions.

"(1) The Charleston Division comprises the counties of Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Georgetown, and Jasper.

"Court for the Charleston Division shall be held at Charleston.

"(2) The Columbia Division comprises the counties of Kershaw, Lee, Lexington, Richland, and Sumter.

"Court for the Columbia Division shall be held at Columbia.

"(3) The Florence Division comprises the counties of Chesterfield, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Horry, Marion, Marlboro, and Williamsburg.

"Court for the Florence Division shall be held at Florence.

"(4) The Aiken Division comprises the counties of Aiken, Allendale, Barnwell, and Hampton.

"Court for the Aiken Division shall be held at Aiken.

"(5) The Orangeburg Division comprises the counties of Bamberg, Calhoun, and Orangeburg.

"Court for the Orangeburg Division shall be held at Orangeburg.

"(6) The Greenville Division comprises the counties of Greenville and Laurens.

"Court for the Greenville Division shall be held at Greenville.

"(7) The Rock Hill Division comprises the counties of Chester, Fairfield, Lancaster, and York.

"Court for the Rock Hill Division shall be held at Rock Hill.

"(8) The Greenwood Division comprises the counties of Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenwood, McCormick, Newberry, and Saluda.

"Court for the Greenwood Division shall be held at Greenwood.

"(9) The Anderson Division comprises the counties of Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens.

"Court for the Anderson Division shall be held at Anderson.

"(10) The Spartanburg Division comprises the counties of Cherokee, Spartanburg, and Union.

"Court for the Spartanburg Division shall be held at Spartanburg."

(b) The existing district judgeships for the Eastern District of South Carolina, the Western District of South Carolina, and the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina heretofore provided for by section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code shall hereafter be district judgeships for the District of South Carolina and the present incumbents of such judgeships shall henceforth hold their offices under section 133, as amended by this Act.

(c) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of districts in the State of South Carolina, such table is amended by striking out the following:

"South Carolina:

Eastern	1
Western	1
Eastern and Western	2"

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"South Carolina 4".

SEC. 2. In compliance with section 132 of title 28 of the United States Code the District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina are hereby consolidated into, and shall henceforth constitute, a single District Court for the District of South Carolina. No loss or interruption of the jurisdiction of the consolidated District Court for the District of South Carolina over cases and controversies heretofore decided by or now pending in the District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina shall result from such consolidation. The District Court for the District of South Carolina shall appoint a clerk who shall supersede the clerks of the District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina and who shall maintain his office at Columbia until the court otherwise directs pursuant to sections 457 and 751(c) of title 28 of the United States Code. The presently existing records of the District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina shall be placed in his custody.

SEC. 3. When the term of office of either the United States attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina or the United States attorney for the Western District of South Carolina, holding office on the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, the President is authorized to appoint a United States attorney for the district of South Carolina as provided by section 501 of title 28 of the United States Code. Until the United States attorney for the district of South Carolina has been appointed as herein authorized and has qualified, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States attorney and to perform the duties of such office in the Charleston, Columbia, Orangeburg, Florence, and Aiken divisions of the district of South Carolina, and the United States attorney for the Western District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States attorney and to perform the duties of such office in the Greenville, Rock Hill, Greenwood, Spartanburg, and Anderson divisions of the district of South Carolina. In the event a vacancy, other than a vacancy resulting from expiration of term, arises in either of such offices prior to the appointment as herein authorized and qualification, of a United States attorney for the district of South Carolina the incumbent of the other such office shall also perform the duties of the office in which the vacancy occurs until such appointment and qualification.

SEC. 4. When the term of office of either the United States marshal for the Eastern District of South Carolina or the United States marshal for the Western District of South Carolina, holding office on the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, the President is authorized to appoint a United States marshal for the District of South Carolina as provided by section 541(a) of title 28 of the United States Code. Until the United States marshal for the District of South Carolina has been appointed as herein authorized and has qualified, the United States marshal for the Eastern District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Charleston, Columbia, Orangeburg, Florence, and Aiken divisions of the District of South Carolina, and the United States marshal for the Western District of South Carolina holding office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as a United States marshal and to perform the duties of such office in the Greenville, Rock Hill, Greenwood, Spartanburg, and Anderson divisions of the District of South Carolina. In the event a vacancy, other than a vacancy resulting from expiration of term, arises in either of such offices prior to the appointment as herein authorized and qualification of a United States marshal for the District of South Carolina the incumbent of the other such office shall also perform the duties of the office in which the vacancy occurs until such appointment and qualification.

SEC. 5. All deputy clerks, clerical assistants, and other employees of the clerks, all court reporters, all probation officers and their clerical assistants, all referees in bankruptcy and their clerical assistants, all United States commissioners and all other presently serving officers and employees of the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina shall henceforth be officers or employees, as the case may be, of the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina and shall hold their offices or employment under and perform their duties for that court. All presently serving assistant United States attorneys and clerical assistants of the United States attorneys and all presently serving deputy marshals and clerical assistants of the United States marshals appointed for the Eastern or Western District of South Carolina shall henceforth hold their offices or employment for the District of South Carolina.

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

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 304), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend (a) section 121 of title 28 of the United States Code, to provide that South Carolina constitutes 1 judicial district comprising 10 divisions. This measure would consolidate the eastern and western districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and would upon enactment achieve a measure of economy in the operation of the U.S. district court within the State and contribute to a more efficient administration of court business.

STATEMENT

This proposed legislation has the approval of the congressional delegation of South Carolina, the Fourth Circuit Judicial Council, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the late Honorable Olin D. Johnston, who urged and introduced this measure on March 25, 1965.

MASSACHUSETTS RESIDENTS CALL FOR ENACTMENT OF GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public demand for enactment of the cold war GI education bill increases with each passing day. I ask unanimous consent that a petition calling for passage of the GI bill signed by several hundred residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the signatures themselves, together with a letter of transmittal from Mr. Arthur E. Waite, of Foxboro, dated June 5, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the letter of transmittal and signatures thereto, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOXBORO, MASS.,
June 5, 1965.

Hon. Senator YARBOROUGH:

Enclosed are a few hundred signatures of residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who are in favor of bill S. 9, the cold war GI bill, 1965.

I recently read in the newspaper that the bill has just been approved by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on an 11 to 5 vote. Congratulations.

As a member of the Marine Corps League, I am seeing to it that your proposed bill (S. 9) is brought to the floor of our State convention which takes place next weekend and given an endorsement of the Massachusetts Marine Corps League.

I would certainly appreciate it if you could tell me of the procedure this bill must go through before being brought to the floor of Congress for the vote, and the approximate time you think it will get there.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR E. WAITE.

PETITION FOR PASSAGE OF BILL S. 9

The undersigned residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts request immediate action and passage of bill S. 9.

This act, known as the Cold War Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act, proposed in the 89th Congress, 1st session, is now in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

We urge immediate action and passage as it would be an additional benefit to the country as well as the veterans who served it.

Arthur E. Waite, Arthur A. Levesqeue, Foxboro; Frank F. Miller, Walpole; Margaret Gecewicz, John Gecewicz, Norwood; Lawrence P. Morcer ET, ISS U.S. Navy (Ret.); Debra A. Moran; Kevin L. Van Den Bergh, Foxboro; Beverly Johnson, Ruth Johnson, Edward F. Carberry, Barbara A. Carberry, Walpole; Paul E. Kelly, Marguerite S. Kelly, Ronald C. Jurgens, Carol A. Jurgens, Donald E. Mackie, Jane Mackie, Foxboro; Epke R. Mackie, Walpole; Robert J. Cunningham, Norwell; James Simpson, Cambridge; Anthony P. Meninn, Canton; Eileen P.

Roche, Edward E. Mackie, Phyllis M. Jones, Anna F. Ellis, Frank Cassidy, Margaret Cassidy, Judith A. O'Rourke, Audrey J. Caskie, Richard A. Koffinkey, William J. Ruff, Richard E. Funch, Walter R. Angus, Norman G. Desprey, Walpole.

Louis Spada, Dedham; Joseph E. Guewz, Canton; Edwin Ahola, Norwood; Warren Johnson, Stoughton; John Fernandes, Duxbury; J. N. Armand Montembault, New Bedford; Raymond Ferrone, George P. Wyende, Brockton; Thomas J. Costi, Fall River; Milton Creiger, Mattapan; Salvatore J. Romanelli, Canton; Lenwood Savage, Stoughton; David Leverson, Mattapan; Ernest M. Gillis, Brockton; Lucius D. Mendes, South Easton; John Barbos, Sharon; Joseph Gonahue, Hyde Park; Joseph Powers, Sharon; Charles Green, Roxbury.

David S. Conner, Joan H. Conner, Donald F. Barradas, Doris M. Barradas, William R. Buckley, Rosemarie A. Buckley, Antoinette Donnelly, Harold H. Donnelly, Jr., Richard Sullivan, Nancy B. Sullivan, Harold T. Crossley, George A. Rau, Foxboro; Daniel Antonelli, Jr., John J. Flagg, West Newton; Robert LeBlanc, Billingham; Ann Waite, Canton.

Millicent Cherry, William W. Cherry, Walpole; Rafel L. Keyes, Fall River; Clifford R. Nelson, Needham; Alfred S. Ferguson, Ruth P. Ferguson, Walpole; Howard S. Freedman, Sharon; James S. Wright, Winchester; Joseph E. Smith, Greenfield; Eugene E. Elmes, Westwood; Charles T. Booth, Paul J. Bruneau, South Walpole.

Salin S. Zilfi, Mrs. Helen Zilfi, Sami Zilfi, Norwood, Mrs. Mildred Johnson, Elizabeth O. Miller, Lawrence M. Hewins, Eva H. Hewins, Walpole; Mrs. Dorothy M. Waite, Foxboro; George S. Johnson, Emma F. Kamp, Mrs. Mary Lawson, Walpole; Elin E. Johnson, Mrs. C. P. Johnson, Norwood; Kenneth R. Towle, Evelyn R. Towle, Walpole; Francis E. Johnson, Norwood; Mary S. Pearson, Foxboro.

Tony Borros, Stoughton; Roland Roussel, Fall River; Fred Nelson, Stoughton; M. Aguior, Plymouth; Alex J. Epick, Canton; Frank Ippalito, Brockton; Edward Alves, Fall River; John Polavanchi, Stoughton; Coleman Cuman, Canton; Douglas Estabrook, Taunton; Donald Estabrook, Canton; Joseph L. Biron, Fall River· Legio Benassi, Plymouth; Clinton M. Curtis, Canton; Charles Andrews, Brockton; Harris Drake, Roxbury; Manuel Mendes, Canton.

Francis E. Pino, Canton; John Tucker, Randolph; Joseph Mender, Brockton; Gerald Deas, Hanson; Shirley Satterfield, Fannie S. Johnson, Samuel D. Grisson, John L. Andrews, George P. Cryendes, Norma E. Andrews, Brockton; Mary Ann Pina, Vivian Lindo, Canton; Manuel R. Mendes, Zulmira Mendes, Buzzards Bay; Rita Thomas, Manuel Mendes, Jr., Canton; Harry Da Silva, Roxbury; Barbara Mendes, Brockton.

Manuel T. Costy, Jr., New Bedford; Donald Paxhard, Dedham; Harold Thomas, Mansfield; Francis DeBenedictis, Norwood; Ronald Young Nicholas J. Papayno, Kenneth T. Gill, Brockton; Raymond Belanger, Fall River; Wilson Bell, Boston; David Bryant, Stoughton; John Barron, Canton; Ernest R. Berry, Jr., Barbara M. Berry, Foxboro; George C. Murphy, Kathleen A. Murphy, Walpole; Robert H. Phillips, Janice M. Phillips, Medway; George B. Loring, William C. Mackie, Frances L. Weaver, Floyd M. Brayman, W. D. Lovett, Dorothy Merlin, Marjorie S. Tappen, Walpole; Agnes C. Van Den Berghe, Frank J. Van Den Berghe, Foxboro; Dean A. Swift, Shirley Gooch, Norwood; Karl A. Ross, Virginia G. Ross, Walpole; Charles D. Wilson, Ruth Wilson, Bridgewater.

Ruth M. Hentschel, Patricia R. Castionovo, Marguerite M. McNamara, Hugh Martin, Jr., Helen M. Martin, Norwood; Walter J. Marr, Medfield; Charles L. Balzarini, Hyde Park; Dominic A. Vaccaro, Norwood; Doris Sawyer, Walpole; Charles W. Gooch, Norwood; Bruce Parker Waite, Walpole.

Alyce E. Elmes, Westwood; Marion Adams, Norton; Eleanor R. Walker, Florence Walker, James F. Walker, Terrence P. Kelly, Denis O'Sullivan, Norwood; Paul J. Whittemore, Watertown; Carl R. Queander, Lexington; Jonathan K. Pearsan, Newburyport.

Vincent J. Valin, Sr., Canton; Ronald E. Joseph, New Bedford; Fred Jerl Ippso, Mansfield; James Calcagno, Brockton; Richard Schiffer, Stoughton; Paul A. Lund, Walpole; Rolf W. Wagner, Foxboro.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, June 14, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11, 1965:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Erban E. Wakefield, Jr., Columbia.

ALASKA

Leolla M. Roelle, Platinum.
Charles L. Hermens, Skagway.

ARIZONA

Lawrence A. Lippert, Florence.
James Kennedy, Jr., Williams.

ARKANSAS

William R. Jennings, Lakeview.

CALIFORNIA

Herman G. Whitham, Auburn.
George R. Mitchell, Clearlake Oaks.
Michael E. Neish, Crescent City.
Isadore J. Trigueiro, Edwards.
John A. O'Guin, El Centro.
Roscoe J. King, Indio.
Ora G. Knudson, Lakewood.
Elsie L. Lindner, Lemoncove.
Lucius D. Davis, Morongo Valley.
Lewis N. Hanson, Rio Linda.
Joseph J. Morabito, San Martin.
Emeret M. Beltrami, Soulsbyville.
Ruby M. Willoughby, Stevinson.
Albert J. Hoyt. Topanga.

CONNECTICUT

Marie B. Reid, Amston.

FLORIDA

Walter A. Pfirman, Cape Canaveral.
Harvey F. Baker, Citra.
Leroy Renfroe, Dover.
Everett W. Driggers, Laurel.

GEORGIA

Dolores W. Pearman, Chula.
Roberta I. Barton, Georgetown.
Monterie C. Brewer, Lumber City.
Bernard Knowles, Jr., Stockbridge.

ILLINOIS

Robert W. Mowbray, Bradford.
Kenneth M. Mosher, Dahinda.
Elizabeth F. Parsley, Malta.

INDIANA

Raymond P. Spurgeon, Brownstown.
Edith C. Gamber, Economy.
Rose M. Darling, Guilford.

KANSAS

Earl A. Drake, Garfield.
Roger K. Perry, St. Marys.
Raymond Patterson, Washington.

KENTUCKY

James N. Logsdon, Lewisburg.

LOUISIANA

Aline F. DePrima, Berwick.
Ned L. Arceneaux, Lafayette.

MAINE

Clayton E. Adams, Solon.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert O. Montgomery, Brewster.
Mary E. Lee, Middleton.
Francis P. Shea, Plymouth.

MICHIGAN

Jack H. Gillow, Milford.
Roy M. Skinner, Rockwood.
Elaine C. Anderson, Sagola.

MINNESOTA

Walter O. Grotz, Delano.
Ronald E. Sebenaler, Mentor.
Walter S. Seline, Mora.
Patricia M. Arnold, Young America.

MISSISSIPPI

Mahala A. Ferriss, Bentonia.
William E. Peets, Brookhaven.
Julian K. Allison, Cascilla.
Julian W. McLeod, Pascagoula.
Mattie C. Kyzar, Ruth.
Cecil B. Jones, Sherard.

MISSOURI

Helen H. Bagbey, Bertrand.

MONTANA

Alice R. Bellamy, Dutton.
Adele M. Coughlin, Helmville.

NEBRASKA

Neal C. Thompson, Dalton.
Glenn D. Fraass, Lodgepole.
Evelyn M. Fees, Miller.
Anastasia M. Vrchlavsky, St. Columbans.
Edward V. Sis, Stratton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bruce M. Bottomley, Melvin Village.

NEW JERSEY

James A. Marley, Westville.

NEW MEXICO

James N. Tinnin, Farmington.
Albert A. Ortega, Grants.
Thomas T. Knight, Tesuque.

NORTH CAROLINA

James D. Scroggs, East Flat Rock.
William W. Tarkington, Manteo.

NORTH DAKOTA

Carrol G. Jorgensen, Haynes.
Eliot C. Runquist, Jamestown.

OHIO

Dorrill D. Bounds, Litchfield.
Maynard B. Pelton, Medina.
Clinton E. Miller, Oak Hill.

OKLAHOMA

William W. Tripp, Blair.
Virginia M. Cantrell, Hooker.
Aaron D. Howell, Manitou.
Jerome H. Hodgens, Jr., Moffett.
Harold G. Brown, Nicoma Park.

OREGON

Russell K. McCullough, Dufur.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jeanne Z. Sampsell, Laurelton.
Monroe J. Stavely, Littlestown.
James Y. Schelly, Orefield.
C. Levi Scheidy, Shartlesville.
Justin J. Shook, Spring Mills.
Salvadore J. Sposato, Weatherly.

TENNESSEE

J. Addison Bringle, Covington.
Jake L. Gilreath, Kodak.
William C. Garner, Madisonville.

TEXAS

Lloyd E. Raburn, Valley Mills.

VIRGINIA

Clayborne H. Phillips, Burgess.
James A. Threewitts, Dendron.
Luther W. Swift, Hopewell.
Bine C. Cross, Occoquan.

WASHINGTON

Donald E. Ringhouse, Clearlake.
John G. Iafrati, Du Pont.

WEST VIRGINIA

James E. Matthey, Bristol.

WISCONSIN

George M. Loomis, Sr., Brooklyn.
Louise M. Gross, Brule.
Clark W. Clary, Hustler.
H. Paul Howard, Spring Valley.

DEPARMENT OF DEFENSE

W. Brewster Kopp, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, [redacted], U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, [redacted], U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

To be a senior member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 711

Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as indicated.

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Charles K. Duncan, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admirals

Thomas D. Davies	Thomas J. Rudden, Jr.
Fillmore B. Gilkeson	Charles D. Nace
John R. Wadleigh	Paul A. Holmberg
Burton H. Shupper	Lloyd R. Vasey
Frederick E. Janney	Ernest W. Dobie, Jr.
Robert B. Erly	Dick H. Guinn
Valdemar G. Lambert	Maurice F. Weisner
Frank C. Jones	Roy M. Isaman
Ben B. Pickett	Frederick H. Michaelis
Leslie J. O'Brien, Jr.	Roy G. Anderson
George C. Bullard	William E. Lemos
William N. Leonard	Gerald E. Miller
Walter L. Small, Jr.	Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.
Lucien B. McDonald	Donald M. Showers
Leroy V. Swanson	James F. Calvert
Frank W. Vannoy	Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Walter L. Abbott to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Henry C. Wolk, Jr., to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1965.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Nilo J. Baldasari to be chief warrant officer (W-4), in the Navy, and ending John C. Livingston to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 2, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commencement Address by Representative Hastings Keith, at Mount Vernon Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 11, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, last Monday, June 7, it was my good fortune to attend the graduation ceremonies at Mount Vernon Seminary, here in Washington, as a proud parent of a graduating daughter.

The graduation ceremonies on Monday, like the baccalaureate service on Sunday, at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, were carried out in an atmosphere of academic dignity which did credit to Mount Vernon's President Pelham.

My New England colleague, Hon. HASTINGS KEITH, of the 12th District of Massachusetts, who also was a proud parent of a graduating student, delivered an excellent commencement address, full of wise advice and counsel for the graduating class.

Representative KEITH, whose district includes Cape Cod, where I have spent some of the most memorable summers of my life, addressed the group on the subject of planning. Planning and preparation, he pointed out, are the essential factors in a rewarding adult life; and the responsibilities and challenges of leading such a life are faced squarely by every graduating class. As he pointed out:

The door you step through today will close behind you and lock irrevocably. You cannot go back to the past. But you can learn from it, if you try.

This is the central fact facing graduating classes throughout our Nation today.

Mr. President, I believe that the address deserves the wider reading which publication in the RECORD will bring. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

When I accepted President Pelham's invitation to talk to you today, I determined that I would try to avoid some of the worst features of other commencement addresses I have heard over the years. I also hoped to shun some of the errors I have made in my own right, from time to time, in various private, perhaps even a bit pompous, speeches to a much smaller Mount Vernon audience—my daughter Carolyn, or Carrie, as students have come to call her.

Should I come to you here today, I pondered, and speak of the path that lies ahead, or of the trials you will face? Should I say that "A commencement is a beginning," and that now you are about to set out on the greatest adventure of life? Should I bemoan the fate of the world, and regret that I and my generation could not have presented the future to you on a silver platter? Should I begin a crusade, and launch you on your way toward the horizon?

The possible choices seemed endless: Some of them, I am sure, guaranteed to make you sigh deeply, and say "Oh, no. Not again." But I hoped that some of the thoughts which came to my mind would catch your attention, and that after the festivities were concluded, you'd take them home and mull them over.

I think a little vanity was mixed in with my trying to make up my mind. After all, a speaker likes to think that his words will be remembered. You know, planned obsolescence may be fine for the automobile manufacturers, but immortality, in however small a way, is, frankly, the secret dream of most men.

So, when I had accepted your invitation, I sat down to plan out what I was going to say. I swiveled my chair around to the window, looking for some inspiration from outdoors, and thought to myself: "I must prepare this speech very carefully: First of all, because Carolyn will be among the graduates, and, out of affection, will be gently critical, to say the least, of her father's contribution to this day which is so important to her. But also because in whatever we do, whether it is preparing a speech, scheduling a vacation or drafting a program for the future, planning, itself, should be an integral part of living.

Living and making a living involve taking chances. But those who conduct their business and the business of life, with a minimum of worry are the people who minimize the possibility of adverse chance by planning ahead.

In the business world, and in life generally, there are some people who stake their capital, their talent and their energy upon the caprice of circumstance. Others use their talent to direct their capital and their energy in an ordered way so as to gain the greatest chance of success.

Thus, most success results from two things: Planning and preparation.

Planning is the process of charting a course toward a goal, whether it be general, such as gaining an education, or particular,

such as to become proficient in a particular skill or profession.

Preparation, on the other hand, is the work we do to achieve a desired goal. It is sort of planning in action.

Speaking of preparation, there is an old saying I heard once to the effect that "Opportunity knocks only when you are ready for it; otherwise it was merely a chance you did not deserve."

The singer or dancer who fills in at the last moment for a star who is ill; the officer who comes up with the answer to an impossible situation during battle, the lawyer or businessman tapped out of the blue for a government or diplomatic post—pure luck did not give them their chance. They were prepared for the opportunity when it arrived, and they were equal to the assignment given them. They had prepared themselves. Their planning may not have envisioned such luck, but their preparation allowed them to take advantage of it.

You will all remember the story of the apple which fell on Newton's head, and suddenly he had discovered the theory of gravity. Was it magic? Luck? An accident? Not at all. Apples had fallen for centuries without anyone's coming up with the concept of gravity. But Newton's years of dealing with science and mathematics enabled him, at the moment when the apple collided with his head, to put together the many scraps and facts he already possessed, and to crystalize a concept that had eluded men for centuries.

As with most great inventions and discoveries, his flash of creative genius was based on a long period of planned and painstaking research. He wasn't looking for the law of gravity when he found it. But the individual who has planned his or her course, and is going in the right direction, can set up a group of circumstances which will, in the end, contribute to his success. He is then in a position to turn every incident, and even most every accident, into something for his good. The lucky man, as we call him, is usually the man who knows how much to leave to chance, but who realizes that it is a mathematical certainty that chance is no respecter of persons but is absolutely impartial. And unless there is planning based on information and preparation, the chances of success are minimal and you can find yourself helpless before the impact of an unexpected problem or turn of events. When you provide for known eventualities, you are left free to deal with the unforeseen probabilities.

As I said previously, there is a bonus value in planning: it avoids worry. The wise man, although he will not buckle under preventable misfortunes, will see to it that he is not forced to waste time and emotion upon those problems which can be avoided by careful forethought. The vast majority of things which give you happiness and a sense of accomplishment are the things that are within your control.

This is true not only for an individual, but also for our country. Preparations for the future need to be made by considering first what is necessary and important now, and then, what will be necessary in 2, 5, 10, or more years hence. The leaders of our Nation thus must consider the present state of world affairs and make treaties and alliances for the purpose of preserving the peace, and thereby, the future of our country.

The United States at the present time is a partner in several international organizations or alliances designed primarily to preserve this peace and prosperity for the free world; for example, the United Nations, SEATO, and the OAS. One of these alliances, which has the particular objective of trying to halt the spread of Communist power, is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, more commonly called NATO.

NATO was on my mind as I was preparing this speech, because I am leaving later this week on a factfinding visit to its European headquarters.

This organization was set up, as you will recall, a few years after we had fought and won our battle against the powers of fascism in World War II. A new age was emerging from the chaos of that conflict. We visualized ourselves at the threshold of a peaceful era. At the same time, the explosion of an atomic bomb had ushered in the possibility of a total war. And this was, to alter Hamlet's phrasing slightly, a "consummation devoutly to be avoided." The combination of nuclear power and the space age had brought the world's struggles at last to the door of our own country. It now became apparent that whenever the bell should toll it would toll for us, even though the seas might separate us from the scene of battle. In John Donne's words, we had become involved in all mankind.

At that time we could have ignored the lengthening shadows cast by the rising red sun in the east, turned our backs, and gone home; or, as we did, we as a nation could plan for the future of the free world; for the free European nations were, and continue to be, most important to us, both politically and economically, for the simple facts are that were the Soviet bloc to gain control over Western Europe, it would possess a productive capacity and a military strength which would be vastly superior to that of the free world. So we must plan and prepare for the possibility of any reversal of the existing balance. We must, then, recognize and deal with the problems—both internal and external—which face the NATO alliance today.

In our NATO treaty we have recognized the importance of a unified approach to the military problems of the free world. And the countries of Western Europe, which have a common heritage of a Judeo-Christian ethic and culture, should recognize that, in the long run, we must remain united, not only militarily, but to a larger degree, economically and politically, against the encroachment of communism. In this way, we shall be working effectively for the preservation of freedom.

But what has all that I have just said to do with you who sit before me so patiently, today?

Let me remind you that, the door you step through today will close behind you and lock irrevocably. It is a similar door to that through which your country and the world stepped following the last war. You cannot go back to the past. But you can learn from it if you try. And you are prepared for stepping through that doorway. There will be other educational doorways later on. Although, at this point, you have had far more formal training than Abraham Lincoln ever obtained. But, whether you go on to college or not, the process of learning will stay with you all your life. You are quite well trained already to deal with the problems of living. You are not going to believe me, I'm sure. But the process of thinking logically which you have learned through your science, math, and language courses will really serve you well. This ability to think is one of the major goals of education and you have learned it well at Mount Vernon.

No one argues, of course, that young people need a formal education. It is a universally accepted proposition. Here and there disagreements crop up, however, as to what education really means, what its goals are and, of course, what methods should be used.

Two ideas, however, are not debatable. One is that young people have to learn, and do learn, the habits and customs of the society to which they belong and into which they grow. They have to assimilate the religious, moral, and political traditions of their elders, not word for word, or prayer for prayer, or even party for party, but, rather, what we refer to—all too lightly sometimes—as their heritage. These constitute the canvas and the black and white outlines of the final portrait we call an adult.

Your parents and teachers have attempted to fill in the colors of this portrait by helping to prepare you for your later lives and for the specific tasks which you will shoulder by choice or by necessity.

So you have been prodded and pushed and helped up the first set of steps—whether willingly or not can best be remembered by your parents and teachers.

What you have learned is yours to do with as you will. You are now the masters of your fates and the captains of your souls.

These are not idle words. That is why they have been said so often. You have been given the tools for dealing with what lies ahead. Part of what we have tried to give you is the individuality and the confidence that will enable you to lead when you should lead and yet the strength of character to follow when you must follow. We have tried to instill a feeling of patriotism: Not the casual statement of fact that allows you to put U.S.A. in the blank labeled "country of birth," but a true feeling of respect and love for the land to which it is your privilege to belong. Because a person is not strong in the defense of what he owns unless he loves and understands it. The honor and knowledge of your country, and the national self-respect you take with you wherever you go, make you a better representative of this country abroad, and a better defender at home.

But most of all, we have tried to make you capable of grappling with events and at the same time keeping your heads, so that you will be able to solve the problems as they come along.

More of the realities of life are about to confront you. College has long been known as a time of mental warfare. Much of what you have learned, scholastically, morally, and even politically, will be called to question and mercilessly examined. Truth and life will suddenly become words with capital letters taller than the eye can see, and they will loom before you at every turn. And those of you who stay through the next few years to achieve an A.B. or B.S. degree after your name—or that much coveted degree in front of your name, a Mrs.—you will be discovering that living is something beyond the utopia of class assignments and nagging parents, rules of residence or making an agonizing choice of what to wear. Decisions on such things as "yes or no" to another drink, a second pack of cigarettes, or cutting a curfew, will be fought through only to find yourselves confronted with the agonies of choosing a career, finding a job, helping a husband make his way, or raising a family.

We need people who can face life squarely: People who have been trained as you have to understand the interrelationships and transitions through which the world moves, and to have the courage to face what the future holds and the vision to mold it. The country and the world cry out for young people who have been educated to a sympathetic understanding of situations not ordinarily recognized as being interrelated. Many of the Nation's greatest economic and political problems stem from the inability of leaders to comprehend and interpret the significance of events coming from more than one direction. Never before has a liberal education been more essential to social, political, and commercial progress. But this demands individuals who have come to terms with the world and found themselves.

You have been trained by the teachers and faculty of Mount Vernon. You have been

guided by your parents and friends. You have been tested by the trials and tribulations of final examinations and college boards. Your diploma is indicative of the confidence that all of us have in you.

Recognize that you have the basis upon which to build a future. With the knowledge that you now have, you can aspire to any heights of learning. Believe this work with it in mind, and there will be nothing for which you cannot strive. Just keep in mind this old Scottish saying: Grasp a thistle firmly: For if you hesitate or touch it timidly, a thistle stings. But grasp it firmly, its spines crumble harmlessly in your hand.

So, in life. Each of us must bear one burden or another. But face the problem boldly, come to grips. And, strangely, the thorns that might have hurt, lose the power to sting.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

JUNE 14, 1965.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The Reverend A. Reid Jepson, minister, Charleston, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou holy One of Israel, Father of Jesus Christ, and of all who trust Him: On this day of opportunity, at this hour of crisis, in this moment of quietness, we bring to Thee each heart in this House. Who is not in need of cleansing of mind and soul? Each needs wisdom and righteousness from God to solve the problems, to bear the burdens too great for man alone.

We thank Thee for the inspired word oft neglected: "Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow"—by Thy grace. Since each shall give account to God for his deeds, may we act in the fear of God and for the good of His people.

Through Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 10, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1732. An act to amend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5874. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 16. An act for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mehdi Heravi;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Felicidad Caletena;

S. 207. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Violet Shina;

S. 358. An act for the relief of Vladimir Gasparovic and Dragica Rendulic Gasparovic;

S. 372. An act for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriquez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 454. An act for the relief of Lee Hyang Na;

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia;

S. 550. An act for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane;

S. 551. An act for the relief of Richard Bing-Yin Lam;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangelia Moshou Kantas;

S. 653. An act for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras);

S. 678. An act for the relief of Lee Hi Sook;

S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington;

S. 778. An act for the relief of Nicola Moric;

S. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stylliani Papathanasiou;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa;

S. 1483. An act to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1495. An act to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes;

S. 1496. An act to repeal the provisions of law codified in title 5, section 39, United States Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for a review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 6767, the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 136]

Abbitt	Fulton, Pa.	Nedzi
Andrews, George W.	Giaimo	Nelsen
Ashbrook	Gilligan	Nix
Ayres	Grabowski	O'Hara, Mich.
Baring	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Battin	Grider	Passman
Bingham	Gurney	Philbin
Bonner	Hall	Pickle
Bow	Halleck	Pike
Brademas	Halpern	Pirnie
Bray	Hanna	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Price
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Pucinski
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Randall
Cahill	Hébert	Reid, Ill.
Callaway	Hicks	Reifel
Chamberlain	Holifield	Resnick
Clawson, Del	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cleveland	Horton	Ronan
Clevenger	Hull	Roosevelt
Collier	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Conte	Jennings	Roybal
Corman	Johnson, Okla.	Ryan
Craley	Keith	St Germain
Cunningham	Keogh	Saylor
Curtin	King, N.Y.	Scheuer
Devine	Langen	Selden
Diggs	Latta	Senner
Dingell	Lindsay	Shipley
Donohue	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Dow	McDowell	Smith, N.Y.
Dulski	Macdonald	Stafford
Dwyer	Machen	Talcott
Dyal	Mackie	Thompson, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Toll
Fascell	Martin, Ala.	Tuck
Findley	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Fino	Martin, Nebr.	Vivian
Fisher	Matsunaga	Walker, Miss.
Fogarty	Miller	Watkins
Ford, Gerald R.	Mink	Willis
Ford, William D.	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Fraser	Moeller	Wilson, Charles H.
Frelinghuysen	Morris	Wright
	Morrison	Younger
	Morton	Zablocki
	Mosher	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 297 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 419, Rept. No. 511) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6927)