

the increase in income would be available for the family to use in meeting family needs other than rent. The head of a family making \$250 a month will not lose incentive to raise his income by \$50—\$300 a month—just because that would require him to increase his rent payments by \$12.50 a month. This would be the same as saying that a person would not accept a higher income because his Federal income tax rate would be increased.

Question. Would the rent supplement program tend to establish national rent standards?

Answer. No, the rent supplement program will not cause or enable landlords to increase the rents they charge. Rents in privately owned units are determined by demand and supply in local housing markets.

Actually, the addition to the housing supply which this program would make will help to reduce rents through the normal competitive process. According to the Bureau of the Census, over three-fourths of our lowest income families now pay 35 percent or more of their small incomes for rent because of the inadequate supply of housing for the disadvantaged.

Question. How would a family's income be checked for eligibility?

Answer. First, maximum income limits would be established by the Housing Administrator based on a market analysis showing the lowest rent at which standard housing is available to accommodate a given family size. Payments could not be made on behalf of any family whose income was more than four times the minimum rent required to obtain standard housing in the community. Second, applicants found acceptable by the pri-

vate owner of the project would then be referred to an agency, which might be the community's relocation service or a similar qualified organization, which would determine if the applicant met the maximum income limits established for the project. While the private owner chooses the prospective applicant, he would have no voice in determining the applicant's eligibility.

The check on income which would be performed by this agency would be a mere routine function, much less detailed than is currently being carried on by local housing authorities throughout the country under the public housing program. Primarily, it would involve the applicant—on whose behalf the payment is to be made—presenting either a tax return, or W-2 form, or statement of his earnings from his employer.

Question. Would most families have incomes below the maximum for eligibility purposes?

Answer. The great bulk of rent supplement tenants would have incomes below the maximum. And where an occupant's income is up close to the ceiling, the supplement would be correspondingly small and the family would be paying a substantial rent out of its own income.

Question. How would a family's assets be determined and how would they affect eligibility?

Answer. A family's assets would have to be considered, just as they have to be considered now in determining eligibility for public housing. The Housing Administrator testified that this will be controlled by regulation.

Along with his statement of income, an applicant would have to present a statement of his assets. Just as maximum income limits would be set for each

community, reasonable limits will be placed on the amount of assets permitted in addition to income. Even though an applicant's income qualified for a rent supplement payment on his behalf, he would be ineligible if his assets exceeded these limits.

Question. If a tenant's income decreases during occupancy in a rent supplement unit, will his rent supplement payment be increased?

Answer. Yes, the rent supplement would be increased if a tenant's income decreased. In general the incomes of tenants would be expected to rise, thus reducing their need for rent supplements. There would, therefore, be sufficient funds available under the maximum for the project permitted by the original rent supplement contract to take care of those cases in which income decreased.

Question. How often will incomes be recertified?

Answer. Except for the elderly, incomes of occupants will have to be recertified at least every 2 years, or lesser periods in those instances where the Administrator decides that it is desirable. Since elderly are not likely to have any significant increases in income, there will be no need to recertify the incomes of these households.

Question. What will be considered as income in determining the eligibility of an applicant?

Answer. As indicated in the House Banking and Currency Committee report on the bill, H.R. 7984, gross income of the family or the individual will be used in determining eligibility to receive rent supplements. Gross income would include all income, before taxes, from all sources.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1965

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

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

Our Father, God, amid the seething strife that mars the earth, which could be so fair, we turn from all the vexatious problems which press, to the supreme spiritual verities which cannot be shaken, and which abide forever.

In a violent world, the defense of those eternal values has been entrusted to our fallible hands. We are painfully conscious that this treasure is in earthen vessels. Enable us to exercise our stewardship wisely and well, for the sake of those of all lands and kindreds whose distant feet we hear coming along the future's broadening way.

Deliver us from any complacent satisfaction, as in a world half impoverished we may not be moved with compassion as we gaze from the ivory towers of our own privilege.

By the saving grace of true penitence, may we speedily cleanse our Republic of betrayals which deny our high pro-

fession. With no walls or curtains to blot out freedom's glorious light, may the richness of our inheritance be to us as Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, to unshackle the enslaved, and to clear the way for emancipation everywhere, that, through the potent ministry of our dear land, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 24, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8131) to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

enrolled bill (H.R. 5988) to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 8131) to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc. Before the Chair rules on the request, I should like to say that I believe the President is showing excellent judgment in continuing Adm. David L. McDonald as Chief of Naval Operations for another 2-year term, because I think he has exemplified the best tradition of naval service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, to be a lieutenant general.

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

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

ARMY NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Morning business is in order.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 2154. A bill to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 370).

REPORT ENTITLED "REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 371)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 271, 88th Congress, 2d session, I submit a report entitled "Refugees and Escapees," and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2201. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ruouhollah Kadivar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BASS, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2202. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2203. A bill for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvil Pappan, Julie Gonvil Pappan, Pelagie Gonvil Franceour de Aubri, Victore Gonvil Pappan, Marine Gonvil, Laféche Gonvil, Louis Laventure, Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle, Pierre Carbonau, Louis Joncas, Basil Joncas, James Joncas, Elizabeth Datcherute, Joseph Butler, William Rodger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicill Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2204. A bill to modify the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin in order to provide for certain payments to the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2206. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Classification Act to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 1229

Mr. JACKSON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of S. 1229, which was considered and agreed to.

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

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LONG of Missouri submitted a resolution (S. Res. 120) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS OF CURRENT ADDRESSES OF HUSBANDS AND PARENTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill contemplates making mandatory the release of the last known address of a husband who has abandoned his wife, or of a father who has abandoned his children, and left them destitute.

Under existing law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is prohibited from making available information about the address of the members of the social security system.

Frequently, law enforcement officials trying to find the father to make him take care of his family are unable to learn the address of the parent.

My bill would offer some help to the courts in finding the address of a person who has abandoned either his wife or children.

Mr. President, the bill is introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], and my colleague the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

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

The bill (S. 2202) to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and other Senators), 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 section 1106 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) upon the request of the welfare agency of a State or a political subdivision thereof, or of a court of competent jurisdiction, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall disclose the most recent address contained in the files of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for any individual who is certified by such agency or court as falling, without lawful excuse, to provide for the support and maintenance (1) of his wife in destitute or necessitous circumstances, or (2) of his or her minor child or children under the age of sixteen in destitute or necessitous circumstances. Such disclosure shall be made only if the request is made by the agency or court on behalf of such wife or such child or children; and the address so obtained shall be used by the agency or court only in their behalf. The provisions of subsection (a) with respect to penalties for unauthorized disclosure, and the provisions of subsection (b) with respect to payments for the cost of obtaining information, shall (under such regulations as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe) apply to the disclosure of any address under the subsection."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN KAW INDIANS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill calling for financial reimbursement by the Federal Government to the living heirs of 23 half-blood Kaw Indians who were deprived of lands near Topeka, Kans., a little over a century ago. These lands were tracts originally given to 23 persons by the Federal Government in the treaty of June 3, 1825. Although the Government had a managerial responsibility for these people and their heirs, and a duty to protect their financial interests, they were deprived of their land by various means over the next few years as settlers came to the region. Some allegedly were killed, some were driven away forcefully and some were swindled. Perhaps others were compensated, but not adequately.

This land is today in a state of confusion and titles for the present occupants who have no personal responsibility in this matter whatsoever, are not clear. There exists a state of confusion which should be subjected to careful scrutiny by the Government to accomplish two ends; first, to see that any governmental responsibility to the heirs of the original allottees be discharged if found valid, and, second, to quiet the

titles to the disputed lands for the benefit of the present occupants.

The bill I propose would accomplish these things, in that it would permit the Congress, through its committees to study this matter carefully and systematically. It would be the vehicle through which the Bureau of Indian Affairs could render its position and the results of its research to the Congress for its deliberation. It would give a long overdue hearing to persons who have sought a judgment in this matter for years. I am hopeful of speedy action on this matter.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claims for loss of property to the heirs of the persons named in the bill, the amount of the claims to be determined by the congressional committee after hearing testimony. The bill is expected to be referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to determine the heirs of the individuals named in the bill and the payments provided to them are to be in full and final satisfaction of all claims against the United States growing out of the loss of Indian land allotted to the original persons named in the bill.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] joins me in cosponsoring the bill.

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

The bill (S. 2203) for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellmard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvil Pappan, Julie Gonvil Pappan, Pelagie Convil Franceour de Aubri, Victore Gonvil Pappan, Marine Gonvil, Laféche Gonvil, Louis Laventure, Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle, Pierre Carbonau, Louis Joncas, Basil Joncas, James Joncas, Elizabeth Datcherute, Joseph Butler, William Rodger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicili Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES OF COUNTY COMMITTEES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend certain benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Classification Act, to certain employees of county committees under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, when these employees are appointed to positions under the Department of Agriculture.

This bill would grant these employees rights and privileges in regard to the accumulation of annual leave and sick leave, veterans preference, salary classification, and other benefits, by crediting to their account the service they have had as county committee employees. But it would do so only when these employees are appointed to positions in the Department of Agriculture. It would

not apply if they go to work for any other department or agency.

Some of the best trained and most capable Department of Agriculture employees have had previous experience on county committees. In 1960, Congress extended to these people the benefits of Federal health insurance and life insurance, and civil service retirement. This bill goes a step further in recognizing their valuable experience and service.

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

The bill (S. 2206) to extend certain benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Classification Act to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution with respect to funds for the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. I ask that it be referred to the proper committee for consideration. At the same time, I ask that the text of the resolution and a letter to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary relative thereto be published at this point in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 120) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the sum of money authorized for the expenditure of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under S. Res. 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, be increased from \$150,000 to \$175,000.

The letter presented by Mr. LONG of Missouri is as follows:

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE,

June 25, 1965.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On this date, I have introduced a resolution requesting additional funds for use of the Committee on the Judiciary and any authorized subcommittee thereof, for study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures. The request is for an additional \$25,000. It is very likely that all of these funds will not be needed; any unexpended funds will return to the Treasury; but there are certain vital activities of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure which should continue without letup during the congressional recess. These activities would have to be curtailed if the present funds were not supplemented.

These activities relate primarily to the investigation of invasions of privacy by the

Federal departments and agencies. This investigation has been able to progress more slowly than many of us would like. It has been more difficult and costly than we had anticipated. We have had uncommon difficulty in getting at the facts. We have become increasingly aware of the necessity before recommending restraints on Government snooping, of examining into snooping by other segments of society. In this regard, we have scheduled out-of-town hearings which were not anticipated at an earlier date.

All of this necessitates additional funds. We have requested \$25,000. You may be assured that we will use these funds carefully and return to the Treasury any that are not vitally necessary to our subcommittee activities.

For your information, this request has been approved by all members of the subcommittee.

Kind regards,
Sincerely,

EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 296

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. MILLER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE WAR ON POVERTY—AMENDMENTS

PUTTING THE UNEMPLOYED TO WORK ON CONSTRUCTIVE JOBS
AMENDMENT NO. 297

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, for myself and Senators MORSE, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, PELL, KENNEDY of New York, and JAVITS, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 1759, a bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The amendment would eliminate the 21-year age limitation in the present Neighborhood Youth Corps provisions of the antipoverty program—title Ib.

The amendment is designed to accomplish two purposes: to give unemployed men and women constructive work experience; to simultaneously begin a substantial effort to preserve our wasting natural resources, to beautify the Nation, to increase the value of our recreational areas, and to clean up our cities.

It would provide an additional \$150 million for work-experience programs for "chronically unemployed poor adults." The programs would be administered by existing agencies at the local, State, and Federal level.

For local and State programs, funds are to be expended on a 90-10 matching basis. No more than \$50 million of the authorized funds are to be expended on Federal lands.

The program would be supervised by the Department of Labor under the broad authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is the agency which

has operated perhaps the most successful of the various antipoverty programs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Discussions with Department officials indicate that the experience already gained can be readily transferred to the parallel adult program envisioned by this proposal.

Today America faces twin crises: Through sheer failure to act we are wasting our natural resources at an ever-increasing rate; at the same time there are millions of men who want to work but cannot find jobs who are wasting their lives in poverty. I propose that we face both crises boldly and that we begin a massive program to put men to work and conserve our natural resources.

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

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

The amendment (No. 297) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 297

On page 3, beginning with line 1, strike out all through line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS—EXTENSION AND REVISION

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 111 of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work experience opportunities through participation in Federal, State, and community work training programs. These opportunities shall be afforded to unemployed young men and women and to chronically unemployed poor adult workers with poor employment prospects so that their employability may be increased or their education resumed or continued and so that public agencies and private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties) will be enabled to carry out programs which will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, beautification, and development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, or local government parks, highways, or other lands."

"(b) Section 112 of such title is amended—
"(1) by striking out 'young people' and inserting in lieu thereof 'persons'; and

"(2) by inserting 'and on Federal property as' immediately after 'community activities'.

"(c) Section 113 (a) of such title is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'Federal,' immediately before 'State' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) thereof; and

"(2) by striking out 'or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;' in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'or will contribute to the management, conservation, beautification, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, or local government parks, highways, or other lands;'

"(d) Section 114(a) of such title is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'limited' and inserting in lieu thereof 'open'; and

"(2) by substituting for the period at the end thereof a comma and adding the following: 'and to chronically unemployed

poor employed adults with poor employment prospects provided that not more than \$150,000,000 of the funds appropriated for work training programs under this title may be used to pay the salaries of such adult enrollees.'

"(e) Section 114(c) of such title is amended by striking out 'youths' and inserting in lieu thereof 'enrollees'.

"(f) Section 115 of such title is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Federal assistance to any person pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. The limitation contained in this section shall not apply to projects for the purpose of improving Federal lands or other property but no more than \$50,000,000 of the funds appropriated for work training programs under this title shall be available for projects on Federal lands or property.'

"(g) The title of such title I is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—YOUTH AND WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS"

On page 9, line 23, strike out "\$1,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,650,000,000".

On page 9, line 25, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That \$150,000,000 of the sum appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be used for adult work programs under title I of this Act."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 16, 1965, the names of Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. RUBINOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2152) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. HARTKE) on June 16, 1965.

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. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Facts, Not Myths, on Reds," published in The State, of Columbia, S.C., of June 12, 1965; and Senator THURMOND's newsletter of May 31, 1965, entitled "The Radical Left."

SENATOR BREWSTER URGES SETTLEMENT OF NCAA-AAU DISPUTE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am disturbed to note that there is continuing dissension between the Amateur Athletic Union and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Such squabbling has been going on for a num-

ber of years, despite the efforts of two presidents to resolve it.

The feuding takes on new importance now. The time is approaching for the San Diego track and field competition, which will also be the qualifying trial for the Russian-United States meet to be held later this summer.

Many of our finest collegiate athletes will probably decide not to compete at San Diego because they cannot get NCAA sanction for the meet. Even such top athletes as Gerry Lindgren, the 10,000-meter runner, and 800-meter runner Tom Farrell will compete only at the risk of reprisals by the NCAA. Such a situation will undoubtedly lower the quality of the American team which will compete against the Russians.

There can be no question that sports contests have an important effect on the prestige of the nations involved. Our record against the Russians is especially important for this reason. We must send our finest athletes to compete.

Especially in track and field, which is perhaps our strongest point, we cannot allow petty bickering to affect the quality of the team which will represent the United States.

I therefore strongly urge the parties involved to resolve the dispute as soon as possible, and settle down to the more important task of putting together the best possible group of American athletes. And if the NCAA and the AAU cannot resolve their longstanding difficulties, then I believe that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to take appropriate action to insure that the athletes who represent this Nation abroad are the finest that we have to offer.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I do so from the point of view of parochial pride. We have at Montana State University a 6-mile champion who is caught in a box, so to speak, because of the difficulty between these competing organizations. I hope that they will put aside pettiness and see to it that the best which America produces can be induced to enter the meet so that we can make the kind of showing of which this country is capable.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for calling the problem to the attention of the Senate at this time. I hope some results will be forthcoming. If not, I hope that the suggestion of the Senator will be followed through so far as Congress is concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the majority leader.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 349, and that the measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 349 be called to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The first measure on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT—AMENDMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1903) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734-736).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is already familiar with the provisions of S. 1903 since these identical provisions, as S. 949, were passed by the Senate without objection on December 3, 1963.

To recapitulate them briefly, the first section of S. 1903 is designed to make more flexible our representation to the United Nations in New York. Currently, of our five ambassadors at the U.S. mission to the United Nations, two by law can represent the United States in any of the principal organs of the United Nations. The third one can do so to a limited extent, and the last two are restricted to representing the United States to the Commissions to which they are appointed—The Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council respectively. Under the proposed changes the principal U.S. representative to the United Nations—Ambassador Stevenson—will be enabled to assign the other four U.S. representatives to the positions where they are needed, making it possible to use their expert knowledge to better advantage. For instance, matters involving colonialism arise not only in the Trusteeship Council, but also in the General Assembly and the Security Council and elsewhere and the United States is clearly better represented in these discussions by the ambassador most familiar with them. I want to stress that these five ambassadors will continue to require Senate confirmation and that there is no addition in personnel contemplated in this section.

The second section of S. 1903 provides statutory authority for the position of the U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva. The U.S. mission in Geneva has existed since 1949. Over the years, conference activity in Geneva has increased enormously, outstripping even the headquarters of the United Nations at New York in number of international conferences held. Since 1961, the U.S. representative to the European office has held the personal rank of ambassador by Presidential appointment. This bill would authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European Office of the U.N., by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with "appropriate rank and status," to serve at the pleasure of the President. Of the 36 resident missions in Geneva, 31 are already represented by an ambassador.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that this bill, S. 1903, is worthy of favorable Senate consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 360), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The bill contains two sections. The first will enable the principal U.S. representative of the United Nations to assign duties to

his colleagues on a somewhat more flexible basis than at present. The second will provide statutory authority for the existing position of the U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations.

PROVISIONS

Although on the face, the amendments in the first section appear substantial because they rewrite subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, the real changes are mostly technical. There is no diminution of the confirmation requirements in the present act. There is no provision for additional personnel. What is involved in section 1 is merely greater flexibility in assignments.

Under present law, only three of the top members of the U.S. mission to the United Nations may represent the United States in the Security Council, and only two of them may represent the United States both there and in "any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, other than specialized agencies * * *." This means that of the U.S. representatives to the United Nations, only two have all-round flexibility, and a third one has a limited degree of flexibility. In addition to the three top members of the U.S. mission (currently, Ambassadors Stevenson, Plimpton, and Yost) the U.S. representatives to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations require Senate confirmation. What the amendments to the existing law will effect is an interchangeability of these five top officials in the principal organs of the United Nations. For instance, Ambassadors Franklin Williams and Mrs. Marietta Tree, now respectively assigned to the U.N. Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, could also be assigned to handle an economic or trusteeship matter in the Security Council or another organ or commission of the United Nations. The advantages of this flexibility are self-evident.

The second section is also quite simple. Since 1949, the United States has had a mission to the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva. It is currently headed by Roger Tubby, who has the personal rank of Ambassador but neither the status nor the remuneration of one. The bill provides that in the future, the President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a U.S. representative to the European Office of the U.N., with "appropriate rank and status," to serve at the pleasure of the President, and, at the direction of the Secretary of State, perform functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations.

Conference activity at Geneva has grown tremendously over the years outstripping even that at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York. There are 36 resident missions at Geneva, 31 of them headed by Ambassadors. Giving our chief representative there a statutory position should promote better coordination, direction, and representation of our activities.

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

The bill (S. 1903) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, Eighty-first Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a

representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time, direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the Representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any Deputy Representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g) respectively; and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific, which has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "annually", to insert "not to exceed \$200,000 per fiscal year"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

S.J. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor", as amended (22 U.S.C. 280b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) such sums as may be required annually, not to exceed \$200,000 per fiscal year, for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, as set forth in article XIV of the agreement establishing the South Pacific Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 71 concerns U.S. contributions to the South Pacific Commission. The United States, by virtue of its interests in American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, became a member of this Commission in 1948 and has been active in it ever since. Until 1964, the appropriations for U.S. contributions to the Commission were authorized on a continuing basis but with financial ceilings. In 1963, the executive branch requested the elimination of this financial ceiling but Congress instead authorized appropriations, not to exceed \$150,000 a year, for fiscal years 1965 and 1966, which financed the U.S. contributions for the calendar years 1964 and 1965. Since this authority is now exhausted, the executive branch again requested the elimination of both the financial and the fiscal year limitations. The Committee on Foreign Relations instead voted to raise the ceiling to \$200,000 per fiscal year and eliminate the time limitation. This recommendation is embodied in the committee amendment. The committee strongly felt that a financial ceiling alone afforded adequate congressional control over U.S. participation in the South Pacific Commission. Testimony was given that the \$200,000 ceiling will be reached in calendar year 1967 so it is probable that in any event, this matter will have to be reviewed again in several years. There was further testimony that of the 34 international organizations financed from the State Department's contribu-

tions appropriations, seven have financial ceilings, four have percentage ceilings, and only one has a fiscal year limitation—and that is the South Pacific Commission.

A brief word about the South Pacific Commission itself. Witnesses before the committee, who included our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii, described the South Pacific Commission as a "catalyst" or a "spark-plug." That is, in itself the commission does not undertake large-scale programs but it encourages the metropolitan and territorial governments to undertake these by research, demonstration projects, technical advice, and acting as a clearinghouse for information. A more detailed description of these activities is contained in the hearing which is appended to the committee report.

For these purposes, the South Pacific Commission has a relatively modest budget which for this calendar year is \$747,799, of which the U.S. share amounts to \$149,559.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the committee amendment and passage of Senate Joint Resolution 71 as amended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 361), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSE

As proposed to be amended by the committee, the joint resolution would authorize the appropriation of such sums, not to exceed \$200,000 a year, as may be required annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies, as set forth in article XIV of the agreement establishing the South Pacific Commission.

BACKGROUND

The South Pacific Commission was established in 1948 and includes in its current membership the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Western Samoa. In authorizing U.S. participation in 1948, the Congress placed a ceiling of \$20,000 a year on U.S. contributions to the Commission. This ceiling was raised to \$75,000 in 1950 and to \$100,000 in 1960. In 1963, the executive branch requested the elimination of the ceiling, but the Congress instead raised it to \$150,000 for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. This authorization has now been exhausted and the administration again has requested the elimination of the ceiling, as well as the fiscal year limitation. The share of contributions to the assessed budget of the Commission is as follows: United States, 20 percent; United Kingdom, 17 percent; Australia, 32 percent; New Zealand, 16 percent; France, 14 percent; and Western Samoa, 1 percent.

The calendar years 1963, 1964, and 1965 budgets of the Commission are set forth in the following table.

South Pacific Commission—Budgets for calendar years 1963-65

	1963	1964	1965
I. Administration:			
Personnel salaries and allowances.....	\$153,720	\$138,320	\$159,280
Travel.....	13,384	11,200	12,765
Equipment, supplies, and services.....	74,329	79,934	81,623
Total.....	241,433	229,454	253,673

South Pacific Commission—Budgets for calendar years 1963-65—Continued

	1963	1964	1965
II. Work programs:			
Health.....	\$101,668	\$127,490	\$136,114
Economic development.....	157,472	207,287	193,080
Social development.....	196,333	153,437	145,585
Publications Bureau and Library.....	42,644	67,530	71,377
Research Council.....	5,460		
Total.....	503,577	555,744	546,156
III. South Pacific Conference.....	3,330	25,200	56,000
IV. Reserve working fund: Rhinoceros beetle project.....			36,198
Gross budget.....	748,340	810,398	892,031
Less:			
Carryover.....	-89,264	-47,944	-95,386
Miscellaneous income.....	-60,088	-62,454	-48,846
Assessment budget.....	598,988	700,000	747,799

The 20 percent U.S. share of the assessed 1965 budget will amount to \$148,559. For calendar year 1966, a budget of \$822,360 is envisioned of which the U.S. share would be \$164,472. By 1967, U.S. contributions at the 20-percent rate are estimated to reach the neighborhood of \$200,000.

The U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam, as well as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, are covered by the Commission's activities. These activities center in the economic and social fields, and are mainly consultative and advisory. One of the witnesses before the committee described the Commission as a "sparkling," supporting, supplementing, and complementing the work of the metropolitan powers and territorial governments through research, technical conferences, and training courses, and by acting as a clearinghouse. For this purpose it has a secretariat of 61 members at its headquarters in Noumea, New Caledonia. Such programs as are undertaken are financed by the metropolitan or territorial governments, sometimes with United Nations assistance.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF A SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS OF GREECE TO THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1760) to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill provides for the settlement of a debt arising out of a loan made to Greece in 1929. In 1929, the United States loaned \$12 million to Greece to help meet the costs of repatriating Greek refugees from Asia Minor.

Prior to 1931, the Greek Government made payments on this 20-year loan, reducing the debt to about \$11 million. Since that time, conditions have been so turbulent that no payments have been made.

Last year, however, the United States and Greece entered into an agreement providing for repayment of the loan in a series of 82 annual installments, with interest at the rate of 2 percent per year

on the outstanding principal. Thus, over a term of years, the United States will receive over \$26½ million.

Annual installments will be received from Greece in the amount of about \$329,000. These payments will go into the U.S. Treasury with the understanding that the Department of State, in its regular appropriation bills, will request that these funds be used to support the educational and cultural exchange program between the United States and Greece.

The committee gave careful consideration to S. 1760 and recommends that it be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 362), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The main purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to conclude the settlement of a debt arising from a U.S. loan to Greece in 1929, on which no payments have been made since the early years of World War II. Under the terms of the settlement Greece will repay at interest \$13,155,921 in 82 annual installments; the latter with one exception will each amount to approximately \$329,000, and the payments thus will total about \$26.7 million. Authority is also sought to use these annual payments for educational and cultural exchange activities with Greece under Public Law 87-256, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

BACKGROUND

The United States in 1929 made a loan of \$12,167,000 to Greece for the purpose of helping in the repatriation of Greek refugees from Asia Minor, a task undertaken by the Refugee Settlement Commission under League of Nations auspices. The amount outstanding on this 20-year loan was reduced to \$11.3 million by payments made prior to May 1931. Through an agreement reached between the United States and Greece a year later, \$900,000 due in fiscal year 1931 were funded into a separate loan. However, no payments were made on the latter, and only token payments were received on the original loan prior to the invasion of Greece in 1941. Since that date nothing has been paid under the 1929 and 1932 agreements, and Greece therefore has been in default on both loans.

Despite many efforts over the years to settle Greece's defaulted post-World War I external debts—including this account—the first real progress was made in October 1962, when Greece and the Foreign Bondholders' Protective Council agreed upon settlement of the \$36 million in privately held dollar bonds. The terms and arrangements em-

ployed in that settlement served as guidelines for the governmental agreement now under consideration.

TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

The agreement entered into by the United States and Greece on May 28, 1964—subject to action by the U.S. Congress—is printed below as appendix A. Under its terms principal and interest due up to August 10, 1933, under the 1929 and 1932 agreements are computed at \$12,208,538. The sum of \$947,383 was added in lieu of arrears of interest from the above date, giving a total of \$13,155,921 to be funded. With interest at 2 percent a year on the outstanding principal, and repayment in dollars in 82 annual installments beginning 1 year after enactment of this bill, Greece will pay the United States a total of \$26,731,494. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to accept a bond from Greece which would provide for payment under these terms, and which, upon receipt, would discharge Greece of its obligations under the 1929 and 1932 agreements.

The settlement and the bill provide that these payments of principal and interest would be made available for use in financing educational and cultural exchange programs with Greece authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended. The annual installments paid by Greece in the amount of about \$329,000 each would go into an account in the Treasury, and appropriations of those amounts, to remain available until expended, would be requested by the Secretary of State in the regular appropriation for the State Department. The annual cost of the total educational and cultural exchange program between Greece and the United States currently is about \$750,000. At this level the annual payment under the settlement could cover almost all the dollar—as contrasted with foreign currency—expenditures under the total program.

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

The bill (S. 1760) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1760

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Greek Loan of 1929 Settlement Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to accept a bond from the Kingdom of Greece (hereinafter referred to as "Greece") in the principal amount of \$13,155,921 in settlement of the indebtedness of Greece to the United States under part II of the agreement of May 10, 1929, and under paragraph 1(b) of the agreement of May 24, 1932. The terms and conditions of such bond shall be those set forth in the agreement between the United States and Greece of May 28, 1964. Upon the delivery of said bond by Greece to the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to surrender to Greece all the bonds issued pursuant to part II of the agreement of May 10, 1929, and discharge Greece of its obligations under paragraph 1(b) of the agreement of May 24, 1932.

SEC. 3. The sums paid by Greece to the United States as interest on or in retirement of the principal of the bond issued as provided in section 2 hereof shall be placed in an account in the Treasury of the United States. Such sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended for use in financing educational and cultural exchange programs authorized

by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451-2458), in relation to Greece and the people of Greece.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

The bill (S. 511) to increase the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 511

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1963, the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory", approved May 7, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 491; 22 U.S.C. 278), is amended by striking out "\$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 365), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION

S. 511 would increase the annual authorization for appropriations for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory from \$250,000 to \$500,000.

This increase is required to maintain the research program of the Laboratory at an optimum level and make the most effective utilization of the additional research space that was provided by the enactment of Public Law 86-617.

BACKGROUND

The Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is the medical-research component of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine. The Laboratory was established in 1929 through legislative agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama. It has long maintained close relations with the U.S. Public Health Service and its National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

Located in Panama City, the Republic of Panama, its Laboratory is an internationally known research center in tropical medicine and parasitology. It has made important research contributions through (1) the valuable information it has gathered relating to organisms and their environment; and (2) its investigations of malaria, yellow fever, various types of encephalitis, and other diseases and conditions.

As a result of the addition of a new half-million-dollar facility, the Laboratory has been able to extend its research activities and to undertake new projects in experimental pathology, serology, tissue culture, comparative vertebrate zoology, and epidemiology. Its facilities are utilized by specialists

in tropical diseases from the United States and many other countries. The members of its staff are widely recognized for their achievements in tropical medicine.

In 1964, Dr. Martin D. Young was appointed Director of the Laboratory. Dr. Young is distinguished for his outstanding achievements in research on tropical medicine. He has won international renown for his work on malaria, particularly while Director of the Field Section of the Public Health Service Malaria Laboratory of Parasite Chemotherapy, Columbia, S.C.

The research activities have implications that extend beyond the tropics. Many of the human and animal diseases that flourish in tropical regions are also found in, or may spread to, the temperate zones. The United States depends on many tropical areas for a large share of its important strategic materials. The output of these areas is adversely influenced by debilitating infections of man and by diseases of meat-food animals that deprive the populations of sources of dietary protein and that contribute to undernourishment and the prevalence of nutritional disorders.

The Laboratory is performing a valuable, needed service in offering opportunities for field training in tropical diseases. It cooperates with the program of Louisiana State University fellowships in tropical medicine, under which teachers and research workers in disciplines relating to tropical medicine are able to take training tours of the Caribbean or Middle America in order to familiarize themselves with local research activities and to view clinical cases characteristic of the areas visited. The Army and Navy assign scientists to the Laboratory for various periods, to receive training and to participate in the research program.

The Laboratory occupies an ideal location for the study of certain viruses. Many of these viruses have been found to cause disease in man and to have extensive geographic distribution. In tropical America, the natural vectors and reservoir hosts may be readily investigated, and serologic surveys of human populations subject to infections may be conducted.

In one of its continuing research projects, the Laboratory is investigating yellow fever in areas near the Panama Canal and in eastern Panama. In an effort to discover a means of preventing the northward extension of the disease, Laboratory investigators are seeking to determine the factors which inhibit or favor passage of the virus from South into Middle America.

The Laboratory collaborates with many other research and public health organizations, including the Middle America Research Unit, a laboratory in the Canal Zone operated by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases in collaboration with the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. One cooperative endeavor was work on eastern equine encephalomyelitis.

The Laboratory has utilized its position on the Isthmus of Panama, a "crossroads of the world," to take advantage of many rich opportunities for research in tropical medicine. With its new and enlarged laboratory facilities, it has a modern research plant that will enable it to intensify and augment its work on broad problems of growing importance to the health of the Americas and of the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

ALCOHOLISM—A SURVEY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the addiction to alcoholic drinking—

alcoholism—is the fourth most serious health problem, after heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, in the United States today. According to the latest figures from the Public Health Service there are approximately 5 million alcoholics in our Nation. Four and a half percent of our total population over 20 years of age are alcoholics. School officials are becoming aware that an increasing number of school dropouts are due to teenage alcoholism. A recent study has demonstrated that in the past 10 years there has been an 18-percent increase in the admissions to mental institutions due to alcoholism. The losses in earnings and production due to alcoholic employees is costing American business and industry billions of dollars each year.

Clearly, one does not have to be a prohibitionist to be concerned with a medical, social, and economic problem of this magnitude. I have joined with the junior Senator from South Dakota and others in urging the President to call a White House Conference on Alcoholism and have welcomed the President's appointment of a study commission in the Public Health Service to lay the groundwork for such a meeting, perhaps to be held next year.

During the past 2 months the Christian Science Monitor has been carrying a series of articles on alcoholism in the United States and abroad. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 25, 1965]

EMPTY CHAIRS AROUND THE WORLD

The alcoholic drinking menace assails virtually every facet of world society today.

Few problems are at once so damaging and yet so controversial. On the one hand, individual well-being and the stability of families and careers, corporations, and campuses are widely threatened. On the other hand, age-old pro-drink customs, traditions, and beliefs are still strong.

Communications media on every hand glorify the presumed attractions of alcoholic drinking through a great variety of advertisements. Liquor imbibing is matched with manliness, pleasure, conviviality, prestige, career, and social success.

VIOLENCE IS EVERYDAY NEWS

Once targeted only for a male audience, advertisements today bring women into the picture—not yet portrayed actually drinking but shown holding a drink or admiring the man who indulges.

Movies and plays portray the drunk for comedy or ridicule, making only rare efforts to point up the tragedies of habitual alcoholic drinking or the urgent need for understanding and treatment of the problem.

News items almost daily report violence and degradation directly linked to alcoholic addictions.

U.S. authorities devote much time and money to detecting and prosecuting the "moonshiners" who produce illegal and often lethal alcoholic beverages.

Many nations are mounting substantial treatment and rehabilitation programs for alcoholics. Others are far behind the problem.

LOSS OF CONTROL DOUBTED

To ascertain the precise dimensions of this subject, the Christian Science Monitor

asked its correspondents throughout the world to investigate problem drinking in their areas. Their findings illuminate a problem of serious, subtle, and growing proportions.

It may further be concluded from their stories that while there appears to be agreement in society today that alcoholism—addiction to alcoholic drinking—is a serious affliction to be resisted at all costs, there is considerable acceptance of the belief that moderate or social drinking does no harm.

Many millions of people who indulge in alcoholic drinking feel certain that their imbibing is well under control. They feel certain that they will not fall victim to the enslavement which has overtaken other millions who also once thought their indulgence was in hand.

Yet the problem of alcoholism is undeniably great, say the experts consulted for these articles. By many measures it is growing. They emphasize its assaults on happiness, safety, judgment, and security, to mention only four very evident zones of alcoholism's impact. They stress the urgency of finding more effective ways to deal with the problem.

The U.S. Public Health Service has deemed alcoholism the country's fourth most serious public health problem (after heart disease, cancer, and mental illness).

American businessmen are mounting a major drive against alcoholism in industry.

California is calling for a White House conference on alcoholism.

SPECIAL STUDY SETUP

The Georgia Senate has just established an Alcoholic Study Commission to cope with the 75,000 Georgians judged alcoholics and with crime and traffic accident increases traced to alcoholism.

Adults in countless communities and nations are registering special concern with teenage drinking. But much adult concern stops short of curbing adult drinking and thereby setting a needed example for youth.

In some instances—a current Connecticut case for example—parents not only condone teenage drinking but encourage it by serving alcoholic beverages at teen parties in their homes. After one such party in Connecticut two of the young people entertained were involved in an automobile accident in which one was killed.

U.S. STATISTICS OMINOUS

According to recent World Health Organization statistics, the United States has just moved ahead of France as the nation with the world's highest incidence of alcoholism.

The European Institute on the Prevention and Treatment of Alcoholism was recently told, in fact, that every 15th American drinker of alcoholic beverages is an alcoholic, that altogether 75 million Americans drink alcoholic beverages, and that 2 million American alcoholics on the payrolls of business and industry cost their managements more than \$2 billion every year through absenteeism.

It has been observed that countries confronted with almost any other problem of this magnitude would long since have declared themselves to be in the throes of a crisis of epidemic proportions.

GREATER EFFORTS ASKED

Earnest, forthright public and private attention is being focused on the problems of alcoholic drinking. But Monitor reporters encountered many appeals for much greater efforts than presently exist.

Why is the alcoholism problem so great?

In a copyrighted interview in U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Marvin Block, an internationally recognized authority on problem drinking, offered two explanations for the United States.

"The acceptance of drunken behavior in our society, the tolerance of it. In-

creasingly," said Dr. Block, "people are accepting drunkenness without being shocked.

"The second factor is the social pressures for drinking. Everywhere you go, you are offered liquor. Even during business hours."

CONTROVERSY WIDESPREAD

Drinking could hardly be a more controversial subject. The problem drinker often, until he finds himself on the brink of tragedy, tends to deny that his drinking habit is either unbreakable or a problem.

The moderate or social drinker, who scoffs at the suggestion that he or she is vulnerable to the addictive grip of alcoholism, tends to resent identification with habitual drinkers.

However, despite the majority numbers of so-called controlled, moderate drinkers whose drinking outwardly poses few problems for society, the facts and figures of alcoholism's tragic toll tend to pale the arguments for moderation, in the view of many students of the problem.

Some seek to excuse liquor itself. There is the contention of many, frequently the alcoholic beverage production, sales, and marketing industries, that while alcoholism is admittedly a problem, "Evil is never in the bottle; evil is in the individual."

WINE INSTITUTE QUOTED

The president of the Wine Institute told the Monitor: "Alcoholism is viewed by the wine industry as it must be by any other industry or segment of the population, as a serious problem. * * * Whether any individual decides to drink should be a matter for him to determine himself.

"If he does drink, it should be in moderation. Wine is a beverage of moderation, and is taken with food as part of the meal. * * * The wine industry probably bears the same social responsibility for pathological drinking as the petroleum industry bears for pathological driving."

Despite many reports of crises with drunken airline passengers, the airlines today insist that alcoholic beverage service is a highly competitive feature in modern travel and champion the right of the passenger to have the opportunity to say "yes" or "no" to drinking aloft.

TOLL MULTIDIMENSIONED

The toll of drunken driving and of crime linked to problem drinking, and the millions and millions of dollars spent throughout the world every year for care and treatment of alcoholics underscore other dimensions of this subject.

Antialcohol forces constantly press their pleas for abstinence and prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages, challenging powerful liquor interests and lobbies.

Many and influential citizens warn against resort to depressant alcohol for escape from day-to-day troubles. Many have experienced addiction and have surmounted its claims. Others have refused ever to be lured to indulge.

OPIATE OF THE PEOPLE

Albion Roy King, who has written much on alcohol and alcoholism, contends:

"The resort to alcohol for escape is at best artificial and unintelligent. It never cures any evil thing. The compensating satisfactions which man gets out of drink are likely to make him content with his lot without considered and courageous effort to change the circumstances. In the struggle for better social conditions, alcohol is the great 'opiate of the people.'"

Meanwhile, governments, both national and local, have for centuries wrestled with regulations both to curtail and to control alcoholic beverages. Some have succeeded; many have failed. The London Daily Telegraph asked editorially last year: "How can social legislation be drawn which keeps the alcoholic from temptation, without seriously invading the rights of moderate drinkers?"

In the year 81, the Roman Emperor Domitian ordered the destruction of half of the vineyards and forbade the planting of more without a special imperial license, apparently in an attempt to stop intemperate drinking. The liquor lobby of Domitian's day must have rebelled at this, however, because the ban was soon lifted.

Many other historical as well as contemporary aspects of the drinking challenge are discussed throughout subsequent articles in this series.

Among topics to be examined:

Drinking behind the Iron Curtain;

Hollywood's view of the drinking challenge;

The role of the classroom in portraying alcohol's evils;

The viewpoint of native wives in New Guinea who beg Australian authorities to help them curb their husbands' drinking;

The persevering campaigning of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Salvation Army;

The widely acclaimed rehabilitation programs of Alcoholics Anonymous and other public and private agencies;

A Chicago judge's unique approach to alcoholism;

The U.S. Government's attitude toward drinking;

A Chicago family's frank discussion of its drinking habits.

Clearly, the facets of the drink menace are almost endless. Limitations of time and space preclude mention of every attitude and action on this subject in this series. But an earnest effort has been made to report as many of the most important elements as possible.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 1, 1965]

LIQUOR INDUSTRY EYES WIDER MARKET

The American liquor industry is big.

This fact is pointed out insistently by its various spokesmen and publications. They carefully spell out the industry's contribution to the economy in payrolls, purchases of raw materials, and tax revenues.

During 1964, Americans spent well over \$13 billion on alcoholic beverages of all types. This sum has been climbing by about \$500 million each year recently.

Enormous sums are spent by the liquor industry each year in advertising and promotion to boost these consumption totals.

A compilation of statistics shows that in 1963 the industry spent at least \$345 million in promotion.

The liquor industry also shares a stake in the drink-serving policies of airlines, theaters, sports arenas, and the like.

The liquor industry is thriving.

The total \$13 billion drinking bill run up by Americans in 1964 breaks down to approximately \$6 billion for distilled spirits (hard liquors); almost \$7 billion for beer and ale; and more than \$700 million for wine.

In addition to these legal sales, a large quantity of illegal liquor—chiefly distilled spirits—is sold by moonshiners.

Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., the public relations organization for makers of distilled spirits, estimates that Federal, State, and local governments lost \$600 million in revenues from such illegal liquor in 1963. If sold at normal prices, illegal liquor would add perhaps \$1.1 billion to the Nation's liquor bill.

These statistics indicate a sizable impact of liquor expenditures on the economy.

To some States, the liquor industry is especially important. Some 66 percent of American-made whisky, for instance, is produced in Kentucky.

California is the biggest wine-producing State. New York, Wisconsin, Missouri, and California are the major brewery States.

The brewery industry does not like to be included in the liquor industry. In 1933,

Congress declared the malt beverages with less than 3.2 percent alcohol content were not alcoholic beverages. Thus the sale of beer was legalized before the repeal of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution a few months later.

POSITION CHALLENGED

Spokesmen for the National Council on Alcoholism challenge this position. They note that many alcoholics drink only beer. The alcoholic content of most premium beers, they add, is from 3.8 to 4 percent with some imported brands as high as 5.5 percent.

"The female alcoholic problem is largely one of beer," commented Merle A. Gulick, president of the council. "Some of them live on beer all day long while their husbands are at work."

Still, the argument that beer is a beverage of moderation is used to justify its sale in supermarkets and other food stores.

Consumption of alcoholic beverages is increasing at the same time that dollar expenditures are going up.

The industry says that the United States remains a nation of moderate drinkers. The statistics, however, are not entirely clear as they are based on consumption per capita for the entire population and not just the drinking population.

On this basis, the estimated average number of gallons consumed per capita in 1964 was 15.7 of beer and ale, 1.42 of distilled whiskey, and 0.9 of wine.

Statistics indicate that Americans are drinking more distilled spirits and less beer and ale than 10 years ago.

And, again on a per capita basis, they drink less of both distilled spirits and beer and ale than they did in the peak years of 1945 and 1946 at the end of World War II. In 1946 consumption of distilled spirits was 1.65 gallons per capita and in 1945 beer and ale sales amounted to 18.7 gallons per capita.

Basing beer consumption on a per capita basis of the beer-consuming population, Americans drank more than 24 gallons per drinker last year.

On the basis of consumption per adult in the population, Americans imbibed 2.32 gallons of distilled spirits in 1963, the latest figures available.

Wine consumption has increased rapidly as the wine industry "educates" the American public on its use as a beverage to accompany meals in the European tradition.

MILLIONS FOR PROMOTION

Looking at total volumes, residents of the United States in 1963 consumed some 272 million gallons of distilled spirits, 97,793,000 barrels of beer and ale, and more than 165,200,000 gallons of wine.

Sales of malted beverages were up 4.2 percent above 1963. This has delighted the brewers. They have been worried about some drinkers switching to the more expensive distilled spirits with increased prosperity in the Nation.

Last year's increase in beer sales was one of the biggest year-to-year gains in 15 years. The increase between 1962 and 1963 was hailed as a major sales victory, but it was only a 2.8 percent increase.

Sales of hard liquors—the distilled spirits—climbed about 5 percent last year. That compared with a 2 percent rise during 1963 and 5 percent in 1962.

This year the distillers expect sales of 280 million gallons.

How much money goes into advertising and promotion?

A compilation of statistics shows that in 1963 the industry spent at least \$345 million in these areas.

Its expenditures on research into alcoholism in 1963 amounted to something less than \$150,000.

Industry spokesmen assert that large advertising and promotion expenditures do not increase liquor consumption.

"Advertising does not increase the consumption of distilled spirits," held Vern M. Boxell, a senior vice president of Hill & Knowlton, Inc. (This public-relations firm is hired by Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., the public-relations arm of the distilled spirits industry, to assist it in its activities.)

He continues: "It merely switches people from one brand to another. We don't create drinkers."

Competition between brands is clearly the major reason for heavy advertising expenditures of firms making alcoholic drinks.

But trade publications and the advertising itself make it plain that the firms are also attempting to increase consumption and tempt nondrinkers to start drinking.

ADS BECKON WOMEN

Whenever consumption per capita increases—and it has slightly in recent years—trade and industry publications happily note the fact.

In 1958, the Distilled Spirits Institute repealed its prohibition against showing women in advertisements of hard liquor. Since then, women may appear if a natural part of the scene, say at a barbecue or cocktail party.

The ads still are not to show a woman drinking or dressed improperly.

However, a random sampling of national magazines indicates distillers are stretching their advertising limitations to the breaking point.

One example shows a goblet held to a woman's lips with the liquor portrayed in another illustration. The promotion text reads: "The whole world loves it after dinner. Intriguing on the rocks * * * essential in a side car."

Another layout shows a young couple seated at a table with two whisky glasses before them. "Since when do you drink bourbon?" asks he. "Since I tasted [the brand advertised]," the woman answers.

The number of women drinking alcoholic beverages, including distilled spirits, has increased rapidly since 1958. How much of this could be attributed to advertising and how much to changing mores is an unknown.

The liquor industry cracked one more acceptance barrier recently when New York's Broadway theaters began serving drinks during intermissions. Liquor interests are also indebted to airline and railroad clubcar drink-serving policies.

Despite many hair-raising in-flight experiences with intoxicated men and women, one airline spokesman defended liquor beverage service and made light of those who emphasized scattered incidents.

"In our operation," he asserted, "providing alcoholic beverages in limited servings prior to meal service substantially cuts down, if it does not eliminate, the danger of any unpleasant occurrences. Furthermore, the service of liquor assists our industry in its competition with the railroads."

PILOTS ASSOCIATION OBJECTS

Some airlines reportedly set what amounted to quotas for liquor sales for their stewardesses.

"This is a free country," wrote one passenger in response to a United Air Lines survey several years ago. "All people should be able to enjoy what they like."

"The number of drinks should be governed by the passenger's capacity to assimilate liquor," said another.

"Unregulated consumption of alcoholic beverages by passengers in aircraft constitutes a compromise with safety," replied the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA).

Today the novelty of drinking alcoholic beverages on airplanes seems to have worn off somewhat and the rules have stiffened against allowing intoxicated passengers to board commercial flights.

Still the ALPA opposes liquor service on safety grounds.

"The only real solution to the liquor problem aboard planes," the association has said repeatedly, "is to abolish liquor in flight."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 15, 1965]

LIQUOR CASUALTIES—WHO PAYS?

California is calling for a White House conference on alcoholism. It is also asking Congress to give the States back 5 percent of Federal liquor taxes to help them tackle alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

California, by official estimates, has 885,000 people who have become dependent on liquor to the extent that their capacity to earn their livelihoods is impaired.

It has, surveys show, 700,000 teenagers who are regular liquor users.

Its statewide traffic problem due to liquor is becoming increasingly acute, and the cost to taxpayers in this one area alone, reaches into millions of dollars annually.

One major insurance firm reckons that automobile-insurance costs due to liquor total \$100 million a year for California alone.

Though California's alcoholism rate leads the Nation, many States share its concern and are battling the problem their own way.

In Massachusetts, which ranks fourth nationally in the alcoholism statistics, Gov. John A. Volpe proposes a renewed attack.

The Governor zeroed in on the problem in his 1965 inaugural message, stressing that alcohol was "a prime causative factor" in 14 percent of the State's welfare cases and one-third of its mental-illness admissions.

BUDGET INCREASE DUE

Governor Volpe has requested a sizable budget increase for the Department of Public Health's Division of Alcoholism. The division seeks expansion of its alcoholism education, research, and treatment programs to strengthen its 17 clinics across the State.

Like Massachusetts, neighboring Rhode Island's welfare costs have mushroomed with alcoholic case loads. The Department of Social Welfare estimates that 16 percent of its 2,800 disability cases are alcoholics or problem drinkers.

Connecticut confirms the Massachusetts testimony on alcoholism leading to mental illness. State mental health commissioner, Wilfred Bloomberg, says Connecticut mental hospitals admit about 8,100 patients a year of which roughly 3,300 or 40 percent of the cases are attributed directly to alcoholism.

As the cost to the States mounts—to say nothing of the toll in ruined human lives—public officials are seeking new answers to the problem.

California Assemblyman George A. Willson, Democrat, chairman of a legislative interim subcommittee on alcoholism and alcoholic rehabilitation, is waging a two-front war.

RESOLUTION RECALLED

He is keeping Washington mindful that California urged the White House conference. Last year's legislature embodied this in a joint resolution (AJR15) with strong bipartisan backing.

Mr. Willson is also continuing to press for the liquor-tax rebate. This fiscal year, Californians are paying \$450 million in Federal liquor taxes. A 5-percent rebate would give this State something like \$23 million extra.

Other States with alcoholism rehabilitation programs—about 40 of the States have them—would get rebates proportional to the liquor consumed.

In States with high liquor-consumption averages—such as New Jersey, where the average family spent some \$402 on alcoholic beverages during 1963—this rebate would be sizable.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown indicated his support for action when he opened the 1965 legislature. He said that six times as many people were killed in 1964 California auto accidents where liquor was involved as were killed in the Vietnam war in 5 years.

Mr. Willson has introduced vigorous new legislation in the alcoholism field.

BILL PROVISIONS

One package bill would: (1) Provide for mandatory 30-day jail sentences for first-offense, drunk-driving cases; (2) increase the present mandatory 5-day jail sentence for the second offense to 60 days; (3) provide for suspension of driver licenses in such cases; (4) require drivers to give "implied consent" to chemical tests before getting their licenses back.

It would also provide for mandatory jail sentences for speeding. Extensive testimony before Mr. Willson's committee shows, he says, that speeding often goes with use of liquor.

In another bill, Mr. Willson is asking the legislature to transfer rehabilitation of alcoholics from the State department of public health to the State department of rehabilitation.

He believes this would save California \$700,000 annually. It would also increase the number of rehabilitation offices from 8—maintained by public health—to the 40 offices run by rehabilitation.

Savings would come because the latter already has staff for the work. And Federal funds would be available. Of about \$1 million a year spent on rehabilitation by the State, \$400,000 has gone for costs. Of the \$600,000 left to work with, half would come from Washington under the new plan.

California's request for a White House conference comes, Mr. Willson says, from its legislature's conviction that a national meeting of officials concerned with the problems may produce some workable answers.

Since 1957, he points out, the State has put almost \$7 million into rehabilitation of alcoholics. Results have been small.

Mr. Willson believes this may be due to the fact that the State approach has been mainly medical. Hearings have convinced him, he says, that alcoholism has its roots in personality disturbances.

REPORTS CONFLICT

One witness before his committee, long experienced in helping women alcoholics, charged that State-supported clinics were of little help.

This opinion is in sharp contrast to reports from Florida, for instance, where officials estimate that two-thirds of the patients treated by the State's alcoholic rehabilitation center (ARC) respond favorably to treatment.

As in all the States, however, Florida can handle only a small proportion of its total alcoholic population through its State program. The ARC, therefore, regards its own treatment facilities as demonstration units from which will emerge knowledge and techniques helpful to other agencies, institutions, and professional groups faced with the problem of alcoholism.

The California assemblyman's committee heard a spokesman for the liquor industry advocate dropping from age 21 to age 18 the year when young people can legally buy liquor in this State.

PROBLEM IN BARS

The spokesman reasoned that this would relieve bars of the difficulty of excluding older teenagers who misrepresent their ages when they come as patrons.

"I am unalterably opposed to this," says Mr. Willson. "If we dropped the age level to 18, soon we would be under pressure to put it down to 16."

"Some of the most impressive testimony put before us was that in Scotland and England, where the age has been lowered to 18, the amount of alcoholic consumption has quadrupled."

Lowering California's drinking age could also create another "New York problem" with

neighboring States. New York allows 18-year-olds to drink. Bordering States contend their youths are lured into the Empire State to drink and then become involved in traffic accidents when they drive home under the influence of liquor. In recent years, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont have petitioned New York to raise its drinking age to 21.

What about pressures from the liquor industry itself and from television, radio, and newspaper advertising interests?

COUNTERPROPAGANDA

"We all know the part such promulgation plays," Mr. Willson says. "This is why Former Attorney General Stanley Mosk urged the importance of developing vigorous counterpropaganda."

"He said we must start intensive campaigns to associate abstinence and temperance with success in life. He said we must show young people that those who achieve in athletics, for example, know the dangers of alcohol."

Mr. Willson says he is speaking strictly for moderation. He finds no evidence that total prohibition is either workable or, from the standpoint of general popular opinion, acceptable. He is completely frank about it: he himself drinks socially.

"But we cannot escape the fact," he continues, "that the World Health Organization has designated alcohol as an addictive drug. This is what we are dealing with."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 22, 1965]

ALCOHOLISM IN THE CITIES

SAN FRANCISCO.—Is San Francisco the "most drunken" city in the United States because it is the "most oversalooned" city?

This question comes up whenever someone observes that there is a licensed liquor outlet here for every 143 inhabitants.

Alcohol consumption in San Francisco is 3½ times the national average, according to the city's public health director, Dr. Ellis Sox.

Judge Harold Caulfield, in charging the grand jury on January 17, 1963, said:

"There's a high incidence of problem drinkers here—an estimated 100,000. Only 4 percent of the alcoholics are found on skid row. The rest are citizens in all walks of life. This is one of our city's greatest problems—alcoholism."

More recently, Dr. Malcolm Merrill, State public health director, reported that there now are 885,814 alcoholics in California alone. This figures in excess of 8,600 alcoholics for every 100,000 adult residents.

HIGH ALCOHOLISM RATE

Assemblyman Byran Rumford of Berkeley, chairman of the assembly public health committee, says the figure is approaching a million. The total number of State-licensed liquor outlets exceeds 44,000, roughly 1 liquor store or bar for every 386 Californians.

Of the 14 U.S. cities with the highest alcoholism rates, 6 are found in California, according to the Reverend Wilbur Korfhage, legislative advocate of the council on alcohol problems.

Would fewer State-issued liquor licenses mean fewer cases of alcoholism, wrecked homes, and liquor-related crimes?

Not necessarily, says Judge Gerald S. Levin, chairman of San Francisco's Council on Alcoholism, Inc., the chief alleviate agency in this field.

The Moreland Commission in New York State, appointed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller to recommend changes in the State's liquor control act, comes up with findings that seem to support Judge Levin's conclusion.

The New York study group, in fact, urged legislation to increase the number of liquor outlets. Such an act was passed in 1964 with

intent to abolish price fixing and step up competition.

During the depression, Californians were induced to repeal their prohibition enforcement law by amendment to their State constitution.

LEGAL "JOKER" FOUND

The argument advanced at that time was that taxes on liquor would reduce their other taxes. Later Californians discovered that the measure contained what temperance advocates called a "joker." This took away the people's direct control of the liquor traffic and placed that power in a remote State agency.

Local control of the liquor traffic, which the people thus lost, is known as local option. Not only did the industry-drafted substitute wipe out local option; in effect, it prohibited the legislature from again enacting such a local control law.

The only way local option can be restored to the communities is through amendment to the State constitution. Such an amendment was proposed in 1948. Liquor lobbyist Arthur Samish stated then that liquor interests spent \$750,000 to defeat the local control measure.

Mr. Samish told the crime commission his chief value to the liquor industry was in spending money to influence legislation hostile to local option.

Charles C. Boynton, onetime attorney for the Fleishhacker banking interests and an advocate of local option, championed the other side's view before the Commonwealth Club of California:

"Local option means control of liquor by the people of the community. We had it in this State and what was the result? As one pundit said, 'The trouble with local option is that if you get it in one community and it goes dry, it spreads to community after community.' That is, people like it."

ENFORCEMENT QUESTIONED

The last full-scale study of California's liquor problems in 1954 noted that "sporadic enforcement of criminal laws does not help much in the correction of liquor evils."

"The real power to effectively control illegal sales lies in the power to prevent the granting of liquor licenses and to revoke liquor licenses for misconduct," the report added. "The local communities do not have this power and the State does not effectively exercise it."

Ten years ago, when the liquor issue was being debated, it was disclosed that, had the no-saloon constitutional provision been enforced, 75 percent of the alcohol outlets would have been closed.

Temperance spokesmen argue that the closing of three-fourths of California's 44,000 liquor outlets would reduce alcoholism there considerably.

Official concern today is weighted heavily on the side of rehabilitation, while passing over the intensive promotion of liquor sales.

FIRINGS AVOIDED

CHICAGO.—City government has its alcohol problem, too.

What is a public agency to do about employees, trained at a cost of hundreds and perhaps thousands of dollars, who become liabilities because of alcoholism?

The city of Chicago does not regard dismissal as a satisfactory answer to this question. Firing means that the city loses a skilled employee—and the individual's case may be more serious than before.

Thanks to a former police officer who worked at the problem, a better solution now is offered.

It is commonly known as the Fellowship Club with headquarters in the Board of Health building. Officially it is styled "the Chicago Program for the Prevention of Progressive Alcoholism."

The method is that of Alcoholics Anonymous.

The goal: total sobriety.

Men and women whom it has restored to service testified to its value.

It all began in the Chicago Police Department.

Big, genial Joseph E. Thurston, a member of the force, had been three times suspended for drunkenness which he could not control. Then he found Alcoholics Anonymous and sobriety.

Thankful for being given another chance, he began voluntarily helping those of his colleagues who wanted to quit drinking.

RELIGIOUS ASPECT

Timothy J. O'Connor, then police commissioner, saw the value of the work Mr. Thurston was doing and established for him what he thought to be the first office of its kind—that of rehabilitation officer.

Mr. Thurston set up the Fellowship Club to give 24-hour-a-day service to all those who, as he said, "wanted to stay off the pop."

Not only policemen, but other local government employees, came to the club for aid. After a time it was discontinued in the police department and reestablished within the board of health. It has received enthusiastic support from Mayor Richard J. Daley, said Mr. Thurston.

Quarters of the Fellowship Club on the top floor of the Board of Health Building are inviting. Mr. Thurston's office door is open to all who come for personal consultation, and all are welcome to relax in a club lounge.

Mr. Thurston's approach to those who come to him for aid is simple: He has been through it all himself, knows what it means to be an alcoholic, is certain that there is hope for everyone who wants to quit drinking and will turn unreservedly to God, as he understands Him, for help.

"Be honest with yourself," he tells those who come to him.

"Forgive yourself first. Turn your back on the past. Use your simple, God-given power of prayer."

"I'm not a doctor or a psychiatrist or a reformer or a social worker," he told this correspondent.

"I'm a member of AA in good standing, and there's one thing I know. The cause of alcoholism is drinking alcohol; it isn't drinking buttermilk or eating chocolate cake.

"To handle your problems you have to want to quit drinking. This is a way of life."

FRIENDLY ATMOSPHERE

About 10 new cases come to Mr. Thurston each week. He encourages those who are helped to come often to the social room adjoining his office and visit with each other, enjoy a hot drink and look at television.

The place has a warm and friendly atmosphere. Most of Mr. Thurston's assistants are AA members and they chat with the visitors as they go about their work. Often the AA members who drop in bring members of their own families and all are welcomed. Building employees join the group for their coffee breaks.

Many requests come to this office from individuals and agencies about the country who are interested in setting up similar programs.

"Since 1955 we have sent out 147,000 pieces of our printed material in response to individual requests from all over the world," Mr. Thurston said. He also gives public addresses to groups working on the alcoholism problems. His straight-from-the-shoulder policeman's approach, brightened by humor, is highly effective.

LOSSES CUT

LOS ANGELES.—Francis "Pat" Mahoney reckons that the Los Angeles Post Office Com-

mittee on Alcoholism has saved the local postal operation more than \$2 million.

Mr. Mahoney works as foreman of mails in this city's main postal center called Terminal Annex. He has been chairman of the Alcoholism Committee since he helped start it in 1955.

Post offices, like other enterprises involving many people, he points out, often suffer grievous manpower losses from alcoholism.

Since 1955 the Post Office has offered man-to-man encouragement to employees in danger of losing their jobs through drinking. The Post Office used to fire workers immediately if a drinking problem came into the open, Mr. Mahoney explains.

"This meant that if the post office here hired 500 new workers," he says, "2 years later it would be lucky to have 50 left."

But now the six-man Alcoholism Committee—now composed entirely of Alcoholics Anonymous members—does all it can to help problem drinkers. Drinkers may be referred to their own clergyman, to an alcoholism clinic, to an AA meeting. But they are urged to do something.

The key to victory over alcoholism, Mr. Mahoney tells them, is in realizing the only man you can change is yourself."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 29, 1965]

ALCOHOLISM AND THE COURT

Until quite recent years, a judge had but one sentence for a chronic drunkenness offender. He jailed him.

But after release, the man would get drunk again, be rearrested, and be thrown in jail once more. After his next release, the same thing would happen.

This was the revolving door situation which confronted Judge Gerald S. Levin in San Francisco and Judge Hyman Feldman in Chicago when they were assigned their present benches.

Judge Feldman presides over Monroe Street Court, Chicago's so-called Skid Row Court, and Judge Levin runs San Francisco's Council on Alcoholism. Both—and many other judges—are trying to whittle down the dreary statistics of drunkenness arrests.

When Judge Levin took on his duties, San Francisco police were making close to 50,000 arrests a year. More than half of them were and still are on drunkenness charges.

SCHOOL FOR ALCOHOLICS

In 1963 there were more than 27,000 arrests for drunkenness. And the year before that, and the year before that.

One of the more effective means of changing this, Judge Levin believes, is the San Francisco Alcoholism Prevention School.

Judge Levin borrowed the idea from the traffic school the courts operate in conjunction with the San Francisco Police Department. The council's city-endorsed alcoholism-prevention school opened in May of 1964 and is already showing good results.

As fast as the courts convict a person charged with drunkenness, he is sentenced to the school. It meets from 7:30 to 9 p.m. on Wednesdays. The course lasts four Wednesdays.

So far, Judge Levin says, only a handful of persons convicted of drunkenness have been arrested again. The public-spirited judge figures 4 days of prevention are worth a month of jailing.

TRY 150 EVERY MORNING

"We know it's doing some good," says Judge Levin. "Not just saving the taxpayers' money. It's keeping people out of jail and helping them rehabilitate themselves.

"Those who come into our court are only 3 percent of the drink offenders. So you can see how serious the problem of alcoholism is in San Francisco. We try 150 drunk cases in municipal court every morning.

"Generally we have been sending offenders out to the county jail in San Bruno for

from 1 to 30 days. We find sentencing them to school interests many of these real problem drinkers. We send them over to the Hall of Justice. First offenders are given probation or they are ordered to prevention school if they impress us as being rehabilitable.

"The cost of the school is surprisingly low in view of the good we feel it is accomplishing. And Alcoholics Anonymous is doing a good job in the community."

WOMEN INVOLVED

"Our Council on Alcoholism recognizes AA as one of the effective rehabilitation agencies. AA is helping out with our alcoholism-prevention school. Their lectures make a useful impression, and their doctors participate in the program.

"Every so often, I make a talk at the school, laying down the law, so to speak, and stressing the consequences for the individual who does not try to get a grip on himself.

"I should say 'herself,' too. It is pathetic to see how many women, how many housewives, and single businesswomen are quietly involved in alcoholism problems.

"Right off I observed that some of the enrollees in prevention school started thinking about their problem, facing up to it for the first time, perhaps."

INCENTIVE PROVIDED

"This wouldn't be the case generally if they were just sent to county jail. The more thoughtful ones start asking questions at the end of the class session. Usually the questions are directed to the doctor.

"These alcohol victims are impressed by the fact that the Council on Alcoholism and many of its supporting agencies today fall in step with the American Medical Association.

"We state that alcoholism is a disease, that alcoholics are sick people. We feel we are removing some stigma from those in this serious social plight. We are giving them an incentive."

The council is working with the San Francisco Police Academy, the local Nurses' Association, and as many of the hospitals as are receptive. Beginners in these agency training centers are being given 3- or 4-day lecture courses now on alcoholism as a health problem and how to treat it.

Judge Feldman in Chicago agrees with this approach. As he viewed his many alcoholic cases, the judge recalled, he "decided that this problem was physical, emotional, and mental."

"I took the position that alcoholism is a mental disturbance, an emotional breakdown of some kind," he related. This was 2 years before the AMA officially designated alcoholism as a treatable illness.

NOT CRIMINALS

Judge Feldman quickly realized that the alcoholics who came before him "were not criminal minded." The vast majority had never been jailed for anything but drunkenness. They needed help, not punishment.

At that time, prevailing public opinion regarded alcoholics as weak-minded derelicts who deserved what they got. Judge Feldman took a different tack.

He astounded observers—and drew criticism—by adopting a policy of refusing to confine a man merely for drunkenness. Instead, he called on the city to start a social welfare program for these men. He asked for a city social worker to help screen the men. He urged the city to establish an alcoholic rehabilitation center.

Today, two courts handle most of Chicago's drunkenness cases. Thanks to Judge Feldman's efforts, they have a knowledgeable staff experienced in handling alcoholic cases. It includes two police officers, two city social workers with master's degrees, two representatives from the Illinois Employment Service, and volunteer workers from Alcoholics Anonymous.

STEADY WORK SHUNNED

These men help screen the drunkenness offenders. If a man is mentally aberrated, says Judge Feldman, he commits him to a mental institution. If he has medical defects, he refers him to a hospital. If an offender is employable, the employment service tries to get him a job. More often than not, these jobs are of a day-to-day nature.

"Getting jobs has never been a problem, which is very unusual," relates Judge Feldman. "The only reason I can think of is that these men are not in a position where they have to be paid high wages."

"Many of these men won't take a job for more than a day anyway. So the big answer is that this is unskilled labor which has a ready market. And \$8 to \$10 is a fortune where these men live."

HELP EXTENDED

Some of the offenders, who evince a desire to overcome their drinking, are referred to Alcoholics Anonymous. Still others are sent to a farm, which is part of the city house of correction. There they participate in AA group meetings as well as work, according to Judge Feldman.

Altogether, about 25 to 30 percent of the daily roll of drunkenness offenders receive some sort of service, the judge says. Of these, about one-third are committed to mental institutions or hospital clinics, one-third are referred to AA, and one-third receive help from such agencies as the Salvation Army and various missions.

FACES BECOME FAMILIAR

This, then, leaves 70 percent or more of the day's offenders—the majority of them. What happens to them?

"If a man can walk out, and he has no desire to be helped, we discharge him," says Judge Feldman. "Some of these men say, 'There's nothing you can do for me, judge.' Then you have to let them go."

Judge Feldman estimates that his courts receive from 7,000 to 15,000 repeaters every year, some of them returning as many as 20 to 30 times.

"You get some work for them, and maybe they'll go along for a few days. Then they fall back to drinking, and you get them back," the judge says. "The only help I can give is when they want help."

INTEREST IMPORTANT

And some of them do come around.

"A man comes in six or seven times, and you finally catch him at a time when he isn't even drunk. Something hits him all of a sudden, and he feels he can do something for himself."

Judge Feldman concedes that there's a limit to what he can do for these men.

"The court is a source referral more than anything else," he says. It just doesn't have the facilities to do much more.

"If there's anything that can be done for these men," the judge says, "it is to show that you have interest in them. You don't treat them as just another bum or derelict. You let them realize they are individuals. This constant kindness puts them in a position so that eventually they come to you for help."

EXAMPLE CONVINCING

Judge Feldman no longer handles these drunkenness cases personally, as he used to. He has magistrates under him who do most of the questioning and screening. He himself oversees the operation of the two courts.

When he personally handled the cases, Judge Feldman developed the practice of questioning them in front of the other offenders.

"This is good therapy," he says. By making them share their experiences, he says, "you revive the spark of life in them." Eventually some of these men will see a former derelict living a full life again and he says to himself, "If Mike can do it, I can, too."

Most drunkenness cases are long-term situations. "You can't reactivate them in a week or 2 weeks," says Judge Feldman.

Yet, though rehabilitation is a slow process, the judge's novel approach is a distant cry from the days when the House of Correction used to be 50 to 75 percent filled with alcoholic offenders. Those were the days, the judge recalls, when a repeater "could do life [in jail] on the installment plan."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 7, 1965]

A JOB FOR THE CHURCH

Alcohol problems exist in part because the concerned Christians of America have not given enough attention to the personal, social, and world aspects of drinking.

This is the warning of the National Council of Churches in a study book, "What About Alcohol?" used together with its 1958 pronouncement on "The Churches and Alcohol" in churches across the country.

The pronouncement called for (1) adequate programs of education to make more effective legal controls relating to beverage alcohol, (2) acceptance that alcoholism is an affliction requiring treatment, and (3) recognition that "it is more effective to win understanding than to coerce people."

After repeal of the prohibition amendment in 1933, church leaders participating in temperance activities were sorely demoralized. But new leadership and a deeper understanding of the problems of alcohol have gradually developed.

STAND REAFFIRMED

Today, according to Dr. Harold C. Letts, associate executive secretary of the Division of Christian Life and Work of the National Council of Churches, the churches are still standing on the 1958 pronouncement.

The stress is upon (1) education on the nature of alcohol and its effects as a means of helping citizens reach a Christian decision as to its use and (2) ministering to alcoholics and their families.

The second phase, Dr. Letts explains, now includes pastoral care for narcotics addicts and compulsive gamblers as well as alcoholics.

"We are coming to see," he says, "that we have a sort of class of these people in our population that the church really needs to be concerned about."

Dr. Letts recalls that the only real point of disagreement when the churches adopted their present position on drinking was whether alcoholism should be classed as an "affliction" or a "sickness."

The churches agreed that once drinking has passed a certain point, it becomes alcoholism which cannot be met effectively by the unaided efforts of its victims.

"We decided to use the word 'affliction,'" he explains, "because we felt it connoted an element of decision—of moral choice—in the early stages of a person's drinking * * * and something that he could do something about."

SOCIAL DUTY STRESSED

But the churches also stressed the social duty that attends each individual's decision whether or not to drink. Says the national council's manual on alcoholism:

"The simple decision of a Christian to decide the question of drinking in terms of whether or not he is strong enough to handle it is not an adequate criterion. Our concern must also involve helping our brother live creatively in a world that is filled with despair, fear, and anxiety—a world in which indulgence is practiced for indulgence's sake."

Practically every denomination and faith in the United States has shown some interest in the problem of alcohol. Many are sponsoring outstanding programs of alcohol education and action.

Many urge abstinence from the use of alcoholic beverages for all members. Others

hold that abstinence is not necessary. They say that sobriety can be practiced by moderate use.

VIEW BUTTRESSED

Many observers feel that both groups must join in a united front if they hope to sway the drinking public. This view is buttressed by Roger Burgess, associate general secretary for the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church:

"Churches always have been the main support of the temperance movement, supplying both leadership and financial resources," he wrote in 1964. "In the United States this has meant a handful of abstinence-oriented Protestant churches, most of them from the 'fundamentalist' tradition."

"But in Europe, Britain, and Canada temperance organizations are supported by churches in the so-called 'moderate' tradition as well as those teaching total abstinence."

"Working together within one temperance movement these 'abstinence' and 'moderation' churches have discovered areas of solid agreement and common purpose which far outshadow their continuing differences over social drinking: alcoholism rehabilitation, drinking and driving, teenage consumption. Differences on the question of social drinking are not allowed to stand in the way of constructive action in areas of agreement."

EFFORTS UNDERWAY

Mr. Burgess notes that an effort is underway in the United States to bring the churches closer together in this field.

"It is not going on within the temperance movement," he points out. "Instead the churches themselves are building a common mind through cooperation in the National Council of Churches in interfaith groups such as the North Conway (N.H.) Institute. An interfaith consensus is growing."

Denominations that have urged or commended abstinence as the best Christian response include the American Baptist Convention, Church of the Brethren, Congregational Christian Church (now a part of the United Church of Christ), Disciples of Christ, the Methodist Church, Evangelical United Brethren, Moravian Church in America, Presbyterian Church in the United States, Seventh-day Adventists, United Presbyterian Church in the United States, Southern Baptists Convention, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints (Mormon), and the Church of Christ, Scientist.

Bodies such as the Protestant Episcopal, Roman Catholic, and some Lutheran denominations hold that sobriety may be practiced either by abstinence or moderate usage.

The Protestant Episcopal Church, despite this stand, has placed a new emphasis on alcohol problems in recent years. Resources and energies of a number of outstanding Episcopal leaders are currently being used to develop study materials and action projects.

In the Roman Catholic Church there is a continuous program of education and action with particular concern about excessive use of alcohol and alcoholism. There are within the United States several Roman Catholic organizations urging abstinence as an act of devotion to Jesus Christ.

Although many Jews drink, the rate of alcoholism among them has been low, partly due to the positive sanctions against drunkenness imposed by Jewish communities and the closeness of the family unit in Jewish life.

HOSTESSES ADVISED

One Episcopalian document, "Alcohol, Alcoholism, and Social Drinking," tells much about the church's position in its rules for a proper hostess:

"Never give a party for the main or sole purpose of drinking."

"If alcoholic drinks are served, serve always with them, and as attractively, non-alcoholic drinks."

"Never violate courtesy by allowing pressure to be put on guests to drink if they do not wish to do so.

"Never delegate to cocktails the host's responsibility to create an atmosphere, to encourage relationships conducive to wholesome recreation.

"Avoid drawing attention to a guest who is known to have the illness of alcoholism."

The Methodist Church sponsors a multifaceted program of alcohol education and action, including stimulation of laws to curb the liquor industry and protect citizen rights.

The Methodist program also sponsors the particularly important national schools of alcohol studies and seminars on the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

FORD GRANT

The United Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and the United Church of Christ each publishes special editions of social-action journals focusing on the alcohol problem.

An annual grant from the Ford Foundation, administered by the National Council of Churches, makes it possible for six ministers each year to attend the Summer School of Alcoholic Studies at Rutgers University (formerly at Yale) where they get both a broad understanding of the alcohol problem and specific information on how to minister to the alcoholic.

Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish churchmen regularly meet together at the North Conway Institute in New Hampshire. Here they study means of stimulating education on alcohol within the churches.

The Reverend Ernest A. Shepherd, a Methodist minister, organized the alcoholism program in New Hampshire and then went to Florida to lead an expanded program in that State.

WORK RECOGNIZED

In Dallas the Reverend Thomas Shipp has received State and National recognition for his work with alcoholics and others in special need.

The Reverend Mr. Shipp spends hours counseling alcoholics, finding fellowship friends to see them through their initial agony on the road to sobriety, referring them to Alcoholics Anonymous and other rehabilitation agencies and conditioning his congregation to welcome them into its fellowship.

Many of the approximately 200 alcoholics in the congregation are used to help other alcoholics who come for help.

The Church of the Brethren in Elkhart, Ind., has worked out a plan to have alcoholics from a nearby prison paroled to the church.

The social-action committee of the church helps them obtain employment and involves them in Alcoholics Anonymous and the sustaining fellowship of the church.

EXAMPLES OF HELP GIVEN

One man who had been hospitalized for alcoholism 50 times became an excellent workman and a leader in Alcoholics Anonymous. He has not touched liquor since the start of his association with the church. He moved to another city, where he was given a \$10,000 a year office manager's job in a manufacturing company. He continues to be active in his church.

As a result of its program with alcoholics, the Graves Memorial Presbyterian Church in Clinton, N.C., has brought several former alcoholics into leading roles in the life of the church. One is an elder and one teaches the young adult Sunday school class.

Publications of the Church of Christ, Scientist, record abundant examples of the overcoming of alcoholism—sometimes in its extreme stages—through systematic reliance on divine help.

Here the approach is individual rather than organizational, but a sufferer may en-

list the aid and support of a Christian Science practitioner.

The practitioner's method involves bringing the individual into a better awareness of his true relationship to God. This method heals the individual—by means of prayer—of the maladjustments, tensions, and anxieties which drive him to seek solace in alcohol.

Adherents of Christian Science practice total abstinence.

Some church bodies seek regulation and restriction of alcohol advertising. The national council's manual has urged church members to send any advertisements in poor taste to the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury Department. From time to time, churchmen's attention is called to bills before Congress needing grassroots support.

SOBRIETY IS NEEDED

"All church bodies," says the national council, "are agreed that a nation of sobriety is needed. We find that church bodies from various traditions agree on far more things than they disagree on and can do an unlimited number of things together to achieve this goal.

"Through a redemptive ministry to alcoholics, education within the church and outside which may lead to abstinence, and a constructive program of Christian social action on every level, we have ample opportunity for constructive work.

"It is the high task of churches and church members to express renewed Christian social responsibility in seeking lasting solutions to the problems related to drinking."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 20, 1965]

TWO DRINKERS EXPLAIN

"It's not a matter of how much you drink but what it does for you."

A suburban husband settled back into a porch chair one after-work evening recently. He and his wife had volunteered to talk about alcoholism, and drinking. Their four under-10 children romped in and out of the house, while Frank and Edith, we'll call them, discussed their drinking habits with a visiting friend.

"My parents drank," Edith said, starting off. "They would offer me watered-down drinks when I was little. Drinking for them was a social thing, as it is for us today. Drinking seems always to be a factor in the social situation. You drink because others do."

Frank said he likes to have a drink or two when he gets home from work, especially when it has been a trying day. (By drink, both these people refer to hard liquor, distilled spirits—whisky, gin, etc.)

"It relaxes me. It makes the troubles go away for a while," says Frank.

AND THE TASTE?

Do you like the taste? the visitor asked.

"Oh the flavor's terrible," Edith hooted. "You absolutely have to learn to tolerate the flavor. After you drink for a while, the flavor doesn't bother."

"No," said Frank, "I think I really do like the flavor."

But why not handle the day's troubles directly instead of, say muffling them with drink, wondered the guest.

"You're right there," said Frank. "The drinking doesn't get rid of the problems. But it sure helps put them aside."

Both Frank and Edith believe their own drinking to be well controlled. They have had long firsthand contact, however, with drinking in the extreme. Members of each of their families have fought alcohol addiction.

Each has observed the role and effect of medical, psychiatric, ministerial, and group therapy on these distressing family cases. (Both Edith's mother and Frank's stepfather became alcoholics.)

Frank pointed out that sometimes both husband and wife drink, with but one able to control it. There are some cases of record where the effort of the non- or slight-drinker to commiserate with the heavy drinker has led the former into addiction.

"Alcoholics can literally sense the presence of liquor in a house," said Edith.

"There is no place you can hide it where they won't find it. And they themselves, when they reach the point of sneaking their drinking at all hours of the day, will hide and steal and do absolutely wild things to acquire and hide drink. It would almost be funny if it weren't so horrible.

"Fine minds have crumbled because of this drink problem," Edith went on. She told of another instance she knows where a brilliantly talented professional man fell deeply into alcohol addiction and only through great moral courage and determination escaped the problem.

"He used to say that it was a prison in which 'everyone was shut out except you and the bottle.' He said life was 'all gray.' Then he told me: 'One day I heard the birds sing. I heard children's voices. I saw life in color.'

"All this cost him 18 years."

CREDIT TO AA

Both Edith and Frank credit Alcoholics Anonymous with outstanding rehabilitation work with drink addiction cases.

AA says, "Look, we have the problem together." They start with you admitting that you have a problem. This is the crucial point. Once you have decided to stop, then you can go any number of places for help; but it takes a long time to reach this point. And often by the time you get to it you have already shut yourself off from all help.

"You know," said Frank, "the alcoholic fights this admission. He'll tell you, 'I don't drink as much as Joe Jones, and he's not an alcoholic.'

"But really this man does drink that much and probably more. He will also tell you that he can stop whenever he wants to but that he doesn't want to yet.

"He constantly hides his problem and his drink. He can hide it on the job by taking a customer to lunch and adding several drinks. He can stop for a drink on the way home from work. He can drink in the bar car on the commuter train.

"By the time he gets home he is nearly drunk. He has no appetite and he just goes to bed. The next day the pattern starts all over."

ABOUT \$56 FOR MONTH'S LIQUOR

Prompted by the evening's discussion, Frank said they had spent no less than \$56 for alcoholic beverages the month before at his house and that this would have to be cut down. He said most of it had been consumed by guests "who just seem to expect to have a drink when they drop in."

Will Frank and Edith's children be allowed to drink? "Some day, probably, but we'll certainly instruct them firmly and strictly on the dangers involved."

They realize the contradiction of telling their children not to drink while persisting in it themselves. Nor are they moved to stop their drinking together because of the tragic experiences they have witnessed when drinking became excessive.

Thus, for the moment, these two points of seeming ambivalence stand unresolved in their home.

That sociable drink with the boys is leading alarmingly often to broken homes and divorce.

This is the view from the Boston Probate Court bench of Judge Robert G. Wilson, Jr., in a city which ranks second only to San Francisco in its alcoholism rate.

In more than half the divorce cases to come before Judge Wilson, for example, he estimates that extreme intoxication is a major factor.

"Many of these cases arise in families where the breadwinner is a manual worker and has become a heavy drinker," he says.

"It's customary for some of these men to drop by the corner bar for a Friday night beer—and they never stop drinking it the rest of the weekend."

Massachusetts law grants seven grounds for divorce, of which "gross and confirmed habits of intoxication" is but one.

WAS HE SOBER?

"More often than not a woman will file suit on other grounds—say 'cruel and abusive treatment,'" the judge explains.

"But I'll ask her, 'Was he sober when he hit you?' and 50 percent of the time I'll find the husband had been drinking heavily.

"This is the answer in a rising number of cases."

Judge Wilson says the statistical count of such husbands as alcoholics is misleadingly low.

"I've never been arrested for drunkenness," they'll tell me.

"I say, 'That's no criterion.'"

"You have to be lying in the gutter to be arrested for drunkenness. A man can stagger home without the police bothering.

"It's what happens when he's at home that counts."

VIEWPOINT SUPPORTED

Judge Wilson's viewpoint is supported by Dr. Selden O. Bacon, director of the Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1958.

Dr. Bacon declares that in the progression toward alcoholism, the word "drinking" falls to describe the victim's use of alcohol.

"He is no more a drinker than a kleptomaniac is a customer or a pyromaniac is a Campfire Girl," he writes.

"Alcoholics may consume alcohol. They do not drink it."

Alton L. Blakeslee, writing in Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 118, 1952, of the Parent-Teachers Association elaborates on the type of "secondary alcoholic" Judge Wilson describes.

"Outwardly, this kind of alcoholic may appear to have been a reasonably well-adjusted person for most of his adult life. He starts out as a social drinker but may wind up as an excessive drinker in reaction to some trouble or problem * * *. He seems to possess strong predisposing factors for excessive drinking."

Two agencies are designed to aid families when a member becomes a victim of alcohol. One is Al-anon, a fellowship primarily of wives of alcoholics (there are more men than women alcoholics). Friends and relatives of alcoholics also may join.

HELP FOR TEENAGERS

A more recent group is Alateen, which brings together teenagers whose parents are alcoholics. Through sharing experiences, these teenagers are helped to overcome any resentment and bitterness toward their alcoholic parents and to learn how to cope with criticism toward them.

Neither Al-anon nor Alateen is organizationally linked with Alcoholics Anonymous, but both are considered important allies. All three depend, to some degree, on working through a group.

States with highest rates of alcoholism

[Cases per 100,000 population]

Nevada.....	6, 638
California.....	6, 388
Rhode Island.....	5, 913
Massachusetts.....	5, 713
New York.....	5, 463
Illinois.....	5, 050
Missouri.....	5, 038
Wisconsin.....	4, 988
Connecticut.....	4, 838
New Jersey.....	4, 838
Michigan.....	4, 350
Pennsylvania.....	4, 325

By Joan Forbes, staff artist, based on "Selected Statistical Tables on the Consumption of Alcohol, 1850-1962," and on "Alcoholism, 1930-60," copyright by Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Inc.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 27, 1965]

DOWN THE PATH OF SOCIAL DRINKING

A freshman adviser at a well-known eastern men's college had some of the boys over for a get-acquainted supper at his house. Wine was served before the meal. One of the boys declined the drink.

The adviser remarked: "Anybody who is going to be a success in life has to drink socially."

The boy said that abstinence was a matter of religious conviction with him. The adviser was not embarrassed, just shocked, as the boy recalls it.

"You've got to get used to parties," said the professor, "and you had better learn to hold your liquor."

The adviser's viewpoint, shared by many, dramatizes the role drinking has come to play in modern society. It also poses a challenge to every individual: "Must I drink to succeed?"

The evidence weighs topheavily to the contrary. Not only does it cite impressive testimony of those who have achieved greatness without drinking. It presents strong arguments that alcohol is a longrun obstacle to success in any field.

NOTABLE FILMS

Hollywood, armed with movies—the most potent means of mass communication yet devised—has occasionally taken aim on alcoholism and the success-through-drinking notion.

Notable among a handful of past films on the subject have been "Come Fill the Cup," "Lost Weekend," and "I'll Cry Tomorrow." The latest and one of the most powerful was "Days of Wine and Roses," produced by Martin Manulis in 1962, directed by Blake Edwards, and starring Jack Lemmon and Lee Remick.

The film bluntly chronicled the dismal decline of a young couple into the morass of alcoholism. The husband, in lurching desperation, finally sought Alcoholics Anonymous for help and eventually pulled himself out.

The wife, introduced to drinking by her husband, became an alcoholic, too. But she refused help, always thinking she could quit whenever she wanted. But she never could, and their life together was ruined.

HARD IDEA TO SELL

"The picture was important," Mr. Manulis explains, "because it dealt not with people who are bizarre or removed or unique, but with a typical young, clean, attractive, wholesome couple. They slipped into alcoholism out of the pressures of life and partly through their own tendencies."

Mr. Manulis had trouble selling the idea to a major Hollywood studio, even though the story had first appeared on television. All the studios turned it down. Finally, Warner Brothers agreed to make it.

"The studios all felt the audience would not be interested in the subject and they would lose money," Mr. Manulis explains. "But when I read the national figures on alcoholism, I felt there was enough curiosity that a film dealing honestly with the problem would do well. There is hardly anyone who is not touched in some way by it, who hasn't had relatives or friends who have been involved in some way with alcoholism."

MOVIE MADE MONEY

The film did well indeed. It was one of the top 10 moneymaking films of 1963. A major reason for its success, Mr. Manulis says, was its subject matter.

It was suggested, Mr. Manulis recalls, that the film be made for adults only. But he

not only wanted young people to be allowed to see it, but urged to see it.

"We got a big response from young people," he says. "Many of them were at the age where it is considered sophisticated to drink. The film had validity in that it made them realize that the step from light social drinking to alcoholism is not that big.

"I believe the film also brought out something else—that alcoholism has nothing to do with the amount of drinking, but with the inability to stop."

HELPFUL IMPACT SEEN

Mr. Manulis also believes the film may have had an impact in persuading people that it is no shame to reach out for help.

"I am certain," he says, "that a great many alcoholics desire to go to AA or some other source for help but are too ashamed. Many believe, as the girl did in 'Days of Wine and Roses,' that willpower was enough. But it never is."

The film at one point graphically depicted actor Jack Lemmon writhing, strapped to a table in an alcoholic ward, trying to "shake" his addictive urge. Messrs. Lemmon, Manulis, and Edwards spent time watching actual alcoholics in similar circumstances in the drunk tanks in Los Angeles.

Mr. Manulis says that similar field trips to see the "extremities of alcoholism" should be made mandatory for young people in high schools. "As harrowing as it is," he says, "it could be an enormous object lesson."

SKID-ROW LESSONS

An equally sobering lesson can be glimpsed in particularly acute form along the world's skid-row streets, those bleak neighborhoods of cheap restaurants and hotels and tattered lives.

It is talked about there by jobless, homeless, sometimes friendless and hopeless men and women in words such as these:

"Well it's just the bottom. Ya gotta be drunk to stay on this street.

"A man who lives down here is an outcast. He's beat before he starts. The people you have to associate with; they're always looking for a drink.

"They (other men on skid row) are just like me. They are drunk every day and go borrowin' money to buy a bottle.

"You take a man that's sober. They've had lots of interesting things in their lives. As a general rule they come from nice homes. Some of 'em have had upsets in their lives and got to drinking to drown their sorrows. The general run is good when they're sober."

COMMENTS PUBLISHED

Interviews by a group of researchers from the Community and Family Study Center of the University of Chicago under the direction of Dr. Donald J. Bogue elicited these comments. In 1963 the center published a 500-page compilation of skid-row interviews and analyses.

The study identifies and assesses the part alcohol plays in the despairing lives of skid-row inhabitants.

Dr. Bogue and his colleagues got their information from more than 600 interviewees along Chicago's several skid-row streets.

"Obtaining a clear picture of the drinking behavior of homeless men and developing an understanding of motives upon which their drinking is based," writes Dr. Bogue, "are among the principal objectives of the study.

"Drinking to forget trouble" (especially marital trouble) was found to be the dominant theme of skid-row drinking.

"The responses of these skid-row men," reports Dr. Bogue, "indicate that the taverns are not patronized by men filled with a zest for living and enjoying their present freedom, but with men trying to anesthetize themselves to the point of blotting out the present and memories of the past and of trouble."

JUST DRIFTED INTO IT

How did the problem of drinking start for these men? Most say they just drifted into it. Nine out of ten of the heavy drinkers, the chronic alcoholics, along Chicago's skid-row streets said their drinking developed almost without their awareness until it became uncontrolled.

Most said they regarded it merely as a harmless, pleasant pastime at first, although more than one-third said they used it from the beginning as a means of relief, escape, or relaxation from troubles, worry, or tension.

Only a few of these skid-row drinkers claimed to have been just curious or to have drunk solely to demonstrate manliness.

"If this description is correct," observes Dr. Bogue, "the first few weeks or months of drinking were not dissimilar from usual social drinking."

Even skid-row drinking problems are not without balancing courageous efforts to surmount this personal crisis in countless lives.

SUCCESS EQUALS ABSTINENCE

Dr. Bogue reports that most of the heavy drinkers along the down-and-out streets of Chicago "have made an effort to conquer drinking, and many of them have succeeded."

Success at this point, it should be noted, is no longer considered in terms of limited drinking. It is now synonymous with a mastery of alcohol through total abstinence.

One more dimension of the problem as it confronts the individual appears on the Nation's highways. Here again, as grim statistics bear out year after year, the only sure road to success is a sober one. Drinking [of alcoholic beverages] is a factor in more than 50 percent of all traffic accidents in the United States.

Again the individual's drinking customs are partially attributed to widespread social attitudes.

SOCIETY'S ATTITUDE

Dr. Joan K. Jackson, sociologist at the school of medicine, University of Washington, makes this observation:

"The drinker and the driver are considered socially responsible for their behavior at the abstract level of public opinion, but not at the individual level. The very use of the term 'accident' conveys society's attitudes toward the responsibility of those involved.

"The rights and privileges of the offender are stressed, rather than his responsibility.

"Neither drinking nor driving is subjected to consistent punishment or reward.

"The victim is often the object of the sympathy of his social group, rather than of its disapproval. There are no rewards for approved, socially responsible behavior; there are emotional and social rewards for irresponsible behavior."

PARADOX UNCOVERED

Dr. Jackson cites the teenage boy who "can gain prestige by his daring" and the adult who "feels young and dashing" when he takes a chance.

These findings uncover a curious paradox: As the educator and writer Albion Roy King points out, the desire to please, the fear of offending, and the social pressures against those who differ are well entrenched. In a society with so many inducements and coercions to drink, the greatest exhibition of daring is often shown by the individual who can say "no thanks."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 3, 1965]

YOUTH AND DRINKING

Herbie Louis wasn't even old enough to figure into the teenage drinking statistics. When a Boston social worker first found him and his wine bottle, he was only 9 years old. "Even then he needed an eye-opener in the morning.

"He couldn't tell me the last time he'd been sober.

"It took another year for him to admit to me he had a problem."

Youthful Warren McManus of Boston's Huntington Avenue YMCA was recalling one of his "case histories" and giving fresh slants on teenage drinking.

The case of Herbie Louis (not the youth's real name) is no classic exception these days. In fact, Mr. McManus notes that a startling number of 10-, 11-, and 12-year-olds are acquiring a drinking habit in Boston's inner city.

"It's a matter of 'experimenting' much earlier," he says.

SUBSTITUTE NEEDED

From his days as a community worker, the YMCA youth director has formed a theory about alcohol and underprivileged boys.

"It's one thing to take it away—it's something else to provide a satisfactory substitute.

"Drinking has been their outlet, their escape from a hostile home life.

"They're seeking an adult male role. So do kids in the well-to-do class, but it's easier to spot here.

"They identify alcohol with manhood and think they can take a shortcut with it. Cigarettes are just another phase of this.

"You can't destroy this shortcut notion. But you can substitute. We use athletics. We've formed some teams that nobody around here can beat. But we say 'No drinking if you want to compete.'

"Some choose to continue drinking. We manage to change quite a few."

Mr. McManus cites the Herbie Louis case, for example.

"He's 13 now and well on the road to rehabilitation, but it's taken us 3 years. He started drinking to gain attention and then he couldn't lick the habit alone.

"Even now he'll rebel and go on binges sometimes. But we found physical education the right substitute for him. He's on the right track."

As acute as Boston's "inner-city problem" sounds, it is but one sampling of the rising rate of teenage drinking in the Nation.

Dr. George L. Maddox, professor of sociology at Duke University, thinks that almost all youths taste or drink an alcoholic beverage at least once by the time they are graduated from high school. He finds, however, that an established pattern of drinking is characteristic only of a minimum of high school students.

EVOLUTION TRACED

He told the Midwest Institute on Alcohol Studies in June 1964 that most American children are not introduced to liquor early. This points up a nagging contradiction on the matter of drinking—on the one hand the abstaining child and on the other the drinking adult.

How does the one evolve into the other?

"In the in-between stage—adolescence," says Dr. Maddox. "Many adolescents have established drinking patterns by the time they reach 18. Drinking is a large part of growing up in a society where adults have established drinking patterns."

Where do Americans drink? In early America, it was in the tavern. Today it is largely in the home. Young people often report their first exposure to alcohol in the home with an adult present.

The Gallup youth survey of 1961 turned up data tending to confirm Dr. Maddox's contentions.

In a poll of 3,053 young people between the ages of 14 and 23 in 271 American communities, the Gallup researchers found 24 percent admitting they drink wine, beer, and hard liquor.

Fifteen percent of the 15-year-old boys and 11 percent of the girls said they drink alcoholic beverages.

Twenty-one percent of the 16-year-old boys and 16 percent of the girls of that age said they drink; 29 percent of the boys and 21 percent of the girls among 17-year-olds; 42 percent and 22 percent of the 18-year-olds; 61 percent and 49 percent of the 19-year-olds; and 82 percent and 64 percent of the 22-year-olds said they drink.

Among students who reported a pattern of drinking behavior, 57 percent of the boys and 62 percent of the girls reported the home as one of the places in which their drinking takes place.

ENVIRONMENTAL GUIDE

"Approval of alcohol use, then," points out Dr. Maddox, "like drinking itself, appears to be a function of age and of the particular social experiences that the young person has had with regard to alcohol use, particularly in the context of the home."

Four conclusions are drawn from these studies of young people drinking:

Although most high school youths are eventually exposed to alcohol use, a pattern of drinking characterizes only a minority.

There are few reports of intensive drinking.

Many factors (religious, socioeconomic, cultural, and so on) affect drinking behavior. The Gallup poll found for example, that high school students who identified themselves as Protestants were less likely than Roman Catholics or Jews to report a pattern of drinking behavior.

Many of these same factors influence youths to either approve or disapprove the use of alcoholic beverages in their lives.

Dr. E. Mansell Pattison, alcoholism clinic coordinator at Cincinnati General Hospital, feels that youth and others face a situation in which "society simply has never put the case of why not to drink."

Such is often the case among impressionable college freshmen.

These young people consulted for this report say they and their fellows drink for several reasons.

LIQUOR SMUGGLED

"It's just the accepted thing at college." "I'm old enough now, why not?" "It makes you feel like you belong." "You have to drink to be one of the boys."

In several colleges, beer is served at the student union. In at least one, it is available at the campus stadium during football games. At Duke University, students are permitted to keep alcoholic beverages in their rooms at residence halls, although they face suspension for public display of containers.

A college coed from Chicago says that at the small church-affiliated school she attends, liquor and beer are smuggled into dormitories in regular defiance of strict school regulations against any and all campus drinking.

"Let's go for quarts," is the rallying cry heard at one Chicago area university.

"It's sort of a last class; it's the thing to do," says one of the students, explaining the late afternoon and evening visits of students to local taverns.

Does everybody drink?

"Take our fraternity," explains a sophomore. "Out of 50 members only 4 or 5 are abstainers. The age range in the fraternity is 18 to 25. The freshmen don't drink at the start, but in a year or two they join the go-go crowd at the local tavern."

Hearing these comments and statistics a clergyman remarked:

"In what other situation would you go out and buy a quart of something to quench a thirst? Do they want a thirst quencher or an anesthetic? To buy by the quart is not just to quench a thirst. This is a dangerous sign to one who works with alcoholics."

Though drinking attitudes held by collegian and high school dropouts may vary slightly, one line of reason prevails in either case. Both attack their elders' double

standard: "Why condone your own drinking and condemn ours?"

A Chicago police officer experienced in youth problems says the best place for alcohol education is in the home.

NEW YORK ISSUE

"Too often parents look on their child's drinking as a big joke," maintains Sgt. William Touhey. "You bring an intoxicated youngster to his home and the father laughs and says, 'Just like his dad. I have been drinking all my life.' What's a kid to think?"

Sergeant Touhey finds the problem in all parts of his large north side district, among the rich as well as the poor.

National attention focused recently on teenage drinking among the sons and daughters of wealthy Connecticut socialites. Public concern rose from a 1964 automobile-homicide case following two teenage drinking parties in fashionable Darien. Thirteen adults were arrested for serving liquor to minors.

Minors from States bordering New York have also aroused controversy by driving to State-line communities like Port Chester to drink. In New York the drinking age is 18 contrasted to 21 in its neighboring States.

More often, youths will acquire alcohol through a go-between.

Teenagers in Boston will often pay willing adults up to triple the price of the liquor to act as their buyer, Mr. McManus discloses.

"In many of these homes," he relates, "no one cares if a boy comes in with liquor on his breath. In other cases, the kids lean toward vodka, which is hard to detect on the breath."

Police urge citizens to report disturbances due to youth drinking, as well as liquor-sale violations to minors. But they point out that preventive steps—particularly greater effort in the alcohol education area—are much needed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1965]

BREAKING THE "BOTTLENECK"

The lay preacher, a former alcoholic, stood in the skid-row pulpit singing, his voice lifting above a plunking piano.

"Glory, Glory, Halleujah," he sang, "Glory Glory, Halleujah."

Drunks and down-and-outers sat in the congregation. Some listened. Some dozed. Fifteen even raised their hands and "declared for Christ." All knew that with the last prayer came their first free meal of the day.

Few knew, perhaps, that this is the way the Salvation Army "goes fishing."

Back in a cramped little office within earshot of this midmorning skid-row religious service sat C. C. Clitheroe, a Salvation Army brigadier and commanding officer of the Army's Los Angeles Harbor Light Center.

TO CATCH A FISH

During his three decades in the Salvation Army, Brigadier Clitheroe has ministered to alcoholics. Like Alcoholics Anonymous, the Salvation Army is committed to solving the problem through rehabilitation.

"We hold religious services, and then we feed the hungry," he explains. "To get a free meal some of those men go to more religious services than you or I—they can sleep through anything. And we use it to 'catch fish,' to attract alcoholics who need or want help."

The Salvation Army began a century ago in the slums of London. It was born, Brigadier Clitheroe says, "ministering to the drunk."

Today, in the skid rows of 15 major American cities, Army field officers such as Brigadier Clitheroe still minister to the drunk. Their aim is to salvage the alcoholics—ideally to instill "the Christ" in him, as Brigadier Clitheroe puts it. At least they

seek to get him out of the bottle and back into society.

NOT EVEN THE FRINGE

Brigadier Clitheroe, a broad-minded, compassionate former British, is part optimist and part pessimist—but mostly pessimist.

"We haven't gotten to the fringe of the problem," he sighs. He says he has been working with alcoholics personally for 36 years.

"It's a fascinating, challenging, hellish, mysterious thing," he says. "I think I know less about it now than I ever did. I'm lucky even to help these men."

The brigadier works hard trying. In his creaky, cracker-box building in the heart of skid row, he and his staff undertake the rehabilitation of about 300 alcoholics each year. All staff members except himself are former alcoholics.

The Harbor Light Center also feeds and quarters the homeless, the transient, and the down-and-out. It supplied 22,145 lodgings last year and served up to 242,715 meals and at least 700 religious services. But the alcoholic is its chief concern.

ROLE AS CLINIC

"When alcohol becomes more important to a man than anything else in his life," Brigadier Clitheroe explains, "then that man is an alcoholic. * * * And when he dips below a certain economic level he finds himself in skid row."

And that's usually where the Harbor Light finds him.

Harbor Light Centers, however, have changed over the years since the first one was founded in Detroit 25 years ago. It has gone from a mission-type operation solely to a clinic for alcoholics. It now utilizes every modern professional aid available.

"Years ago," Brigadier Clitheroe says, "we got our men only from the streets. But now we get them also from jails, churches, clinics, doctors, and other interested people also send them to us."

"IN ANOTHER WORLD"

The brigadier says they all come in the same general condition.

"The alcoholic's life," he explained, "is severed from the usual run of society. He is in another world. To break out he has got to adjust. His life is completely centered around the bottle.

"He comes here stripped of everything. His teeth, eyeglasses, hearing aid, watch are lost. He often has no identification. He is clean to the bone. We have got to find out if he is involved with the law or with alimony or if he owes money. It takes a while to learn these things.

"He is dishonest, selfish, suspicious. He is a con artist, and he is thin-skinned. And with the alcoholic it is negative thinking all along the line."

TWO-WEEK ADJUSTMENT

Each alcoholic that comes to the center must undergo a 2-week adjustment period. During that time the staff concentrates on getting him reoriented, his past pinpointed. It also gets him cleaned up and starts the long job of getting him thinking differently about things.

After 2 weeks, if the staff thinks him ready, the man gets a job and ventures tentatively back out into society. But he continues to live at the center, undergoing group therapy and counseling. The average length of time in the center is about 4 or 5 months. Eventually he graduates to Harmony House, a lodging where he may stay, paying his own way, until the staff thinks he is ready to go back into society entirely on his own.

The center maintains a Toastmaster's Club for its alcoholics. It is important, explains Brigadier Clitheroe, to have the men begin to think about something other than liquor. The center also maintains a service organization called the Converts Club.

A LINK TO BE BROKEN

"Almost every alcoholic," Brigadier Clitheroe points out, "knows how to make a living, but seems not to know how to live. * * * The man on skid row has lost his link with everything. The only link he has left is his bottle. That link has got to be broken."

The question the center's staff must always eventually face is whether a man is really ready to go back into society and take on its responsibilities and pressures. This is not always easy to judge.

"The alcoholic can always quit," says Brigadier Clitheroe, "but can he stay quit? That's the test."

Nor is it easy to determine if a man's alcoholism has been arrested. "You can get a man out of skid row easy enough," says Brigadier Clitheroe, "but it is another thing to get skid row out of the man. Till you do that you haven't succeeded."

Does the center succeed?

"There's been many a sacred moment," says Brigadier Clitheroe, "when a man has brought his wife or mother or sister back here and said to her, 'That's where I started.' In many cases these men have convinced us completely by their appearance that they have done well."

At the same time other men have had to come back and begin all over again. There are some cases the center just won't take at all.

"Some," says the brigadier, "just don't want to play ball but simply want to use us. Or we feel we don't have a program to suit them."

Brigadier Clitheroe says the average age of the alcoholic treated at the center is 45. Most of them drank as teenagers. Most began simply as social drinkers. Many drank for 5 or 10 years before they discovered they were alcoholics.

The brigadier says many of the old concepts about alcoholics are being challenged today. One of these is the notion that alcoholics can never really be cured. He admits that in most cases, alcoholism is only arrested. But arrest can be permanent.

WORLDWIDE FELLOWSHIP

"Alcoholism," Brigadier Clitheroe says thoughtfully, "is a billion-dollar hangover—there is no better description for it. If the American people really want to be generous and sacrifice something for good, the first thing they should do is solve this problem of the alcoholic."

Fitting in with the Salvation Army approach to problem drinking is Alcoholics Anonymous, a worldwide fellowship of approximately 350,000 victims of alcohol. The AA treatment method is among the most successful in its field. Many Salvation Army workers subscribe to it.

AA, as it is better known, combines group therapy and reliance on "a Higher Power." At open and closed (restricted to members) meetings, AA members share their experience, strength, and hope with one another.

Through this sharing, they gain understanding and support in their efforts to overcome the compulsion to drink.

TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR BASIS

AA's treatment is based on adherence to "The 12 Steps" of recovery from alcoholism. This suggested program begins with an admission that "we were powerless over alcohol—that our lives had become unmanageable." It then proceeds to a belief "that a power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity."

The third step is "a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God as we understood Him."

Above all else, the AA program aims at maintaining sobriety. But it does not require members to pledge never to take another drink.

"We go on a 24-hour basis," explains one member. "Therefore the only important day is today. You don't think about yesterday or tomorrow. When you put it on a day-to-day basis, it's much easier not to drink." This 24-hour approach brings unexpected benefits to an AA's life, this member says.

THE WAY TO ARREST IT

"The next thing you know," she says, "you begin to apply this philosophy in all your problems. It begins to be your operation of living, more or less. You do your best today and worry about tomorrow when it comes. It really gives you peace of mind."

At present, one-fifth of AA members are women. In recent years, many young people in their twenties and some even in their teens have turned to AA.

Along with medical opinion, AA considers alcoholism a progressive illness "which can never be cured but which * * * can be arrested." The only way to arrest it, AA declares, is to stop drinking.

"No one who has crossed the line to problem drinking," says an AA member, "can ever return to controlled drinking. Therefore, the only way he can maintain a normal way of life is total abstinence."

Such discipline is sometimes difficult. "Most experts," says University of Chicago Sociologist Donald J. Bogue, "believe a man must stay 'dry' for at least 3 months before he ceases to need almost daily help and encouragement, and that at least 6 months to 1 year must elapse before the danger of a return to heavy drinking is largely passed."

Working with other alcoholics is AA's time-proved solution for this difficulty.

"The AA program works best for the individual when it is recognized and accepted as a program involving other people," says an AA pamphlet.

HOPES SHARED

"Working with other alcoholics in his local AA group, the problem drinker seems to acquire understanding and support. He finds himself surrounded by others who share his past experience, his present problems, and his hopes for the future. He sheds the feeling of loneliness that may have been an important factor in his compulsion to drink."

Most "solid AA members" attend local group meetings throughout their lives, according to one member. "Many newcomers begin by attending meetings every evening but then level off to about one meeting a week," she says.

These meetings, at which members relate personal experiences, are central to AA work, this member emphasizes. "You've got to help someone else. You can't keep it," she asserts. "This is the foundation of AA that you pass this on."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 17, 1965]

ALCOHOLISM TIED TO RUSSIAN PAST

Alcoholism in the Soviet Union is different from that in almost any other country. Throughout the Russias it is an old belief that "where man does not drink, there is no life."

And drinking for Russians and most of the other Slavic peoples of the Soviet Union means drinking fast and heavily.

After the war Russian drinking habits spread through much of Communist-ruled Europe.

Poland, with its ancient proverb: "If vodka interferes with work, quit work," has a problem of its own.

East Germany and Rumania do not seem to have been affected by Russian and Polish drinking habits.

Because of these habits, the effects of alcoholism are more devastating than in the West, although per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages may be lower.

DRINKS GULPED DOWN

Peculiar traits of the Russian drinking problem, which predate the revolution, are:

Consumption of vodka, and among better paid people now also cognac, fast and in incredibly large quantities. Two or three cups of these highly concentrated liquors are gulped quickly, one after another, each in one gulp. A contributor to this article once saw a Russian worker, who had just stood in line for a large bottle of vodka, empty the whole bottle (about a pint and a half) in one gulp, and drop to the ground unconscious.

Governments again and again have abused the liquor monopoly for financial purposes. Excessive profits from vodka sales were among the darkest spot on the record of czarist Russia. Liberals and revolutionists alike violently denounced this practice.

LIQUOR-BASED BUDGET

Yet the Soviets after a few years did the same thing. Stalin's industrialization drive was financed to a large extent through vodka sales which brought the state a 400- to 500-percent profit.

Only when the defense of the country was at stake, both the czar and Stalin restricted vodka consumption. During World War I the czar's government stopped vodka production and reduced consumption to a minimum. Stalin, less radical in this respect, did it by raising prices fivefold.

The Government's leeway in fighting vodka consumption was and still is limited by illegal production of liquor on a massive scale. Because vodka is many times more expensive than it was under the czar, large profits can be made by selling the product of home stills.

Monopoly vodka costs 6.14 rubles a liter (a little less than 1 quart). At the official rate this would be \$6.75. The ingredients of a liter of vodka cost home distillers about 2 rubles—mainly homegrown potatoes, yeast, and sugar. By selling their beverage at perhaps 4 rubles, home distillers make a 100-percent profit.

HABITS TRACED

Whence came those gargantuan Russian drinking habits? They date in legend to Prince Vladimir of Kiev, the founder of the Russian State. The prince, the tales relate, adopted Christianity rather than Islam because "it is quite impossible to be happy in Russia without strong drink."

The poverty and backwardness of small Russian towns contribute to the problem. Their dreariness, the sheer endless land, the monotony of the landscape, the mud, the snow, unrelieved by remnants of a great cultural heritage, can make for moods of despair and self-annihilation.

The Russian writer, Maxim Gorky, in the beginning of his novel, "The Mother," paints a poignant picture of the rhythm of life in a smaller industrial town before the revolution.

After long hours in a dirty factory, the worker comes home exhausted to dingy surroundings. He drinks because he has nothing else to do. On Sundays and holidays he drinks even more and beats up his wife.

The Orthodox Church did nothing to discourage drinking. The village priests often were among the worst offenders. Drinking became identified with manliness. Common people laughed (and unfortunately still laugh) over the grotesque capers or violent outbursts of the drunks. Only zealous young Communists and the relatively few Baptists are likely to protest today.

The party always has condemned hard drinking, although it cannot be said that the Communist leaders themselves always set a good example.

According to the current social science textbook for Soviet secondary schools, alcohol is "a survival of the past through which tremendous harm is done to society."

CRIME LAID TO LIQUOR

"Abuse of alcohol," the text continues, "is one of the main reasons for hoodliganism (juvenile delinquency) and robbery. Statistics show that the majority of crimes are committed by persons in a state of intoxication. * * * By his conduct the drunkard brings strife into families and prevents people from working and relaxing quietly."

To put it more precisely, in 1957, 50 percent of all accidents and 70 percent of all crimes were due to drinking, according to Izvestia in February 1958.

Lately the Soviets have played down the capitalist survival theory, but until recently the line was: "Alcoholism is a phenomenon alien to Socialist order. Capitalism, with its social inequalities, degrading work, unemployment, lawlessness, and ignorance offers a wide field of alcoholism among the workers. The bourgeoisie needs alcoholism in order to demoralize the workers and to make them unsuitable for class struggle."

The hypocrisy of such statements is too obvious.

MONOPOLY REINSTATED

Stalin reintroduced the vodka monopoly through a ruse. According to a letter by Leon Trotsky of October 1923, there was strong opposition to restoration of the vodka monopoly in the central committee and among the rank and file.

Stalin said at the time that Lenin approved of the reintroduction of a vodka monopoly for financial purposes "as a temporary measure." It was better to "get revenue from vodka than to go cap in hand to foreign capitalists," Stalin wrote in 1925.

At first a Soviet decree of 1923 authorized production of a relatively weak vodka (20 percent), the so-called rykovka, but very soon the alcohol content was doubled.

In June 1925, production of vodka in state factories was still only about 5 percent of prewar volume and was supposed to increase to a "firm limit" of 15 percent. At that time already receipts from vodka sales were considerable, covering about one-quarter of all direct and indirect taxes.

ONE-THIRD OF FOOD SALES

The first 5-year plan (1927-33) called for a 31-percent decline in vodka sales—an indication of internal party opposition. Actually state vodka production increased by 30 percent.

The sale of alcoholic beverages accounted for more than one-third of all food sales in state and cooperative stores. The share of vodka sales in the turnover of restaurants also went up. By 1940, vodka and coarse rye bread were the only items never in short supply at village stores.

Thanks to the sharp increase of the vodka price in 1941 and the inability of mobilized or displaced peasants to go in for moonshining on the usual scale, alcoholism declined during the war.

PURCHASE CLIMBS

But by 1950 the vodka price was down to less than half of what it had been in 1946. In 1958, as part of a campaign against alcohol consumption, it was increased again.

The party's campaign so far has not been very effective. Alcoholic beverage sales increased from a 1940 base figure of 100 to 166 in 1958 and 225 in 1962. The level had risen to 245 for 1963, a 145-percent increase since 1940. During this period the population grew only 19 percent.

One saving factor is the larger consumption of wines, which makes for a smaller share of highly concentrated liquors in the total.

The situation remains disturbing, however. Nearly one-fifth of all retail sales are for beverages of which 72 percent are alcoholic.

Since the average Soviet also buys quite a lot of home-distilled liquor—and more

than one-third of restaurant turnover consists of alcoholic drink sales—it is not exaggerated to assume that more than a quarter of all average earnings is spent on alcohol.

Soviet psychiatrists have disclosed that in 1958 one-third of all hospital beds were occupied by alcoholics. In 1950, 7.1 percent of patients admitted to clinics were alcoholics. In 1953 the percent was 14.3. The "survivals" are growing.

Yet the Communists try hard to fight alcoholism. Intoxication does not rule out penal responsibility, nor are extenuating circumstances granted. People in a state of alcoholic hallucination are picked up by the militia or police and subject to treatment at their own expense.

The main therapy, the Soviets believe, is work. Pravda of August 7, 1964, developed a whole program of antialcoholic activities. Ceremonies like the "first paycheck day" or "initiation into the working class" should be nonalcoholic, according to the program. The great libations on Mother's Day, International Woman's Day, and so on should be stopped.

SOME DON'T DRINK

The danger of drinking should be more insistently explained to children.

People should be taught to use their leisure hours intelligently.

But old habits run deep and the task is a difficult one, especially when the receipts of the alcohol monopoly contribute substantially to the budget.

In the long run there is hope that a generation of younger leaders will react more consistently than today's leaders. In the course of extensive journeys through Eastern Europe during the past 4 years, a contributor to this report met a large number of men who did not drink at all for reasons of principle.

One would have had to look for them like needles in a haystack before the war.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 22, 1965]

GLOBAL FIGHT ON DRUNKENNESS

The recent World Health Organization report that the United States has succeeded France as the nation with the highest incidence of alcoholism in the world points up the attention given differing rates of alcoholism on an international scale.

According to the most recent available estimates, some of which are seriously out of date, the United States, France, Chile, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Canada, Norway, Finland, Australia, England and Wales, and Italy, in approximately that order, are the nations of greatest alcoholism incidence.

"Just a few short years ago," observes David Archibald, "people in North America used to suggest that all we had to do 'was to learn to drink like the French.' (The new statistics appear to indicate that this may be all too true.) This is to suggest that the traditional wine drinking of France and the general absence of public intoxication meant that there was no particular problem with alcohol in that country."

FRENCH FACE BIG HURDLE

But Mr. Archibald, director of the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation of Toronto, notes also the high alcoholism rates in France, among the highest in the world.

To those who wonder why France has not acted more decisively to overcome alcoholism, Mr. Archibald points out that French efforts have indeed begun.

"The slowness of developments must be attributed in part," he contends, "to the great political and economic strength of the alcoholic beverage industry.

"Something on the order of 6 million of the French population are involved in some

phase of the alcoholic beverage industry, either as growers of grapes or other fruit, or as producers or distributors of wine or spirits, or some other associated occupation. You can appreciate that this group forms a powerful voting bloc," Mr. Archibald explained to the Midwest Institute of Alcohol Studies this past July.

"Hence the relatively quick political death of Premier Mendes-France when he boldly suggested that it might be better to drink milk than wine;

"Hence the fact that you pay 5 cents for a glass of wine in France and approximately 20 cents for a soft drink;

"Hence the fact that France is saturated with liquor outlets—1 alcoholic beverage outlet for every 80 of the population as compared with 1 for every 2,600 of population in Ontario."

APPROACHES DIFFER

In Italy, where wine drinking is more closely related to mealtime than in France and where the social pressure to drink is much less than in France, the drinking problem, Mr. Archibald points out, is much less severe.

French drinking also includes large quantities of distilled spirits—more per capita, in fact, Mr. Archibald notes, than in Scandinavia, where it is the tradition to drink distilled spirits.

That Sweden recognizes the magnitudes of its problems is to some extent apparent in the fact that it employs 203 instructors and spends nearly \$500,000 a year for education on the problems of alcoholism, according to a member of the Royal Education Board of Sweden reporting to the August 1964 meeting in London of the European Institute on the Prevention and Treatment of Alcoholism.

Finland, meanwhile, according to a recent Reuters report from Helsinki, is beginning to relax its strict regulations on drinking and gambling.

"Restaurants which formerly started serving beer at noon," said the dispatch, "are permitted to satisfy thirsty customers from 9 a.m. provided a sandwich is ordered with each glass of beer. But liquor drinkers still must wait until noon."

COMPULSORY TREATMENT

The State alcohol monopoly is also pressing for the sale of beer in grocery stores and other outlets not managed by the monopoly.

According to the 1963 E. M. Jellinek survey for the Department of National Health Welfare in Canada, Finland as well as Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland provides compulsory treatment, theoretically at least, for all "true" alcoholics.

France, Italy, and some other countries require treatment only for "dangerous alcoholics" or delinquent alcoholics (but not felonious alcoholics) whose minor misdemeanors are related to drunkenness. In Denmark the compulsory treatment relates exclusively to psychopathic criminal alcoholics.

In the Netherlands, England (as far as the latter has any public care), Denmark, Chile, the United States, Canada, and to some extent in Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union, the implications of the concept of alcoholism as a disease are duly considered, says Dr. Jellinek. "In many other countries," he charges, "the disease concept receives lipservice."

"The treatment of the early alcoholic is a goal aimed at by most workers in the field," the report continues. "It is a moot question whether this objective is most effectively achieved through mandatory measures [as in the Nordic countries] or through the propaganda of voluntary organizations and of government agencies as in Canada and the United States."

EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS

Alcoholism education takes a variety of forms throughout the world.

The Jellinek report notes that "On the North American Continent the main emphasis has been on alcoholism as a disease and its treatability.

"This aspect of education covers only the prevention of the growth of existing alcoholism and other drinking problems, but does not take into account the prevention of new growth. The latter aspect is practically left to the temperance societies which," in Dr. Jellinek's view, "utilize the element of fear more than of prudence.

"On the other hand," he continues, "in most European or South American countries, little if any effort has been made to propagate the idea that alcoholism and other drinking problems are accessible to psychiatric-medical treatment.

"Instead, they concentrate on the evil effects of alcohol, in much the same manner as temperance societies, i.e., the total abstinence movements. Educational activities," Dr. Jellinek insists, "should cover both aspects."

In the area of research, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Chile have national research institutes.

In Switzerland the Federal Committee Against Alcoholism acts as a consultative agency and occasionally carries out research projects on its own or subsidizes research.

The United States offers Federal, State, and local public and private programs.

POSTER CAMPAIGNS

In France, the Haut Comité d'Etude et Information sur l'Alcoolisme serves as a documentation center and fosters research through grants to competent and interested persons at universities and hospitals.

Either at an official or a private level, several French groups are putting up a vigorous battle against alcoholism. They are fighting preventively, helping alcoholics as well as those who have stopped drinking.

Their weapons are posters—representing, for example, a child who cries, "Papa! Don't drink! Think of me!"

The words "Health Sobriety" and "Security Sobriety" are displayed in Paris and on the roads for drivers, and in the carriages of the Metro and the railways.

The fight goes on through the radio and the cinema as well as TV programs. Educational action has been taken by the press in 37 daily newspapers and 6 important weekly magazines.

A campaign in 11 of the most well-known feminine reviews has drawn women's attention to the role they can play in maintaining a moral balance in their home.

In the Nordic countries, the trend of research projects has been toward an increased interest in the sociocultural elements of alcoholism and any other form of drinking, drinking patterns and customs.

MONOPOLIES COMPARED

Alcoholic-beverage control also varies widely from almost complete sales and/or production monopoly to comparatively loose local regulations.

The Swiss alcohol monopoly, for example, covers the production and wholesale of certain spirits only and does not extend to retail by the bottle.

Measures for cutting down the excessive use of alcohol also differ, country to country.

In England and Wales, where drunkenness has risen 50 percent in the past 10 years, "business hours" in pubs have been curtailed. The Christian Economic Aid and Social Research Foundation now reports less drinking among young people.

In other countries, provinces, states, and counties, there has been some limitation of the number of sales outlets in relation to the population of the particular area.

Different licensing regulations and price variations and controls also act as restraints.

In sum, the world offers a variety of responses to the drinking challenge, some

more orderly, broadly based and effective than others.

To assess these efforts, says Dr. Jellinek, "We must get accustomed to think in terms of total government programs on alcohol and alcoholism."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 24, 1965]

BOTTLED EXPLOITATION

Not all exploitation comes in political garb. Many of the world's newly emerging nations are discovering it in bottles.

Alcoholism in Africa, as well as India, dates back to the European colonial days. When freedom came for the native populations, liquor lingered as a sort of farewell booby prize.

Now the degree to which alcoholism hampers stability and growth disturbs many of the new leaders. Too often, drinking has caused backsliding and uncertain futures—and this at a time when responsibility is so vital to personal and national progress. A vivid example occurred recently in Kenya.

A young African in Nairobi was coming up fast as a newspaperman and making a highly favorable impression on his superiors. Then one day he got drunk, insulted a politician, and immediately lost his job.

This was a loss not only to his employers, who found him almost impossible to replace, but, of course, to the man himself, since good jobs are hard to find.

The case is one of many illustrating the growing problem alcohol is creating in underdeveloped nations.

PATTERN ESTABLISHMENT

In many African countries the colonial period established a pattern of drinking for sociability—many times cultural and recreational activities were limited—and the tragic legacy remains today for the young nations.

The African is, naturally, striving to raise his standards of living. While he may scorn colonialism, he still seeks to emulate the ways of life associated with the white man.

Since drinking has been so woven into the fabric of Africa in the colonial past, he associates it with the "good life." Not infrequently he drinks excessively, becoming a problem to himself, his family, and society.

Statistics are not easy to come by in Africa, particularly for the incidence of African alcoholism. National councils on alcoholism have been set up in many countries, but they are still in the early stages and their statistics are not extensive.

However, in a 1964 survey the Salisbury (Rhodesia) Council on Alcoholism found that some 41 percent of those Africans queried reported someone in their family was "drinking a lot." The council estimates alcoholics among urban African households in Rhodesia and Zambia at 2,110, of which 1,300 are men and 810 women.

Salisbury has had a council for more than 7 years. Others have been set up in Umtali and Bulawayo. They have been able to help alcoholics among both the African and European communities. In addition, Alcoholics Anonymous has branches in Rhodesia and other parts of Africa. Through them many have been restored to useful lives.

PARTICULAR PROBLEM

Susan Cassels, organizing secretary of the Salisbury council, points out that this country has a particular problem.

Until 2 years ago, Africans were not allowed to buy European beer or hard liquor. They were restricted by law to drinking native beer, which is a mild brew (3 percent alcohol) with some nutritional value.

Now they can go into any store and buy bottled goods. European beer is four times as strong as their own brew, Miss Cassels points out. Other bottled goods are as much as 20 times as potent.

"Any African with a tendency to alcoholism has every chance of becoming an alco-

holic very quickly," she said in an interview in her office in downtown Salisbury. "There are now bottle stores in African townships. As a result, there are thousands who, if not fullfledged alcoholics, are well on their way."

The council holds conferences on problems of alcohol that are open to persons of both races. It sponsors lectures in native areas, has consulting and counseling services available in some communities.

COUNCILS AFFILIATED

Miss Cassels, who went to the Yale School of Alcohol Studies (now at Rutgers), said that because alcohol has only recently become available to the African in quantity and potency, Africans are at a beginning stage.

"Nevertheless, there is no doubt that drinking has become a severe social problem here," she continued. "Families have been broken up, causing suffering to young children, and many men are out of work."

Alcoholism is a more serious problem in Salisbury and other centers of population in Africa than in small towns because cities offer relatively good wages, heavy concentration of population, and high sales of alcoholic beverages.

Miss Cassels said most of the councils on alcoholism in Africa are affiliated with the National Council on Alcoholism in the United States from which they receive literature and advice.

South Africa has a similar council, although by law it cannot be multiracial. The council has asked an African university there to provide a course on alcoholism for Africans.

Zambia has councils on alcoholism in Lusaka, the capital, and in Kitwe in the copper belt. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, the Prime Minister, is a teetotaler and has encouraged the work of the councils.

A lot of drinking among Rhodesian whites stems from loneliness. Many families live far out in the bush on farms or at mines. Practically their only social activity is drinking at the local country club or hotel bar.

India's experience with alcoholism follows much the same pattern as that of the African nations. Here too the problem is traced to British colonial days.

The Indian freedom movement, waged vigorously from the end of World War I to its successful conclusion in 1947, sought "prohibition of the consumption except for medicinal purposes of intoxicating drinks."

Under the leadership of Mohandas K. Gandhi the Indians picketed bars, liquor shops, and distilleries. When Gandhi's Indian National Congress gained power in 1936-37, 7 of the then 11 Indian states tried prohibition. The liquor industry suffered a major setback.

SALES BOOM

The experiment failed to meet Gandhi's high expectations but was rated a moderate success. Then came World War II. India became a base for thousands of soldiers. Drinking and drunkenness, particularly in cities near military camps, increased.

When freedom came in 1947, Gandhi opposed a return to prohibition. But his party decided otherwise. With Bombay and Southern Madras leading the way, state after state legislated prohibition.

The system failed, due largely to bootlegging, smuggling of foreign liquor, and bribery of the prohibition police. A new health permit system was introduced in Bombay. It allowed physicians to prescribe liquor for medicinal use. This system was abused to the point of ridicule.

The Government derives a high income from liquor taxes. But with more than 80 diplomatic missions in the city, plus a constant flow of tourists, liquor sales are booming. Gandhi's greatest living disciple, Acharya Vinoba Bhava of the Bhoodan (land gift) movement, consistently refuses to come to Delhi—"a city which floats on a sea of whisky."

Today, hard liquor imbibing appears widely as a proudly worn badge for India's new technocracy, the Western-style men and women of the new elite who set the fashion.

Alcoholic absenteeism in the hundreds of new plants and factories is not high at present. But with the managerial class forming the pattern, this may be a future problem.

FURTHER OUTCRY

One further outcry against alcoholic excess in underdeveloped areas comes from the native women in Australian New Guinea.

"Our men are drinking too much and it has to stop," they maintained during a public protest in Rabaul, where Australian authorities are stationed.

These New Guinea women, not very far removed from their primitive past, trudged many of the miles on foot from their villages, some carrying babies, to stage this sitdown demonstration.

They declared their men were spending all their money on drink as a result of relaxed Government liquor laws. Families were without food. Husbands returned home violently drunk and forced entire families out of their homes, they said.

The New Guinea protest received wide support from Australia and New Zealand, where drinking habits are a continuing problem. The Foundation for Research and Treatment of Alcoholism reports that 1.5 million Australians are victims of alcoholism. This figure includes the New Guinea family men.

RUNNER'S STORY

At the same time, New Zealand's National Society of Alcoholism expresses concern at the rising drinking rate among high school students there. It blamed this on parents who set an example by drinking in the home.

New Zealand 3-mile champion Neville Scott has a tale to tell, and he does so most places he goes "because it may help others."

He told it to the press in South Africa recently. It was related, with Mr. Scott's permission, to the crowd attending South Africa's track and field championships while the tall Kiwi stood alone on the victory dais after winning the 3-mile title. It is a story of triumph over alcoholism.

Mr. Scott ran for New Zealand in the Melbourne Olympics in 1956 with such distinction that he was hailed as a hero back home. The accolades "went to my head" says Mr. Scott, and within a few years he was a compulsive drinker. When New Zealand's team flew to Rome in 1960, it was without Mr. Scott, by then a confirmed alcoholic.

During 1961, realizing the futility of it all, the track star determined to rehabilitate himself. Steadily his prowess returned until last year he again wore the black vest and silver fern of New Zealand at the Olympics. After Tokyo he returned home to the finest season of his career.

As Mr. Scott's story was related the spectators in South Africa were strangely hushed. The silence continued momentarily after the announcer had finished speaking. Then followed a roar of acclaim and sustained applause not accorded any other athlete throughout the 2-day meet.

REPORT OF THE PORTLAND CHAPTER OF THE OREGON UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon United Nations Association has been fortunate in having enthusiastic leaders throughout the years. The Portland chapter recently held a dinner which I was privileged to attend at the invitation of the president, a prominent young lawyer of Portland, Mr. Frank A. Bauman. At this meeting a unique fea-

ture was the honoring of 20 Peace Corps returnees in the Oregon area.

The President's report to the members can explain better than I some of the activities of the Portland chapter and the plans for making it a useful adjunct to the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the annual report to the members of the Portland Chapter of the United Nations Association be printed following my remarks.

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

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PORTLAND CHAPTER

This is the first time, I believe, since succeeding Judge William L. Dickson that I have written to the members as a whole. Let me say how very much the board and I appreciate your membership in the Portland chapter. The fact that some 275 or more of you have seen fit to join this organization and maintain your membership at this time is significant. Nevertheless, if the search for peace is the cardinal issue of our time and if the United Nations is the principal world instrument to undertake this search it would seem that the membership of the Portland chapter should be tenfold, yes, twentyfold of what it is at present.

Lamentably the United Nations is passing through a period, at least for now, in which it is being overlooked as a principal source for maintaining peace. In fact, to put it more bluntly, it can be said that it is being largely ignored as the primary agent for maintaining international peace and security. Only recently Mr. U Thant, Secretary General, voiced this concern about the United Nations attrition in a speech at Queens College, Kingston, Ontario, when he deplored the trend of the first 5 months of this year, to reduce the United Nations to "merely a debating forum and nothing else."

This lack of vigor of the United Nations which we find on the international level we find on the local level insofar as the Portland chapter is concerned. Consequently, on the local level this has not been a period of significant accomplishment in enlisting support for the United Nations. At most I report to you that for the past 12 months your board and officers have been engaged in an action of stewardship merely to breathe life into the local organization so that, if nothing else, it will continue as a public organization on the local level. This pronouncement may seem harsh to some, even unduly critical or unfair, nevertheless it is a fact that not only must be faced, it must be faced and overcome if the Portland chapter is to have a significant role in this community. In the larger sense, both locally and conceivably internationally, this is all the more tragic in view of the boundless citizen support for the United Nations as the principal instrument to maintain the peace. True, we find on the local level criticism of the United Nations but generally it is ineffective and misses its mark. Thus there exists in this community a formidable reservoir of good will toward the Portland chapter and, more significantly, the United Nations itself.

This is underwritten by the fact that in creating and carrying out our admittedly limited program our organization has had wholehearted and complete cooperation of the most cordial kind from all areas of our community. As a result there exists in Portland a profound abundance of resources and material upon which the Portland chapter can and must build. Nevertheless, if our chapter is going to be, as it has in the past, an organization of preeminence and influence in this community, let alone perform a leading role in enlisting support for the

United Nations, it must carry out what I consider to be the following minimal steps:

First, the Portland chapter must obtain the services of at least a permanent part-time secretary who will remove from the shoulders of the board and officers the all too ensnaring and fettering detail that is required of any organization if its books, records, correspondence, program and accounts are to be in order. By this I do not mean to cast the slightest aspersion upon our treasurer, Mr. Herbert Collard, whose financial recordkeeping has at all times been of the highest order.

Second, we must strengthen our program on all levels. This is fundamental, without which all else is as nothing. True, in the past year you have had some meetings that have been highly successful. I call to your attention particularly the impressive gathering in December at Westminster Presbyterian Church when some 350 citizens assembled in the great hall to hear our internationally esteemed Clarke Eichelberger speak on the challenges facing the General Assembly in 1964. I have heard it said that this was one of the largest U.N. gatherings ever held in Portland. The success of this event is due in a large measure to Leon Jourolman, Tom Young, and many others. Then too, I recall with pride the efforts of our indefatigable friend, John W. Pugh, in serving as chairman of the Portland United Nations Week. The culmination of this week in Portland was Mayor Schunk's reading of his proclamation at half time to some 23,000 spectators at Multnomah Stadium at the Oregon State-Syracuse University football game. Not only did Oregon State win a significant victory that day, but so did the Portland chapter. The example of community cooperation by the U.N., Slat's Gill and his Oregon State University was of the first magnitude. Why, Mr. Ted Messang, the musical director of Oregon State University, even wrote a march for the occasion which was played at half time by the band and was named in honor of the United Nations.

These, of course, are examples of program events which reminds the community in no uncertain terms of the United Nations work. Yet there are many areas in which our program must be, and I trust will be, strengthened. For some reason or another we do not have the essential support of the young people in this community. For some reason or another we have not actively enlisted the decisionmakers of tomorrow in our cause. I am speaking about the school age groups on the high school and the college level and the after school years young people. Of the school age group you are aware that our Portland school system does not have a course dedicated principally to the study of international bodies such as the United Nations. If it is important that our students know something of Oregon history, and I submit that it is, then how much more important is it that they at least have some fundamental grasp of international institutions or better, the lack of effective international institutions in the world of today?

The supreme governing rules of the United Nations are collected together in the charter just as the supreme rules of this good country are embodied in the Federal Constitution. We recognize that the conditions today are not the same as were found by the charter creators in San Francisco 20 years ago. Both the founding fathers of the United Nations and those that met in Philadelphia in 1787 recognize the certainty of changing conditions by providing an amendment procedure. In the 20 years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1789, 13 amendments were put to the States and 12 were adopted. If new conditions require amendments to the United Nations Charter this, like any other hard fact, should be faced and overcome. Yet on the local level anyway we find that our organization is doing precious little or

nothing by way of study in the field of charter revision.

I ask our new president and officers, therefore, to give the highest priority to programs in terms of content, penetration and timing, as well as in the area of ample planning at an early hour so that the Portland chapter can present to the community in the fall of 1965 a program that will be truly meaningful.

Third, you cannot discuss a program without relating it to membership. Both subjects are closely interrelated and tend to cross-fertilize each other. If we do not have an adequate program our membership list is going to dwindle. If we do have an effective program this, in and of itself, will be most helpful in maintaining and increasing membership. Still, this is not enough. We must obtain the services of a community leader to serve as membership chairman who will do battle on this subject. This we do not have at this time.

I urge our new president and our officers, our incoming board, and all members to give thought to these three categories: a permanent part-time secretary, a vigorous program, and enlarging our membership. Of these categories the area of program is the area of greatest need.

This search for peace is the great quest of our time. It would appear that we will be engaged in this quest for a good many years to come. I hope that you and I will remain on this search team not only for the coming year but in the foreseeable years ahead and more immediately will give our new president and board every reasonable support during the coming year.

This week McDivitt and White in carrying out their brave feat nailed another major plank on our bridge to the moon. What use will it serve to put a man on the moon if he cannot view the earth beneath because of it being enveloped by seemingly endless martian clouds. Must this be the prelude to tomorrow and the 21st century? Surely our children are worthy of a better view.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK A. BAUMAN.

JUNE 7, 1965.

NAVAL EXPERIMENT—HOME UNDER THE SEA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday I had the rare opportunity to visit once again with a famous and personable Coloradan, Lt. Comdr. Scott Carpenter. Since his multiple orbiting flight in the *Aurora VII*, he has been assigned to temporary duty with the U.S. Navy and has been training with other carefully selected young men for exploration down instead of up. Scott will be the officer in charge of the naval experiment to live for 45 days far below the surface of the sea. They are scheduled to make free dives to their "home under the sea" off La Jolla, Calif., on August 16, 1965. This home will be 210 feet below the surface, at more than seven times sea level pressures.

Pressurization will be supplied, and helium will be used instead of nitrogen because of the nauseous effects of the latter when it is absorbed into the bloodstream.

Scott himself will attempt to remain below for a continuous 30 days and will be the officer in charge of all the experimental work conducted during the entire period. This will be the longest continuous period that any of them will be below the surface.

It is cold at that depth, so cold that body temperatures drop rapidly, requiring the use of electrically heated

suits while in the water, and 90° temperatures in the housing unit. The cold which any of us can envisage, particularly those of us who have done any diving, is accentuated by the use of helium, which is less dense and which viates body heat far more rapidly than usual.

From this "home" located 210 feet below the surface, the men will conduct work programs and deeper experimental dives. The deeper dives are scheduled to go below 300 feet, with pressures as high as 150 pounds per square inch.

One of the problems with deep diving is the necessary time required to decompress on the way up, in order to avoid the bends. At a level of 210 feet, for example, it would take 70 hours to decompress properly; but once the pressures have driven the gases into the blood stream, the same 70 hours apply whether a man stays down for 2 hours or 2 weeks. Hence, for any kind of efficient diving schedule, it makes sense to have a place at that depth where the men can rest and remain pressurized and still perform productive work on an extended scale.

It is my understanding that the men who will participate in the program will be conducting realistic experiments which could create a pattern of values for the country and the world almost unlimited in scope. Vast oil reserves are believed to be in existence in the North Sea and in the Continental Shelf. But there are problems in properly spudding the drills at the depths encountered, and many problems in trying to anchor them from the top. One of the experiments which these men will perform at 200 to 300 feet below the sea is the construction of a drilling derrick, called a "Christmas tree" in ordinary trade language. Studies of marine ecology will be conducted, and there is even the possibility of marine agriculture and ranching.

Communications will be maintained not only with the top, but, also, by way of Telstar, with a similar group under the sea off Ville, France, under the command of the famous Jacques Cousteau.

Methods of penetrating the blackness of those depths will be explored, as well as fantastic trips on underwater vehicles. Just as our astronauts are conducting experiments in the effects of long periods of weightlessness, these men will be conducting living experiments in the effect of long continued pressure patterns on the body.

Mr. President, I salute the imagination and courage of this Navy group and its commanding officer. Once more we see this country bringing forth men to match our mountains, men of faith, courage, imagination, and great intellectual capability.

This is no easy task. This is an unusual and deliberate test of man's strength and ability to function productively under adverse conditions in order to expand knowledge of our environment and to apply that knowledge for the beneficial use of future generations, from the heights to the depths in search of knowledge; and once again Colorado is in the lead.

"BIG BROTHER"—WIRETAP VERSUS PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, My "Big Brother" item for today is an article from the New York Times of June 15, 1965, entitled "Wiretap Versus Privacy." It is a very excellent article by Mr. Sidney E. Zion, outlining recent judicial developments which indicate that both the State and Federal courts are taking a very strong interest in restricting the activities of "Big Brother."

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

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

WIRETAP VERSUS PRIVACY—COURT'S RECENT RULING ON BIRTH CONTROL SEEN AS WEDGE AGAINST EAVESDROPPING

(By Sidney E. Zion)

The connection between birth control and wiretapping may not seem obvious to the naked eye. But there were legal experts yesterday who predicted that last week's ruling, by the U.S. Supreme Court invalidating Connecticut's birth control statute would very likely mean the outlawing of wiretapping and other forms of electronic eavesdropping.

The link between the two questions is the right of privacy, which was given a constitutional home of its own for the first time in the Connecticut case.

Ever since 1890, when Louis D. Brandeis and Prof. Samuel Warren argued in the Harvard Law Review for the "right to be let alone," civil libertarians have contended that the right of privacy is implicit in the Bill of Rights.

But until last week this position had never been accepted by the Supreme Court, although in certain specific and peripheral matters a limited right of privacy was recognized.

When the wiretap issue first reached the Court in 1928 in the Olmstead case involving a Seattle bootlegging ring, Mr. Brandeis, who had become an Associate Justice, was forced into dissent on the privacy issue.

By a 5-to-4 vote the Court ruled that wiretapping was outside the protection of the fourth amendment's prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures. The Court maintained that wiretapping did not involve a physical intrusion on the defendant's premises.

BRENNAN CRITICAL

The Olmstead case, although widely criticized inside and outside the Court—Associate Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., called it "insupportable" 2 years ago in a dissenting opinion—is still the law, since the Court has sidestepped the wiretap issue over the years.

But lawyers yesterday viewed the new right of privacy as enunciated in the Connecticut case as overriding the technical distinction of a physical intrusion that the Court made both in the Olmstead case and in decisions involving other electronic eavesdropping.

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, of the Yale Law School, who argued for the defense in the birth control case in the High Court, said the ruling "furnishes a substantial basis for declaring wiretapping and other eavesdropping unconstitutional."

"I view it as a very promising development," he declared.

Supreme Court Justice Nathan R. Sobel, who ruled last February in Brooklyn that New York State's "bugging" law was unconstitutional, flatly predicted that the Supreme Court would knock out all forms of eavesdropping.

"I have always believed that the Court could do it on the fourth amendment alone," Justice Sobel said, "but apparently there was resistance to it. Now, with the broad-

ened right of privacy, I think they will have to do it in the next case."

THE MARITAL ASPECT

The majority opinion in the birth control case rested heavily on the fact that the Connecticut statute banned the use of contraceptive devices by married couples. Undoubtedly, law enforcement officials and others who favor wiretapping will argue that the privacy doctrine is limited to marital relationships.

Indeed, the American Civil Liberties Union voiced some caution regarding the extension of the privacy right to wiretapping because the opinion referred so extensively to the marriage relationship.

But the Civil Liberties Union, which has long opposed all forms of eavesdropping, echoed the views of many lawyers in saying that the decision "logically applies in all circumstances where the interest of privacy is paramount."

Opponents of eavesdropping say that it is by nature an invasion of privacy, since it indiscriminately picks up all conversations in the bugged or wiretapped premises.

Thus, they argue, an electronic device "hears" the most intimate conversations between husband and wife as well as other conversations. Therefore they say that, like the birth control statute, it invades "the sanctity" of the marriage relationship, if the argument need be limited to that relationship.

If the Supreme Court does eventually rule out wiretapping it would, of course, put an end to the long congressional fight for legalization, which in the last few years has been led by ROBERT F. KENNEDY, both as Attorney General and Senator.

Wiretapping is now outlawed in Federal courts by the Federal Communications Act, but is permitted in State courts. A constitutional ruling would forbid its use in State courts as well.

The Kennedy proposal would permit wiretap evidence only in serious cases, such as espionage and kidnaping.

But even Mr. KENNEDY, in the New York Times magazine in June 1962, said "wiretapping involves a greater interference with privacy than does the conventional search and seizure."

At that time, of course, privacy was beside the point, legally speaking. Whether it is now relevant is very much the point.

VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD three recent items from the American press which help to illuminate the situation in Vietnam.

The first item is an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Telegram on June 12, commending President Johnson for his appeal to the people of the Soviet Union to join us in new initiative for world peace.

The second item is an editorial which appeared in the Boston Traveler for June 10. Commenting on the continuing American troop buildup in South Vietnam and on the increased involvement of American servicemen in the actual fighting there, the editorial says that while "there will be no shortage of critics," these are measures that had to be taken to meet the changing circumstances. The editorial also points out that President Johnson, last year, received congressional approval to take "all necessary steps" to keep South Vietnam free.

The third item I wish to insert is an editorial which appeared in the Wash-

ington Evening Star on June 23, commenting on the TV debate last Monday between Mr. McGeorge Bundy, Prof. Hans Morgenthau, and other speakers on both sides. Having myself witnessed this debate, I believe that the observations of the Star editorialist are extremely well taken. In fact, I think Mr. Bundy did an outstanding job of presenting the administration's case. I plan to say more about this within the next few days.

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

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram, June 12, 1965]

A GOOD TRY BY L.B.J.

"There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere," President Johnson said, in an unusually strong and direct appeal to the people of the Soviet Union to seek new initiatives for world peace.

Adding that "No true Soviet interest is served by the support of aggression or subversion anywhere," Johnson pledged U.S. cooperation in seeking new roads to peace. At the same time, he told the non-Communist world not to delude itself that peace can be achieved by submissiveness or extended by expediency.

These appeals were made at about the same time that Communist Chinese Premier Chou En-lai was telling Egyptians that only the United States and the Soviet Union could start a world war and that China will defend her own territory if she is attacked, and will not need Soviet aid to finish one.

Chou is talking out of the other side of his mouth, the side he uses to sell emerging nations his peace line. The real side is the one he uses to clobber the Soviets for not being more belligerent against the United States.

As for President Johnson's appeal to the Soviet people, it has little chance of reaching through the curtain of propaganda their government showers them with. People in Communist countries are powerless to change policy. Witness the bloody attempts in Hungary, East Germany, and Poland.

The President made a good try. It won't satisfy our appeasers but it will keep the record straight for those of us who care.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler, June 10, 1965]

THE NEW WAR

Without any fanfare whatever, the United States has shifted its role in South Vietnam from a restricted position of advisory support to that of ground combat.

That's the meaning of President Johnson's action in giving Gen. William C. Westmoreland authority to order our ground forces into battle against Vietcong, North Vietnamese or any other aggressor. The restrictions are that our forces must be requested by South Vietnam, and that South Vietnamese troops must be fighting alongside ours.

In a sense, this gives Westmoreland a new war to fight. Offensive action may now replace defensive action. A new cycle of escalation probably has begun.

There will be no shortage of critics objecting to this move. Yet it is a step that must be taken to meet the changing circumstances.

The arrival of the monsoon season, just now beginning, will mean a sharp cutback in U.S. air activity. This will permit the Vietcong to hurl heavy ground power against the forces of South Vietnam, which are already badly depleted in some areas. It could be that the Vietcong might sweep to victory in the rainy season unless American troops are moved in to block them.

Our forces in South Vietnam now number about 52,000 men, of whom about 16,000 are combat troops. Indications are that we may double our forces there before the summer is over.

President Johnson several months ago received congressional approval to take "all necessary steps" to keep South Vietnam free. This is one such step.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1965]

"VIETNAM DIALOG"

The "Vietnam dialog" presented by CBS Monday night obviously did not convert any of the professors to the administration's point of view. Nevertheless, the show served a useful purpose.

It demonstrated, for one thing, that McGeorge Bundy is indeed a formidable opponent on the debating platform. He was more than a match for the representatives of the academic community, singly or collectively. And the President's aid was especially effective in carving up Prof. Hans Morgenthau, who is generally thought of as the guiding spirit of the academic critics of our policy in Vietnam.

More importantly, it demonstrated that you can't beat something with nothing. In this instance, Bundy's something was a clearly articulated definition of the administration's policy and program. The policy has not yet achieved the desired result. But we may know more about its usefulness six months from now, and in any event it constitutes a tangible, affirmative course of action which can be stated in terms that are understandable.

The great weakness of the position of the other side was that it offered nothing which could rationally be described as an alternative.

Mr. Morgenthau said he is "opposed to our present policy in Vietnam on moral, military, political and general intellectual grounds"—an interesting rhetorical exercise, but it means little or nothing. He also mentioned five "alternatives" to our present policy, and said he favored the fifth. What is it? "I think our aim must be to get out of Vietnam," he said, "but to get out of it with honor." This is an alternative? President Johnson has said essentially the same thing on half a dozen occasions.

One thing more. Mr. Morgenthau seemed to take as his model the French withdrawal from Algeria and Vietnam. He failed to mention that in each case the French were waging a purely colonial war, which is quite a different thing from honoring treaty commitments for the sole purpose of helping South Vietnam maintain its independence in the face of plain aggression by the Communists.

INTEGRATION VERSUS EDUCATION—FRATERNITIES AND CLUBS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been astounded to learn that the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, has stretched title VI of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 another extra few miles in his efforts to put integration ahead of education. Mr. Keppel has written a letter stating in effect, that if a college fraternity on a college campus refuses to integrate, then the college itself may be denied Federal funds under title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The distinguished news columnist and analyst, David Lawrence, has pointed out, in a column in the Washington Star of June 21, 1965, that this could mean that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could be made to apply to all private clubs,

groups, and associations, although in the debate over this legislation it was made very clear that it was not to apply to any private clubs, groups, or associations.

The National Observer of June 21, 1965, has also pointed with alarm to Mr. Keppel's action. The editorial in the National Observer makes the point that the Commissioner of Education has apparently failed to distinguish between college facilities and property and the facilities and property owned by others—in this case, a social fraternity.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these commentaries be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

[From the National Observer, June 21, 1965]

Colleges may lose their Federal aid money if one Federal official decides a fraternity on the campus is practicing racial discrimination.

The official is Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, a fellow who has distinguished himself by also saying "schools can teach no lesson more important for all our children than integration." Under his new dictum, not only could one college lose its grants if one fraternity discriminates. Also, all colleges having chapters of a national fraternity, one of whose chapters discriminates, could lose their Federal money.

Mr. Keppel believes this is required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The law requires schools to assure the Federal Government that there is no discrimination in "making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment or property."

Says Mr. Keppel: "This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as part of its activities and overall program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system."

Well, fraternities have long been unpopular in many circles for various practices ranging from hazing to snobbery, with an occasional dash of envy thrown in. They make a convenient handle, certainly. But that is not an argument we care to go into.

What interests us is the apparent leap in logic by the Commissioner, an apparent disinclination to distinguish between university facilities and property, and facilities and property owned by others.

We are fascinated also to see that, yes, indeed, Federal grants to colleges are not only a carrot but a stick. A stick that doesn't have much to do with education unless, of course, you believe that "schools can teach no lesson more important for all our children than integration."

[From the Washington Star, June 21, 1965]

CLUBS' RIGHT OF PRIVACY PERILED

(By David Lawrence)

The way has been opened to compel every fraternity in the colleges, universities and high schools, every private club and every fraternal organization to include in its membership persons of every race and religion or suffer as a penalty the loss of Federal tax exemption. In the case of educational institutions, there would be a loss of Federal financial aid to the university or college which permits any campus organization to practice racial or religious discrimination.

These steps are foreshadowed by the interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 just issued by the administration through the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel.

The Federal Government intervened recently when it was discovered that the local chapter of the Sigma Chi Fraternity at Stanford University in California had been suspended by the national chapter for having decided to admit a Negro student. The national chapter is a private organization. It is not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, nor does it receive any financial assistance from Washington. But the U.S. Commissioner of Education warned in a letter that, unless the Stanford chapter were allowed to include the Negro student in its membership, Stanford University itself would be penalized.

This extraordinary threat is contained in the Commissioner's pronouncement. It states first that there must be no discriminatory practices in "making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment or other facility or property." Then the Commissioner points to the regulations which were issued supposedly under the authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and which require schools to give assurances that there is no racial discrimination "in admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students." Furthermore, the Commissioner declares:

"This language makes it apparent that an institution which maintains a fraternity system as a part of its activities and overall program is responsible under the Civil Rights Act requirements for assuring that discrimination is not practiced by the fraternities in the system.

"To my knowledge the suspension of Sigma Chi at Stanford by the fraternity's national executive committee is the first major test involving de facto discrimination within a national fraternity to develop since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As such, it seems certain to attract wide public interest."

Unfortunately, though the letter was made public last Thursday, it hasn't attracted "wide public interest." But possibly this is because the American people—particularly those who are identified with clubs, fraternities or other social organizations—haven't discovered as yet that the new ruling makes a mockery of what the Supreme Court of the United States said just a few days before on the importance of preserving the "right of privacy" as an inherent part of the Constitution itself.

While almost everyone with human sympathy and understanding recognizes that discrimination by reason of race or religion gives the individual affected a feeling of unforgettable stigma, there is a bigger injustice in brushing aside constitutional methods and endeavoring to achieve reform by applying the doctrine that "the end justifies the means."

There is nothing in the Constitution which permits the Federal Government to control the educational process in America. The mere grant or loan of taxpayers' money to the States or directly to colleges or universities does not carry with it the right to exercise any jurisdiction over such matters as regulating the conduct or relationships of students to each other.

But if a regulation can be derived from the civil rights law of 1964 empowering the Federal Government to use its financial transactions with the citizens to impose punishment for actions which are not in themselves forbidden by State or Federal law, then the way is opened to apply the same procedure to fraternal organizations of all kinds, as well as private clubs generally. It can be done by denying them exemptions from the payment of income taxes in those years in which their receipts exceed expenditures.

It apparently would be sufficient for the Treasury to declare that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the withholding of financial assistance to any organization or institution which permits discrimination on

racial or religious grounds. Certainly in these days of official word twisting, financial assistance is a broad enough term to cover tax exemptions.

Thus, Federal power could be used as a form of coercion in private clubs in the same way it is about to be exercised in passing upon the qualifications for membership in student fraternities in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

MINORITY OPINION—PROTESTS HELD HEALTHY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond stands up today to disagree with Americans who have decided that campus debates on Government policy are a bad and unhealthy thing, and with those who attribute to radicals the ferment among the academies of the land.

Many of us disagree with the loudest voices heard at the many teach-ins across the land, but, nevertheless, accept the opinions and convictions of the professors as honest. Certainly we do not quarrel with their right to be heard. Mr. Drummond states this very well in his article, which I think the Members of this body and all other Americans can profit from. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was published in the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MINORITY OPINION—PROTESTS HELD HEALTHY (By Roscoe Drummond)

A recent Louis Harris poll reveals two startling and disturbing facts:

That a majority of Americans who have followed the campus teach-ins and student protests over Vietnam feel that these actions are "a bad thing," unhealthy, to be condemned.

That a near-majority does not even concede honesty of conviction to the protesting professors and students and dismisses the teach-ins as something organized by "radicals."

I dissent.

As one who strongly supports the rightness and necessity of President Johnson's unwavering defense of South Vietnam, I think that the teach-in movement is overwhelmingly honest in purpose and is not harmful or unhealthy.

I think it is helpful and healthy for these reasons:

1. There are nearly 5 million college students in the United States. Many can already vote. Nearly all of them will be voting in the next presidential election. Far better that they should be sharpening their concern about the real world than swallowing goldfish as they did in the 1930's or indulging the woes of the "bland generation" or the "beatnik generation" as they did in the 1950's. It's healthy.

2. We needed more debate and more public discussion—for the Government's stand on Vietnam and against it—and we were not getting it until the campus teach-ins helped to stimulate it.

3. Criticism of the Government does not hurt. It helps. It serves to focus and stabilize public opinion. Did the anti-Vietnam teach-ins undercut support for the President's course in Vietnam? No, just the opposite.

In the wake of the teach-ins the Gallup poll revealed three changes in public opinion—Support for quitting Vietnam went up 1 percent, support for defending went up 7 percent; the personal popularity of President Johnson went up 6 percent; support for

the Democratic Party as the best guardian of the peace went up 3 percent.

4. The expression of unpopular, minority opinion—about Vietnam or anything else—ought to be respected and defended. The only way to protect the right of free speech for the majority is to protect the rights of the minority. Let's not look down at minority opinion; let's look up to it—and meet it head on in the arena of free speech.

5. But shouldn't we close ranks in time of war, ideally, yes. But this must be voluntary. It cannot be brought about by compulsion or coercion. Furthermore, our stake in the defense of South Vietnam is not so self-evident that it does not need more exposition and debate.

The truth is that the size of our commitment to defend South Vietnam has grown in a way that made it difficult for the American people to really know where we stood until the President's Baltimore speech of last April.

Our military help was to be "advisory." It became far more than advisory.

Our troop buildup in 1961 and 1962 was kept secret by President Kennedy. We had 2,000 men in Vietnam in 1961 and 11,000 in 1962. This buildup was not disclosed to the country until January 1963.

The size of our forces in Vietnam has now grown to 75,000 as of this month.

I believe that President Johnson is acting wisely to resist this aggression right where it is taking place. I believe that to permit it to succeed could only mean larger aggression under worse circumstances.

But public opinion has not been well served until recent weeks and it is only fair to state the facts candidly. That is what we need more of.

HONORABLE-MENTION ESSAYS ON "MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK"

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for several years it has been my good fortune to be able to conduct for the graduating high school seniors in Wyoming the McGee Senate internship contest, which brings to Washington one boy and one girl for a week of observation of democracy in action in the Senate and elsewhere in Washington, D.C.

As a part of the contest, each student is required to complete an essay on the subject, "Making Democracy Work." Each year, I am impressed by the depth of understanding and the dedication to our democratic principles displayed in the essays by these young people. All show real thought and a thorough knowledge of our system of Government.

Of course, it would be impossible for everyone to read all the essays; but I think some of the most outstanding ones, selected by an impartial panel of three judges, should receive wider circulation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that two of the essays, written by Mary Dean, of Basin, Wyo., and Alan Feiner, of Cheyenne, Wyo., which received honorable mention in the McGee Senate internship contest, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

(By Mary Dean, of Basin, Wyo.)

Our Founding Fathers were practical men who fought for their independence, wrote our Constitution, and subdued the hardships of the wilderness. Some of them were dreamers who dreamed of a Nation with

doors open, on the same basis, to the people of all creeds. From these dreams they conceived a Nation in which people, regardless of race or class, had a full measure of opportunity and personal and civil rights. They established this Nation without nobility and eliminated the idea of the political and social caste system. Opportunities were open to all men. Minorities, the smaller and culturally different elements in the population, were heard and protected by the stronger majority. This was the beginning of our democracy.

The people of the United States are guaranteed the rights of speaking out for what they want, of having a trial by jury, of having free enterprise, and of devoting their lives to whatever they choose. These freedoms show our true democratic way of life. We are not ruled by an aristocracy, but instead, we, the people, govern.

To strengthen our way of life, we must change with the times. Every day new discoveries are made that alter our lives, and we must keep in stride with these changes.

Although we are one of the strongest nations in the world, we have many weaknesses. One of them is the problems which arise from our racial differences. Legislation alone in this area will not solve the problems. It is the people who are involved who must find the solution. The answer does not lie in the violence that is now taking place in some of our States; it lies instead in the understanding that we must eventually develop.

Bitterness deepens and tempers rise among both the whites and the Negroes when an assassination takes place as it recently did in Selma, Ala. Extremist groups, which usually cause these acts of violence, should be severely dealt with. These groups are usually comprised of people who believe they are the leaders and must be looked up to, people whose ideas are so far-fetched from the actual situation that they cannot do any good. One such organization, the Ku Klux Klan, believes in violence to put fear into the people and so drive them and force them to stay in their lowly position. The Ku Klux Klan does not think that Negroes belong on the same level as white people. But where do they belong? They are citizens of the United States and our Constitution guarantees the rights of every man, black or white.

Our Nation cannot continue to grow and prosper if we do not cease having racial violence and unrest among us. Each of us must fight for our rights; not the rights of the Negro or the rights of the white, but the rights of all freemen.

If our people can live with harmony between the races, perhaps we can solve many of our other problems, problems that weaken our Nation.

Something that we should be thinking very seriously about is the high standard of living in relation to school dropouts and the mentally retarded. It has become a necessity for all young people to finish high school and perhaps attend college. A student with emotional problems who drops out before graduating from high school, and the student who does not have the mental ability to maintain the required grade standard, are cripples before they have the chance to get started. They have little opportunity to make up any lost time because of the stiff competition from the other more stable, intelligent people. It is up to those of us who have succeeded and who want to do something for our country to get out and, if at all possible, help rehabilitate these people.

One of the best ways, I think, to make our democracy work is through our social organizations. If people begin to attend functions of the various groups while they are young, they begin to adjust to the ideas, needs, and wants of other people. They are associating with many different philosophies and they can benefit by these associations. Discussions, in which everyone contributes his

ideas, are held in most social organizations. This gives fellow members the chance to recognize other viewpoints on some of our problems. Through these organizations and our communications, we must make people aware of our national and international problems. If the people are aware of and understand these problems, they will be willing to fight for what they feel is right.

Our country has often been called a "sleeping lion" who awakens to snarl and fight only when a major crisis develops. We must keep our "lion" awake by informing the people of what is going on at all times.

The United States is supporting several organizations whose aims are to make our democracy work and to show other people just how wonderful it really is. One of these is the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps has high entrance acceptance requirements which must be met, but those people who have given part of their lives to this organization feel it was well worth their while. The aim of this group is to educate and help the millions of illiterate and poverty-stricken people of the world. To help one of these people is to help a score of them, for he will spread his knowledge and respect among his peers.

On our homefront, President Johnson's "unconditional war on poverty" has caught the eye of the American public. It is estimated that one-fifth of our population—about 35 million people—lives in abject poverty. Because things don't have to be this way in our country, it is a challenge to us to do something about it. In a country with a standard of living such as we have, we must serve our fellowman to keep him on a level where he might at least have the necessary things in life. Economically and morally it is not good for our democratic way of life for such a large percentage of our population to be poverty stricken.

It is our responsibility to continue the heritage that our Founding Fathers began and to pass it on to our children so that they, too, can live in our land of opportunity with a democratic system of government. If each of us takes it upon himself to understand our Government, to break down the prejudices that exist among us, and to fight for the rights of all men, our democracy can and will work.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

(By Alan Feiner, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

"All of us are involved in the discipline of self-government. All of us in this country, in a sense, are officeholders. All of us make an important decision as to what this country must be and how it must move." These words by our late President John F. Kennedy seem to summarize one of the cardinal principles upon which any democracy must be founded, the belief that each citizen has a primary role in the operation of his Government. Black, white, red, yellow—we are all involved in a unique governing experiment. Without this special emphasis on the importance of the individual, no true democracy can hope to survive. Yet, simply placing emphasis on the general populace of a society does not guarantee that the democratic system will work. Much more is involved. Each of us has certain responsibilities inherent in his citizenship. The neglect of these responsibilities diminishes the success of a democracy. Also to be considered is the misuse of these obligations. Our main objective, then, should be to awaken every American to the responsibility placed upon him and to educate him in the proper exercise of his freedom under our constitutional system.

Making democracy work involves one of the oldest processes known to man: Education. Education is the key; we must now use this key to open the door to a better way of life for all mankind. Any failure we have in our present society may be attributed to our edu-

cational system. We must, therefore, examine the curriculums used in many schools and decide if students are being properly motivated. Courses in government should be required as a prerequisite to graduation from high school. Every student must understand the basic organization and structure of our constitutional government so that he can begin to assume some of the responsibilities of citizenship. A thorough understanding of all levels of government is to be desired. This is important.

Even more important, however, than the simple "how" of democracy is the "why" of the system. Perhaps no aspect of our society is more fascinating and yet more neglected. It is imperative that every student have a sense of identity with his governmental organization. Democracy is much more than the Capitol Building in Washington or the Statehouse in Cheyenne. Students must realize this. Our principal beliefs extoll the virtues of equality for all and the pursuit of peace. These rather high-level abstractions must be related to each individual's life. In this respect, our schools could play a major role in making democracy more meaningful and in eliminating the parasites of hatred and intolerance from the contemporary scene. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch reasons in this manner: "Our democracy [should be] reminded that the very fabric of popular self-government depends upon a universal faith in reason and moderation, in patient accommodation of conflicting views and interest, in the democratic processes of conciliation." Our ancestors knew the value of freedom. They understood the principles behind it and were willing to sacrifice their lives in the defense of it. Before we are able to believe in this glorious ideal which they prized so dearly, we must first understand it thoroughly. Our educational system must not fail.

The general obligation of education follows closely with this understanding of our Government. We must have a citizenry that has some knowledge of the vast scientific and technological age in which we are living. Our people should understand history, both American and world, and should be able to apply it in analyzing trends. The American must cultivate an appreciation for literature and its meaning. Indeed, we must copy the ancient Greeks in striving for physical strength and mental alertness. In order to be successful, democracy needs for its foundation a society able to think and reason critically. A society that values worthwhile creations and yet is constantly analyzing its values provides the firm basis upon which a democratic nation can survive. Given the proper liberal education, the average citizen is able to meet his responsibilities and contribute something to the advancement of our way of life. The light of learning shines through the darkness of bigotry and suspicion and points the way toward peace for all.

Education, until now, has been limited solely to schools. This, however, has excluded other methods of educating the general populace, particularly those methods that would reach individuals no longer in school. Our consideration of education, therefore, must be expanded. In our expansion, we may consider the use of the mass communication systems now dominating our country. Their powerful influence might be used in enlightening the citizenry toward the intelligent use of their citizenship. Television discussions among national personalities concerning our democratic society might interest a previously unreached segment of our population. Even more important than this idea, however, might be a massive campaign designed to reach every citizen at the local level. Service organizations could play a part by helping to stimulate this democratic renaissance in their own communities. Seminars and group workshops could be sponsored in an effort to educate and promote renewed interest in our way of life. Every citizen

must be reached; every effort must be made; democracy must be preserved.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that, "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm." His words are quite applicable to the situation at hand. It is high time that enthusiasm was generated for democracy. Ignorance and complacency are our enemies. Only total victory over these forces will insure the preservation of our society. Every properly educated and informed citizen should be encouraged to express himself on the operation of his Government. As was stated in the beginning, democracy is everybody's business. It can succeed only when everybody is intelligently participating in its functioning.

This goal will not be easy to attain. It will involve a conscientious effort on the part of every true Democrat. The challenge is great; but the blood shed across the plains of Europe, through the jungles of Vietnam, and on a Dallas street make our commitment firm. We, today, have a responsibility to ourselves and to the rest of the world. The torch of liberty must illuminate the far corners of the earth's surface and the deep caverns of men's minds. We must have faith in, and understanding of, democracy, so that its message to all of mankind will be abundantly clear. If we, our children, and our children's children are to enjoy the benefits of freedom, we must not fall in the preservation and promotion of our democratic ideals. A sick, oppressed world begs for help; a strong, working democracy must answer with a resounding "yes."

CONTINUANCE OF AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM AND SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently the California Legislature passed a resolution sponsored by State Senator Virgil O'Sullivan urging that the Congress of the United States "give the necessary and adequate support to the continuance of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service" of the Department of Agriculture.

This resolution was brought to my attention by Arthur L. Darsey, secretary to the State soil conservation commission, in behalf of Harold B. Blatz, chairman, and the other members of the commission.

Mr. Darsey, who is also chief of the division of soil conservation of California, pointed out that there are 30,000 cooperatives in the soil conservation program in California, and that these will be affected by whatever action the Congress takes on the agricultural programs named in the State legislature's resolution.

Many of my State's farmers and others interested in its agricultural well-being have also written to me about the Federal services in question.

Therefore, because of its great interest to so many individuals and groups, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the California Legislature's resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 48

Joint resolution relative to the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service

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

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

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

Whereas the agricultural conservation program and the technical assistance provided the landowners of California by the Soil Conservation Service are a vital link in the overall natural resource conservation movement through the State; and

Whereas for the past 30 years the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service, 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 this period many California farmers and landowners have put to good use the many conservation practices of the agricultural conservation program; and

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

Whereas through the medium of agricultural conservation program farmer-elected committeemen and soil conservation district supervisors throughout the State, farm leadership has been developed to a most helpful degree: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give the necessary and adequate support to the continuance of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service; and be it further

Resolved, That an adequate amount be set aside from an appropriation to make it possible to administer the program through the present system of farmer-elected committeemen; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the California congressional delegation.

NO LIMITATION FOR GI EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this Government cannot afford to discriminate against the dedicated young men and women of this Nation who have served in the Armed Forces during this period of cold war danger merely upon the basis of actual physical danger or the quirk of geography. If one looks to the record of service during World War II and the Korean conflict it becomes apparent that a surprising number of soldiers never saw the shores of a distant land yet they received, and rightly so, the benefits of the GI bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Leonard A. Newton, of 6000 Fulton Avenue, Van Nuys, Calif., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VAN NUYS, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to voice my approval of your proposed Veterans' Readjustment Act. Our country's fighting men are exposed to constant hazards in the line of

normal duty. These hazards seem to be inherent to the technological posture of the military today.

In addition to normal hazards there is the hazard of poor morale among those who serve, especially the enlisted man. He is not and will probably not be accepted within the same economic level of society as his counterpart who stayed home and continued his education.

I can speak with personal knowledge of the present situation since I have served for more than 10 years with the air wing of the Marine Corps, Marine Reserve, and California Air National Guard. The great majority of those with whom I serve have seen bloodshed, homes lost, families broken and personal hopes for the future lost in the interest of service to their country. Those who continue to make these sacrifices and those who have made sacrifices in the past 10 years do not even have the privilege of calling themselves veterans in the eyes of our present statutes. We need the cold war GI bill.

Respectfully,

LEONARD A. NEWTON.

THE HUMAN ELEMENT: AMERICA'S FIRST ASSET—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDOLPH BEFORE NATIONAL AEROSPACE EDUCATION COUNCIL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] delivered a most thought provoking and perceptive address at a luncheon of the National Aerospace Education Council on June 24 at the Mayflower Hotel. His topic was "The Human Element: America's First Asset." His dedicated service on the Senate Education Subcommittee qualifies him to speak with authority on the needs and challenges of young, as well as adult, America. His comments on our rapidly changing technological society and the problems caused thereby and the bright future which may result therefrom are worth the time and attention of every member of this body. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the history of National Aerospace Education Council, together with Senator RANDOLPH's address; and I strongly urge my colleagues to read with great care this excellent and timely speech.

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

NAEC was organized in 1950 by representatives of industry, education, and Government. It is an independent, nonprofit organization directed by professional educators who are convinced that the use of aerospace material in the teaching of science, arithmetic, social studies, or reading enriches instruction and relates it to life.

The council has several major programs. It publishes and distributes books for students at all grade levels on such subjects as jet aircraft, aviation careers, helicopters, and space exploration. It offers to schools numerous aerospace teaching aids such as bibliographies, source books, units of work, and suggestions to teachers for using aerospace education materials in their daily classroom instruction. It provides a library or curriculum service which assures subscribers of a continuous flow of up-to-date, informative and authoritative aerospace information, background material, and related teaching aids. The council also answers requests from thousands of students and

teachers for free aerospace pictures, booklets, and pamphlets.

At the council's annual conference now in session in Washington, D.C., such distinguished Americans as Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Mr. Karl G. Harr, Jr., president of the Aerospace Industries Association; and Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, are included on the speakers' list. Also, more than 25 recognized national leaders in aviation and space education are participating in the conference panel discussions and symposiums.

THE HUMAN ELEMENT: AMERICA'S FIRST ASSET
(Remarks by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the National Aerospace Education Council Conference Luncheon Session, June 24, 1965, the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

Never before have all of us needed, so urgently, people qualified to cope with a world in which bewildering changes and advances are routine. President Kennedy stated it so well when he said that we are engaged "in a race for the mastery of the sky, and the rain, the ocean, and the tides, for the far side of space and the inside of men's minds."

Nowhere is this more true than in the field of aerospace technology. The rapid progress in this new frontier requires the best minds in the Nation—minds that translate into skillful hands. The rapid technological progress is creating a demand for skilled manpower unequalled in past generations.

The increasing need for highly motivated, highly trained scientists, engineers, and technicians is urgent and unprecedented. People of this caliber are not just born; they must be developed. They are the product of carefully planned programs. Stuart G. Tipton, able president of the Air Transport Association, has told me that the question of future manpower is one of the most prominent subjects discussed in airline executive offices. The airlines see the necessity for an extensive recruiting job to find the people to operate their rapidly expanding system.

And the system is expanding at rates that were deemed unattainable only a few years ago. Last year the airlines flew 82 million passengers and 800 million ton-miles of airfreight. By 1970, the airlines expect to fly 120 million passengers and 2½ billion ton-miles of airfreight.

At the same time that they will be flying more people and goods to more places, they will be operating a much more sophisticated system than exists even today. They are in the process of installing all-weather landing systems which require enormous investment in electronic equipment. They are introducing new reservation systems using the most advanced electronic computing data known to science. They are experimenting here and testing there. All of this means that the airlines will be needing not just pilots, not just hostesses, not just salesmen, but the electronic experts, the data processing specialists and all of the men and women who will be entering the new careers being opened up by the advancing technology of the United States.

How are technological advances made? They are made possible by trained and dedicated scientists and engineers. They are made possible by an understanding public—by industrialists, businessmen, doctors, lawyers—by the poet, the musician, the painter, the architect. For ours is a world that requires a citizenry informed by the humanities, as well as by science, industry, business, and the professions. Ours is a world that requires Renaissance men.

Men of this stamp exist today. They will be required in much greater numbers tomorrow.

Such manpower is the product of native ability, education, and experience. Added to which is the all-important factor of guidance and motivation that will enable young people to find and develop their potential for a chosen career.

You in the audience are a vital element in shaping the world of tomorrow by helping young people find their way into a future that depends on them.

I mentioned motivation. Young people are motivated to choose a career not only because they like a given business, profession, or category of the arts or sciences, but because jobs exist. And because they beckon.

Also, young people are motivated to choose a career because they can identify with it. Certainly aerospace makes an impact on the young and inspires intense identification.

This identification is even being recognized at college commencements—forums not always characterized by speakers remarkable for discovering the yeast in life that causes enthusiasm in young people to rise.

It was noted in a recent issue of *Time* that Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said in his commencement address at the University of Iowa that "commencement speakers generally have a good deal in common with grandfather clocks; standing usually 6 feet tall, typically ponderous in construction, more traditional than functional, their distinction is largely their noisy communication of essentially commonplace information."

In the same article, it was reported that this stereotype was shattered by the 1965 crop of commencement speakers. They hewed much closer to the realities of contemporary life. An example was the remark by Emmett Dedmon, executive editor of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, when addressing the graduating class of George Williams College in Chicago. Dedmon said: "May the explosions of your generation cut as clear as those which freed the capsule of Gemini 4 from the booster engines."

Time observed that whatever his fellow editors might think of that particular metaphor, Dedmon states the dominant theme of the 1965 commencement speeches: The "explosions" of the younger generation.

Our interest here today is focused on aerospace—the aerospace that serves as an important source of career opportunities for young people preparing to be in the forefront of the world in the making—"exploding" into the world in the making, to continue the metaphor.

I understand that you had concentrated sessions on the space and general aviation aspects of aerospace in this morning's program. Also, I am told that Karl Harr, president of the Aerospace Industries Association, will talk at the banquet on Saturday night, so I know that aircraft technology and its impacts on education will be well covered.

Therefore, my remarks essentially concern the airline industry, whose progress I have participated in and followed with intense interest for many years. Certainly the airlines, along with the rest of aerospace, have been as concerned about the "explosions" of the younger generation as the commencement speaker at George Williams College.

The airline industry provides a textbook example of how to make new jobs. Here are a few examples of how they have done it:

During the first 6 years of the jet age (we are now in the seventh), the airlines created some 39,000 new jobs in their industry alone.

The many billions of dollars the airlines have invested in flight and supporting equipment since the beginning of the jet age has created work for over 5,000 factories and jobs for over 100,000 men and women in manufacturing.

For every employee directly concerned with assembling the sections of just one airplane into the finished product, there are additional workers employed by the subcontractors, the electronic equipment companies, rubber companies, and other industries who directly contribute to the aircraft assembly process.

Wages and salaries paid to these workers provide employment for an equal number of nonmanufacturing workers in trade and service industries.

The airlines themselves employ approximately 190,000 people who, in 1964, were paid over \$1½ billion in wages.

These figures in themselves are impressive. But their impact on the total economy is the vital matter.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has reported that 100 industrial employees add an average of 296 more people to the community, 112 more households, 50 more schoolchildren, 107 more automobiles, 174 more jobs in the community, 4 more retail stores and a minimum average of \$590,000 more in retail sales per year.

As to the future, the airline reequipment program is most encouraging for young people looking for a career and for teachers helping them to prepare for one. At the present time, the airlines have on order approximately 450 new jets, representing an investment of \$2.2 billion. It is the largest equipment order in the history of the industry, exceeding in dollar volume the orders placed in the late 1950's at the time of the beginning of the transition from piston to jet aircraft.

To purchase this new equipment, the airlines, of course, must have adequate earnings. I am gratified that recently the airlines have indeed been making an adequate return on their enormous investment. They'll need these earnings and more to pay for the new equipment that is on order and the additional planes which will be necessary to add to the existing fleets in the years ahead.

This emerging new transportation system is expected to provide new job opportunities in the airlines for 50,000 additional people by 1970. In the flight crew category alone, the airlines will hire 3,000 to 5,000 new pilots and copilots. It may be expected that many thousands of new jobs will also be created in the aircraft and related industries.

The trends are contrary to some expectations. It was widely believed that the larger, faster jet would require fewer pilots. But airline experience has not borne this out. In 1955, there were about 11,000 pilot and copilot jobs. At the end of 1964, the number of flight crew positions had grown to 14,934.

From the beginning, all phases of air transportation have reflected marked advances in technology, making the airline industry in a very real sense a barometer of technological development. Always, too, there has been concern over what the impact of various equipment revolutions might be on airline employment.

Gloomy prophecies from many quarters had it that jet aircraft would mean greater capacity per plane and a consequent reduction in the number of airliners, a reduction in the number of flight crews, and a generally declining employment picture in commercial aviation.

What the pessimists failed to understand is that an industry with growth potential can adjust to automation and technological change while at the same time providing more and better jobs.

In other words, an expanding economy can, by creating a demand for more jobs, absorb those who may be replaced by automation.

Looking further into the future, as subsonic flight merges into supersonic flight, new

challenges in navigation, meteorology, metallurgy and the application of the multiple uses of computers will require the ablest minds of our generation.

It is estimated that the SST would create some 40,000 new jobs in the aircraft industry alone. It would provide opportunities for hundreds of thousands of people in the supplier industries. Progress in the design of the SST today shows that it would be more than three times as productive for the airlines as today's subsonic jets.

There is hardly a facet of the Nation's life that the aerospace industry does not touch in some way through its vast need for supplies, equipment, and services.

My cherished friend throughout the years, C. R. Smith, chairman of the board of American Airlines, addressed not long ago a group of new Air Force pilots following their completion of a year's training in preparation for the career they had selected. He said:

"As you grow older, you will realize more and more how fortunate you are if you have an occupation that interests you. There are millions of people who arise in the morning and face the tasks of the day with reluctance, because they have an occupation unable to hold their interest. Your outlook and your opportunity is not that; you have chosen the Air Force because its mission appeals to you; the Air Force has chosen you because it believes that you have ability and promise. A very happy combination."

Board Chairman Smith might well have been addressing a group of young people who had decided to seek their careers in the aerospace industry—with the manufacturers of planes or space vehicles, with the airplanes, or in the field of general aviation.

Angela Morgan has written:

"To be alive in such an age
With every year a lighting page
When miracles are everywhere
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be.

To be alive in such an age—
To live in it—to give to it!
Give thanks with all thy flaming heart—
Crave but to have in it a part!"

PRESIDENT JOHNSON URGES THE WHOLE WORLD TO FACE PROBLEM OF MULTIPLYING POPULATIONS AND TO INVEST IN POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wholly and highly applaud the fact that for the second time since the assumption of the Presidency, President Johnson has come out in favor of meeting the population problem—namely, birth control.

His first statement in his state of the Union message, delivered after his election to the Presidency, was primarily addressed to the people of the United States, when he said:

I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

Now, using the United Nations as a forum, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary, he has made the same plea to the whole world, saying:

Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world. Let us act on the facts that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth.

His second statement, made today, with the eyes of the whole world focused upon him, carries his efforts beyond that of his state of the Union message 6 months ago. His San Francisco statement—

Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth—

Is essentially a mandate to various Government agencies—to the Agency for International Development, which is spending billions of dollars annually in trying to promote economic growth in less developed nations; to the Agency for Economic Opportunity, which is investing large sums in trying to combat poverty in our own country; and to the Interior Department, whose Secretary Udall has announced his purpose to carry out such a program among the impoverished Indians and Eskimos of our land and the people in the trust territories; and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, all three of whose titles are pertinent to the carrying out of the President's mandate. This may well be a framed slogan placed above the desk of each of these executives and others:

Less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth.

President Johnson cannot be praised too highly. Of the many important achievements of his Presidency, it may be difficult to choose the one that is most outstanding. It is entirely possible that history will record this to be it—that, for the first time, a President of the United States came out forthrightly and unmistakably in favor of population control, thereby facing what several witnesses at the birth-control hearings now being held by our Senate committee and President Eisenhower also declared to be the most crucial issue of our time.

POPULATION HEARINGS PROGRESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, June 22 and June 23, the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, held the first 2 days of what will be an extended hearing on Senate bill 1676 and related bills which would coordinate and make available, upon request, birth-control information.

The response to the hearing has been gratifying. The hearings continue next week. Members of Congress have appeared before the subcommittee, to express their interest. In my opening statement, I quoted Thomas Jefferson, who said, 187 years ago, that giving information to the people is the most certain and most legitimate engine of Government.

I had the privilege, when the hearings opened, of reading a statement submitted to the Foreign Aid Expenditures Subcommittee by former President Dwight Eisenhower, who believes the population problem has serious portents, both at home and overseas.

President Eisenhower said:
If we now ignore the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our un-

readiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us.

Unless a solution is found, said former President Eisenhower—

there is going to be in some regions not only a series of riotous explosions, but a lowering of standards of all peoples, including our own.

Thanks to the interest of the press and the radio in the population dilemma, the words of former President Eisenhower have reached across the land, the seas, and the nations beyond. The subcommittee is gratified.

President Lyndon Johnson has pledged to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

We will do what we can to help the President.

The Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will resume the hearings on Senate bill 1676 and related bills on Tuesday next, starting at 10 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Witnesses who will appear before the subcommittee on June 29 are Dr. John Rock, of Brookline, Mass.; Gen. William J. Draper, Jr., of Palo Alto, Calif.; and Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, of Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. Rock, a distinguished Catholic gynecologist, helped develop the birth-control pill, and has written the informative book entitled "The Time Has Come."

General Draper, a distinguished investment banker and statesman, is renowned for his work in stimulating public discussion on the population dilemma. The Draper report on foreign aid, in 1959, pointed up the dangers to our foreign aid and assistance program, and recommended that the United States become aware of the fact that economic development in foreign nations is being offset by rapid population growth.

Dr. Kistiakowsky, a world-renowned chemist, was Special Assistant for Science and Technology to former President Eisenhower. A member of the National Academy of Sciences, he—perhaps more than any other member of the Academy—has contributed to the reports on population issued by the Academy.

The subcommittee looks forward with great interest to the contributions these men can make to the population dialog.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial and several articles related to the hearings on Senate bill 1676 or to the population problem in general. They are an article written by Arthur Krock, and entitled "In the Nation: The Birth Control Hearings," which was published in the New York Times of June 24, 1965; an editorial entitled "More Headway on Birth Control," which was published in the New York Times of June 21; an article entitled "Cushing Softens Birth-Curb Stand," which was published in the New York Times of June 24, 1965; an article entitled "Udall Urges Action," published

in the New York Times of June 24, 1965; and an article entitled "Pope To Redefine Birth Curb Stand," published in the New York Times of June 25, 1965.

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

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1965]
IN THE NATION: THE BIRTH CONTROL HEARINGS
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Of all the contributions President Johnson may make toward the goal he has described as the "harmonious unity of man with the world he has built," none may prove to have been more substantial than his initiative of recognition by this Government of the problem of birth control. Until he did that, with one sentence in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 4, 1965, the political community avoided direct involvement with this gravest of existing menaces to human progress.

SENSITIVE SUBJECT

The subject, as Representative UDALL, of Arizona, phrased it yesterday at the first hearings Congress ever ventured upon, had been accepted by American politicians as "too sensitive for public discussion and action." And if the President had not taken the lead in dispelling what UDALL, referred to in the hearings as "a myth that deserves oblivion," the Government with the greatest resources for checking the most critical threat to human progress would have continued to keep it at a distance.

But, once the President sponsored Government action, the groups of private citizens and the few in public office who long and vainly have been urging it were furnished with sufficient political authority to break down the wall of congressional resistance to open discussion. This authority was directly derived from the following sentence in the January message: "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity of world resources."

EARLIER SPADEWORK

Mr. Johnson's predecessors had, however, helped to fertilize the political ground for his position. President Eisenhower had already publicly reversed his position of 10 years ago that birth control was not a proper issue for Government, having become convinced—as he told the Senate subcommittee yesterday—by studying "the results of some of the [foreign] aid programs of the early fifties * * * that without parallel programs looking to population stabilization all we could do would be to maintain rather than improve standards in those who need our help." And President Kennedy had authorized the supply of birth control information by this Government to any nation requesting it, but without appearing to "advocate limitation of the black, brown, or yellow peoples."

But it required President Johnson's direct espousal to bring from the pigeonholes of congressional committees into open consideration the definite legislative proposals made by Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for the establishment of Government units specifically assigned to deal with the world population explosion and evolve the role of the United States in efforts to control it. For some years statistics collected and published by private organizations such as Population Reference Bureau, Inc., and Planned Parenthood have made the necessity of control appallingly plain. Yet, though those statistics demonstrated that the menace was steadily mounting, and more rapidly in areas where the bulk of U.S. aid is being dispensed the American political community continued to imitate the ostrich which thinks he will be spared by an indiscriminating predator by sticking his head in the sand.

The best analysis of the problem the subcommittee heard yesterday was from General Eisenhower, perhaps in proof of the axiom that there is no faith stronger than an honest convert's. "Since the earth is finite in area and physical resources," he said, "it is clear that unless something is done to bring an essential equilibrium between human requirements and available supply, there is going to be in some regions not only a series of riotous explosions but a lowering of standards of all peoples, including our own. If we now ignore the plight of unborn generations which, because of our unreadiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied all expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us."

DANGER OF DESPERATION

The condemnation, however, is not likely to await history, in the usual connotation of a century or more. In a few decades, at the present rate, even a concentration of aid from the nations which can afford it will not keep pace with the bare individual needs of the peoples that most require it. Then every self-sufficient nation, including the United States will be directly imperiled by the potentials of mass desperation created in three continents by starvation and endless penury.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1965]
MORE HEADWAY ON BIRTH CONTROL

American Indians, Eskimos, and natives of the islands the United States holds in trust in the Pacific have just been made beneficiaries of the first Federal program offering direct help in family planning and birth control. The announcement by Secretary of the Interior Udall that contraceptive advice and services will be made available, where desired, on reservations and in trust territories encourages hope that the taboos against birth-control programs will also crumble in such domestic undertakings as the war on poverty.

Congress can help by moving on some of the bills now before it to encourage wider dissemination of information on family planning in this country and in overseas areas afflicted by low incomes and expanding populations. Typical of most of these measures is one sponsored by Senator GRUENING of Alaska and seven other Senators, which calls for special offices in the State Department and in Health, Education, and Welfare to carry forward positive programs in this field.

Representative SCHEUER of New York has moved in another and equally important direction. He wants repeal of two 1873 Federal laws, both hangovers from the prudery of the Comstock era, that still technically ban importation, interstate transportation, and mailing of contraceptive devices and data. Even though time and court decisions have made the laws largely inoperative, they ought to be removed as a sign of congressional recognition that the 20th century has brought changed attitudes and needs.

New York State set an example last week by repealing its 84-year-old law against disseminating birth-control information. Colorado, Kansas, and Indiana had already taken similar action. The Supreme Court's decision invalidating Connecticut's law probably makes all such statutes unenforceable.

The need now at both Federal and State levels is for affirmative action to assist in family planning. As the distinguished committee on population of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council observed in a report last month: "The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right." Poverty and ignorance now stand as the principal obstacle to the exercise of that right by millions of Americans.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1965]
CUSHING SOFTENS BIRTH-CURB STAND

BOSTON, June 23.—Richard Cardinal Cushing, once strong against repealing the Massachusetts birth-control law, indicated yesterday that he had changed his thinking since the Vatican Council began a study of family planning.

Distraught mothers asking for specific guidance have been told by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston that he hopes the problem will be settled when the Second Vatican Council opens its fourth session on September 14.

In a radio interview yesterday, Cardinal Cushing said: "My sympathy and love goes out to those people who are having problems with large families, and who are worried sick about the church's teaching. I'm hoping and praying that all these problems will be settled by the commission's report."

The Cardinal appeared as a guest on the "Haywood Vincent Show," a conversation program on station WNAC. When one telephoner, a mother, asked if Catholics who had gone against the church's teaching in using contraceptives were guilty of mortal sin, the prelate answered, "Only God knows that, my dear."

At another point he said: "I do not see where I have the obligation to impose my will on those who do not accept the faith I do."

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1965]
UDALL URGES ACTION

ASPEN, COLO., June 23.—Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall called yesterday for an urgent effort by public and private agencies "to slow the critical population explosion in this hemisphere."

Secretary Udall's statement was jointly issued here at the close of a week-long conference on population growth in the Western Hemisphere, a meeting sponsored by the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

Mr. Udall and General Draper, chairman of the Presidential Committee on Foreign Aid, which was set up during the Eisenhower administration, said "it is now clear that a growing consensus is being reached in the United States on the need for more public and private action to reasonably limit population growth on a wholly voluntary basis."

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1965]
POPE TO REDEFINE BIRTH CURB STAND—SAYS HE HOPES TO ACT SOON—PRESSES COMMISSION TO RUSH STUDY OF SUBJECT

(By Robert C. Doty)

ROME, June 24.—Pope Paul VI said today that he hoped soon to be able to make a statement redefining the Roman Catholic teaching on birth control.

In a 3,000-word review of the many difficult problems facing the church in a world of flux, the Pope listed also the questions of marriages involving non-Catholics, reform of the Roman administration of the church and establishment of some form of consultative body of bishops in the spirit defined by the Ecumenical Council.

All of these, he indicated, require still further reflection.

Addressing 30 members of the College of Cardinals, the Pontiff also restated his overriding concern for world peace. He warned that nuclear weapons could end "not difficulties, but civilization," and he praised statesmen who take "bold and uncommon" initiatives for peace.

This seemed to allude most directly to Prime Minister Wilson's Commonwealth peace mission on Vietnam.

COMMISSION STUDY CONTINUING

On the birth-control issue, the Pontiff said the papal commission that had been studying

the question for more than a year had not yet completed its labors.

But he is pressing the clerical scientific and lay members of the commission with "respectful urgency," the Pope said, so that "we hope soon to be able to say our word, supported by the light of human science, as we ask the Lord that it should be by the light of His wisdom, on a theme of such vital importance."

The Pope gave no indication of the trend of his own thinking on maintenance or modification of the church's current absolute ban on any form of birth control except abstinence from sexual relations during female periods of fecundity. Some commission members are known to support the use of the pills or even more direct means of contraception.

The 30 cardinals had called on the Pope to express good wishes on his Saint's Day, that of St. John the Baptist. Pope Paul was christened Giovanni Battista (John the Baptist) in Italian Montini 67 years ago.

He spoke feelingly of "the bark of Peter [the church] sailing a stormy sea."

"Everything moves," he said. "Everything is a problem."

The modern world, he went on, raises "new questions of all kinds, rendered more acute for us who cannot fail to remain firm and faithful to a conception of the world and to a body of doctrine and precepts not only immutable but permanently current and thus rich in always new and coherent expressions."

This appeared to be a renewed warning that neither the pontiff nor the church could yield to the increasingly heavy pressure for merely rationalistic and materialistic solutions to world problems.

As an example of this pressure, the pontiff recently received appeals from 78 Nobel Prize winners in science for modification of the church ban on chemical and mechanical birth control.

The Pope seemed to postpone decision on questions involving marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics with the statement that it was "a delicate question that demands some more reflection."

During the Ecumenical Council's third session last fall, a majority of bishops expressed the desire for some liberalization of the rules in this domain.

They approved a "wish," passed on to the Pope, for changes requiring only the Catholic partner to make formal pledges to raise children in the Catholic faith instead of both partners, as at present.

They asked also a liberalization of the rules regarding the legality, if not the validity, of marriages contracted before a non-Catholic clergyman.

The American hierarchy was split on this issue.

Spokesmen for about half the American bishops warned that relaxation of the present rules might do "serious spiritual harm" in a country of multidominational religious composition wherein mixed marriages were frequent. Other American churchmen sided with the majority for change.

Indirectly, the Pope urged patience, too, on two other church issues—reform of the Curia, the central administration, and establishment of some body of bishops to give expression to the principle of their collective authority, voted by the council.

Under study, he said, is a statute for an episcopal conference from which would evolve "one of the forms of better collaboration with our brothers of the episcopacy."

Establishment of the principle that the bishops collectively with the Pope—but never without him—formed the ruling college of the church in emulation of St. Peter and the original apostles was the major accomplishment of the council last year. Its implementation, which would almost certainly

reduce the Roman and Italian dominance in the church, has been opposed by conservatives.

There is similar resistance to the Pope's expressed intention to reorganize and internationalize the predominantly Italian and conservative Curia.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the decisionmaking process of farm legislation for 1966 and following years is now in operation and will reach its consummation in the next month or two.

General hearings are underway in the Senate Agriculture Committee, while a farm bill has already begun to take shape in the House Agriculture Committee.

This Congress must act, not only because some of the basic legislation expires at the end of this calendar year, but because farm income is still low by whatever measurement might be applied—whether by the U.S. parity ratio, by comparisons with earnings of skilled nonfarm workers, or by statistics of median incomes in our rural counties.

Farm net income in each of the years since 1961 has been about \$1 billion higher than prevailed in 1960 because of the programs carried out by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

However, on-farm costs have also continued to advance, reaching new record highs. As a result, a shocking proportion of our farmers fall into the income level below \$3,000 a year—a dividing line which, for the purpose of many programs, is considered the poverty level.

I am not talking about marginal, inefficient or part-time farmers, even though the part-time farmer is having income trouble—the small farmer is having income trouble—and their situation needs to be dealt with. The price support program alone is not the complete answer for these people. Specialized income, credit, and economic opportunity measures can help in this sector.

We must be concerned today with the situation of the full-time commercial family farmer, the farmer who needs a fair return for his products, so that he can have a standard of living more nearly comparable with that of the skilled worker in the cities.

It is a well-known fact that the number of farmers has been declining for many years.

It has been assumed superficially by many that the outmigration from farming has principally been from the ranks of the marginal, part-time, residential or retirement farmers—and it is true that some of these people have left the farm.

But surprisingly, the total number of these marginal farm operators has stayed relatively constant over a period of years, and it is from the middle group of farmers—the commercial family farmers—that the great exodus has taken place.

The question still remains: How many farmers do we need to do the job of providing adequate supplies of food and fiber, plus reasonable reserves, at a fair price to the Nation's industries and consumers?

The distinguished former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Ad-

visers, Dr. Leon H. Keyserling appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last Friday, and in the course of an able and comprehensive statement on the proposed farm bill, offered some significant comments on the number of farmers we ought to have. He declared that our policy should be to reasonably stabilize our farm population.

Dr. Keyserling said:

Despite the amazing advance of farm technology, we need considerable expansion of acreage and livestock breeding units, and a virtual stabilization of the farm population, looking forward to 1970 and 1975, if we are to have a healthy and serviceable agricultural sector in a fully employed American economy, make due allowance for adequate food reserves, and contribute effectively to the war against starvation and poverty in other areas of the world. Even if this were not true, and it is true, we should recognize the urgency of efforts to rehabilitate and utilize our farm people where they now are. This holds far more promise on all scores than to continue to believe that farm people or others can be helped by the continued massive flow of unfortunate human beings from the farms to the cities and other industrial areas, where the new technology and automation are presenting a difficult enough challenge on the job front without compounding this problem by the influx of dispossessed farm people.

He made the point that it is better, both economically and socially, to maintain these people on the farm where they can be used productively, since they cannot be employed in urban labor markets.

Most people still believe and I am emphatically among that group that our agriculture is and should be based upon a family farm system; that is, families owning, living on, and cultivating the land.

If we agree on this fundamental premise, then we must examine the extent to which existing farm programs are assisting in strengthening the income of commercial family farmers.

A careful examination of the frequency distribution of the feed grains base acres in each of the Minnesota counties, in which the production of feed grains is substantial and in which program payments totaled \$1 million for the year, shows that in the 42 principal feed grains counties in Minnesota, an average of 80 percent of the payments went to cooperating producers with a base acreage of 200 acres or less.

Rather than 80 percent of the money going to large farmers who do not need it, the bulk of the payments, as high as 96 and 97 percent, went to typical family farm operators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print table 1 at this point in the RECORD. Table 1 shows the percentage of payments going to feed grains producers with a base of 200 acres or less.

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

TABLE 1.—Feed grains program, 1964—Major Minnesota counties (percentage of program payments to farm with base acres of 200 or less)		Percent
Blue Earth	-----	81
Brown	-----	96
Carver	-----	93

TABLE 1.—Feed grains program, 1964—Major Minnesota counties (percentage of program payments to farm with base acres of 200 or less)—Continued

	Percent
Chippewa.....	85
Cottonwood.....	85
Dakota.....	89
Dodge.....	87
Faribault.....	80
Fillmore.....	96
Freeborn.....	90
Goodhue.....	93
Houston.....	96
Jackson.....	76
Kandiyohi.....	98
Lac qui Parle.....	88
Le Sueur.....	90
Lincoln.....	93
Lyon.....	70
McLeod.....	97
Martin.....	72
Meeker.....	93
Mower.....	88
Murray.....	89
Nicollet.....	88
Nobles.....	80
Olmsted.....	90
Pipestone.....	71
Redwood.....	81
Renville.....	76
Rice.....	97
Rock.....	86
Scott.....	97
Sibley.....	94
Stearns.....	95
Steele.....	88
Swift.....	82
Wabasha.....	98
Waseca.....	89
Watonwan.....	96
Winona.....	94
Wright.....	96
Yellow Medicine.....	82

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the problems which we have in the Congress and on the Agricultural Committees is that the vast amount of statistical data available to us always deals in averages, in samples, in estimates and projections. The data which comes from the Department of Agriculture and from the Census Bureau is valuable and is accurate to the best of the ability of competent researchers and economists.

It is worthwhile on occasion to go beyond the statistical tables—the typical and the averages—and see how the living, breathing individual is doing.

I wish at this time to recommend to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the reports from an accumulation of economic case histories of individual farms in every agricultural county of my State.

This project was carried out by one of our effective farm organizations in Minnesota—the Minnesota Farmers Union—and by its constructive and imaginative State president, Mr. Edwin Christianson.

In this effort, individual farmers were asked to supply data on the location of their farm, the acres being farmed, investment in farm plant, farm debt, and then to copy off from their 1964 schedule F form, the farm income and expenses for the year.

Schedule F shows the income from sales of crops, livestock, dairy and poultry and other commodities, together with other farm income, such as agricultural program payments, patronage refunds, and pay for machine work.

It also shows farm expense for the year, such as labor, repairs, interest, feed, seeds and plants, fertilizer, supplies, machine hire, gasoline, fuel and oil, storage, taxes, insurance, transportation, and conservation expenses.

Many hundreds of farmers cooperated in divulging these operating facts about their farms. Many of those who submitted balance sheets for their farms made additional comments.

Although it was suggested that the name of the farm not be identified, one farmer from McLeod County signed his name to the report and said:

I am signing my name because the figures might not be believed otherwise.

A Steele County farmer in one of the most productive areas of the State, reported a net loss for the year and added that both he and his wife are working off the farm in order to meet payments as they come due. He said:

We would like to make the farm pay its way.

A Red Lake farmer asked:

What would I have done without the farm program payments?

A Todd County farmer listed several thousands of dollars in needed farm buildings and improvements, but said a new barn and machine shed have had to wait because with farm prices as they are, "by the time we paid other expenses each year, there was not anything left to build with."

A Dodge County farmer who was able to show a net income only because of substantial farm program payments, wrote in huge letters across his return "Keep farm supports we need them."

A Norman County farmer asked:

How can we keep going paying on a \$39,000 farm debt when our net income is only \$2,300 a year?

His report showed interest payments of nearly \$1,900 for the year.

A Marshall County farmer, who netted \$1,622 for the year said:

If it had not been for the farm programs, I would have been \$660 in the red.

A McLeod County farmer reported:

I have a \$100,000 investment and I netted \$1,732. I would have been better off putting the money in the bank on interest, rather than farming.

A Murray County farm, which showed a \$4,190 loss, reported:

This operation is a full-time job with no other income.

A Todd County farmer attached to his return, a grocery bill for \$10.48 which he purchased on the same day that he marketed 44 dozen of eggs. He said:

The income from the eggs did not bring in enough to pay for the groceries.

A Swift County farmer said:

The home we live in is 70 years old—no money to fix it—or to build a granary or henhouse we need.

A Stevens County farmer commented:

As you see, I made 2.5 percent on my investment, not counting anything for labor.

A Marshall County farmer declared:

Off-farm income kept us alive this year.

A Steele County farmer said:

Everything is worn out and should all be replaced. I have \$15,000 in equipment, repairs, and remodeling which would be done if I had the income.

A Pennington County farmer said:

Two of us have to work in town to meet our farm expenses.

A Marshall County farmer declared:

I work 12 to 18 hours a day and don't earn as much as a fellow working 8 hours a day at \$1.25 an hour.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of pertinent figures from these economic case histories of Minnesota farmers.

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

WHY FARMERS NEED HELP—THE FACTS ABOUT FARM INCOME IN 1964—ACTUAL OPERATING FIGURES FROM MINNESOTA FARMS, WITH 1964 GROSS AND NET INCOME AS REPORTED ON SCHEDULE F TAX FORM

INTRODUCTION

Here are operating figures supplied by Minnesota farm operators from their record books and their schedule F Federal income tax forms in response to a plea by Minnesota Farmers Union for them to "lay the facts on the line."

Each line in the tabulations below represents an individual farm and shows the acreage being farmed, the total farm investment, farm debt, gross farm income, farming expenses, net farm income, and USDA farm program payments.

These are actual economic case histories of how farmers fared in 1964, the unvarnished truth about farm income.

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments
Atkin County:							Benton County:						
400.....	\$45,070		\$25,552	\$28,369	-\$2,816	\$60	160.....	\$27,000	\$9,000	\$6,000	\$5,125	\$885	
770.....	26,675	\$9,713	10,600	9,118	1,472	200	400.....	53,652	8,352	8,901	7,135	1,746	\$7,309
200.....	43,500	13,000	4,257	6,257	-2,127	72	520.....	23,000	3,500	7,367	5,923	1,439	436
240.....	45,000	7,000	5,926	4,294	1,623	57	Becker County:						
240.....	24,000		7,203	5,328	1,875	107	693.....	110,800	27,200	24,902	16,007	8,895	3,165
228.....	22,890	2,000	6,186	5,469	717	60	160.....	8,800	1,200	2,000	1,593	383	153
224.....	15,750		6,348	2,951	3,397		160.....	44,000		4,778	4,267	502	81
Anoka County:							160.....	12,000	1,000	3,627	2,696	931	
240.....	59,000	10,000	10,041	8,694	1,346	1,456	340.....	37,105	12,500	5,291	3,295	2,085	222
500.....	32,500	14,500	6,966	4,782	2,184	109	166.....	25,420	3,815	5,245	2,702	2,543	27

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres, being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments
Becker—Con.							Cottonwood County:						
287	\$42,500	\$52,500	\$2,196	\$2,367	-\$171	\$279	40	\$18,330		\$3,284	\$1,608	\$1,672	\$305
640	116,000	40,000	11,300	9,952	1,347		247	11,340	\$1,400	13,283	11,900	1,383	1,394
340	37,150	12,500	5,291	3,205	2,085	222	320	67,465	26,093	22,620	20,966	1,653	2,384
160	24,500	8,000	4,806	5,553	-746	885	240	10,500	3,500	3,976	2,959	1,020	782
730	49,000	24,000	12,770	8,419	4,360	2,098	240	84,000	17,000	18,421	17,665	755	959
480	40,660	20,800	9,176	8,057	1,119	849	320	79,000	45,000	17,330	16,458	872	3,904
Beltrami County:							Crow Wing County:						
505	31,500	3,500	9,090	8,029	1,060	332	320	47,266	12,870	15,110	11,690	3,449	938
820	38,000	2,400	6,587	5,816	771	604	480	104,500	42,000	19,414	15,711	3,702	4,795
320	31,000	2,000	6,858	4,457	2,401	74	160	48,000	7,700	8,934	3,662	5,272	1,498
1,030	61,328		22,185	13,898	8,286	5,381	160	104,000		9,602	9,985	-382	
Big Stone County:							Dakota County:						
240	73,000		4,858	5,170	311	859	160	63,025		5,952	9,027	-3,075	2,400
435	97,000	29,000	14,973	11,530	3,443	682	200		37,000	8,016	15,635	-7,619	1,600
400	64,400	5,500	12,568	8,237	4,330	2,119	320		4,000	6,454	6,001	453	1,171
320			16,623	13,801	2,822	975	80		9,000	11,000	10,616	10,438	178
480	80,000	14,000	8,503	6,304	2,198	1,047	240		37,500	6,179	6,609	-429	556
320	45,000	30,000	13,812	10,777	3,035	2,581	240		37,500	10,102	8,457	1,645	248
400	45,000	2,000	21,470	16,888	5,996	2,039	160		39,500	13,000	10,701	9,671	1,029
100	65,000	25,000	11,429	8,918	2,511	660	770		98,446	20,000	16,336	11,532	4,803
460	28,720	4,000	8,492	6,555	1,936	375	290		31,710	1,800	7,983	6,794	1,209
190	13,700	5,250	4,646	2,073	1,470	491	240		29,900		5,657	4,375	1,281
320	24,000	11,000	6,208	6,389	-181	656							
160	27,500	2,258	2,182	2,395	-212	284	Dodge County:						
320	60,000	29,600	15,486	12,697	2,785	2,433	200		65,000	37,000	8,016	15,635	-7,619
395	76,000	21,000	12,242	11,790	452	3,010	320		71,000	4,000	6,454	6,001	453
690	75,000	45,000	24,860	22,506	1,854	1,262	200		33,000	11,000	10,616	10,438	178
480	18,000	7,900	16,645	12,482	4,158	965	80		36,000	4,000	4,138	2,899	1,238
694	53,717	25,926	10,070	11,994	-1,923	1,904	200		62,000		7,914	5,181	2,732
450	19,050	6,000	7,781	7,551	230	996	260		55,350	8,600	13,693	11,622	2,071
352	50,000	36,000	15,310	12,244	3,066	1,443	240		114,925		15,470	15,505	-35
400	110,329		15,806	11,480	4,326	1,324	Douglas County:						
600	61,000	18,500	16,233	13,446	2,787	563	381		34,315	4,100	10,668	9,762	960
351	49,100		9,515	11,001	-1,486	1,114	155		42,000	10,000	9,778	9,105	673
480	10,350	7,800	5,750	6,204	-453	883	200		50,000	15,000	10,960	9,225	1,734
Blue Earth County:							Faribault County:						
280	66,000	28,000	18,318	12,864	5,454	2,239	200		190,800	66,000	37,488	34,346	3,152
160	49,000		3,164	1,380	1,783	277	200		86,000	24,000	23,996	19,844	4,151
160	58,000		12,306	10,322	1,983	1,140	380		126,100	80,000	15,322	14,105	2,938
280	137,462	18,000	24,699	21,104	3,594	1,430	130		124,000	22,000	18,499	18,073	425
160	70,000		8,226	4,732	3,493	1,288	200		158,000	47,000	29,072	25,932	3,140
200	60,100	34,600	19,626	22,519	2,893	2,406	104		37,000	1,500	5,076	3,942	1,134
130	180,000	5,580	12,529	10,378	2,151		104		26,500	4,500	4,376	2,892	1,484
200			8,028	4,191	3,827	509	154		51,500		11,979	17,550	-6,136
120	25,800	4,700	11,164	8,191	2,850	531	240		89,960	27,000	13,825	15,781	-1,956
60	14,512		2,657	1,197	1,460	344	320		108,750	52,000	18,225	17,023	1,201
512	244,800		45,000	15,695	29,304	5,300	200		62,000		11,870	9,856	2,013
200	70,000	35,000	26,000	22,477	3,523	2,500	154		15,000		2,306	2,306	995
280	101,000	9,000	11,999	11,098	1,011		200		35,000	1,200	4,188	3,546	586
160	36,000	2,000	3,720	4,619	893	387	400		82,900	32,690	12,745	12,298	447
310	93,500	29,000	18,351	17,235	1,116	1,166	225		47,300		10,459	6,371	4,088
Brown County:							Fillmore County:						
160	22,000		6,441	1,702	4,738	1,498	280		8,950	5,936	6,032	3,535	2,496
240	23,274	23,274	12,997	13,774	-995	645	330		66,000	30,000	17,252	16,350	902
240	106,500	11,000	12,814	9,046	2,767	1,777	240		49,490	8,298	11,094	9,388	1,705
160	20,000	1,900	4,707	2,209	1,997		160		44,500	20,000	10,964	11,824	-806
Carver County:							Freeborn County:						
230	42,000	7,500	15,384	11,897	3,487	1,452	120		30,000	6,000	3,907	3,467	1,312
160	47,448	2,800	14,698	14,002	696	1,363	215		54,000	28,000	14,589	14,358	1,530
80	42,000		4,768	2,630	1,650	4,768	200		54,000	12,800	9,243	7,663	1,579
Carlton County:							Goodhue County:						
292	35,400	3,500	9,304	7,854	1,450	14	280		158,000	47,000	29,072	25,932	3,140
80	8,000		604	1,159	-554	12	320		171,451	38,500	27,370	27,889	-518
160	6,500		2,701	1,691	1,010	20	240		27,000	8,500	16,957	12,571	4,385
200			6,182	5,211	971	71	315		8,500	6,600	11,667	10,625	1,041
Cass County:							Grant County:						
238	29,500	9,500	7,416	5,049	2,367	197	146		39,100	16,000	4,406	5,333	-1,127
80	12,300		1,771	1,241	529	394	180		21,250	2,000	16,224	13,504	2,719
Chisago County:							Hibbing County:						
210	54,940		9,721	8,563	1,157	1,636	159		10,000	500	6,145	4,373	1,571
540	65,000	28,750	15,620	14,978	642	74	392		129,500	60,000	17,662	14,152	3,510
220	29,450	17,900	15,645	10,891	4,753	22	280		8,950	5,936	6,032	3,535	2,496
100	32,000	20,000	5,683	4,111	1,472	841	330		66,000	30,000	17,252	16,350	902
350	38,150	16,000	3,966	5,153	1,187		160		44,500	20,000	10,964	11,824	-806
Clay County:							Iron County:						
470	58,987	22,000	13,965	8,323	5,642	1,295	260		75,000	1,800	5,649	2,672	1,926
280	53,000	21,500	11,723	8,043	3,679	827	281		17,600	4,050	8,965	6,146	2,819
480	52,200	29,800	12,200	10,953	1,248	1,148	290		68,000	20,000	16,822	14,069	2,753
Clearwater County:							Jackson County:						
720	27,320	2,863	4,506	3,475	1,030	70	240		12,500	4,500	10,250	8,937	1,312
280	25,606	1,800	4,825	4,517	308		514		67,000	30,000	30,261	28,089	2,172
320	35,570	19,586	9,337	6,964	2,372		440		111,000	15,000	9,468	9,216	215
180	35,950	26,000	9,068	7,622	1,446	571	120		24,000	14,000	4,530	4,292	237
464	43,000	700	5,453	4,019	1,434	496	200		75,960	2,500	8,066	5,920	2,146
285	23,500		7,067	4,349	2,687	444	325		57,536	20,000	10,459	10,963	-503
639	35,160	14,700	9,798	8,099	1,699	393	200		36,000	23,800	7,495	6,447	1,047
Chippewa County:							Le Sueur County:						
200	73,000	14,000	12,216	10,218	1,995	1,313	120		30,000	6,000	3,907	3,467	1,312
200	9,300		10,680	9,550	1,129	510	215		54,000	28,00			

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	
Goodhue County:							Kandiyohi—Con.							
80	\$13,000	\$5,800	\$3,733	\$3,448	—\$287	\$576	160	\$53,500	\$22,235	\$15,011	\$15,108	—\$97	-----	
300	41,000	15,000	12,715	10,014	2,700	1,681	140	54,300	6,500	6,806	6,063	742	-----	
160	39,000	14,000	11,054	5,408	5,645	1,182	630	140,500	32,000	45,304	46,762	-1,457	\$5,953	
80	20,800		4,900	975	3,925	1,000	230	102,000	14,750	15,534	1,252	2,684	852	
240	33,000	25,000	7,865	9,843	-1,977	1,634		112,500	26,000	12,720	10,429	2,290	1,107	
162	54,500		9,677	6,331	3,346	1,501	185			10,023	7,015	3,007	-----	
120	30,000	6,000	7,375	3,907	3,467	1,312	280	50,000	40,500	12,767	14,454	-1,687	-----	
240	95,000	16,000	9,379	1,210	2,467	1,125	140	51,025	4,000	6,662	4,833	1,829	347	
140	47,100		9,797	10,629	-831	1,467	476	114,500		19,694	16,501	3,193	1,807	
160	24,000	11,500	2,992	2,605	386	601	320	84,250	54,400	32,157	28,785	3,372	3,447	
240	16,500		7,505	3,752	3,752		470	123,180	108,777	43,980	45,747	-1,767	-----	
Grant County:							Kittson County:							
520			8,405	6,505	1,900	724	385			18,900	14,034	11,743	2,290	3,276
640	50,636	15,000	7,160	6,986	173	1,146	1,281	16,700		17,741	14,889	2,851	2,403	
237	13,376	3,068	4,797	3,007	1,790	310	960	207,000		33,381	25,955	7,425	9,046	
317	37,000	10,000	18,039	14,369	3,670	502	360	36,700		11,711	8,287	3,423	450	
110	18,000		4,828	5,109	-280	56	1,300	54,864	54,864	12,255	15,935	3,677	1,469	
200	60,000	12,000	8,109	6,870	1,238	814	360	31,200	5,160	3,176	3,078	98	348	
180	44,000	10,000	5,765	3,843	1,922	3,092	240	47,300	12,000	6,108	4,812	1,296	505	
430	61,000	40,000	17,142	14,406	2,736	680	460	2,462		12,041	8,152	3,888	2,015	
350	27,000	25,600	4,164	6,850	-2,686	1,547	320	79,300	33,000	19,003	15,157	3,846	2,573	
156	40,000		4,694	2,278	2,415	528	800	22,978	26,215	7,409	7,072	336	-----	
280	68,000	8,000	6,899	6,611	2,288	1,257	660	108,000	35,000	17,491	13,725	3,766	3,617	
490	49,430	19,050	14,963	12,448	2,514	1,438		35,000	4,500	9,053	6,082	2,971	86	
Hennepin County:							Lac Qui Parle County:							
120	67,000	12,000	10,732	8,811	1,921	-----	520	68,375	25,000	9,155	8,857	305	2,307	
Houston County:							Lake of the Woods County:							
440	177,080	48,000	21,142	21,156	-14	56	306	16,000	8,000	9,051	5,428	3,623	836	
520	76,325	7,250	20,543	13,004	7,449	965	320	64,000	40,000	16,365	12,725	3,639	2,531	
80	4,575		3,315	1,822	1,492	-----	382	51,000	41,000	10,165	8,840	1,325	3,081	
160	80,200		13,894	13,472	4,422	1,020	360	67,000	27,000	12,853	8,974	3,879	1,907	
279		0	7,269	5,590	1,678	1,130	616	81,868	2,500	8,409	5,771	2,638	1,330	
161	25,018	900	4,227	4,901	1,584	-----	220	34,000	17,000	11,066	8,879	2,187	94	
230	83,000		9,330	4,901	4,429	-----	160	18,450	1,800	1,666	1,567	98	-----	
190	90,000	40,800	14,279	12,428	1,851	5,372	240	60,000		16,634	7,463	9,170	1,549	
1,080	189,000	120,000	34,128	33,940	187	481	100	24,490		4,885	3,619	1,265	684	
170	43,000		8,556	9,697	2,553	481	400			11,983	8,965	3,018	979	
80	35,000		17,674	17,896	-222	755	320	35,500	23,000	8,481	6,609	1,172	673	
210	52,000	9,000	11,921	10,061	1,859	-----	340			7,246	3,020	4,217	1,348	
160	62,128	49,972	8,164	6,449	1,615	-----	280	23,500		6,455	5,378	1,077	886	
Hubbard County:							Lake of the Woods County:							
260	22,000		4,205	3,526	679	877	480	23,838	4,555	15,305	16,414	1,109	1,098	
195	22,000		4,130	3,575	554	13	300	62,500		14,302	9,781	4,521	1,688	
336	40,360	1,300	9,442	7,628	1,813	2,902	340	100,000	30,000	9,144	6,554	2,589	-----	
219	16,100	4,800	1,704	1,239	465	-----	255	65,700	25,000	12,058	9,128	2,930	942	
443	51,000		5,532	4,353	1,279	1,034	240	13,000	13,000	12,385	11,601	784	-----	
Itasca County:							Lake of the Woods County:							
420	15,450		3,562	2,000	1,562	47	600	110,000	3,000	9,162	13,040	-3,877	1,869	
440	27,000		1,743	1,088	961	1,480	160	20,350		3,284	1,960	1,323	41	
200	21,400	1,200	2,100	1,763	337	-----	320	36,500		2,625	3,248	-623	-----	
Isanti County:							Le Sueur County:							
120	27,000	13,000	2,820	4,651	1,659	831	220	93,331	37,000	11,642	9,162	2,479	434	
160	28,000	5,500	6,581	4,616	1,934	-----	160	55,000	38,700	9,043	8,621	422	717	
390	176,000	49,000	17,287	15,708	1,579	2,732	760	64,700	15,600	7,933	7,008	924	886	
104	17,894	2,253	2,855	1,673	1,182	-----	550	32,620	5,200	6,068	5,573	495	215	
80	25,345	4,400	3,779	3,269	510	321	740	53,000	18,000	5,498	7,671	-2,172	182	
100	12,000	1,000	1,400	1,715	-315	-----	280	21,911	11,687	4,809	4,078	730	-----	
240	14,000		2,377	3,319	-942	-----	120	13,800	4,000	2,207	1,346	861	46	
85	12,364	5,250	1,811	3,353	-1,542	-----	560	44,400	1,000	9,274	7,289	1,985	423	
263	19,000	9,500	13,688	11,234	2,453	91	495	38,500	9,900	8,922	6,085	2,936	294	
116	53,000	9,500	14,011	9,185	4,826	500	360	32,000	24,000	6,366	5,357	1,009	311	
Jackson County:							Le Sueur County:							
240	160,529	20,200	6,540	12,894	-6,353	1,369	222	25,300	9,000	3,631	3,059	571	108	
240	16,169		10,716	7,313	3,403	1,369	360	26,000	22,000	11,185	11,356	-170	442	
180	11,220		3,200	6,037	-473	1,175	319	34,475	1,870	3,953	3,378	575	321	
480	28,000	8,000	23,070	15,980	7,089	1,246	280	20,700	9,093	3,997	2,941	1,056	372	
590	212,180	101,953	36,786	33,305	3,481	1,378	360	41,000	20,000	8,369	7,193	1,176	751	
240	5,000	1,600	8,005	6,025	1,985	-----	400	70,000	25,000	7,100	8,301	-1,135	1,924	
160	16,000	1,800	12,744	1,965	1,785	-----	220	93,331	37,000	11,642	9,162	2,479	434	
256	30,000		14,167	7,278	859	-----	160	55,000	38,700	9,043	8,621	422	717	
240	80,000	79,372	10,861	9,368	1,492	565	135	44,500		9,514	9,486	28	633	
320	63,315	30,374	18,691	17,651	1,039	3,201	208	86,000	1,000	12,855	9,076	3,779	176	
260	87,000	77,000	23,449	13,377	10,071	2,500	305	130,615	21,000	17,087	18,729	-1,641	2,645	
Kanabec County:							Le Sueur County:							
150	25,000	8,500	4,626	4,899	-272	393	170	41,000	3,700	9,803	8,223	1,201	1,032	
80	12,000	6,000	5,489	3,415	2,073	-----	224	63,800	9,300	10,753	9,077	1,675	542	
160	40,000	15,000	8,358	7,417	941	-----	232	70,000	10,000	10,190	9,485	705	-----	
790	39,775	4,800	12,980	11,541	1,438	146	385	208,498	67,862	25,957	25,030	927	159	
240	25,356	950	5,595	5,925	-330	-----	540	565,000	172,500	92,872	114,153	-21,280	-----	
Kandiyohi County:							Lincoln County:							
220	62,000	30,000	17,499	11,851	5,648	2,560	320	46,000	16,000	12,114	10,383	1,731	1,596	
226	53,073	13,000	9,519	8,570	948	569		125,000	10,500	8,550	10,025	-1,175	2,250	
470	14,710	100	11,984	7,063	4,920	3,031	320	125,000	36,000	12,531	13,858	-1,327	1,221	
169	43,500	8,000	11,596	8,450	3,146	-----	160	34,000	11,000	6,456	5,625	631	-----	
40	19,000	1,000	3,294	2,394	999	115	160	48,000	16,700	9,465	5,881	3,484	665	
160														

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments
Lyon County:							Murray County:						
240	\$83,000	\$35,000	\$9,059	\$10,655	\$1,596	\$1,728	161	\$44,300	\$36,000	\$4,615	\$4,667	-\$52	
210	58,600	5,000	8,307	6,477	1,830		320	67,955	10,150	9,717	6,891	2,825	\$2,249
320	44,450	14,500	12,039	12,608	360	800	200	75,000	11,000	11,304	10,451	853	1,056
116	19,100	1,800	4,491	4,117	343	855	400	89,469	36,320	12,010	16,200	-4,190	59
290	42,450	12,900	10,758	13,212	2,453	625	240	95,000	23,000	22,269	19,433	2,835	2,400
280	10,336	12,630	17,315	14,102	3,212	1,726	155	39,945	8,817	8,367	4,553	3,814	564
225	29,200	29,200	11,455	10,385	1,070	1,023	160	26,951	5,000	8,262	8,047	-214	99
328	89,250	8,500	12,132	10,007	2,045	2,523	Nicollet County:						
240	32,500	16,000	9,889	8,190	1,659	1,357	240	61,400	30,000	23,320	18,309	5,011	3,662
320	51,090	10,000	12,604	8,282	4,321	2,753	197	85,000	25,000	19,123	16,653	2,469	805
Mahnomen County:							250	79,500	10,200	21,663	13,483	8,179	620
440	61,500	15,000	13,766	10,506	3,260	160	700	200,000		32,501	35,164	-2,663	
231	50,000	9,000	7,253	6,095	1,158	677	193	88,573		12,840	12,128	712	1,513
Marshall County:							Nobles County:						
560	63,000	15,000	13,831	12,297	1,534	251	232	43,000	4,350	8,946	7,543	1,403	
560	34,507	22,900	16,078	14,455	1,622	2,281	160	39,800	18,000	7,933	5,165	2,769	706
480	58,000	16,000	11,241	10,594	647	2,180	160	17,000	6,000	11,145	8,315	2,830	
183	12,600	4,800	4,143	2,948	1,194	86	140	23,365	6,500	30,777	27,416	3,361	236
480	42,479	27,830	13,880	11,941	1,939		640	205,000	100,000	47,746	48,640	-893	38,899
307	44,000	14,000	8,815	7,580	1,237	526	552	150,500	49,000	50,041	28,790	21,221	2,956
31,200			2,386	3,270	-834	135	Norman County:						
600	95,000	72,000	10,548	12,115	-1,567	279	500	57,500		10,371	6,961	3,410	905
297	23,500		3,335	1,967	1,368	607	440	51,000	2,000	10,357	7,215	3,142	2,446
680	51,980		8,479	7,118	1,361	418	480	76,180	52,300	15,155	14,232	896	474
185	15,000		2,106	1,253	852	167	600	72,180	26,683	20,292	16,323	3,968	
640	36,600	35,600	4,952	5,148	-195	3,880	320	23,000	3,200	6,030	4,615	1,605	1,035
450	45,000	15,000	12,070	9,724	2,346	592	320	74,000	12,000	8,122	7,283	767	1,126
400	25,400	23,000	5,703	4,026	1,677	431	970	66,380	38,400	28,375	27,228	1,147	2,919
450	57,000	18,000	8,099	7,944	154	311	560	109,000	30,000	14,643	11,506	3,337	582
240	38,593	890	10,144	5,905	4,239	204	570	102,500	10,000	8,226	6,968	1,257	1,900
320	14,000	780	5,803	3,751	2,052		170	20,800	7,000	7,568	4,033	3,535	694
640	74,050	46,800	27,423	25,423	2,000	2,186	355	45,710	3,965	8,686	5,818	2,868	898
460	94,000		11,620	6,451	5,168	2,151	512	57,350	29,100	14,474	11,217	3,257	850
320	76,000		10,958	6,952	4,006	2,335	Olmsted County:						
60,120		6,350	9,783	8,188	1,595	237	160	33,000	26,000	11,585	8,314	3,270	1,510
480	91,000		6,975	6,781	194	14	316	72,204	3,200	13,870	11,708	2,162	
360	21,920	4,100	2,862	2,606	256	110	160	24,500	1,500	6,356	3,873	2,482	
420	4,000	4,000	4,593	3,697	895	250	320	75,000	20,000	7,990	7,471	512	2,312
490	34,106	8,300	8,284	6,659	1,624	80	Ottawa County:						
760	47,000	22,000	4,875	4,883	7	16	380	57,000		8,827	6,131	2,696	260
1,040	74,000	44,000	20,065	17,632	2,433	400	270	37,350	3,000	10,460	7,500	2,960	100
200	18,500	8,000	5,760	3,655	2,105		90	10,500	4,800	4,966	2,891	2,074	
330	88,550	1,500	4,468	3,194	1,274	2,531	140	35,030		3,472	2,780	712	522
900	102,000	15,000	17,333	15,030	2,295	3,052	340	60,500	10,000	11,024	6,571	4,452	101
480	39,450	10,000	6,965	4,937	2,028	1,854	986	97,516	19,600	19,020	17,576	1,444	2,651
240	27,000	3,000	899	1,147	248	49	215			1,096	2,243	-1,147	333
240	38,593	89	10,144	5,905	4,239	204	246	53,925	14,000	13,189	9,653	3,535	
Martin County:							123	16,500	5,500	18,131	5,237	2,595	289
360	54,200		24,922	12,904	12,508	1,575	160	31,500	2,000	4,063	3,359	704	145
120	12,153	3,240	8,162	8,022	137	1,665	560	98,555		11,468	7,558	3,909	218
80	27,225	13,400	4,541	4,295	245	887	495	55,000	2,000	8,427	6,002	2,420	697
880	130,000	50,000	48,900	37,260	11,700	12,000	232	12,450	2,700	2,678	2,017	660	399
McLeod County:							320	53,000	15,000	9,477	8,670	806	
260	66,445		9,955	7,883	2,072	2,207	Pennington County:						
120	48,400		13,864	13,094	770	1,255	320			3,363	2,399	963	543
100	59,150	5,000	5,618	5,577	41	437	440	34,900		9,891	7,100	2,791	895
150	55,000	30,000	17,344	13,611	3,733	1,648	160	36,000	600	5,901	5,930	-29	665
90			4,296	2,732	1,564		580	62,000	18,000	15,713	11,701	4,012	1,050
300	118,000	25,000	17,438	16,638	800	949	322	56,000	560	4,370	5,000	-1,530	-143
80	30,527	6,300	4,668	3,103	1,564		160			1,670	1,875	-205	
80	35,500	12,000	8,358	6,502	1,856		760	78,400	7,000	16,511	10,410	6,100	1,374
160	56,000	30,000	17,665	16,145	1,520	1,315	400	66,323	13,000	-7,379	8,739	-1,359	188
190	51,000		3,662	2,773	889		540	46,000	6,174	6,154	7,651	-1,497	468
245	78,000	20,000	14,000	12,267	1,732	1,715	640	118,294	5,836	5,534	301	274	
67	30,000		5,217	4,028	1,188	647	400	40,200	5,800	7,328	4,320	3,008	2,084
155	66,000	33,000	13,499	9,592	3,906		44,000	44,000	2,000	5,645	6,041	-308	172
120	58,500	6,200	9,630	9,154	476		320	71,700	32,900	19,689	22,229	-2,540	48
Meeker County:							207	24,700	8,000	5,470	4,938	1,179	144
240		2,000	2,224	1,729	494	1,346	240			2,167	1,787	379	475
260	74,375	19,000	16,389	14,212	2,176	61	250	60,000	9,000	13,998	13,627	371	420
141	39,666	800	8,460	6,420	2,040	900	Pine County:						
200		5,000	8,505	8,345	159	331	640	129,000	8,500	12,239	8,144	4,095	4,180
360	113,900		14,272	11,577	2,695	2,134	1,080	41,180	23,057	27,916	22,909	5,006	
160	47,000	24,000	14,140	12,811	1,328	854	200			6,000	5,546	3,562	1,953
260			5,934	6,117	-183	769	440	21,500	4,500	6,544	6,766	-222	61
180	52,000		6,645	4,291	2,343	429	120	42,000	30,000	13,932	9,918	4,013	
520	80,500	15,025	11,661	10,464	1,197	2,218	400	62,000	12,500	14,204	11,158	3,045	1,937
546	55,000	6,000	10,631	7,119	3,512	1,060	Pipestone County:						
100	35,000		5,721	5,415	206		160			15,444	12,729	1,545	1,442
122	24,280	2,700	14,058	10,050	3,832	15	280	50,000		6,305	4,201	2,104	
920	220,000	77,000	61,806	35,892	25,914	6,059	180	97,000	10,000	12,190	7,771	4,418	1,821
Mille Lacs County:		</											

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments
Polk County—Con.							St. Louis County:						
156	\$22,000		\$3,342	\$2,560	\$782	\$571	280	\$20,400	\$15,300	\$7,752	\$6,732	\$1,020	\$86
60	22,000		1,920	2,204	-283		Scott County:						
547	100,000		25,112	13,649	11,463		272	98,100	18,000	14,421	7,767	6,653	2,386
160	23,500		2,084	1,894	190		120	28,500		8,373	4,388	3,985	305
400	107,500	\$22,000	17,460	16,741	718	2,712	160	69,000	69,000	8,016	6,506	1,510	1,618
1,390	241,500	7,000	65,400	51,228	14,169	6,294	140			5,240	3,446	1,798	671
160	22,900	9,000	4,668	4,355	312	120	Sherburne County:						
360	58,000	31,000	9,980	7,589	2,391	800	252	21,080	4,000	6,645	4,830	1,815	
240	50,870	50,870	7,286	3,720	3,566	1,400	325	53,665		8,613	7,785	828	1,208
160	22,909	1,500	3,850	1,878	1,972		544	98,000	30,000	33,937	36,872	-2,935	1,026
360	53,000	5,000	8,108	8,133	-25	415	300	36,800	15,450	5,164	6,331	-1,167	321
310	20,000	900	10,351	9,714	637	1,393	Sibley County:						
604	100,000	14,000	13,286	10,177	3,108		160	79,400		7,624	4,398	3,225	530
520	137,354	20,800	19,646	13,642	6,004	197	201	68,000	31,800	14,961	11,518	3,173	
174	30,420		8,172	5,501	2,671	255	320	133,500	27,000	35,361	33,691	1,669	1,874
468	50,000	9,000	12,711	10,068	2,643	200	120	41,000	17,000	8,928	7,158	1,770	650
440	128,308	9,400	22,062	17,233	4,828	4,233	200	102,000	8,000	19,727	15,177	4,555	
320	39,000	8,500	5,850	4,832	1,018	1,167	160	46,400	22,250	10,605	7,057	3,547	661
240	23,000	2,000	6,294	5,667	627		Stearns County:						
320	17,853	1,200	6,043	4,985	1,058	976	320	76,500		9,898	9,678	215	430
320	54,500	6,000	8,549	8,138	420	74	262	49,700	14,000	5,630	6,403	-1,773	
Pope County:							402	174,900	2,500	41,388	32,741	8,647	
240	43,000	20,000	10,221	8,978	1,243	800	50,000	26,000	13,207	8,495	4,711	1,078	
400	51,000		5,793	5,671	121	811	600	220,000	10,000	28,887	23,382	5,505	3,823
310	60,000	60,000	7,850	9,173	-1,323	618	240	43,600	20,000	8,012	8,166	-153	762
320	84,000	8,900	26,458	18,826	7,632	1,424	80	25,500		2,993	1,811	1,182	
343	31,000	25,000	9,237	8,640	597	1,054	172	28,000		5,944	5,393	531	
400	47,000	31,500	3,775	5,507	-1,732	1,002	137	41,700	9,000	6,400	5,590	810	525
160	42,000	3,600	10,751	7,124	3,627	1,001	160	27,600	21,060	5,899	3,720	2,128	775
		6,000	16,169	12,986	3,182	82	160	41,000	26,997	6,751	8,524	-1,772	50
400	48,700	24,000	3,374	5,556	2,182	1,120	320	117,500	56,308	19,195	15,616	3,579	1,472
320	45,900	9,122	11,426	8,532	2,894	595	280	44,400	20,300	10,283	8,466	1,817	1,775
120	10,794		1,217	1,826	-609	612	120	20,500	2,185	3,279	2,282	996	489
Red Lake County:							180	65,000	21,000	19,337	16,244	3,093	231
240	14,600	14,600	3,628	5,169	-1,541		320	38,000	14,000	11,603	9,125	2,478	2,010
950	82,000	28,000	18,533	17,790	743	1,342	235	69,422		4,402	5,647	-1,244	328
1,080	82,000	19,300	18,791	16,470	2,320	2,775	320	71,000	20,300	9,960	9,120	839	461
160	29,000		3,478	3,771	-293	444	160	50,200	14,000	14,831	10,485	4,345	
678	54,600	26,700	8,934	9,055	-121	867	480			12,056	12,389	-332	
320	19,503		2,247	2,104	143		165	25,000		5,507	4,935	561	382
473	63,200	28,000	9,603	7,998	1,605		160			7,880	7,776	104	
193	54,000	500	3,330	3,111	219	1,718	162		24,000	12,577	10,468	2,109	
Redwood County:							Steele County:						
480	20,000	20,000	24,725	19,847	4,878		160	73,000	23,000	17,258	13,811	3,447	1,800
320	120,000	42,000	26,282	20,732	5,550	2,959	160	48,150	16,000	12,926	9,488	3,437	1,974
410	30,000	3,000	8,682	8,839	-159	391	230	57,000		7,042	6,471	570	1,861
520	194,000	40,000	26,723	24,418	2,310	4,796	140			10,432	9,069	1,362	667
260	10,700	2,400	18,293	14,061	4,231	1,052	199	61,489	18,680	14,423	10,396	4,026	1,294
320	133,400	16,000	17,689	16,500	1,188	4,400	200	20,000	21,000	12,367	8,934	3,832	1,708
518	79,515	17,900	37,101	34,773	2,328		164	73,500		11,476	7,442	4,033	760
120	34,240	3,600	6,400	5,083	1,317	1,300	120	39,600		8,813	6,155	2,657	
240	70,000	3,700	15,699	10,447	5,252	2,600	240	65,314	20,500	12,427	8,447	3,979	1,676
651	68,000	45,000	14,638	10,200	4,438	1,722	145	55,650		8,610	6,367	2,243	632
Renville County:							202	114,000	47,000	17,872	14,706	3,176	2,561
162	30,903	10,000	9,077	8,162	914	1,498	118	55,400	25,000	6,966	8,601	-1,645	1,089
135	51,000	30,000	3,928	3,266	661		224	66,000	30,000	20,300	13,099	7,200	2,077
160	45,000	12,000	5,926	7,410	1,484	72	437	118,000	46,400	15,752	14,883	868	1,236
150	55,000		6,656	5,536	1,119		Stevens County:						
160	66,500	50,000	5,644	12,202	-6,558		450	33,400	14,000	19,120	15,459	3,660	1,156
494	85,500	9,000	13,472	11,131	2,340	8,004	340	82,000	45,000	11,125	13,954	-2,829	1,242
360	47,500	30,000	19,353	11,005	8,348		148	5,000		1,601	3,522	-2,218	
200	115,000	11,000	10,862	8,311	2,551	866	240	67,000	28,000	8,754	9,766	-1,006	1,331
120	48,000	1,000	14,320	5,420	8,495	8,800	320	79,000	27,000	6,783	6,604	170	745
320			12,221	9,496	2,724	1,173	480	100,000	52,500	20,367	16,798	3,569	1,835
200	37,000	10,000	6,637	7,903	-1,265	1,757	451	69,066	12,600	13,161	11,364	1,796	2,410
120	45,900	5,000	6,266	5,059	1,204		400	27,850	3,150	9,436	6,682	2,754	789
160	69,000		11,159	2,727	8,432	1,279	320	100,000		5,858	3,548	2,310	1,179
240	51,593	12,023	13,165	8,296	4,868	645	320	45,900	41,000	11,471	9,809	1,662	947
290			7,521	4,196	3,325	1,700	480	34,000	5,800	8,653	7,028	1,615	2,038
160	21,500	7,000	8,015	7,935	80		Swift County:						
240	12,000	8,000	6,174	5,953	221		240	81,000	11,100	8,433	5,352	3,081	2,167
240	41,500	34,500	11,814	10,108	1,706	1,648	195	86,500	15,000	8,266	8,391	124	
320	97,600	22,000	17,800	13,996	3,803	3,415	200	60,500	7,000	11,882	10,498	1,383	
200	70,000	30,000	10,448	11,199	-851	1,158	280	44,000	11,000	7,967	7,264	703	
480	180,000	115,000	51,357	47,092	4,264	9,124	320	21,000		8,775	2,409	2,409	
120	50,000	30,000	14,954	12,880	2,073	1,188	400	66,000	25,000	9,142	9,108	-26	2,652
435	108,000	72,000	21,313	17,411	3,901	2,518	360			15,029	20,491	-5,462	
120	57,480	29,000	12,842	11,677	1,165	648	160	39,400	1,500	12,799	9,401	3,398	
540	62,730	12,000	19,466	13,060	6,406	2,853	360	50,000	11,000	10,500	8,200	2,750	14
320	44,000	12,000	8,722	7,498	1,224	2,130	320	13,650	31,000	6,188	5,552	635	
Rice County:							400	38,600	2				

County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments	County and acres being farmed	Total farm investment	Total farm debt	Gross farm income	Total farming expenses	Net farm income	Income from USDA payments
Todd County—Con.							Watonwan County:						
235	\$65,000	\$860	\$6,175	\$6,383	-\$207		100	\$64,000	\$1,900	\$4,759	\$4,492	\$267	
135	51,000	900	3,287	3,191	96		160	33,375	10,500	3,718	1,784	1,933	\$762
140	24,800	12,815	4,146	4,887	-741	\$175	611	228,373	100,000	48,707	36,201	12,505	2,698
190	29,000	6,000	6,521	6,001	520		Wilkin County:						
159	44,850	24,871	8,786	8,569	217		650	96,000	15,000	15,611	13,351	2,259	1,307
100	26,000	1,200	4,786	3,080	1,705	62	320	35,000	17,000	7,411	9,164	-1,753	1,212
160		8,000	6,983	4,796	2,191	1,013	1,624	314,150	45,000	44,978	43,517	1,561	7,101
38		3,000	4,038	3,937	101		Winona County:						
383	50,700	38,000	14,000	11,532	2,468	800	765	170,000	40,000	14,897	42,653	-27,755	
200	22,500	2,500	1,872	3,193	-1,321	879	600	67,000	19,000	15,056	12,022	3,034	1,040
Traverse County:							320	100,000	10,000	29,169	26,815	2,353	
320	82,400		8,448	7,060	1,388	67	350	75,000		15,079	14,222	1,259	14
360	72,000	20,000	12,694	9,756	2,938	1,914	440	95,000	35,000	15,060	11,641	3,419	
900	160,000	2,000	27,240	15,387	11,853	2,867	156	44,250	3,000	7,788	4,509	3,279	
820	73,140		33,992	25,757	8,235	203	Wright County:						
220	54,000	9,000	18,309	15,096	3,202	1,237	240	95,000		13,660	8,424	5,236	
480	37,400	250	4,871	3,954	916	484	100		630	1,995	1,559	385	449
540	6,227		10,288	4,167	6,121	3,158	160	40,000	14,000	12,401	10,798	1,693	1,651
400	59,581	17,100	6,969	6,368	611	677	80	35,500	27,000	7,401	7,401	59	
460	42,479	21,600	7,367	8,093	-725	496	200	46,000	20,000	5,516	5,936	420	1,195
480	43,000	13,500	15,478	9,883	5,594	139	120	34,000	4,000	4,322	3,138	1,174	665
320	78,500	8,700	11,505	8,648	2,857	2,224	160	40,000	11,000	10,299	10,661	-261	
480	76,900	18,700	10,427	9,083	1,344	1,090	254	50,459	21,000	7,328	7,649	-321	10
520	67,600	43,000	11,551	8,995	2,556	2,819	160	41,500	8,500	6,906	5,244	1,582	467
560		9,000	9,319	9,202	116		75	15,000	8,000	2,813	3,532	-719	636
615	69,000	25,000	19,563	12,144	7,389	3,226	Yellow Medicine County:						
400	73,000	14,000	15,203	11,600	3,603	844	240	33,160	3,500	10,557	5,070	5,480	1,934
Wabasha County:							240	78,100	9,000	10,609	11,053	-444	3,517
320	54,000	7,500	11,463	10,070	1,392	4,872	160	40,100	9,600	10,629	7,534	3,095	1,073
386	50,000	11,500	14,965	12,985	1,980	1,244	480	49,000	24,000	11,734	12,087	-352	1,729
400	72,000	23,000	13,189	12,924	265	662	400	128,200	34,950	14,201	12,984	1,217	5,543
Wadena County:							372	100,000	8,000	10,477	8,881	1,596	528
547	12,500	14,000	5,586	6,341	-755	1,297	240	100,000	28,000	12,210	12,476	-266	927
160	47,350	5,000	10,069	7,626	2,443		320	18,000	15,000	8,018	11,024	-3,048	
604	48,600	19,400	17,548	15,446	2,101	1,089	280	96,500		10,472	7,216	3,255	1,548
218	31,000	12,000	6,685	5,531	1,153	60	190	27,000		5,515	5,398	117	592
480	97,000	2,000	10,984	11,188	-204	163	240	66,000	10,800	19,367	12,253	2,117	817
240	26,000	8,000	4,445	2,125	2,320	627	278	38,800	900	6,019	4,236	7,113	644
650	63,755	20,000	11,567	7,924	3,643	939	393	62,500	39,000	14,066	6,738	1,783	891
720	91,755		11,055	8,090	2,965	400			2,850	9,555	8,609	946	610
240	6,000		725	387	338		200	49,200	22,000	8,297	9,197	-900	1,431
240	47,000	3,000	2,113	2,721	-608		240	54,000		6,926	5,043	1,883	825
380	56,200	12,210	12,210	11,062	1,148	1,213	320	50,000	25,000	24,214	17,508	6,705	875
250	41,755	1,000	5,881	4,010	1,871	658	360	99,500	62,000	13,888	11,452	2,432	2,460
Waseca County:							351	44,000	18,800	12,267	10,055	2,212	1,635
260	105,000	30,000	20,851	16,614	4,236	2,914	160	44,303	15,834	8,263	6,071	2,192	523
136			10,637	6,408	4,228		211	72,000	10,000	6,810	5,383	1,427	505
400	52,000	25,000	14,360	11,590	2,770	1,700	280	25,000	25,000	11,851	8,136	3,715	817
240	80,000	20,000	9,698	8,247	1,450	1,652	400	37,400	12,000	6,300	3,700	2,600	200
96.6	41,229	8,500	3,460	3,631	-171	986	60,000	49,000	19,765	15,950	3,815	2,229	
Washington County:							320	135,000	78,000	22,538	20,593	1,945	1,342
120	45,200		8,461	4,901	3,559		26	25,700	15,000	11,242	8,157	3,084	2,462
80	27,130	6,116	5,250	3,808	1,441		320	25,000	2,400	11,759	7,916	3,843	
455	469,500	85,000	23,379	25,279	-1,900	6,450	200			6,324	6,035	288	863
320	88,500	35,000	17,317	17,445	-128	1,950	200	45,000	2,000	6,358	5,455	902	2,229
195	74,500		16,768	14,867	1,901	1,780	200			5,126	6,982	-1,855	6,066
							420	113,000	55,000	26,744	33,024	-6,279	2,072

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the tabulation shows the acres being farmed, the total farm investment, farm debt, gross farm income, total farming expense, net farm income, and income from USDA payments. The figure for income from farm program payments is included in the gross farm income total.

However, it is listed separately in the last column so that an evaluation can be made of the impact of farm program payments on net farm income.

This is not a collection of horrible examples. It is clear from the acres being farmed and the total farm investment that these are substantial farm units. More than three-fourths of the farms in this tabulation show a greater total farm investment that the census shows to be the average for the State. By and large, therefore, these farms are mainly operations which are larger than average.

Each one of the lines in the tabulation is an individual farm. I could tell you that the average net income on the farm reported was \$2,497; that 18 percent showed an operating loss for the year; and that of those who showed a net profit for the year, the farm program payments were equal to 90 percent of the total net income shown on the average.

However, the purpose of this series of case histories was not to find averages,

but to find actual operating figures for real farms.

The value of this material is in studying the returns farm for farm, line for line. I regard it as a startling revelation of conditions as they exist.

I regard it as a challenge to us in Congress to renew and redouble our efforts to provide programs and measures through which farmers can help themselves earn an adequate return for the valuable service they provide to us.

Farming is a business, efficient and productive, which makes a great contribution to our national economy. We must not fail to find the way to permit our family farmers to operate on a business-like basis, with an adequate return on labor and capital.

WATER CRISIS IN THE NORTHEAST

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune be printed in the RECORD. Mr. William Wing has comments on the shortage of water facing the Northeast, following a 4-year drought which has led to a rainfall deficiency of 49 inches in parts of this area. He points out that water rationing may be required in communities in New York State, New Jer-

sey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware if the drought continues.

The seriousness of the current water shortage is manifest. Governor Hughes has asked that New Jersey be declared a disaster area because of the shortage of water. New York City has taken many steps to conserve water and may have to introduce water rationing.

I commend Mr. Wing's article to my colleague's attention. It is particularly pertinent to pending legislation in the fields of water resources planning, water pollution, and water desalinization.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 25, 1965]

WATER RATION IN NORTHEAST A POSSIBILITY

New York City's reserve water supply yesterday, as compared to the day before and a year ago at this time:

	Gallons (billions)	Percent capacity
June 24, 1965	252.1	52.9
June 23, 1965	252.6	53.0
June 24, 1964	407.2	85.5

(By William G. Wing)

The possibility of water rationing in a four-State region of the Northeast was

raised yesterday. New York City, however, would not be immediately affected because of its unique status within the region.

The region is the Delaware River Basin, which covers 1,300 square miles and parts of 4 States and includes 20 million people. New York City lies outside the basin, but depends on it for about half its water supply.

The possibility of rationing for communities in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware came with the announcement yesterday of a public hearing in Philadelphia on July 7. The hearing was called by the Delaware River Basin Commission, which has overall authority over water in the basin.

The commission, created by an unusual compact among the four States and the Federal Government, said the public hearing will collect information on the basin's water supplies. On the basis of this information, the commission will consider whether to proclaim a state of emergency.

AUTHORITY

A state of emergency would give the commission almost supreme authority over the region's water supply.

This might lead to allocation of water among the many cities in the region, such as Philadelphia, Trenton, Bethlehem, and Allentown. New York City is the biggest user of Delaware water, but its use is protected by very special guarantees.

Following a dispute with New Jersey over use of the Delaware, New York City was given the right to take 490 million gallons of Delaware River water a day by a 1954 decree of the U.S. Supreme Court. In return, the city is obligated to release a certain amount of water each day into the Delaware River.

No change can be made in this formula of 490 million gallons a day without unanimous agreement among the parties to the Supreme Court suit: New York City, New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. The city holds veto power, therefore, over any move to ration its Delaware water.

But any amount of water over the 490 million gallons a day which New York City takes from the Delaware presumably could be regulated by the commission.

MEMBER

The city is not a member, however, of the Commission which will consider the emergency decree. This Commission is composed of the Governors of the four States and a Commissioner appointed by the President. H. Mat Adams, who serves as alternate for Gov. Richard Hughes of New Jersey, is Chairman.

Mr. Adams noted yesterday that the northeast is now suffering the effect of a 4-year drought. "In a critical situation such as this," he said, "it may be necessary to draw upon all possible sources of water, including private water supplies and even hydroelectric power reservoirs."

A spokesman for the Commission shied away from the word "rationing." He said the Commission feels sure it will be able to work out equitable divisions of the water supply through negotiation and voluntary agreements.

"We don't anticipate that any allocation of water will have to be enforced against any one's will," the spokesman said.

If an emergency is declared, it will be the first in the 2½ years of the Commission's existence.

Under Federal law, "no person, firm, corporation or other public or private entity shall divert or withdraw water for any purpose, in excess of such quantities as the Commission may prescribe" during the emergency.

In New York City yesterday, the Board of Health adopted regulations for the sale of water brought into the city during the shortage. Such water must be pure enough to drink and must be treated with chlorine.

A permit from the department is required before water can be imported.

In a water-related action, the appellate division unanimously affirmed yesterday that the city's water fluoridation program is constitutional. A suit to stop the city from fluoridating the supply was brought in 1964 by Dominick F. Paduano, former water commissioner. No date has been set for the start of the program.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS—20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, all thoughtful Americans are grateful for the United Nations. Though not perfect, it is our best hope for peace.

On the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter, we pause to reflect upon the achievements of the United Nations and to consider its future. It has a record of great accomplishments in keeping the peace and in promoting economic and social development.

But the future is cloudy. The shadow of nuclear terror still falls upon the world. Many of us believe that the U.N. Charter requires fundamental revisions if it is to continue to meet the challenges of the nuclear age.

I was therefore gratified that on this 20th anniversary of the signing of the U.N. Charter, the United World Federalists organization is attempting to persuade opinion leaders in this country to take the lead in calling for a strengthened United Nations.

The Federalists have issued a 32-page booklet to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco on June 26, 1945. The handsomely designed and profusely illustrated booklet affirms that the United Nations has taken several major forward steps in its first two decades, so "the story of the U.N. in the first 20 years is one of the brightest chapters in the history of the human race."

Unfortunately, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot do justice to this fine booklet. The dramatic pictures and excellent layout have to be seen to be appreciated. Nonetheless, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the opening and concluding portions of the text of this booklet entitled "No Longer a Dream."

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

SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

San Francisco, June 26, 1945, was a strategic American port. The gray ships of the U.S. fleet moved silently through the Golden Gate ferrying fresh troops to the Pacific theater of war. By June 26, the European campaign was over. The Blackhawk Division had just returned from LeHavre, and was on its way to San Francisco en route to the Philippines.

The week before, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower had come home to a triumphant and tumultuous welcome in New York City and Washington, D.C. Six million people in Manhattan crowded the sidewalks to cheer the West Point hero who had led the Allied Command to victory in Europe.

In Moscow, the victorious Soviet Army generals had come home, too. Astride a gleaming white horse, Georgi K. Zhukov, defender of Moscow and conquerer of Berlin, rode over the cobblestones of Red Square and received the thunderous praise of his countrymen.

The long war in the Pacific writhed in its last agonies. On June 26, Gen. "Hap" Arnold reported that 520 B-29's had just dropped 3,000 tons of bombs on Osaka, Japan. The last remnants of Japanese strength were ebbing away in the jungles of the Philippines and Borneo. Like their allies in Germany, the Japanese people were tasting the bitter dregs of a war that had gone too long the wrong way. Their weariness was shortly to be replaced by the shock of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

On June 26, 1945, it had been 70 months since Hitler's troopers had blitzkrieged into Czechoslovakia and Poland. England had suffered her finest hour. America had lost 270,000 of her sons. France had known national humiliation. Russia had borne her Stalingrad. The economy of Greece was shattered. Italy was swept by poverty.

In all 25 million men, women, boys and girls had lost their lives—under the rubble of Coventry, in the steaming jungles of Okinawa, in the bitter cold of Stalingrad, in the gas chambers of Dachau. Within a few days, 90,000 more would be totally destroyed in the cremating blast of one atomic bomb.

Little wonder that on June 26, 1945, the whole world was sick of war. Victors and vanquished shared this common sufferance. They were sick of mass murder. Sick of the smoke and the noise, the succession of horrors, the humiliations and the brutalities, sick of filth, hunger and pain, sick of the hollowness of grand national schemes and the emptiness of victory, sick of this worst of all plagues.

On that day, a world, sick of war, created the United Nations.

What a phenomenon * * * that from a world of such rubble and such a people, dumb with grief and almost smothered by cynicism, should spring again such a phoenix of hopefulness.

Twenty-five years before, after World War I, a similar tide of desperation had surged through Europe and given birth to the League of Nations. At that time, Woodrow Wilson declared, the people of the world had brought their hopes to America and America had failed them. Now, on June 26, 1945, in spite of the failures of history, long past and just past, the world was again caught up in hope and had again carried its hope to America.

This time there was no talk of realism or idealism. There was only an eloquent compulsion. On June 24, the Associated Press reported that 52 of the 75 U.S. Senators interviewed had already gone on record for the still unfinished U.N. Charter. None had said he would oppose it.

For 2 months before the signing, 1,200 delegates from 50 nations forged that eloquent compulsion into a framework for world law and order. With traditional distrust, the diplomats spent their mornings laboriously promoting their national interests and their afternoons tearing each other's phrases apart. But the newspaper headlines—morning and afternoon—told them of men still fighting and falling and held them to their commitment.

At 5 o'clock in the morning on June 23, the U.N. Conference Coordination Committee completed the text of the charter, the constitution of a new international order. The charter they produced was hastily translated and brought before the June 25 plenary which adopted it unanimously, then rose and cheered exultantly.

At 9 o'clock on June 26, 153 statesmen, the great men of Europe, Asia, the Americas,

Africa, and Australia, stepped one by one to a round table bearing the hand-wrought charter and penned their names.

The table was 11 feet in diameter, draped with a blue cloth. The charter, printed in five languages, was bound in royal blue morocco. The ink in the pens was permanent.

The next morning, President Harry Truman stood before a listening world to say: "This is a declaration of great faith, that war is not inevitable * * *."

Thus, did history take a turn.

The pain of war is past. A new generation which has known neither the sharp fear of falling bombs nor the dull shame of senseless destruction has come of voting age. The nuclear age has come of age too, and matured to diabolic strength. The great powers are equipped with overkill capabilities too unbelievable. President Lyndon B. Johnson has said, "Indeed, for the first time, death in an afternoon is literally possible for most of the Northern Hemisphere."

The tide of hope has, for a long time, been ebbing. Yet on this once more day in June, the world again carries its hopes to America, to the doorstep of a United Nations celebrating its first 20 years.

The first two decades of the government of man is like a coin with two sides. The engraving on one side is deeply etched. It is an honorable record of humanity at its best—building, teaching, nourishing, healing—of keeping the peace in troubled places. After 20 years of practical projects, the United Nations is "no longer a dream."

The other side of the coin, the commitment of the U.N. to universal disarmament, that highest hope of 1945, is almost blank.

In recognition of both—the fruitfulness of the past and the ultimatum of the future—to what the U.N. has been and to what it must become—this commemorative book is dedicated. It says let June 26, 1965, also, be a beginning again.

A MIRROR TOO SLOW

The many have hoped and the few have feared that the United Nations was created as a counterweight to history and a reformer of reality. It is not true. The United Nations was intended to be a creature of history and a reflector of reality. Still the hopeful persist and the fearful insist that the United Nations will deliver us into a world government. But they are mistaken.

The United Nations stands between us and the history which created it. We stand between the United Nations and the future to which it might bear a creative relationship. Man is the crucial element. We have fashioned the United Nations as a skeletal international organization. Now we must apply the creative touch which can make of the United Nations the sustainer of peace in the world community.

I. HISTORY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Prenuclear history said three things to political realists engaged in international relations in 1945: The first was that the nation-state, absorbed in the relentless pursuit of its own interests, was the basic and inviolable unit of political organization; the second was that the nation-states were unequal in the power they could bring to bear in these individual pursuits; the third was that, regardless of their autonomy or their power, the states often shared the need for communication among themselves.

Reflecting these understandings of history, the creators of the United Nations (1) founded the organization on the basic principle of the sovereign equality of its members, (2) provided special privileges for those possessing the greatest power, and (3) made the United Nations primarily a communications organ with limited power. What they fashioned in San Francisco during the spring of 1945 was more a mirror of that era's political forces than it was the creation of a new

force. So the United Nations reflects more the limited consensus of the powerful than it does a dream of supranationalism. Further, the writers of the charter perpetuated the wartime power relationships by extending into the amendment process and to the admission of new members the special privileges of the then powerful.

Thus, in some ways most troublesome, what they gave to us was more a 1945 vintage photograph than it was a living mirror capable of reflecting future political realities.

Within a few weeks, the picture was radically altered by the first atomic explosion. Within 5 years, the photograph was hopelessly dated by the success of a Communist revolution in China. Within 15 years, the mirror was failing to reflect vast changes in the distribution of political power among the continents. By its 20th anniversary, the United Nations, unable to amend its charter, is reflecting the most glaring deficiencies of the League of Nations—the absence of major world powers and the lack of authority to safeguard the peace.

Thus were the fearful wrong and the hopeful premature. Thus did the United Nations lean too heavily on history and prepare too cautiously for the future. Thus did the United Nations—fashioned to reflect the realities of one historical era—know a certain dimension of failure in another era which came too fast for the slow mirror which was trained uncertainly on it.

Yet there have been some successes, casting forward a beam of hope. The mirror has become distorted; it has not shattered. The organization has faltered; it has not collapsed. Weaknesses cloud the troubled day; evolving strengths support the hopeful horizon.

An umbilical cord tied to pre-nuclear history cannot impart perpetual vitality to the United Nations. But the still strong desire of the world for peace gives hope that the United Nations can be strengthened to serve the nuclear age. Peace-keeping machinery, although relatively young, has been employed with success in Africa and Asia, in the Middle East, and the Mediterranean. Frustration, tensions, and hostile actions, which before the United Nations would certainly have meant war, have been moderated, mellorated, and mediated.

The message from history is clear. Success and failure tell the same story about the past and submit the same advice for the future: Communication facilitates cooperation; isolation aggravates conflict. The nation-state is no longer a viable security unit. Peace is a global mission. The nation-state is no longer a sufficient provider. Prosperity is a task for mankind. The nation-state is no longer the ultimate concern. Humanity cannot be bordered.

These truths guide the destiny of man. They tell us that we exist only because we have understood at least a part of them. They tell us that we will continue to survive only if we grow to understand them better. They impel us to reconsideration. They challenge us to strengthen, to extend, to dedicate ourselves to, the United Nations as a universal instrument of mankind.

In a very real sense, the transition to world community is inevitable. The question is not whether, but how. Yet caring men cannot relax. We cannot become mere spectators of history on its destined journey to peace. History will not run by itself. Inevitably, man must learn to guide his destiny away from senseless war. That it is inevitable will make it in no way easier.

II. THE UNITED NATIONS AND HISTORY

Upon us is the struggle with ourselves. How can we help history on its course toward peace? How can we, the peoples of the old and still ununited nation-states, convert our troubled past into a creative and truly united world community? How do we

win the struggle to reach outside ourselves for the greater strength and the fuller wisdom which can make the United Nations more responsive, give it a more creative relationship to history?

We decry the fact that the natural sciences have developed more rapidly than the social sciences, that man has learned to build the bomb before he has learned to ban it. And it has become our lament that our fathers, reflecting that deficiency, gave to the United Nations no power save that of communicating with each other. Yet our hope is born of these two facts:

That there is a bomb makes peace necessary.

That we are in communication with each other makes peace possible.

The United Nations, as presently constituted, bears only an ancestral relationship to the world institution which our times require. But that relationship will be sufficient if we take courage from its successes and move forward, if we fashion from this primitive configuration a vehicle capable of meeting the greater challenges ahead.

There is nothing to deter us but ourselves. We are our only obstacle. The survival gap for mankind stretches not between what is necessary to do and what is possible. It is between what is possible for us to do and what we are doing.

We can build a bridge across the survival gap. We can reformulate the Charter of the United Nations. We can forge, from our own will to do so, the instruments of a community of mankind. We can. We must. We will.

There is only one secret to such a success: We can achieve it only if each of us as an individual strives to achieve it. We can, perhaps, afford the luxury of a few who do not care or do not know, but we cannot survive the quietude of the convinced. We who are wholeheartedly dedicated to the ideal of world community must wholeheartedly devote our resources to the daily press toward achievement of that ideal.

The first step toward peace tomorrow is the advocacy of peace today. In the long march of history, every action is a step. No word of hope expressed is ever lost. No work of vision is ever in vain.

This then was our dream, now become a practical necessity. What shall we, the peoples of the United Nations, do to convert the necessity into reality? The answer to these questions is our duty for these days.

The present charter expresses our goals and it records our determination. It has started us on the road. The new charter must translate the old vision of universality into a new reality of all nations joined together under the common controls necessary to assure peace, order, and justice.

The present charter moves us a step away from the primitive state of nation-states communicating sporadically in small groups and often acting alone. It has started us talking together and acting, sometimes, as a community. The new charter must shape these progressive experiences into a dynamic organization with the capacity to act quickly and judiciously in the interests of mankind.

The present charter reserves to some minorities the power to nullify the proposals of any majority. The new charter must provide democratic machinery which will allow "majorities of mankind," acting in good faith, to promote the total interest of the world community.

The present charter permits some peace-keeping operations. The new charter must make it possible for the U.N. to take immediate, positive, and prefinanced actions against aggression.

The present charter exhorts us to provide for disarmament. The new charter must create international safeguards commanding such confidence that national armaments

will no longer seem feasible for any international purpose.

It is easy to catalog the obstacles which separate us from these goals. It is harder to overcome them. But we can.

The idea of world community is sound. Therefore it can become popular. The idea of the rampant nation-state is no longer sound. Therefore popularity cannot save it.

One day's work will not insure one world's future. Nor will the dedication of each of us for a month, or for a year, be sufficient to bridge the gap between the turbulent today and the tranquil tomorrow.

Yet, no man can fail to influence the future. The work of every person of peace is a positive force for peace. It is not our leaders who determine the course of history. They can but guide as we command. We are at the source of command.

Our influence can reach up only as it reaches out. We can reach out only in the measure of our own devotion.

Our world is what we have been. It will be what we are.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Small Reclamation Projects Act has proved itself a most desirable supplement to Federal reclamation law. As of June 20, 1965, applications had been received and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and Congress for 33 separate projects, involving loans estimated at over \$80 million, and 2 applications for loans of over \$600,000 are now pending before the Congress. Two applications totaling nearly \$5.3 million have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and will be submitted to the Congress in the near future, and 3 additional applications involving loans of over \$7.6 million are under consideration by the Department. With favorable action on the pending applications, over \$93.2 million of the original \$100 million authorized for this program in 1956 will have been committed, leaving only about \$6.8 million for future loans. However, 17 local agencies are actively working on loan applications involving over \$40 million.

The important statement in this summary, for the purposes of this body, is that of the \$100 million originally authorized, only about \$6 million is uncommitted, and there are loan applications totaling over \$40 million, with others undoubtedly on the way. Unless this bill is passed, the whole small reclamation program will shortly end.

The idea of a Small Reclamation program was born in a National Reclama-

tion Association resolution in 1946. It took 10 years to translate that resolution into public law. There was doubt on the part of some Members of Congress that the plan was workable. It was finally given a chance because there was obviously a "no man's land" in our western reclamation development, and all were agreed that neither the western reclamation States, nor the Nation, can afford underdevelopment of any part of our water resources.

Irrigation by Anglo Saxons was introduced in America by the Mormon pioneers. That was over 115 years ago. Almost immediately after arrival in Utah, groups of Mormon pioneers joined together to build ditches and to construct small irrigation dams. As other Western States were settled and developed, small irrigation ditch groups and companies began to develop small irrigation projects, each of them monuments of private cooperative initiative.

Naturally the easy projects were developed first. Then the settlers began to work on those where the water was harder and more expensive to divert.

The Reclamation Act of 1902 made possible the vast projects which have turned water onto millions of arid acres, and built community after community in the West. But left undeveloped were the smaller projects which fell outside the conventional reclamation program, and it gradually became evident that these smaller projects, like their larger counterparts, could not be developed without some Federal financial assistance. The Small Reclamation Projects Act has been the answer.

Enactment of this legislation has made it possible for local water users and small ditch companies to combine their efforts, talents, and investments with Bureau of Reclamation know-how and financing to broaden our water resource development. The program has been a success.

But experience has shown that improvements are needed to increase the scope and effectiveness of the program and to bring it more nearly into line with related water programs. This bill is intended to do this. It is a good bill, worked out in cooperation with representatives of the National Reclamation Association, and unanimously reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

S. 602, as amended by the committee, would change the act as follows:

First. Increase the authorization for funds available for the loan and grant program from \$100 million, as at present, to \$200 million. The overwhelming proportion—approximately 98 percent—of the funds to date have been used for loans which will be repaid in full.

Second. Raise the limitation on loans or grants of Federal funds for single projects from \$5 million, the present limit, to \$7.5 million.

Third. Make the interest rate that payable by the Treasury, as provided in the Water Supply Act of 1958, instead of that of the average annual yield on long-term Government obligations; interest on loans currently outstanding would be revised retroactively to this rate.

Fourth. Incorporate into the Small Reclamation Projects Act provisions for establishing recreation and fish and wildlife facilities at projects aided by the act. These provisions are substantially comparable to those of S. 1229, the administration bill for participation by local entities of certain of the costs of recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities at Federal reclamation projects. The House has agreed to the conference version of this bill, and the Senate will consider it shortly.

Fifth. Authorize as a loan an advance of up to one-half of the funds required for a project investigation, preparation of an application, and meeting other conditions precedent to the granting of a loan.

Sixth. Provide for affirmative action by the Senate and House Interior Committees to accelerate appropriation for approved projects.

Mr. President, full water resource development is the key to tomorrow. To serve the national interest properly we must use imagination, resourcefulness, and tenacity to develop every source of water available to us. There are numerous opportunities for the development of new small sources of irrigation water, and for the rehabilitation and betterment of existing irrigation projects through the Small Reclamation Projects Act. It offers us the type of cooperative local-Federal project which is most desirable. It has its roots in local initiative and local management, but it is made feasible through Federal technical and financial assistance.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

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

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS—SMALL IN NAME ONLY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure today to ask the Senate to approve S. 602, legislation to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. I similarly supported the original Small Reclamation Projects Act which has proved to be so highly successful and desirable over the years. I am a cosponsor of S. 602, as I was of similar legislation in the two prior Congresses.

Utahans have reaped considerable benefit from the Small Reclamation Projects Act. Within the State we have five projects completed and three additional ones under construction. Two of these should be finished this year.

The act which has been in effect since 1956, however, does need to be modernized and extended. The amendments proposed in S. 602 have the support of and were recommended by the National Reclamation Association.

Appropriations of \$100 million were authorized in the original act for small projects. The program is rapidly approaching that ceiling and legislation is needed to increase the total limitation

on appropriations to \$200 million. This would be accomplished by S. 602.

Other significant changes recommended by the National Reclamation Association and incorporated into S. 602 would:

Increase the limits of Federal participation per project from \$5 million to \$7,500,000;

Change the interest formula to bring it into conformity with the Water Supply Act of 1958, the rate presently being applied by Congress to Federal water resources programs;

Permit the Secretary of the Interior to advance funds to the local organization for project planning;

And permit the congressional committees to reduce the 60-day waiting period for a specific project by resolution of both committees.

S. 602 also would include recreation as an authorized function eligible for grants, and would provide for the same cost-sharing treatment of recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of projects constructed under the Small Reclamation Projects Act as for those constructed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. The bill also makes several minor clarifying changes.

The entire group of amendments is of significant value in expanding and making more workable the Small Reclamation Projects Act.

Irrigation has made possible the development of Utah and the West, beginning in 1847 when the Mormon pioneers first arrived in the Salt Lake Valley and began building irrigation ditches and constructing small dams. Irrigation companies were formed and cooperative irrigation projects built, and these local irrigation companies still continue their immensely important role in our Western States civilization. In more recent years the Bureau of Reclamation has engineered and built huge dams and vast, regional reclamation projects not possible through local or even regional enterprise. But the need remains for continuing local development of new small sources of irrigation water and the rehabilitation and betterment of existing systems. The highly successful small reclamation projects programs is making this possible by combining local initiative with Federal financing and technical assistance. The local companies are responsible for planning, building, operating, and maintaining the system and for repaying the loan with interest.

In the rapidly growing West we must continue to develop every source of water available to us, with the help of both the regular program of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Small Reclamation Projects Act and through other local, State, and Federal programs. The strengthening of the Small Reclamation Projects Act through the proposed legislation is an important part of that pattern.

I urge the Senate's prompt approval of S. 602.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Colorado for his statement, which indicates, I believe, that there is unanimous support for the bill on the part of

not only the Senators from the West, but all of the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I join the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in supporting the bill.

It strikes me that the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 is one of the most productive measures we have been able to put into legislation. This updating of that act would be very helpful.

I wonder if the Senator would mind if I had my name added as a cosponsor.

Mr. MOSS. I would be happy to have the Senator listed as a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah.

I hope that we shall move this forward rapidly.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

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?

The bill (S. 602) was passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 336), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

Purpose of S. 602, which is sponsored by Senator Moss for himself and 14 other Senators of both parties, is to broaden and strengthen the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Public Law 984, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 85-47, found in 43 U.S.C. 442a, et seq.). This act was designed to encourage State and local participation in the development and improvement of reclamation projects in their own localities. It has been outstandingly successful in accomplishing this purpose.

S. 602, as amended by the committee, would change the act as follows:

1. Increase the authorization for funds available for the loan and grant program from \$100 million, as at present, to \$200 million. (The overwhelming proportion—approximately 98 percent—of the funds to date have been used for loans which will be repaid in full.)

2. Raise the limitation on loans or grants of Federal funds for single projects from \$5 million, the present limit, to \$7.5 million.

3. Make the interest rate that payable by the Treasury, as provided in the Water Supply Act of 1958, instead of that of the average annual yield on long-term Government obligations; interest on loans currently outstanding would be revised retroactively to this rate.

4. Incorporate into the Small Reclamation Projects Act the substance of the provisions of S. 1229, the administration bill for participation by local entities of certain of the costs of recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities at Federal reclamation projects. This measure has passed both Houses of Congress and now is in conference.

5. Authorize as a loan an advance of up to one-half of the funds required for a project investigation, preparation of an application, and meeting other conditions precedent to the granting of a loan.

6. Provide for affirmative action by the Senate and House Interior committees to accelerate appropriation for approved projects.

LEO M. MONDRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 244, S. 321.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 321) for the relief of Leo M. Mondry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been concluded.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak without regard to the rule of germaneness.

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

ADEQUACY OF FISCAL YEAR 1966 MILITARY BUDGET

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was my original intent to make this statement during the discussion of the military construction authorization bill. However, the delay in bringing that bill to the floor, coupled with the special responsibility that I feel in connection with this matter, prompts me to make it now.

The \$1.7 billion which the military construction bill authorizes for buildings and other facilities will, of course, contribute to the overall efficiency of our Military Establishment. However, that bill does not provide for the men, machines, arms, ammunition, supplies, and other tools of war which are vital and essential to actual combat. Such funds would be covered by other legislation. A great part of these funds would be contained in the major military appropriation bill.

Based upon a careful and extensive study and analysis over a period of several months I am compelled to suggest to the Senate and to the decisionmakers in the Pentagon that it is now time to re-examine the entire fiscal year 1966 defense budget for the purpose of insuring that funds will be available to meet our defense requirements, including our stepped-up activities in Vietnam and our peacekeeping operations in the Dominican Republic.

The fiscal year 1966 budget was developed during the summer and fall of 1964. The fiscal year 1965 budget under which we are now operating was prepared 18 months ago. These are peacetime budgets and neither is overly generous. In neither was there any specific planning or programming for the large demands on our funds and assets which have resulted from our heavy involvement in Vietnam. There is, therefore, a very serious question as to whether the fiscal year 1966 defense budget is now adequate for our defense needs.

The drain of the Vietnam operations on our military resources is substantially greater than is generally recognized. Except for the \$700 million supplemental appropriation of a few weeks ago they have been funded out of a peacetime budget. Thus the men, equipment, and materiel sent to Vietnam come out of the hides of the military services. The effect on the readiness of the forces not committed to Vietnam is substantial. The situation is already serious. Without corrective action it could become critical in the months to come even if our activities should continue at the same level.

I have no figures in connection with these matters, but this refers to hardware of the most essential kind. I refer to trucks, and tanks, and even to small items like grenade launchers.

This cuts across all of the services. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are all experiencing manpower problems, particularly in the more critical skills. Problems with respect to equipment and materiel—including aircraft, ships, and certain weapons—already exist and are growing. Maintenance, supplies, and spare parts also present existing problem areas. They will become more serious in the future.

I do not say that there is any fatal deficiency or shortage now. I emphasize that—there is no fatal deficiency now. However, there are obvious and increasing problems. A peacetime budget is being used to support combat operations which were not factors in the original planning. Unless the budget is revised upward and additional procurement is instituted in the near future critical problems could arise in combat essential firepower, mobility, and communications equipment. Fortunately, we have the time, the resources, and the know-how to take action to prevent this.

Our military forces must be provided with the weapons, equipment, and other resources necessary to fulfill our commitments around the world. Our servicemen committed to Vietnam, or anywhere else, must not want for any essential. At the same time the drain and requirements of Vietnam must not be permitted to create an unacceptable degradation in the overall readiness of our Military Establishment elsewhere.

The unstable situation around the world is given emphasis by our commitment in the Dominican Republic. The drain upon our resources by our forces in Vietnam—and these forces are relatively small as compared to past wars—shows how delicately balanced we are between adequate strength and serious weakness. The key to avoiding future problems is

sufficient strength in being to permit flexible responses to a variety of simultaneous contingencies. The time to make a start toward this goal is now.

I emphasize that these remarks are based upon months and months of careful investigation and analysis of the situation, of the so-called military depots and the preposition supplies of the essential hardware I have mentioned. Our checking on these matters was careful.

Recognizing that it is months and, in some cases, years before congressional appropriations are translated into hardware in the hands of our troops, I believe that our fiscal defense planning must be changed to take into consideration both the past developments and those which can be anticipated in the future. Further delay will be an unwarranted and risky gamble with our national security.

Therefore, I urge the Secretary of Defense to make an immediate study of the entire situation and to come to the Congress with all the facts and with such revisions in the fiscal year 1966 budget as are necessary to take up the slack caused by the heavy unplanned and unprogrammed expenditures.

As I say, our checking and investigation of this matter will continue. We will supply the actual figures that can be published, but we will make a special classified report to members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and any Member of the Senate who wishes to see it.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who is familiar with this matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First I commend the Senator from Mississippi for what he has said. I wish to add to what he has said that there are two bills which will come before this body in the near future. The first is the authorization bill for construction of more military establishments in the next fiscal year. Our committee has eliminated what we believe are all construction activities that can be postponed or delayed, because we believe we must concentrate on our efforts in Vietnam and other problems in other areas, realizing that they are more vital than some of the construction proposals presented to us for this year.

The second bill which will come before us is the military appropriation bill. The House has passed it. The House cut the amount slightly below budget recommendations.

I agree with what the Senator has said—that when the hearings are held on that bill—and they will be held shortly—we must consider the bill not only as a peacetime measure, but as a preparedness bill in relation to our activities in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Mr. STENNIS. Before the Senator leaves that point—he has stated it well, but we also need some specific facts and figures of estimates as to the hardware and other items that are needed, in addition to what is reflected by the normal budget. Does not the Senator believe we

should have proof of what is needed as soon as it is available?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. As brought out in the Preparedness Subcommittee, we ought to keep our forces in Germany and Europe fully equipped with all the necessary equipment that can be made available in the highest class of readiness. We know that that requires a certain amount of reserve equipment. If it is used for activities in Vietnam and elsewhere, that must be provided for in our military budget.

We also have many troops in reserve in this country and Hawaii. They must be built up with equipment for readiness. If their reserve supplies are used to fill the need in Vietnam and other areas where that equipment has been sent and used, it must be built up at the present time.

So, as I see it, what the Senator from Mississippi emphasizes is that when we consider the military budget next month and consider the military construction bill in the next week, we must consider those two bills in the light of world conditions today and our participation in certain areas of the world, including Vietnam, and the destruction of planes, helicopters, artillery, and tanks.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I am glad he is present on the floor. He has done most important work on the matter of the needs of this country involving equipment to meet our commitments in view of conditions in the world.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able and distinguished chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee. As usual, his statement is carefully worded, thorough, and comes to the point.

Many times I have presented on the floor of the Senate the fact that if we had the right to send men out to fight, and in some cases die, in the interest of the security of the country, we also have the duty to give them the best equipment in duty to, in turn, give them the best chance to come back to their families. The Senator has stated that as of this time there are no fatal deficiencies; what he is doing, as I see it, is advising the Secretary of Defense—and I am sure his advice will be given full attention because of the respect the Secretary of Defense has for him. He is telling us that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, not only in the case the South Vietnamese developments escalate, but also because the present heavy use of materials can cause a shortage, tomorrow if not today.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Missouri has spoken with proper emphasis. There is no fatal deficiency. We are well armed and well prepared. We do not wish to leave any inference to the contrary, but in the course of time we will not be well armed and well prepared, unless proper anticipation is made now for the drain that is going on of our reserves and our preposition material, and actually on the weapons.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, if I may paraphrase the statement of the distinguished chairman of the

Preparedness Subcommittee, the hearings have shown that unless prompt action is taken at this time to recognize this increased use of our military equipment, there could be some serious shortages in the not too distant future; and the time to take care of such a situation is now.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Normally, it takes months—as the Senator knows as an original production man and later as Secretary of the Air Force in the Department of Defense—even longer, after a need has been recognized, to get the materiel, equipment, hardware, and guns into the hands of the men and at the places needed.

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me, and close with the observation that it is a good thing for the United States we have as the head of this committee a man of the character and caliber of the Senator from Mississippi, one who is so deeply interested in the security and prosperity of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington, who is vitally concerned and very much interested in this matter and makes a valuable contribution daily to solving the problems.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee has carried on, over a period of time, a very fine investigation into this most serious problem. The chairman has been objective. He has been forthright. I believe that what has been brought out to date in the executive sessions of the committee will, in the end, prove to be beneficial and helpful in strengthening our posture, to deal not only with the current situation in the Far East but also with other so-called wars of national liberation with which we will be confronted from time to time.

It is my understanding, and I believe it is the view of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that in going into this problem of materiel and equipment we are looking at not only the problem of Vietnam and elsewhere but also at what will happen in the future.

Our biggest problem involves contingencies. I know that the Senator would agree with me that he and the members of the subcommittee have been particularly assisted by the competent staff, the able investigators who have been assigned to these many tasks. They are men with a fine spirit of professionalism. There has been no attempt to be petty, no attempt to be partisan. The effort has been one of assistance to the executive branch, and above all to the American people, in making sure that we have the means to carry out and fulfill our commitments honorably.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington very much for his kind remarks, especially what he said regarding the competence of our staff and their nonpartisan approach.

There are figures which we cannot give, for security reasons, but I know that we on the Preparedness Subcommittee all agree that the figures are substantial, sound, accurate, and represent a very grave need for the future, not a fatal deficiency for the present.

The staff members are trained men and know how to ferret out the facts, and how to evaluate them when they find them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SITUATION ON THE NEW YORK STOCK MARKET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the continuing decline of the stock market is now in its sixth week and is causing a great deal of concern throughout the Nation, especially to the banking and financial business community as to what the cause may be.

I believe that the country is strong economically. I do not believe that this is the only economic indicator we should consider. Certainly we should, at this time, stop for a moment and give some thought as to where we are going and whether the time for action has now arrived and, if it has, what action, if any, should be taken.

Let me point out that the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board has for some time been indicating that it wishes to maintain a tight money policy in the United States. This is reflected in the reserves which are available in the Nation's banking system. When the total of these reserves are in a negative position, it means that we have a relatively tight money situation. When there is a surplus, it is considered to be an easy money situation.

From 1960 until early this year, there were no negative reserve situations so far as the Federal Reserve System is concerned; but, beginning in the latter part of April, positive action was taken by the Federal Reserve Board to change the situation, the net result being that we have had a daily average deficit of \$150 to \$175 million. This means that there is a shortage of available credit in the United States.

This is probably one of the factors—which I have pointed out to the Secretary of the Treasury on several occasions—which has caused the continued decline of the stock market. This is not the only factor, but certainly a major one.

Therefore, I believe that the country would be open to suggestions, and I would have two suggestions that could be followed:

First, so far as the reserves in the Nation's banking system are concerned, we should eliminate the requirement that we continue the negative position and return to an equilibrium so that there will be a net surplus and not a negative situation so far as our finances are concerned, so that we can have a more or less steady, moderate policy.

The second suggestion is directed to the stock market itself, that during a period of time in the future, as the stock market rectifies itself, to reduce the

reserve requirements which are required so far as purchases of stocks are concerned.

GUAM'S NEW REPRESENTATIVE IN WASHINGTON HAS LONG RECORD OF SERVICE FOR HIS PEOPLE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, many of us in this body have known Antonio B. Won Pat for many years. I was personally very pleased by the election on March 15, 1965, when he became the first elected representative of Guam in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Won Pat is no stranger to Washington or to the Members of Congress who have worked with him during the years when he served as speaker of the Legislature of Guam. Tony Won Pat is, indeed, one of the founding fathers of democracy on Guam. He fought long and hard for the passage of the organic act of 1950, which transferred the powers of local government from the U.S. Navy to an elective legislature and an appointive governor. The organic act, which provided Guam with the first form of democracy in its history, has worked very well during its 15 years of existence.

The office which he holds, that of Washington representative of the people of Guam, is an elective one, which was established in August 1964, by an act of the Legislature of Guam. By the islandwide election of March 15, Mr. Won Pat is charged with representing his people in their Nation's Capital.

I believe that this is a good thing—both for the people of Guam and for the U.S. Government. Guam has taken a stride forward in the democratic process by having their own popularly elected representative here to negotiate with Congress, the executive departments, and agencies over problems which affect our farthest outpost of democracy, over 9,000 miles away. The right to speak in Washington, D.C., for the people of Guam has been given, in free election, to a man highly capable of representing their best interests and the national interest.

There has been a steady, fruitful growth of democracy in our westernmost outpost, our picture window which faces the bamboo curtain. Now, with the representative elected by the people stationed here in Washington, I predict that even better things will be in store for the people of Guam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks a brief biography of Mr. Antonio B. Won Pat and his speech on the occasion of his inaugural as Guam's first elected Washington representative.

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

Born in Sumay on December 10, 1908, he attended Guam public schools and became a schoolteacher in 1926. In 1934 he was appointed a principal, a position he held until 1939. In 1940 he taught at George Washington High School until the outbreak of World War II. Speaker Won Pat married the former Ana Perez in March 1932. They have eight children, one of whom, Jacqueline, is a captain in the U.S. Army Nurse Corps. He was elected to the Guam Congress in 1936

and reelected in 1948 as speaker. It was while in this position that he participated in the drafting of the Organic Act for Guam. Since the passage of the Organic Act in 1950, Speaker Won Pat has appeared before nearly every committee of the U.S. Congress on behalf of legislation for Guam. Among the most significant pieces of legislation for which he has testified and lobbied are the War Claims Act, social security, urban renewal, rehabilitation, Small Business Administration, Airport Act, and the Federal Disaster Act and Agricultural Services Act. He has served on the advisory committee of the SBA and in November 1963 he received a public service award from the SBA. Mr. Won Pat has served as a delegate to the junior chamber of commerce international conclave in Dallas, Tex., the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders in New York, Seattle, and Boston. During the Boston conference, he had the distinction of serving as a panel speaker on Federal-State relations. He also served as Guam's delegate to the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences Conference in 1958. He is a sustaining member of the Democratic National Committee, the National Capital Democratic Club, and was the first president of the Guam Lions Club and Fraternal Order of Eagles. The veteran legislator has served as speaker of the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh Guam Legislatures. He served as a minority leader in the third legislature. Executive vice chairman, Democratic Party of Guam. He served as a minority leader, eighth Guam Legislature; elected as the first Washington representative on March 15, 1965.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, MARCH 28, 1965

Governor Guerrero, Speaker Taitano, Judge Shriver, Admiral Bird, General Ohlke, Governor Skinner, Mr. Reckord, Mr. Heller, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my chief emotion today at this ceremony marking my inauguration as Guam's first elected Washington representative is one of humility and warm gratitude to the people of Guam for the confidence they have reposed in me in selecting me for this post. At this moment I find it hard to express how humbly proud I am, how much I hope to merit the great honor bestowed upon me. I have been in politics for almost 30 years, and I have frequently been to Washington as a member of the Guam Legislature delegated to so appear in our Nation's Capital, but never before has anyone had the privilege to have been chosen by the people of Guam in an island-wide election as their sole elected Washington spokesman.

I know full well the magnitude and responsibilities that the office of Washington representative entails, and I promise you that, with God's help, and your support, I will do my utmost to represent you all in Washington to the best of my ability. I fully understand that I go to our Nation's Capital not as a spokesman for a particular party, or a particular group, or a particular philosophy, but as the spokesman for all of the people of Guam regardless of their race, religion, or creed, and regardless of their origin.

It was extremely heartening to me to receive the many friendly compliments and tributes from friends here and in Washington. It's also gratifying to me to see here today participating in this ceremony, representatives of our National Government, of all three branches of our local government, and of the military commands located here which are so important to the security and welfare of us and the others of the free world. I gratefully acknowledge their support, just as I have the support of the people of Guam. I will dedicate all my energies, I will devote

all my time, I will strain all my powers, and I will do all in my command to live up to this responsibility and to persuasively voice before the leaders of our Nation the aspirations, needs, and desires of the people of Guam.

Although today's occasion celebrates a remarkable step forward in our continuing efforts for more and more self-government and ever closer ties with our Nation, we should not forget to pay our respects to past efforts of others beginning back in 1936. Over the years since that first courageous effort almost 30 years ago, much has been accomplished and throughout the long period, it must be noted that all of these delegations to Washington, informal as many of them were, received unfailing cooperation and sympathetic understanding from both the Congress of the United States and the Federal agencies in Washington. When one considers the charges made by strangers that Guam is merely a dependent possession of the United States without the people of Guam being given any chance for self-determination, one remembers with pride the ready attention the problems of Guam have always received in Washington, the generous assistance that has been given by our Federal Government, and the remarkable advances we have made over the last generation, both economically and politically; then one knows full well that the charges that we are a colonial dependency is nonsense, and that both the people of Guam and the leaders of our Nation in Washington are united in a common desire to build ever greater bonds between us and the mainland and to bring us as rapidly as is possible to the mainstream of American life.

In giving credit to Federal Government and its leaders for the remarkable progress we have made, I do not forget, nor do they, that the people of Guam themselves can take pride in their own rapid advances over the past years, and I take nothing away from the efforts on Guam's behalf of our friends in the continental United States when I say that the people of Guam are to be commended upon the new and better Guam that we have seen abuilding on this beautiful island of ours.

In assessing our progress, we must never forget what we owe to the military commands stationed here. It was the Navy that started us on our road to self-government and economic stability; it was the combined efforts of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force that freed us from 3 years of dreadful enemy oppression, and it is those large military bases now here that have made possible Guam's present prosperity and future expectancy. The people of Guam are ever proud that they help man one of the most important defense bastions of the free world. In the dire struggle that is now going on in southeast Asia, we in Guam are practically in the frontlines, and in this we rejoice as we know of no greater honor than that of joining with our fellow Americans and others in the free world in resisting the spread of tyranny and in forwarding the march of freedom and justice. Asia will be the main arena of the world for at least the next century and Guam is America's sole permanent foothold in Asia. Thus, it is our destiny to play an ever-increasing role in depicting for the downtrodden Asian masses the unequalled advantages of democracy and freedom. Thus, the phrase, "Guam—America's showplace for democracy" is more than a mere slogan; it is our most important responsibility and one in which we should take the deepest pride. It will be my main task in Washington, as I see it, to help make Guam an ever better example of American democracy in action.

Thus I place priority on seeking from the Congress and the Federal agencies in Washington greater local autonomy, combined with closer ties with our National Government. As an example, an elected Governor

is legislation I will pursue with vigor. I will also do my best to regularize the position I now hold by seeking legislation to provide Guam's elected Washington representative, whoever he may be, a seat in the Halls of Congress itself. I will also seek to discover whether support can be obtained for a constitutional amendment that would permit Guam to cast its vote in the electoral college that chooses our President. I am, however, completely aware that I go to Washington not to express my own views, but to represent the views of the people of Guam, particularly as duly manifested by our elected representatives in the Guam Legislature, and I will look to them for assistance. Thus, at this time, the legislature is on record in support of both an elected Governor and a Delegate in Congress, but has not decided what other changes are desired in our political status; whether some other form of association with the American Union should be attempted. I have my own views on this, but I intend to live up to both the spirit and the letter of the law that authorized my election and I shall pursue actively the programs and policy of the Guam Legislature as well as that of the administration.

As I see it, another major responsibility that Guam's Washington representative has is that of establishing in Washington the image and identity the people of Guam desire. Although those in Washington who are directly responsible for our well-being are both sympathetic and fairly aware of our problems, the Nation at large, we must admit, is not familiar with either Guam or its peoples, and I shall do what I can to advertise Guam and tell our fellow Americans of our colorful past history and our present contributions to the effective role America is playing in the Far East. If tourists are to be attracted to Guam, which is a goal all of us are united upon, Guam must be better known and its beauties and attractions must be widely advertised. Furthermore, as a firm believer in the American system of free enterprise, I am deeply interested in the commercial and industrial plans of our business leaders here and I shall do all I can in helping them attain assistance to achieve their goal of economic prosperity for all of us. I have been deeply impressed with the great interest taken by the military commands under the leadership of Admiral Bird and General Ohlke in their efforts to promote the further development of Guam's civilian economy, and I promise that they and the business leaders in the community will find me completely receptive to their advice and suggestions on the programs I should pursue in Washington. I am sure that they will be equally cooperative with me in providing me the information and data I will need in bringing to the attention of our public officials and also major American business leaders, all of Guam's potentials—commercial, industrial, and agricultural.

Finally, and frankly I can promise no miracles, and, armed as I am with the mandate of a free election as Guam's first Washington representative, I do not expect, nor should the people of Guam, that the legislation and assistance we seek will be easy to obtain. We must remember the enormous national and global responsibilities faced by Congress and the Federal agencies. Those of necessity come first and Guam must await with patience the attention of our Nation's leaders. Furthermore, the legislative process itself is rightfully a long and complicated one in that both Houses must carefully consider and weigh all proposals from varied angles, and we do not and should not demand for quick decisions from Washington. Guam's political and economic future is too serious a matter to be hastily considered and acted upon in Washington, and, therefore, I urge you to be patient because, just as sure as was the promise of eventual citizenship for us met by the Organic Act, so will our

aspirations for even greater autonomy be eventually met by our Nation and its leaders. We must also never forget we are first and foremost citizens of the United States and that our greatest duty is to our country, and next to our territory. It is our national interests that come first and it is the challenges that we as a part of the American Nation face that call for our greatest concern. We must therefore expect delay and difficulty in overcoming our territorial problems, but we shall never lose confidence in their eventual solution. The United States of America is the greatest nation in the world, not because of its resources or its wealth, but because of its recognition of the dignity of the individual and the rights of freemen, and we as part of that great Nation can rightfully expect that our goals of more self-government and greater freedom will be met.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I beseech all of you to give me the support and confidence that I will need in representing you all in our Capital. I am deeply proud of the many honors you have bestowed upon me in the past but I cannot carry out my task without your counsel and encouragement.

Thank you very much.

WATER PROJECTS RECREATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 23, 1965, pp. 14463-14464, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the conference report was agreed to by the conferees in behalf of the Senate and the conferees in behalf of the House of Representatives.

The principal purpose of the conference version of S. 1229 is to establish prospective standard guidelines on the allocation of and the reimbursability of recreation and fish and wildlife costs of Federal multiple-purpose water-resource projects.

The conference version also gives the Secretary of the Interior certain limited authority for recreation development on existing projects under his control.

The final version also provides for more active congressional participation in the Department of the Interior's water project investigation process. The conferees believe that this will substantially strengthen the Department's water-resource program and be to the mutual benefit of both that agency and the Congress.

This particular provision is found in section 8 of the bill as finally approved.

The effective date on which congressional authority would be required before undertaking project feasibility reports has been changed from January 1 to July 1, 1966, pursuant to agreement of the House and Senate conferees.

This provision was approved in an effort to bring Congress more fully into the water resource project cycle. It will allow the Congress to be better informed on prospective water resource projects nearer their inception rather than to be faced with virtually a "take it or leave it" situation following the submission of the completed project feasibility report by the Secretary of the Interior. The Corps of Engineers has operated under similar planning provisions for many years.

As the author of this particular provision, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is convinced that this will not pose a burden upon the Secretary of the Interior. In fact, in order to obtain funds at present to undertake such feasibility reports, the Bureau of Reclamation must now presumably justify requests to pursue its reports before the Bureau of the Budget and subsequently the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress. The congressional committees with the responsibility for recommending the authorization of these not infrequently very large projects are often not satisfactorily apprised of their scope and nature until the project feasibility report has been submitted. But the authorizing committees must be fully advised on all phases of the project cycle in order to meet their responsibilities to their respective Houses.

As I previously stated, I foresee no difficulty for the Department of the Interior under section 8. I anticipate that an annual omnibus list of project feasibility reports will be presented to the Congress as an executive recommendation. Such an omnibus recommendation would be received shortly after the Congress convenes in each new session.

Of course, the Secretary of the Interior could submit project feasibility report recommendations individually whenever circumstances might warrant such action. Such individual proposals, as well as the annual omnibus bill, will receive prompt consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Secretary of the Interior must plan with foresight the potential water resource project development he intends to advocate before the Congress. In the interest of congressional efficiency and responsibility and in view of the increasing amount of taxpayers' funds involved in our water resources program, the Congress must fully participate in the project cycle. This, of course, does not mean that congressional approval is required for every preliminary investigation of the Department. We recognize that reconnaissance surveys are necessary to determine where potential projects are located and whether they merit further investigation. Once the Secretary of the Interior has determined, however, that a potential project is worthy of the detailed study necessary for its submission

to the Congress for authorization, he must secure congressional approval to undertake the preparation of the project feasibility report.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers of the House, which details the agreement between the House and Senate, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 1229, to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language agreed upon is essentially the language of the House amendment except as herein noted.

REACQUISITION RIGHTS OF PRIOR LANDOWNERS

Section 3(b)(2) of S. 1229 relates to the situation where a construction agency has acquired lands to preserve the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of a project and there has been no interest by a local public body in developing such potential during the specified 10-year period. In these circumstances, the Secretary must make a decision with respect to further use or disposition of the land.

The language of the Senate-passed bill required the head of the construction agency to first offer the land for sale to the immediate prior owner at its appraised fair market value. If it were not disposed of in this manner within 90 days he would have had to determine whether the lands were to be put to other use or reported as excess to the General Services Administration for disposition.

The language of the House-passed bill provided that the head of the construction agency may (1) utilize the lands for any other lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of his agency, (2) transfer custody of the lands to another Federal agency for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that agency, (3) lease the lands to any non-Federal public body, or (4) transfer the lands to the General Services Administration for disposition.

Both the Senate language and the House language provided that in no case shall the lands be used or made available for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed. The House language provided, in addition, that preference be given to uses which promote the recreation and fish and wildlife potential.

The language agreed upon by the conference committee follows:

"Sec. 3. (b)(2) If, within ten years after initial operation of the project, there is not an executed agreement as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the head of the agency having jurisdiction over the project may utilize the lands for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of his agency, or may offer the land for sale to its immediate prior owner or his immediate heirs at its appraised fair market value as approved by the head of the agency at the time of offer or, if a firm agreement by said owner or his immediate heirs is not executed within ninety days of the date of the offer, may transfer custody of the lands to another Federal agency for use for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that

agency, or may lease the lands to a non-Federal public body, or may transfer the lands to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the surplus property laws of the United States. In no case shall the lands be used or made available for use for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed, and in every case except that of an offer to purchase made, as hereinbefore provided, by the prior owner or his heirs preference shall be given to uses which will preserve and promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project or, in the absence thereof, will not detract from that potential."

This language is intended to require the head of the construction agency, if he has no authority to utilize the lands for some other needed and justified purpose, to first offer the lands for sale to the immediate prior owner or his immediate heirs at the appraised fair market value. If the lands are not disposed of in this manner within 90 days, the head of the construction agency may (1) transfer custody of the lands to another Federal agency that needs the lands and has authority to utilize them; (2) lease the lands to any non-Federal public body; or (3) transfer the lands to the General Services Administration for disposition. In the event the prior owner or his immediate heirs cannot readily be found, it is the intent of the conferees that 30-day notice be given by publication in a local newspaper or newspapers of wide circulation in the project area, the 90-day period to begin to run with the first publication of notice in this way. The lands can be used or made available for any purpose not in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed and, except in connection with an offer to sell to the immediate prior owner or his immediate heirs, preference must be given to uses which promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project.

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT AT EXISTING PROJECTS

Section 7 of S. 1229 as passed by the Senate authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate recreation facilities at projects heretofore authorized, provided the cost for such facilities for any one project does not exceed \$50,000.

The language of section 7(a) of the House-passed bill authorized the Secretary to construct and operate recreation facilities and acquire lands for such purpose at any existing project or project hereafter authorized but, with respect to existing projects, no appropriation for land acquisition or development could be made until 60 legislative days after a report recommending such development had been submitted to the Congress and then only if neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had disapproved such proposal.

In lieu of the language in the two bills, the conference committee adopted language making section 7(a) applicable only to projects heretofore constructed by or under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and providing authority for both the construction of recreation facilities and the acquisition of lands provided the Federal cost for both development and acquisition at any one reservoir does not exceed \$100,000. The development could go forward only under an agreement with a local public body for cost sharing and administration.

FEASIBILITY REPORTS OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Section 9 of S. 1229 as passed by the Senate contained language prohibiting the preparation by or under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior of any feasibility report on a water resource project unless it had been specifically authorized by law or unless such preparation had been specifically

directed by either the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There was no similar provision in the House-passed bill.

The conference committee agreed upon language in section 8 which requires prior approval by the Congress of any studies and investigations leading to the preparation of a feasibility report on a reclamation project. The term "feasibility report" is defined in section 10 to mean any report of the scope required by the Congress when formally considering authorization of a project. It does not include such preliminary studies as normally go into the making of reconnaissance-grade reports.

EXTENT OF ALLOCATIONS TO RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE

The language of the House-passed bill contained a provision which, in effect, means that projects in which the sum of the allocations to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement exceeds the sum of the allocations to the other project purposes should not be recommended for authorization and construction under Federal reclamation laws or under any Rivers and Harbors or Flood Control Act.

There was no similar provision in the Senate-passed bill.

The conference committee retained this language but exempted from its coverage any project for the enhancement of anadromous fisheries, shrimp, or the conservation of migratory birds protected by treaty, when each of the other functions of such a project has, of itself, a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL REFUGES

The provision in the House-passed bill placing a \$28 million ceiling on expenditures for lands acquired by construction agencies for the establishment of migratory waterfowl refuges in connection with water resource projects was retained by the conference committee. The conference committee wants it clearly understood that this is a limitation on expenditures and is not itself an authorization for land acquisition. The authorization for the appropriation of funds to acquire lands for these migratory waterfowl refuges will be considered on a case-by-case basis in connection with the authorization of individual water resource projects.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JOE SKUBITZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to direct several questions to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who managed the bill, S. 1229, when it was passed by the Senate, who served as a conferee with representatives of the House, and is now presenting the conference report to the Senate for its consideration.

My questions concern sections of the conference report which I identify specifically as those which would require that one-half of the separable costs of the recreational and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities or project modifications on any multipurpose water project must be assumed by a non-Federal public body.

I have discussed this subject with the distinguished Senator at times, but I am asking these questions to ascertain his

view with respect to the intentions of Congress respecting these sections. In addition to the questions we will discuss here, I want to say that I have discussed these sections with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, with the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, with the Secretary of the Army, and with the Counsel for the Department of the Army. I have been given helpful information by these officials, and I have also addressed questions to the Bureau of the Budget as this legislation was being considered. I think it will be useful to this discussion to have my letter of April 21 and the Bureau of the Budget reply of May 5, 1965, included here, and I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
April 21, 1965.

HON. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: I have been very much concerned about the policy which would require that one-half of the separate costs allocated to recreational and fish and wildlife enhancement in Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects be borne by non-Federal public bodies. This policy might be useful in Bureau of Reclamation projects, but I am sure that it would deny needed flood protection to many communities and areas.

If the community nearest a flood protection reservoir should be required to assume obligation for the non-Federal charge, I doubt that the great majority of communities could do so. The consequence would be the denial of vitally needed flood protection to such communities. If it is said that the community could avoid the obligation by the elimination of recreational and fish and wildlife enhancement, the result would be that, in many cases, the project could not meet the cost-benefit ratio. In either case, the result would be denial of flood protection.

Further, the policy being followed and the legislation which has been proposed are not clear in defining "non-Federal public bodies" against which the cost would be allocated. Recreational and fish and wildlife benefits are enjoyed not alone by the community which is immediately adjacent, and it would seem unfair to impose the cost upon the community nearest the facility. My chief opposition, however, to the policy is that it would deny in many cases necessary flood protection to many communities.

I have discussed this question with the Secretary of the Army, with the Corps of Engineers and with officials of the Bureau of the Budget. I know the subject is complex, but I do not believe that full consideration has been given to the fact that the policy will deny vital flood protection to many communities. I hope very much that you will discuss this problem with the concerned agencies and that procedures may be worked out to assure that communities which cannot bear the cost will be relieved of this imposition and thus assured of flood protection.

On November 10, 1964, I wrote the President of the United States on this subject, and I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of my letter. I will, of course, appreciate any additional information you can provide on this urgent matter.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1965.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Your letter of April 21, 1965, to the Director raised several questions concerning S. 1229, the proposed Federal Water Project Recreation Act. You expressed concern that the proposed act may deny flood protection to some areas. Your concern is appreciated. However, we do not believe enactment of the bill will adversely affect the economic justification of flood protection projects.

The enactment of S. 1229 would establish congressional policy recognizing recreation as a purpose in the planning and construction of Federal water resource projects. Recognition of recreation as a project purpose means that recreation benefits may be considered in the economic justification of a project and that project costs may be allocated to recreation. With the increasing demand for outdoor recreation and the important role that water resources development can play in meeting that demand, we think it very desirable to have general legislative policy on this subject.

The importance of recreation at water resource projects has been recognized in recent years, as in the statement of "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources," approved by President Kennedy in May 1962 for the guidance of executive branch agencies and in the legislative authorization of individual projects. However, there has been no general legislation recognizing recreation as a purpose of water resources development and no uniform policy for treatment of recreation as part of these projects. The enactment of S. 1229 would remedy these deficiencies.

As you know, S. 1229 is similar to H.R. 9032 of the last Congress. However, major changes were made in the provisions relating to cost sharing to reflect the experience of the agencies in applying the provisions of H.R. 9032 and also to reflect comments received on that bill. Your views on H.R. 9032 which were expressed in your letter of November 10, 1964, to the President were very carefully considered in the drafting of S. 1229.

This brings us to another point in your letter—that is definition of "non-Federal public bodies." It is recognized that in some instances a community immediately adjacent to a reservoir may be unable to meet the cost-sharing requirements. And as you indicated, a reservoir could benefit a larger area than the nearby community. Accordingly, the term "non-Federal public bodies" includes one or more of the following public entities, as appropriate: States, counties, municipalities, recreation districts, or other special purpose districts with sufficient authority to participate under the provisions of the bill. The Federal water resource agencies will work with the appropriate non-Federal entities in planning recreation developments, and the extent to which non-Federal interests are willing to participate will be an important factor in developing an appropriate recreation plan for each project.

In recognition of varying abilities of non-Federal interests to share in the costs of recreation developments, two methods of fulfilling the sharing requirements are provided in the bill. First, payment in cash or provision of lands or facilities required for the project; and second, repayment with interest within 50 years. Repayment could be through user fees collected at the project by non-Federal interests. This latter method of repayment would mean that non-local, as well as local, recreation users would help pay for the non-Federal share of project costs.

We do not believe that there will be many instances where agreement cannot be reached on cost sharing under the foregoing provisions. As an example of the ability of non-Federal interests to share costs in recreation development, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation indicates that under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which authorizes grants for non-Federal development of recreation facilities, the States stand ready to match all the Federal funds expected to become available in 1966 under that act.

We appreciate receiving your comments on the bill, and we hope the foregoing explanations will be helpful to you. We consider enactment of this legislation essential in order to establish sound general policy for the treatment of recreation and fish and wildlife at Federal water resource projects.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Deputy Director.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, because the conference report is now being considered by the Senate, and because if the conference report is approved by the Senate, it will become law after being signed by the President, I believe that the intent of Congress in regard to the language about cost sharing is a very important matter and should be made clear here.

Specifically, my concern about this section goes to two points, and I will illustrate my concern by some examples of the problem as it affects areas I know well. In the eastern part of Kentucky there are a number of streams and rivers, including those in the Big Sandy River basin, and its Tug and Levisa Forks, and there are the important basins encompassed by the Kentucky River, the Cumberland River, and the Licking River, among others. In the northern and western parts of my State, there are other great and important river basins, with long valleys and full tributaries. Year after year, the section of Kentucky—and similar areas in other States—are ravaged by floods, which result in property losses of millions of dollars, as well as the loss of human life and the destruction of community and family life.

To protect the river valleys not only in Kentucky but in the many States with similar rivers and streams it is necessary that flood protection facilities such as dams and reservoirs be constructed. It is the only way that the communities in these valleys and the people living there can be protected, and that their security and economic opportunity can be provided and maintained.

Although the total cost of each of the proposed facilities is not great, there is always the problem of whether the cost-benefit ratio can be met. As the Senator knows, Congress in practice does not authorize and appropriate funds for flood control facilities unless the cost-benefit ratio is favorable.

My first question applies to a facility in which, in order to gain a favorable cost-benefit ratio, recreational benefits, and perhaps fish and wildlife enhancement benefits would be included. Let us assume that there is a facility which, without these benefits, had an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio. If the provisions of this conference report mean that the recreation or fish and wildlife facilities giving benefits could not be included

unless the non-Federal public body, which might be a community or a local government unit, would assume one-half of the separable costs of the facilities bringing this benefit, I believe the result will be that vital flood protection will never be made available to these communities in a great many cases.

I also ask the Senator, in the event that there were cases in which the inclusion of recreational benefits and fish and wildlife enhancement benefits would make a very important difference in determining whether the ratio is favorable, would this provision be so strictly applied, that if a community were not able to pay half the cost, the benefit could not be used, and therefore the complete project, including the vital flood control facility, would never be able to meet the cost-benefit ratio requirement, with the result that flood protection would be denied?

Mr. JACKSON. First of all, I commend the distinguished and able Senator from Kentucky for his continuing interest in this problem. He has conferred with me a number of times in connection with the pending legislation.

I should say that the thrust of the pending legislation is principally to provide guidelines for the executive branch of the Government in planning these multipurpose projects for submission to the Congress. The Congress, of course, can consider each proposed project on its own merits and take whatever action it finds appropriate.

Therefore, I emphasize that the pending legislation is a directive to the executive branch in connection with the planning of water-project proposals.

It is clearly expected that the Bureau of the Budget and the water-resource agencies would give most careful and sympathetic consideration to the cost-sharing problems you outlined in eastern Kentucky and similar areas, with a view to recommending whether an exception to these guidelines would be in order. In this regard, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, wrote Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL on February 19, 1965, that:

The formulation of a general policy to fit every circumstance is made difficult by the great variety among water-resources projects—in size, purposes served, and problems encountered. Therefore, the water-resources agencies may in some instances recommend departures from the general policy.

Mr. COOPER. In connection with the construction of reservoirs and dams which will protect a number of communities and areas downstream from the facility, there has been much fear that the term "non-Federal public body" might cause costs to be allocated against a community which geographically might be nearest the flood control facility. Would the Senator say that a proper interpretation of the term "non-Federal public body" could mean a State or a group of communities, and is not limited to the community nearest the facility?

Mr. JACKSON. The term "non-Federal public body" as used in the pending proposed legislation is used in a broad sense. It includes everything

other than the Federal Government in the public area. It would mean the State—and I make the citation only by way of example—and it could mean a political subdivision of a State.

Mr. COOPER. That interpretation would seem more reasonable, because the recreational benefits and those resulting from fish and wildlife enhancement would not be available only to the nearest community.

Mr. JACKSON. Often the benefits might go to those far beyond the adjacent community.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has said that the provisions in the bill are guidelines. I see the distinguished chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in the Chamber. Assuming that the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House, or the Appropriations Committees dealing with projects of the Corps of Engineers found, upon considering an authorization bill or appropriation bill, that a particular flood control project was vitally needed for flood protection and could not be brought under the proposed guidelines, could those committees decide in specific cases that the cost-sharing guideline or cost-sharing formula should be waived with respect to a particular facility?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question about that. I again emphasize that the pending proposed legislation merely represents guidelines for the executive branch to follow prior to the submission of project proposals for consideration by the Congress. When they are submitted Congress can take any action it finds appropriate. Similarly, the Appropriations Committee can take whatever action it might deem fit.

The bill is, I reemphasize, principally a broad-gaged policy directive to the executive branch by which it is stated, "These are some of the criteria that we believe you should generally follow in planning."

When a project is submitted it will be up to Congress to decide whether to accept, reject, or modify it.

Mr. COOPER. That raises another point. The Senator has referred to the submission of projects to the Congress.

The Senator has said—and I believe he is correct—that the appropriate committee—for example, the Committee on Public Works with respect to an authorization bill and the Committee on Appropriations with respect to an appropriation bill for, say, a Corps of Engineers project—could take whatever action it thought proper. I have noted your expectation, as the floor manager of this bill, S. 1229, that the Bureau of the Budget and the water-resource agencies would give most careful and sympathetic consideration to the cost-sharing problems we have been discussing here, and my distinguished colleague, who is chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which reported this legislation, has said that the intent of this bill is for the Bureau of the Budget to consider this problem with a view to recommending whether an exception to these guidelines would be in order in situa-

tions such as I have outlined in eastern Kentucky, where flood protection is vitally needed.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has said that nothing in this bill is to be taken to mean that a committee of the Congress cannot take action it deems proper with respect to any particular facility. In this regard, it would be recognized that the Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, or any other agency which makes a study or is responsible for making recommendations to the Congress in regard to flood protection facilities would not be directed in every case to apply the formula for local sharing of separable costs as included in this bill. Could the Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, and other agencies, if they found in a particular case that it would be inequitable to apply the formula, or if they found that it would be impossible for such a formula to be applied and still enable construction of the needed flood protection facility, or if they found that the overriding need for flood protection was so great that the formula should not be insisted upon, recommend to the Congress either the authorization of a project or appropriations for a project without requiring the assurance of sharing in connection with the separable costs provision?

Mr. JACKSON. I fully appreciate the very real importance of the problem the Senator from Kentucky describes. There is no question that the Director of the Budget Bureau has authority to recommend an exception to the planning guidelines of S. 1229 when special circumstances warrant it.

I am sure that we are not wise enough—I must confess that I am not learned enough—to look so far in advance as to be able to state that the guidelines in this legislation are immutable. Obviously, they are mutable. They will always be so. But there is a need, I believe, for some broad planning directives to the executive agencies in regard to water projects. We need wise and prudent standards. That is what we are trying to establish here. I believe that the Congress will continue, as it should, to exercise its discretion properly and make its final decision on the merits in every case. But this legislation does not purport to prejudge the future in the field of public works, reclamation, or in any other area of resource development.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the reason the Senator has given for the provision of these guidelines, which may help in the establishment of some priorities among projects.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But we all know that some are much more necessary than others. I assume also that the purpose is to insure that we do not get away from the basic purposes of flood control, navigation, and water resource control, so it is important to provide for very careful study and determination before submission, authorization, and construction of projects which may be mostly concerned with recreation, fish, and wildlife enhancement.

My concern has been that a rigid application of this formula might deny to the States—not only to my State, but to other States, as well—and to areas that are stricken year after year by awful floods, the possibility of flood protection. I am much pleased by the Senator's statement that the guidelines are not rigid, immutable rules that must be followed in every case.

One other question: Some officials of my State, some communities of my State, and the people of some communities have expressed a fear, which I felt at the beginning of the consideration of this problem, that a public body might be required to supply funds immediately, either by way of appropriations or from the sale of bonds, and might not be able to do so. Does the Senator from Washington know whether or not this method of assuring and paying the separable cost has been considered and might be approved; that is, that over a period of years the separable cost may be amortized and repaid by user funds?

Mr. JACKSON. We deliberately made provision for repayment from entrance and user fees or charges within 50 years of first use of project recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities. The clear intent of the planning guidelines—again, I emphasize planning guidelines—is to give to local public entities the broadest possible assurances of an opportunity to participate in the program on a reasonable basis.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Washington for his consideration and for his answers.

Mr. JACKSON. I compliment the Senator from Kentucky for his thoughtful contribution to the proper understanding of this legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the bill, it is, more or less, to make uniform the rules and regulations that now apply or that can be applied by the Corps of Engineers, so that they may be applicable to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JACKSON. We have had policies that have been inconsistent with respect to Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent would the regulations apply to the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. JACKSON. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation could be subject to uniform planning guidelines with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs. For example, we provide for reimbursability in connection with the separable costs of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom?

Mr. JACKSON. By local public bodies. In regard to fish and wildlife, reimbursability is required where the benefits are of a local nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. The next question is not in respect to the pending business. I was busy this morning holding hearings on the farm bill. I was informed

that the Senate had passed S. 602, which had been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As I understand, the purpose of the bill, according to the report, is to increase the authorization of funds available for the loan and grant program from the present \$100 to \$200 million; second, to raise the limitation on loans or grants of Federal funds on single projects from \$5 million to a limit of \$7.5 million; third, to make the interest rate payable by the Treasury as provided in the Water Supply Act of 1958, instead of the rate of the average annual yield on long-term Government obligations. Is the Senator from Washington familiar with that particular interest rate? Can he say how it differs from what the law now provides?

Mr. JACKSON. First, in connection with the small reclamation projects, to which the bill, S. 602, is directed, I should mention that the interest rate requirement in the act is different from that in regular reclamation law. The Small Reclamation Projects Act, to which the Senator has referred, requires that the portion of the loan applicable to municipal and industrial water, power, and excess lands be repaid with interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the same principle being applied to these projects?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, loans for non-irrigation facilities and features are repayable with interest. When a single-purpose reclamation project has been completed, the principal is repaid, but without interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as to the small reclamation projects—

Mr. JACKSON. That principle does apply. All that is involved here is the rate of interest to be applied to small reclamation projects. As the Senator knows, the argument over interest rates has been going on for a long time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that. That is why I am raising the question.

Mr. JACKSON. What we have followed in this instance is to attempt to make the rate on the interest-bearing features of small reclamation projects conform to interest rates on regular Federal water projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the report, the third item of amendment would:

Make the interest rate that payable by the Treasury, as provided in the Water Supply Act of 1958, instead of that of the average annual yield on long-term Government obligations; interest on loans currently outstanding would be revised retroactively to this rate.

I should imagine that the purpose of that amendment is to provide a little relief in the interest field. Am I correct in that assumption or not?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, the Senator is correct. But the problem is one of uniformity. The amendment would make the rate on small projects conform to that on regular Federal water projects with respect to the interest bearing features.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not if the payment is made retroactive and the rate of in-

terest is lowered. The Government would be out of interest in some way. I wonder if the Senator could be more specific.

Mr. JACKSON. The bill would change the interest rate in the Small Projects Act to make it the same as now applicable under the Water Supply Act formula. That is all that we are doing at this time. The rate would be the same.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that rate is what?

Mr. JACKSON. Approximately 3¼ percent, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Regardless of what the Government pays for that money, we are providing that it be 3¼ percent; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. We are providing for it on the basis of the formula that has been in effect since 1958.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the present rate of interest?

Mr. JACKSON. The Water Supply Act formula interest rate is 3½ percent for fiscal 1965.

Mr. ELLENDER. The rate of interest is 3½ percent under existing law.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would it be under the bill that was acted on, I presume, on the Consent Calendar, without any opposition and without anyone knowing what was being done here? What would the rate be under S. 602?

Mr. JACKSON. It would be 3½ percent, which the Secretary of the Treasury has certified to be the average rate of interest paid on the long-term securities of the United States which are neither due nor callable for 15 years from the date of issue.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, has the motion to reconsider been made on S. 602? I would like to move to reconsider, if I am in order. I have been trying to watch some of these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No motion to reconsider was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion is entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the explanation of the distinguished Senator from Washington and his interpretation of the various sections of the conference report.

The Senator from Washington knows that I have absolute confidence in everything he says, and there is no question in my mind about the statement or interpretation of the Senator. However, I am concerned about the interpretation that some agency in the executive branch may give to this legislation. I am concerned specifically that the Bureau of

the Budget might apply these guidelines so strictly that, in some cases—where flood protection is vitally needed—the construction of vital flood control facilities might be delayed for a long time.

For that reason, I am constrained to vote against the bill, but I shall write the President again about these problems and to call the attention of the executive agencies to them and to the intent discussed here. Mr. President, I ask that my vote be recorded in the negative.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40 TO PROVIDE UNIFORM POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE BENEFITS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 40—concerning the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multipurpose water resource projects, and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 40—to correct the enrollment of S. 1229.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1229), to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to strike out the words "Act of 1965" in the last line of subsection (h) of section 6.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution was necessary to correct a technical error in citation in subsection 6(h) of S. 1229 as reported by the committee of conference. No change of substance is in any way involved.

LEO M. MONDRY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Leo M. Mondry.

OPEN DISCUSSION ON VIETNAMESE SITUATION IS HEALTHY AND WISE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there appears a column by Roscoe Drummond on the national debate over Vietnam.

I agree with President Johnson on his Vietnamese policies. I believe that they make sense. The President is right in continuing our 10-year commitment to South Vietnam to help it resist aggression. He is right in doing all that he can to seek negotiation. I recognize that the facts are far from clear, and there is a great deal of room for disagreement on the part of many.

I believe that what Mr. Drummond has to say in his column in this morning's Washington Post is unusually significant. He calls attention to the fact that close to a majority of the American people believe that the protests and teachings on Vietnam are not even sincere. A majority feel that while they may be sincere, they are unhealthy and unwise and bad for the country.

It seems to me that, in these circumstances, a protest in our universities is in the best American tradition. I believe that with regard to Vietnam that it serves a useful purpose. Indeed, I believe that our policies have already been refined, improved, modified on the basis of some of those criticisms.

The debate between Mr. Bundy and Mr. Morgenthau on television recently was a most enlightening and informative discussion and was one of the most instructive programs that television has carried this year.

We have had throughout our history a tradition of protest, even in periods of dire national peril. How can any Senator forget that it was the Senate of the United States which was the foundation for the protest against President Wilson's involvement in World War I? Indeed, my predecessor in this seat, once or twice removed, Senator Bob La Follette, did a great deal in trying to slow down our involvement in World War I by means of his vigorous and vehement criticism of President Wilson. We know that in World War II there were voices of dissent raised—as they should have been—in the Senate. We know that the same thing occurred in the Korean war.

I believe that the debate that we have had on South Vietnam is far from an unhealthy or unwise thing. I believe that it is very useful. I believe that if anything is needed, it would be more of this debate, more vigorous dissent, and discussion. After all, a democracy is only a democracy when the people are fully informed on the pros and cons of vital policies, and what policies are currently more vital than our actions in Vietnam? What policies require greater information or enlightenment?

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the column published in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Minority Opinion—Protests Held Healthy," by Roscoe Drummond, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROTESTS HELD HEALTHY
(By Roscoe Drummond)

A recent Louis Harris poll reveals two startling and disturbing facts:

That a majority of Americans who have followed the campus teach-ins and student protests over Vietnam feel that these

actions are "a bad thing," unhealthy, to be condemned.

That a near-majority does not even concede honesty of conviction to the protesting professors and students and dismisses the teach-ins as something organized by "radicals."

I dissent.

As one who strongly supports the rightness and necessity of President Johnson's unwavering defense of South Vietnam, I think that the teach-in movement is overwhelmingly honest in purpose and is not harmful or unhealthy.

I think it is helpful and healthy for these reasons:

1. There are nearly 5 million college students in the United States. Many can already vote. Nearly all of them will be voting in the next presidential election. Far better that they should be sharpening their concern about the real world than swallowing goldfish as they did in the 1930's or indulging the woes of the "bland generation" or the "beatnik generation" as they did in the 1950's. It's healthy.

2. We needed more debate and more public discussion—for the Government's stand on Vietnam and against it—and we were not getting it until the campus teach-ins helped to stimulate it.

3. Criticism of the Government does not hurt. It helps. It serves to focus and stabilize public opinion. Did the anti-Vietnam teach-ins undercut support for the President's course in Vietnam? No, just the opposite.

In the wake of the teach-ins the Gallup poll revealed three changes in public opinion—Support for quitting Vietnam went up 1 percent; support for defending went up 7 percent; the personal popularity of President Johnson went up 6 percent; support for the Democratic Party as the best guardian of the peace went up 3 percent.

4. The expression of unpopular minority opinion—about Vietnam or anything else—ought to be respected and defended. The only way to protect the right of free speech for the majority is to protect the rights of the minority. Let's not look down at minority opinion; let's look up to it—and meet it head-on in the arena of free speech.

5. But shouldn't we close ranks in time of war? Ideally, yes. But this must be voluntary. It cannot be brought about by compulsion or coercion. Furthermore, our stake in the defense of South Vietnam is not so self-evident that it does not need more exposition and debate.

The truth is that the size of our commitment to defend South Vietnam has grown in a way that made it difficult for the American people to really know where we stood until the President's Baltimore speech of last April.

Our military help was to be "advisory." It became far more than advisory.

Our troop buildup in 1961 and 1962 was kept secret by President Kennedy. We had 2,000 men in Vietnam in 1961 and 11,000 in 1962. This buildup was not disclosed to the country until January 1963.

The size of our forces in Vietnam has now grown to 75,000 as of this month.

I believe that President Johnson is acting wisely to resist this aggression right where it is taking place. I believe that to permit it to succeed could only mean larger aggression under worse circumstances.

But public opinion has not been well served until recent weeks and it is only fair to state the facts candidly. That is what we need more of.

Mr. PROXMIER. 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.

WHITE HOUSE SIT-IN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a few days ago a judge in Washington imposed a 6-month jail sentence upon certain young men and women who, in a defiant way, entered the White House and sat down, thus defying the requests and commands to leave, and remained in the White House for a rather protracted period of time in violation of the law.

The judge who imposed the sentence was Judge Scalley, in the court of general sessions.

There has been some discussion as to the propriety of the sentence imposed. There are some who have expressed the view that the 6-month sentence is too severe and cannot be justified in any manner, when one considers the need of justice in our courts.

Mr. President, the imposition of sentences in criminal cases to precisely meet the seriousness of the offense committed is a rather difficult problem. The judge who has heard the testimony and listened to the answers given by the accused must use what he believes is his best judgment in determining the type of sentence that will in the best interest of the people be imposed upon the offender. I was a judge for 10 years.

Mr. President, in that experience on the bench, my recollection is that I approached the imposition of penalty on certain bases. First, I wanted to learn whether the act of the defendant was one of deliberation and premeditation; second, whether the offense was committed under compulsion of economic want; third, whether the offense was the consequence of a mind that was immature in its capacity to determine what a proper social course of conduct ought to be; and, fourth, to ascertain whether the individual had previously been involved in criminal misconduct.

One who commits an offense because of a limited intellectual capacity to understand his social responsibilities likewise must be treated with some degree of leniency. Judge Scalley had before him a group of offenders who, with premeditation and deliberation, violated the law. These young men who decided to enter the White House as visitors, knowing in advance that when they got into the White House they intended to sit down, challenge the officers of the Federal Government, and refuse to leave when request was made upon them. In my opinion, this offense was one of deliberate and premeditated intention of violating the law.

We now come to the question as to whether or not what these young men did was a serious challenge to duly constituted government and law enforcement officials. All but one who were sentenced are students in college. It cannot be said of them that their capacity to think and recognize their social responsibility was limited. It cannot be said that they were driven by economic

pressure to commit the offense. What they did was deliberate and premeditated. They challenged the sanctity of the White House. They challenged the authority of duly constituted government officials and law enforcement officers.

If these boys are to be dealt with leniently, with a slap on the wrist, I ask the question, What will be the impact on boys in the future concerning their responsibility to comply with law and order?

We speak about liberty in our country, but we cannot have liberty unless there is obedience to law and order. When law and order are defied, liberty leaves, and leaves with great speed. Those of us who want to preserve for the future the liberties provided for us in the Constitution owe a grave responsibility to see to it that law and order are maintained.

In the administration of the criminal laws of our country, there must be a blend of tenderness and firmness. Unless there is that blend, the result is, if the penalties are too severe, eventually that juries will not convict and judges will not convict. But if there is a leniency beyond reason shown to offenders, the net result is that encouragement is given to all others to defy law and order.

The Senator from Arkansas has just mentioned the status of criminal conduct within our country.

On the floor of the Senate, I venture to say that in the past 6 months we have dealt with half a dozen bills trying to help youth stay out of crime. Bills have been passed providing aid to youth. No one objects to those efforts. But, unless the courts will deal firmly with offenders who deliberately and premeditatedly violate the law, there will be trouble.

What is the status of the moral picture in America today? In one State, 80 persons are under indictment for corruption in Government. In another State, a number of judges have admittedly been involved in the acceptance of bribes in the administration of justice. All these things contribute to a general disrespect for law and order.

I comment further on the propriety of the sentence imposed in this case by Judge Scalley. Judge Scalley presided over the trial. He heard the evidence. He therefore understood the gravity of what happened. He decided that these men should serve 6 months in jail. I am prepared to rely on his judgment in a greater degree than I am prepared to rely on those who are not fully familiar with the complexities of the case, and who are not officially burdened with the responsibility of executing the law.

The time has come when these sit-in demonstrations—which are thought out, planned, and then put into action—must be dealt with by the lawful authorities with a degree of severity far greater than has been practiced in the past.

My final view is that the sentence imposed by Judge Scalley will have a salutary effect upon the maintenance of law and order throughout the country. It will be an example to other persons in

authority to exert themselves to prevent disobedience to law and order. In my judgment, it will strengthen the backbone of the presidents and boards of regents of our universities. It will strengthen the backbone of other judges in the country. The net result will be constructive and wholesome in the maintenance of law and order which is so vitally needed today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe it can be said—at least this is my observation; I think millions of Americans will join me in this conclusion—that we now have more lawlessness and greater disrespect for law, and the lowest respect for law and order in the United States than ever before in its history.

I believe that comments such as the distinguished Senator from Ohio is referring to and the kind of support given to those who, as the Senator has observed and stated, willfully defy constituted authority, knowing they are doing it, simply contribute to further disrespect for law. Those who disrespect the law and those who want to violate the law will get solace and comfort from that kind of support.

I do not think there is anyone in America today who, by reason of the article being published, has greater respect for law and order than he would have had. I simply think it is support for those who today deliberately violate the law and who feel they can get off with light punishment and, in many cases, no punishment at all. They will feel a greater defiance for the law and exercise a greater defiance for the law from this sort of moral support than would be so if there were a demand for tighter enforcement and greater punishment for crime than is the rule in our land today.

I wish to commend the Senator for his remarks.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has been closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 321.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 357, S. 596.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 596) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has approved, without a dissenting vote, S. 596, that would assist communities in establishing regional medical complexes to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

The toll of heart disease, cancer, and stroke in terms of human suffering, pain, and hardship cannot be measured. But we do know that the three killers in this country affected the lives of 30 million persons and their families and friends in 1963. We also know that 1,187,558 lives of Americans ended with the cause of death listed as heart disease, cancer, or stroke in the same year.

Heart disease, cancer, and stroke account for 71 percent of the deaths in this country and for 51 percent of the deaths of our people under 65 years of age.

The economic cost to the Nation for the ravages wrought by heart disease, cancer, and stroke amounted to \$31.5 billion in 1962. This total includes an estimated \$4 to \$5 billion in direct costs of care and treatment as well as the indirect costs associated with loss of earnings due to disability and premature death.

A panel to our country's most distinguished medical authorities and laymen has reported to the President and to this committee that we can eliminate several hundred thousand unnecessary deaths each year if we bring to our citizens the full benefit of what we know today about prevention, detection, treatment, and cure in the case of heart disease, cancer, and stroke. It is to this purpose that S. 596 addresses itself.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the membership of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

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

MEMBERSHIP OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, professor and chairman, Department of Surgery, Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Tex., Chairman.

MEMBERS

Dr. Samuel Bellet, professor of clinical cardiology, Graduate School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.

Mr. John M. Carter, editor, McCall's magazine, New York, N.Y.

Dr. E. Lee Clark, director and surgeon in chief, the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, Houston, Tex.

Dr. Edward W. Dempsey, former dean, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.: Resigned on September 28, 1964, to become special assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Sidney Farber, director of research, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, and professor, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Marion S. Fay, former president and dean, the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y., and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Emerson Foote, former chairman of the board, McCann-Erickson, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, immediate past president, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Philip Handler, professor and chairman, Department of Biochemistry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N.C.

Mr. Arthur O. Hanisch, president, Stuart Co., Pasadena, Calif.

Dr. Frank Horsfall, Jr., president and director, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, N.Y.

Dr. J. Willis Hurst, professor and chairman, Department of Internal Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, director, Division of Scientific Activities, American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill. Resigned as of September 5, 1964, to become special consultant to the Commission.

Mrs. Florence Mahoney, cochairman, National Committee Against Mental Illness, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Charles W. Mayo, emeritus staff surgeon, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.

Dr. John S. Meyer, professor and chairman, Department of Neurology, Wayne State University College of Medicine, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. James F. Oates, chairman of the board, Equitable Life Assurance Society, New York, N.Y.

Dr. E. M. Papper, professor and chairman, Department of Anesthesiology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, professor and chairman, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University Medical Center, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Paul W. Sanger, surgeon, Charlotte, N.C.

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Helen B. Taussig, emeritus professor of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Harry S. Truman, Independence, Mo.

Dr. Irving S. Wright, professor of clinical medicine, Cornell University, Medical College, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Jane C. Wright, adjunct associate professor of research surgery, New York University School of Medicine, New York, N.Y.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, many distinguished doctors and scientists served on the Commission. However, the Commission was not composed entirely of

doctors and scientists. For example, many of the members of that Commission were distinguished leaders in their fields, outside medicine and science.

I cite Mr. Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.; Mr. John M. Carter, editor, McCall's magazine, New York, N.Y.; and Mr. Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y. Of course, we remember him also as the former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have had the privilege of knowing a number of Cabinet officers all through the years that I have been in the Senate, but I believe that Mr. Folsom was among the most able, most outstanding, and finest heads of Government departments that I have ever known.

Also on the Commission was Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, immediate past president of the American National Red Cross in Washington, D.C. Also Dr. Frank Horsfall, Jr., president and director of Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. Also Dr. Charles W. Mayo, emeritus staff surgeon of the famous Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn. Also Mr. James F. Oates, chairman of the board, Equitable Life Assurance Society in New York City. Also Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America in New York. He is one of the most forward looking men that I have ever known in my life, a man of great vision, a man of tremendous ability.

I shall not read all the names on the list. I have already placed all of them in the RECORD. I have almost hesitated to read any of them without reading all of them. One I wish to refer to is Dr. Helen B. Taussig, of Johns Hopkins University, who with Dr. Blalock—and I say to my friend from Georgia that Dr. Blalock is a native of the great State of Georgia—at Johns Hopkins Hospital performed the first blue baby heart operation.

People of that character served on this Commission. They served on the Commission and brought us a unanimous report. They are all outstanding leaders in our country. As Members of the Senate know, the Chairman of the Commission was Dr. Michael DeBakey, of Houston, Tex. When the Duke of Windsor had to undergo a serious operation on his heart, it was not done in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, or any of the other places that we used to think of as great centers of medicine and surgery. He went from London to Houston, Tex., where this operation was performed successfully. The bill before the Senate is to carry out the recommendations of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

I notice in the Chamber my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. One of the distinguished members of the Commission was from the State of North Carolina. North Carolina has three very fine medical centers and some very great scientists in the field of biology and health.

The members of the Commission, and I shall not repeat the names of these outstanding leaders of our country, carried out the most comprehensive and careful study of heart disease, cancer, and stroke that has been undertaken and set forth recommendations for minimizing the toll of these three leading killers and cripples of mankind.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Alabama so far has alluded to southerners. Were there no Yankees on that Commission?

Mr. HILL. Certainly there were Yankees on the Commission. For example, I noticed the name, which I had not read, of Mr. Emerson Foote, former chairman of McCann Erickson, Inc., New York, N.Y. I believe the Senator might claim Mr. Emerson Foote, who came from New York; but let me get a little closer to New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. New Yorkers are not Yankees; only a New Englander is a Yankee.

Mr. HILL. Then, for the sake of my friend from New Hampshire, I shall refer to a doctor in New England. From the list I select the name of Dr. Sidney Farber, who is as dedicated a man as any I have ever known in my life. He is giving his life fighting leukemia, particularly leukemia in little, beloved children. He is director of research, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, and professor of Harvard Medical School at Boston, Mass., which is in the heart of New England.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I see in the Chamber my friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I notice on the list the name of Dr. Philip Handler, professor and chairman, Department of Biochemistry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N.C. Dr. Handler is one of the great biochemists of our country.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill now being considered is the bill which New England people from Vermont discussed with the Senator and about which they are so enthusiastic.

Mr. HILL. It is, indeed. They are not only enthusiastic about it, but they have already started the formation of such a complex as the bill contemplates.

Mr. AIKEN. They already have full approval of the State legislature.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. They have my full approval, too. I believe we have the approval of the Senator from Alabama. They have an application which they intend to file the instant the bill is signed. They are prepared to be the first institution or group in the United States to establish the proposed regional complex.

Mr. HILL. They are first on my list.

Mr. AIKEN. Therefore I hope there will be no delay in enacting the proposed

legislation and having it signed by the President.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend, Vermont is first on the list of States that have laid the foundations for the program. They have already proceeded with their planning. They have already gone to work to form a complex such as is contemplated under the proposed legislation.

Their work is evidence that there is already a growing and enthusiastic response throughout the Nation to the prospect of regional medical complexes in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

On May 5, Governor Hoff, of Vermont, signed a bill which creates a mechanism for planning with regard to the proposed new program that would be authorized by S. 596. This act of the Vermont Legislature creates an advisory board representing the medical society, the health department, and interested organizations and institutions. The act also designates the University of Vermont as the planning agency and appropriates funds to carry out the planning activity.

Preliminary discussions involving the two medical schools, the State medical society, and other health organizations and agencies in the State of Virginia have been held. These discussions look forward to the development of a cooperative approach on the part of all interested institutions and organizations in Virginia in bringing the benefits of regional medical complexes to that State. Virginia is fortunate in being able to build on the experience derived since the end of World War II in operating a limited program of cooperation between the medical schools and hospitals in various areas of the State.

Discussions are also proceeding in North Carolina which indicate that this program can help the people of North Carolina to achieve some of the objectives set forth by a statewide commission established by the State legislature almost 20 years ago. That commission saw the need to establish more fruitful relationships between the medical schools and the community hospitals in order to create better training opportunities and to communicate more effectively in health knowledge.

The State of Iowa already has in being some of the elements of regional medical complexes in that the university hospital in Iowa City has cooperative arrangements with all areas of the State and a program is underway which links the university medical center with other community hospitals in the State through a closed-circuit TV network for the purpose of communicating the latest advances in medical science.

The Bingham Associates program operating out of Boston has for some years provided the basis for making available to a considerable number of hospitals throughout the State of Maine and in other New England States the capabilities of the New England Medical Center in Boston.

Another successful program already in operation is the Albany regional hospital

program which provides on a limited experimental basis for formal collaboration between the Albany Medical College and five hospitals in other communities. This collaboration is intended to make available to the physicians of hospitals the latest advances in medical knowledge through continuing programs of post-graduate medical education.

These brief examples show that, not only has this program struck a responsive chord throughout the country, but that it will build on the base of a number of activities already in progress on a limited scale.

Mr. AIKEN. Over half of the graduates of the University of Vermont are now practicing medicine in New England. They specialize as family doctors.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. They are about the only medical institution left which turns out old-fashioned family physicians who know what ails a person no matter what it is.

Mr. HILL. The Legislature of Vermont has its plans well underway.

Mr. AIKEN. They work in close harmony with the 2-year premedical course at Dartmouth College in Hanover, N.H., which nearly 200 years ago was intended to be established in Vermont, but the geographical lines became twisted. Hanover happens to be the next town to where our distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire resides. I am sure that he has an interest because it is in his region.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct. We are all very proud of what the University of Vermont is doing. Dartmouth is seeking to help. But in reference to the remark of the distinguished Senator from Vermont about the fact that Hanover, N.H., was intended to be in Vermont, I merely wish to say that at the time Dartmouth was founded, Vermont belonged to New Hampshire, but we let Vermont go.

Mr. AIKEN. Not exactly. The towns on the east side of the Connecticut River, including the Senator's hometown of Lebanon, were considered part of Vermont. As evidence of that I point out that at one time Vermont elected a Lieutenant Governor from the town of Lebanon. And at the one time a meeting of the Vermont State Legislature was held in what is now considered to be a part of the State of New Hampshire.

The intentions of the people of western New Hampshire were good, but when Vermont decided to join the Union, the U.S. Government, as it has done sometimes more recently, stepped into our affairs and upset the plans.

Seriously speaking, I believe that the bill is a very fine measure, and I hope that it will be passed.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the following communication from Dr. Robert J. Slater, dean of the College of Medicine at the University of Vermont, as it pertains to the pending legislation.

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

MEMORANDUM BY DR. ROBERT SLATER

This memorandum is written to delineate the planning by Gov. Philip Hoff, the legislature, and the University of Vermont regarding the intent of the President of the United States and the recommendations of the DeBakey commission to assure a continuing potential for physicians and other health professionals to provide the best in services through new programs in heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

THE REGIONAL INFLUENCE OF THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

The College of Medicine of the University of Vermont is the only 4-year medical school north of Boston. In relation to other medical schools it is located 175 miles north of Albany and 250 miles northwest of Boston, 80 miles north of the 2-year Dartmouth Medical School in Hanover, N.H., and 100 miles south of the McGill and University of Montreal schools.

The patient-care programs extend throughout the northwestern New England region, including northern Vermont, northeastern New York, northern New Hampshire, and western Maine. The programs for continuing professional education reach out to the entire region of the northeastern United States, integrated with similar programs of other medical schools.

Historically, since 1822, this college of medicine has been the well-spring of medical care for this region. Over one-half of the doctors in Vermont are graduates of the medical college and one-half of the living graduates are practicing medicine in the New England States. Vermont ranks fifth in the Nation with its physician-population ratio and first in the relative number of family physicians.

The capability of the medical college has expanded greatly in recent years, in large part resultant to major Federal support of research and training programs. Having been awarded \$4.3 million of Federal funds in the spring of 1965, it is currently embarking on an \$8.7 million program of construction to complete the replacement of antiquated facilities and to expand for an increase in the medical student body from 200 to 300.

THE CONCEPT OF A REGIONAL MEDICAL COMPLEX

Resultant to the DeBakey Commission report and the ensuing Federal bills for the establishment of regional medical complexes (S. 596 and H.R. 3140), the health committees of the Vermont Legislature developed a bill (S. 30) to create a mechanism for regional planning. Signed by Governor Hoff on May 5, 1965, the bill designates the university as the agent to submit an application for planning funds, if and when the Federal legislation is enacted.

To support the university in this task, the bill created an advisory board of nine members to be appointed by the Governor with the advice of the president of the university. These represent the college of medicine, the Vermont State Medical Society, the Vermont State Health Department, the Vermont Hospital Association, the paramedical groups, the health insurance industry, and three lay individuals. Ten thousand dollars was appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill. It is anticipated that the Governor will call the first meeting prior to July 1965.

The next stage will involve development of an interstate regional planning group.

INTERPRETATION OF THE DE BAKEY REPORT
AND LEGISLATION

It is generally conceded that the recommendations of the DeBakey Commission contain many ideas which, properly implemented, could assure continuing improvement in the health of the people. Our preliminary thinking supports the concept that there is much to be achieved by adapting the recommendations of the Commission particularly to expansion and greater financial support of existing programs of the various health agencies, coupled with interagency areawide planning and coordination.

There is concern felt by many that too rapid an increase in emphasis on research in new centers as well as in regional hospitals may place a considerable strain upon existing professional staff. Since there exists a major deficit in manpower in the health fields at present, we consider that the suggested reorientation of programs and staffing must be phased in such a way that there is assured no lessening of the number and effectiveness of physicians and other personnel who provide primary patient care.

THE ROLE OF THE PRACTICING PHYSICIANS

The major potential of this medical college for continuing improvement in medical care throughout this region is based upon its excellent relationships with the practicing physicians. Thus, when the university suggested the value of early planning in anticipation of Federal legislation, with the idea of helping to shape the implementation of such planning as it might apply to New England, the council of the State medical society went on record in supporting the resultant Vermont legislation outlined above.

It was clearly understood that this support by the society was not to be construed as an official endorsement of either the DeBakey Commission report or the pending Federal legislation for regional complexes. Rather this cooperation was provided to enable a more united approach by the medical college, the practicing physicians, and other health agencies for positive planning.

REGIONAL MEDICAL COMPLEX FOR NORTHERN
NEW ENGLAND

The central role of any medical school in a regional medical complex (as defined in S. 596 and H.R. 3140) is a very natural development considering their increasing ability to assist in programs for continuing excellent patient care. Such an evolution grows out of the directions in scientific and medical leadership taken by the schools in recent years—on the one hand strengthened by being able to draw upon the broad intellect of their parent universities, and on the other hand greatly enhanced by the marked focus of public and private support of programs in medical education and research.

It is our opinion that a very flexible attitude should be taken by the National Advisory Council in the development of regional medical complexes, as seems implicit in the legislation S. 596 and H.R. 3140. Major consideration should be given to the local and regional capabilities of existing medical schools and their established and evolving relationships with regional hospitals and the health professional groups.

We consider that the University of Vermont College of Medicine, working within the framework of the aforementioned inter-agency council, and in concert with other medical schools, can spearhead a regional medical complex embracing northwestern New England. Such a program, adapted to the particular characteristics of this rural and semirural region, should ultimately assure a greatly improved potential

for advances in the prevention and cure of major diseases.

Mr. HILL. The State of Vermont is a pioneer in the field which the bill contemplates and provides for.

I asked the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] to remain in the Chamber for a few minutes so that I might have an opportunity to point out that one of the men the distinguished Commission relied upon heavily was Dr. James B. Dixon, president of Antioch College, at Yellow Springs, Ohio. So Ohio had a large part in the whole plan, just as North Carolina, Georgia, Minnesota, Vermont, and New Hampshire did. If time permitted, I could name each of the 50 States of the Union and point out the help that has been given by them.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. My friend the able Senator from Alabama has made a geographically compelling case for his bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. As the distinguished Senator knows, Dr. Alfred B. Blalock, who has now gone to his rich reward, was born, raised, and educated in Georgia.

My understanding is that Dr. Blalock and the distinguished colleague of the Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, were college mates at the University of Georgia. Dr. Blalock was one of the greatest surgeons the country ever produced. He was head of the Department of Surgery at Johns Hopkins University.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I fully share the Senator's view with respect to the abilities and the great service of Dr. Alfred Blalock, who was born and reared 7 miles north of where I reside, in the little town of Jonesboro, Ga. Unfortunately, as the Senator knows, he passed away a year or two ago. His brother, Edward Blalock, still resides in Jonesboro, Ga., where he is a prominent businessman in the oil business. He served as a member of the general assembly on several occasions in the Georgia Legislature during the period when I served as chief executive. He is an outstanding businessman. He comes from a prominent and distinguished Georgia family. I thank the Senator for referring to the able doctor.

Mr. HILL. I thank my able friend from Georgia for his appropriate remarks and the tribute he has paid to Dr. Blalock and to the Blalock family. As I have said, there is no man with whom I have had contract whom I have held in higher esteem or greater appreciation than Dr. Alfred P. Blalock, who has now gone to his rich reward.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his gracious and generous remarks in relation to the distinguished Dr. Phillip Handler.

I express my surprise that New Hampshire needs any kind of medical aid. My

understanding was that New Hampshire was such a healthy place that there was no need for physicians there.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not answer the good-natured jibe of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina other than to say that if he comes to New Hampshire, we will guarantee him long life and happiness.

We have engaged in a little good-natured humor. Perhaps that is pleasant on the floor of the Senate, but it does not lend it dignity when it appears in the RECORD. The reason I asked the distinguished Senator from Alabama to yield is that I desire to say seriously that I believe every Senator on both sides of the aisle feels that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has rendered the most conspicuous and valuable service through the years in his dedication and devotion to all the measures that Congress can possibly and legitimately take in assisting in research and combating the dread diseases that we are fighting in this rather intense and crowded generation in which we live.

It is my privilege to serve as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. We have been holding hearings during the past few days concerning the activities of the National Institutes of Health.

Each year my admiration for the Senator from Alabama grows, not only because of his devotion to this cause, but also because of the great knowledge that he has of the cause of the advancement of medical science in this country. Seriously and sincerely I compliment the Senator from Alabama and express my gratification at serving with him. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to join in the remarks of my good friend from New Hampshire and to add my testimonial that no legislator in any legislative body in the history of this Republic has made so great a contribution as has the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama to the prevention and alleviation of human suffering.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Having served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under the Senator from Alabama for 14 years, I am in a position to state that I am in full accord with everything that has been said by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire regarding the Senator from Alabama. If it had not been for the Senator from Alabama and his school of thought, it is quite unlikely that the progress of medicine, the progress of hospitalization, and the progress of health services would be anywhere near where it is, particularly

in States like Vermont and New Hampshire.

The Senator from Alabama has served all the people, not merely some of the people. To him we owe nearly all the progress that has been made during the past 20 years in the fields I have mentioned.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, frankly, I am rather overwhelmed; but I wish to express my thanks and heartfelt appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. They have been most generous. I shall ever be deeply grateful to them.

We say that water seeks its level. I have sat and worked with these men. They have been my fellow workers in the field of health. We have played together on the same team, so to speak. They have made mighty contributions to the work. They are responsible for much of what may have been accomplished in the battle against disease for the health of our people and peoples all over the earth.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Having served for 6 years on the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I have seen much at firsthand in that time of his fine work as has any other member of the committee. Because I am next to the Senator from Alabama in seniority on that committee, I believe I have spent more hours listening to testimony than any other Senator, with the exception of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama is always present. Often the chairman by himself hears all the testimony. No Member of the Senate has given more diligent attention to public health than has the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Years—yes, decades—before I came to Congress, I heard of his work in connection with the Hill-Burton and other acts in the field of public health. His record is one that I think will not be equaled in the future. He has written such an enviable record that no one in the future can surpass it. Because so much ground has been plowed and so many improvements have been made, hereafter people will only be adding to it. The groundwork has been laid in the field of research by the establishment of the National Institutes of Health; in the field of hospitalization, by the Hill-Burton Act; in the field of mental health, by the Mental Health Act of 1963; and, by extensions through bills that are now on the calendar, in the field of nursing home care and in every other field of care for people who are in pain.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama has been a leader in promoting research in all fields of medicine, and even now is engaged in promoting re-

search in the fields of heart disease and sclerosis.

As one who has for 6 years had an opportunity to view his dedication and detailed work, I pay tribute to him for the outstanding record he has made. The entire Senate reflects the glow of his leadership.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to associate myself with the deserved praise that has been heaped upon the strong and compassionate shoulders of my dear friend from Alabama. No Member of the Senate better exemplifies the eternal command to love one's neighbor than my great friend from Alabama.

It has been my pleasure, privilege, and honor to serve with him on various committees. I know of no one who has done more to promote good health for the people of this country than Lister Hill, of the great State of Alabama.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama is a modest man, but I wish to join my colleagues in paying honor to him. The Senator from Alabama is probably the most quietly useful Member of the Senate, because without ostentation or parade, he has been the foremost promoter of public health. At times, perhaps the Senator from Alabama has his enthusiasm carried away, so far as dollar restraints are concerned. But his motive is always good. He was the moving spirit behind the Hill-Burton Act for hospital construction and the moving spirit in improvements in medicine and public health. The Nation owes him a great debt. We in the North are fully aware of this and respect him highly. I hope this praise does not hurt him in Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I stand rather overwhelmed by these most generous words.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I cannot let this opportunity pass without joining my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying deserved tribute to the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama. I, too, agree that the Senator from Alabama has done more to promote the relief of human suffering than any other person in the entire history of our country.

I well remember that when I was elected Governor of Georgia in 1948, hospitals were institutions that were limited to the principal urban areas and our largest cities. If one became ill or had a serious accident, it was necessary to transport him hundreds of miles to a hospital. Sometimes the arrival was too late.

One of the proudest accomplishments of my administration was to implement the Hill-Burton hospital program in our State. I am happy to say that a hospital, a health center, or both are now within reach of every man, woman, and child in Georgia.

I compliment the Senator from Alabama for the vision, foresight, and lead-

ership which he still exercises in the Senate to relieve human suffering throughout the country.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, to the words of tribute and commendation spoken of the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama, by neighbor and friend, I add, in capital letters: AMEN.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

I stand here rather overwhelmed. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, who serves, and who has served for a number of years, on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which handles health legislation; the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who serves on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We have worked together on the same team. Surely, great credit for any accomplishments that may have been brought about to better the health of our people and all people must be given to others.

The Hospital Construction Act, often referred to as the Hill-Burton Act, was not brought to passage solely by one Senator. The bill had to be very much implemented by the action of several Senators.

I well recall that the State of Georgia, under the leadership of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], then the Governor of Georgia, was one of the pioneers in bringing about the success of that act in the State of Georgia and the construction of many hospitals and health facilities throughout the State.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] sat with me for many years on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

He was always helpful. He was most helpful in waging a battle for the betterment of the health of the American people.

My friend the Senator from Tennessee, when he was in the House of Representatives, was one of the leaders in the battle for the betterment of the health of all people.

I thank each and every one of them.

The Commission concluded its study with respect to heart disease, cancer, and stroke in these terms:

America need no longer tolerate several hundred thousand unnecessary deaths each year from heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

By bringing to all the people the full benefit of what is now known of prevention, detection, treatment, and cure, we could save, each year, a number of lives equal to the population of a major city.

This legislation would authorize the Public Health Service to award grants-in-aid to public and other nonprofit institutions and associations to assist them in planning, establishing, and operating regional medical complexes to combat heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

The term "regional medical complex" denotes a group of institutions such as medical schools, research centers, hospitals, and other health institutions and

agencies that has adopted an organized plan for a coordinated program of demonstrations, consultations, research, and training in order to assist physicians and hospitals in preventing, diagnosing, and treating heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

A regional medical complex would utilize the existing network of community hospitals and other health facilities, and would not interfere with existing methods of financing patient care, with professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals.

A complex could be administered by a university, a school of medicine, a research center, or by some other public or nonprofit agency or institution, or by an association of such organizations. An advisory group at the local level would assist in formulating and carrying out the program for the improvement of health services.

This legislation is needed so that the latest advances in medicine can be made more available to our citizens. As Dr. Donovan F. Ward, the president of the American Medical Association, has stated:

More progress has been made in medicine in the last 25 years than in the preceding 20 centuries.

This progress in medicine will be of little benefit unless steps are taken now to provide for its practical application.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has adopted amendments proposed to S. 596 that were recommended by the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, and the American Hospital Association.

In addition, the committee amended the bill as introduced to limit construction under the legislation to renovations, alterations, and the purchase of new initial equipment and equipment to replace obsolete equipment. No new hospital beds could be added under S. 596, as amended by this committee.

The committee has approved authorizations for appropriations that total \$650 million over the 4 fiscal years 1966-1969. The administration had proposed a 5-year total of \$1.1 billion and the President's Commission had recommended a 5-year total of \$1.6 billion.

S. 596, as amended by the committee, is endorsed by the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Hospital Association, and the American Public Health Association.

Mr. President, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I urge the Senate to approve S. 596, so that we may further assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

This is usually done in connection with appropriation bills.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 15, after the word "arrangements", to strike out "the" and insert "a more abundant"; in line 23, after "1966", to strike out "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next four fiscal years" and insert "\$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969"; on page 3, line 6, after the word "institutions", to insert "hospitals"; in line 7, after the word "agencies", to insert "or associations thereof"; in line 15, after the word "planning", to strike out "or" and insert "and"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "each of which is"; in the same line, after the word "training", to insert "prevention"; in line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "health of the Nation" and insert "aforesaid objectives of such regional medical complex"; at the top of page 5, to insert "or other medical institution involved in postgraduate medical training"; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "diagnosis and treatment by"; in line 14, after the word "quality", to insert "preventive"; after line 21, to strike out:

"(f) The term 'construction' includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings; including architects' services, but excluding off-site improvements and the acquisition of land.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(f) The term 'construction' includes alteration, major repair (to the extent permitted by regulations), remodeling, replacement, and renovation of existing buildings (including initial equipment thereof), and replacement of obsolete, built-in (as determined in accordance with regulations) equipment of existing buildings.

On page 6, line 10, after the word "General", to strike out "after consultation with" and insert "upon the recommendation of"; in line 15, after the word "institutions", to insert "hospitals"; at the beginning of line 17, to insert a comma and "or associations thereof"; on page 7, line 14, after the word "will", to strike out "provide for the designation of" and insert "designate"; on page 8, line 3, after the word "General", to strike out "after consultation with" and insert "upon the recommendation of"; in line 6, after the word "institutions", to insert "hospitals"; in line 7, after the word "institutions", to insert a comma and "or associations thereof"; on page 9, line 9, after the word "designated", to strike out "or will designate"; on page 10, line 4, after "(a)", to strike out "The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint without regard to the civil service laws," and insert "There is hereby established in the Public Health Service"; in line 9, after the word "Chairman", to insert "and the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, ex officio"; at the beginning of line 12, to insert "appointed by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary and without regard to the civil service laws"; in line 15, after the word "sciences", to insert "hospital administration"; on page 11, line 23, after the word "title", to insert a semicolon and "and such recommendations shall also be transmitted to any advisory council or committee, established by or pursuant to this Act, which the Surgeon General deems appropriate"; and on page 12, line 13, after "June 30," to strike out "1969"

and insert "1967"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the 'Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965.'

"Sec. 2. The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—REGIONAL MEDICAL COMPLEXES FOR RESEARCH AND TREATMENT IN HEART DISEASE, CANCER, STROKE, AND OTHER MAJOR DISEASES

"Purposes

"SEC. 900. The purposes of this title are—
 "(a) Through grants, to encourage and assist in the establishment of regionally coordinated arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals for research and training and for demonstrations of patient care in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases;

"(b) To afford to the medical profession and the medical institutions of the Nation, through such coordinated arrangements, a more abundant opportunity of making available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis and treatment of these diseases; and

"(c) To accomplish these ends without interfering with the patterns, or the methods of financing, of patient care or professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 901. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for grants to assist public or nonprofit private universities, medical schools, research institutions, hospitals, and other public or nonprofit private institutions and agencies, or associations thereof, in planning, establishing, and operating regional medical complexes for research, training, and demonstration activities for carrying out the purposes of this title. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall remain available for making such grants until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

"(b) A grant under this title shall be for part or all of the cost of the planning and other activities with respect to which the application is made, except that any such grant with respect to construction of, or provision of built-in (as determined in accordance with regulations) equipment for, any facility may not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such construction or equipment.

"(c) Funds appropriated pursuant to this title shall not be available to pay the cost of hospital, medical, or other care of patients except to the extent it is, as determined in accordance with regulations, incident to research, training, or demonstration activities.

"Definitions

"SEC. 902. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) The term "regional medical complex" means a group of public or nonprofit private institutions or agencies engaged in research, training, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment relating to heart disease, cancer, or stroke and, at the option of the applicant, any other disease found by the Surgeon General to be of major significance to the aforesaid objectives of such regional medical complex; but only if such group—

"(1) is situated within a geographic area, composed of any part or parts of any one or more States, which the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, to be appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(2) consists of one or more medical centers, one or more categorical research centers, and one or more diagnostic and treatment stations; and

"(3) has in effect arrangements for the coordination of the activities of its component units which the Surgeon General finds will be adequate for effectively carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The term "medical center" means a medical school or other medical institution involved in postgraduate medical training and one or more hospitals affiliated therewith for teaching, research, and demonstration purposes.

"(c) The term "categorical research center" means an institution (or part of an institution) the primary function of which is research (including clinical research), training of specialists, and demonstrations and which, in connection therewith, provides specialized, high-quality diagnostic and treatment services for inpatients and outpatients.

"(d) The term "diagnostic and treatment station" means a unit of a hospital or other health facility, the primary function of which is to support and augment local capability for providing specialized high-quality preventive, diagnostic, and treatment services to outpatients and inpatients.

"(e) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any institution or agency means an institution or agency which is owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(f) The term "construction" includes alteration, major repair (to the extent permitted by regulations), remodeling, replacement, and renovation of existing buildings (including initial equipment thereof), and replacement of obsolete, built-in (as determined in accordance with regulations) equipment of existing buildings.

"Grants for planning and development"

"Sec. 903. (a) The Surgeon General, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Council on Medical Complexes established by section 905 (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Council"), is authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private universities, medical schools, research institutions, hospitals, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, or associations thereof, to assist them in planning the development of regional medical complexes.

"(b) Grants under this section may be made only upon application therefor approved by the Surgeon General. Any such application may be approved only if it contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that—

"(1) Federal funds paid pursuant to any such grant will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this title and the regulations thereunder;

"(2) the applicant will provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as are required by the Surgeon General to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for such Federal funds;

"(3) the applicant will make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Surgeon General may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(4) the applicant will designate an advisory group, to advise the applicant (and the resulting regional medical complex and its component units) in formulating and carrying out the plan for the establishment and operation of such regional medical complex, which includes representatives of or-

ganizations, institutions, and agencies concerned with activities of the kind to be carried on by the complex and members of the public familiar with the need for the services provided by the complex.

"Grants for establishment and operation of regional medical complexes"

"Sec. 904. (a) The Surgeon General, upon the recommendation of the Council, is authorized to make grants to public or nonprofit private universities, medical schools, research institutions, hospitals, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, or associations thereof, to assist in establishment and operation of regional medical complexes, including construction and equipment of facilities in connection therewith.

"(b) Grants under this section may be made only upon application therefor approved by the Surgeon General. Any such application may be approved only if it contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that—

"(1) Federal funds paid pursuant to any such grant (A) will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this title and the regulations thereunder, and (B) will not supplant funds that are otherwise available for establishment or operation of the regional medical complex with respect to which the grant is made;

"(2) the applicant will provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as are required by the Surgeon General to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for such Federal funds;

"(3) the applicant will make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Surgeon General may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(4) the applicant has designated or will designate an advisory group, described in paragraph (4) of section 903(b), to advise in carrying out the plan for the regional medical complex; and

"(5) any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by payments pursuant to any grant under this section will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"National Advisory Council on Medical Complexes"

"Sec. 905. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Advisory Council on Medical Complexes. The Council shall consist of the Surgeon General, who shall be the Chairman, and the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, ex officio, and twelve members, not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary and without regard to the civil service laws, who are leaders in the fields of the fundamental sciences, the medical sciences, hospital administration, or public affairs. At least one of the appointed members shall be outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of heart disease, one shall be outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of cancer, and one shall be outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of stroke.

"(b) Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment, four at the end of the first year, four at the end of the second year, and four at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. An appointed member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms.

"(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Council shall advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of regulations for, and as to policy matters arising with respect to, the administration of this title. The Council shall consider all applications for grants under this title and shall make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to approval of applications for and the amounts of grants under this title; and such recommendations shall also be transmitted to any advisory council or committee, established by or pursuant to this Act, which the Surgeon General deems appropriate.

"Regulations"

"Sec. 906. The Surgeon General, after consultation with the Council, shall prescribe general regulations covering the terms and conditions for approving applications for grants under this title and the coordination of programs assisted under this title with programs for training, research and demonstrations relating to the same diseases assisted or authorized under other titles of this Act or other Acts of Congress.

"Report"

"Sec. 907. On or before June 30, 1967, the Surgeon General, after consultation with the Council, shall submit to the Secretary for transmission to the President and then to the Congress, a report of the activities under this title together with (1) a statement of the relationship between Federal financing and financing from other sources of the activities undertaken pursuant to this title, (2) an appraisal of the activities assisted under this title in the light of their effectiveness in carrying out the purposes of this title, and (3) recommendations with respect to extension or modification of this title in the light thereof."

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to IX, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the "Public Health Service Act."

"(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is further amended by renumbering title IX (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title X, and by renumbering sections 901 through 914 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and references thereto, as sections 1001 through 1014, respectively."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the problem of a large amount of Government research.

I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without prejudicing my right to the floor.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair).

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I applaud the efforts of the distinguished chairman and his committee. So far as the Senator from Louisiana knows, this is a very good bill. I am concerned, however, about the danger and possibility that the Federal research moneys might be spent in such a way that the public would be denied the benefit of that for which it has paid in the field of research in health through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We find that the Government pays a tremendous amount for research and development in entering into contracts for research. And in many instances the Government pays out almost for the entire cost of the research. When the Government does that, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare quite properly recognizes that there should not be private patents granted for this type of research, but that it should be available to all the people.

Most European countries, for example, will not permit private patents to be placed on drug products, even when such drugs are produced as a result of the expenditure of private money. In most instances they will permit a patent to be obtained only on the process. This is true in France, Germany, and Switzerland, the sources of many of the world's greatest drug discoveries.

This practice is based on the simple premise that no private company should exercise monopoly privileges in an area of such importance to the public welfare.

In 1950, England changed its law to conform with ours—granting patents on drug products as well as processes. But, to protect the public, it included a compulsory licensing provision to be used if prices were too high or the product was not made available generally. This is also the case in Australia, Canada and India, and in most countries where product patents are permitted.

In other words, in many of the advanced countries, companies are not permitted to have patents on medicines or drugs. They are permitted to have patents only on the method by which the drug is produced. If someone can find a process to produce the drug more cheaply, he is able to obtain a patent on the process, but not on the product, so the public can have the benefit of the product by the best methods known to produce it. So, although someone can have a patent on the process, he cannot have it on the product, which is what we have today in this country. Those

who do not have a patent on the process can nevertheless compete in the market. This practice permits competition for the market, even though a company may not be able to use the patented process which may be used by one company for producing the product. It prevents companies in that nation from having a complete monopoly over the product.

That is what those countries do when the companies spend their own money.

What I do not want to have happen here is to have one company develop a certain product as a result of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, and then obtain a patent on the process, which is permitted under the law, so that the company can charge the public anything it wishes. I can produce examples in which the price was 1,000 times the cost of the product and fantastic profits were made.

I am not trying to change that, but I would like to see the matter nailed down so that when the taxpayers pay for the research, there will not be a private patent on research done with the taxpayers' money on heart disease, cancer, stroke, or any type of health research.

That is the policy the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself advocates. That is what I am advocating as a solution to this problem.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, a former member of the Cabinet in the Kennedy administration, who was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the time when this matter was considered in his Department.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I wish to ask the Senator a question. As I understand his amendment, he does not provide that all inventions will belong to the Government; does he? The Senator does make certain exceptions, does he not, so that under certain circumstances, an invention may be transferred to a contractor or charitable health organization?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; I make some exceptions.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe that point should be cleared up, because there is some misunderstanding about the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I make exceptions in certain instances where the equities are in favor of the concern that asks for a waiver. It is also provided that when exclusive rights are granted to a concern, and they are abused, the Department can protect itself. These were suggested either by the White House adviser on this problem or by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who was particularly conversant with these problems.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We are in an unusual dilemma. I do not agree with the Senator from Louisiana in putting the Long amendment on every proposal. I believe that the McClellan subcommittee is trying to develop a general policy. That is something which is needed. On the other hand, we have the situation with the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Alabama, who has done

more to further research in the field of health than any other man in the history of the country. He has been so successful that in 1966, \$680 million is coming out of Federal funds to go to NIH for research grants. This is a problem which took a great deal of my time when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Kennedy recognized that there were policy differences in all the agencies, and that is why it is important for the Senator from Arkansas to try to straighten the matter out, and for Congress to enunciate a general policy. But I took the position, during the period 1961 and 1962, that practically all the research that was being done for health in America was flourishing and being accomplished because of the large infusions of Federal funds.

There is no question about that. The great activator of all those Federal funds was the Senator from Alabama. Of all the men in this world who deserve the most credit, it should go to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator in charge of the bill.

Much of this research is oriented through universities, through hospitals, and through nonprofit organizations. Every once in a while a pharmaceutical or other company engages in this field of research. The exceptions that the Senator from Louisiana has made would take care of the unusual situation.

But I say to the Senator that I believe he is correct. When it comes to the field of health. When the Federal Government expends \$680 million a year to try to find a cure for cancer, to try to find a cure for heart disease, to try to find a cure for arthritis, to try to find a cure for a great many other diseases that bedevil mankind, under these circumstances, I deem that the Federal Government must have some control on inventions dealing with health.

Private sources are entitled to a profit in the development stage and in the manufacturing stage; but a patent for these discoveries, in my opinion, belongs in the public domain and to the Federal Government which is actuating the discoveries. The Federal Government should make the determination as to who should do the manufacturing. I would hesitate to give any one company the exclusive right to sell the results acquired through Government research in the field of health. This should be made available by the Federal Government to any private concern, any university, any public concern that wishes to produce the serums, antibiotics, vaccines, medicines, pills, or what have you, which will help to cure the many ills which plague not only this Nation, but also the rest of the world.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I very much thank the Senator for his statement. I am happy to know that we agree on this subject. The view which he expresses is the view of all those who have studied the matter at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is also the view of the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his capable and competent advisers and assistants who work in this field.

A short time ago, I discussed with these very people, by pursuing this kind of policy which the Senator has recommended, the protection of little children from being exploited in the field of mental retardation, to prevent them from contracting a disease which, unless immediately corrected, could result in mental retardation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe that the Senator in his exceptions has shown a way out, because I believe the biggest field of work being done with private industry in this field is in the field of cancer and chemotherapy. If my memory serves me correctly, these contracts were let by Secretary Hobby with a number of pharmaceutical houses which have continued their research, but it has been done by private industry. I believe that the agreement was entered into with the companies which initiated the work, and which are continuing the work, that they would have the rights and custody of the patents. What the Senator highlights is that there are great barriers to this problem.

I do not follow the Senator in his attitude in regard to NASA, or the aeronautics field, because I recognize the difference when private industry is basically engaged in manufacturing on basic research. But I believe, from my experience, and the experience that has developed because of the work of the Senator from Alabama, that when we come to the field of health, the greatest actuator, without question, is the Federal Government.

Here, it is clear that without Federal funds being used, great research efforts would not be going forward in the field of health and many of the discoveries would not have taken place.

While the Senator from Alabama is a great benefactor of all mankind, I believe that we should be in such a position that when it comes to health, these patents should belong to the Federal Government. I am pleased to see that allowance is made in the amendment for the unusual situation, in which the work is going forward in the main by private industry or private enterprise. The amendment does make it possible for the contractor or grantee to receive a license to do the manufacturing.

I do not know whether I state the position of the Senator correctly or not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. These are the equities for which Dr. Hornig, the White House adviser in this field, held forth. These are the considerations that we thought the heart and cancer people would like to have under certain conditions. They had endorsed the amendment which I had drawn, which would be stricter than this one. Then, having been urged to make it more flexible to meet the one problem that they had, we went beyond that and drafted this amendment to make it even more flexible, on the urgings of some of the advisers in the White House and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Even so, when the question came to a vote, at the last moment we found them urging that the amendment be not agreed to. I regret to see that.

It seemed that we had worked it out in a way which we thought had satisfied

them completely, so that they would be for it. But the Senator well knows that in the field of health the public does not have much choice. If there are certain diseases and certain medicines are indicated to help alleviate them, if they are new medicines and we are spending our money to try to develop them, we want those medicines, or else our health will be in great danger. We could possibly die.

If we have diabetes, we can use insulin—at one time insulin was about the only thing available—and if we do not get it, it can cost us our lives. Perhaps a pill will cost 50 cents. If that same pill should be sold at 50 cents instead of one-half a cent, that would be a high degree of exploitation of the public, especially if the Government buys the pills by the thousands and over a period of time. It could become an extremely costly operation to the public.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much for his statement. I agree with him that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has rendered a distinguished service. He and the chairman of the committee have rendered a magnificent service to the Nation in this fight for research to help us find ways to better protect the public health.

Mr. President, the difference in cost when a product is sold under monopolistic conditions and when the same product is sold under competitive conditions is very striking. For example, I cite a product called tolbutamide. It is sold in this country by the Upjohn Co. as Orinase. That product is the latest development in the treatment of diabetes. It was not developed in this country, but was developed overseas. It is a substitute for insulin. It has the advantage of being in the form of a pill. Therefore, it can be taken by mouth, and it is not necessary to use a needle, as is the case with insulin. It is widely sold in the treatment of diabetes. It is protected by the kind of patent system that Germany has had. It permits those people to patent the process, but not the product. When sold on a competitive basis in Europe, that product costs 18 cents for 100 tablets. The company that developed it licensed the Upjohn Co. That company has a patent on the product itself, not merely a patent on the way it is produced. What does Upjohn sell it for? Instead of 18 cents for 100 tablets, a person over here must pay \$7.70. I do not know, at the moment, what the percentage increase is. It works out to about 40 times as much.

Senators should bear in mind that the Upjohn Co. did not develop that product. They received a license from the European firm that developed it, and that sells it in Europe for 18 cents for 100 tablets. Upjohn Co. sells the same product for \$7.70 for 100 pills.

Mr. President, it would be all right with me if the Upjohn Co. had developed this product with their own money and was charging the public \$7.70. However, if that product is to be developed with public money, I do not understand why the Upjohn Co. should be permitted to charge \$7.70. On a competitive basis that product is being sold for 18 cents.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Generally I agree with the Senator. However, mention was made of the Upjohn Co. in connection with this particular product. Does the Upjohn Co. sell the product under the same name that the product is sold under in Europe?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Here it is called Orinase.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is a different name, then?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. The real protection is on the name, then, rather than on the product. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. The protection is on the product. The one who acquires the license is protected so that no one else can sell that product in this country. If that were not the case, the company selling it would not be able to charge 40 times as much as is being charged for the same product overseas, where it is sold on a competitive basis.

Mr. McNAMARA. Even if the product is protected, by changing the name, it is possible to do the same thing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, no.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is done in the case of other products that are developed in this country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Bayer Co. may, through its advertising, make people believe that their aspirin is the best. Of course aspirin is nothing but salicylic acid. A manufacturer of aspirin can make his product sound better and make the public believe that it is a better product.

Let us take the case of Bufferin. It is possible to mix a little soda with aspirin, and it need not be any more than the kind of soda that costs about 10 cents for a big can; and if a little soda is mixed with the aspirin it can be called Bufferin, and made to appear better than aspirin. Or, on the other hand, a little chemical can be mixed in with the aspirin to make it fizz, as is the case with Alkasetzer, and in that way it can be advertised as a fantastic product which is much better than aspirin. Actually it need not contain anything more than plain baking soda. That is all it is. That brand name can help a person sell that product at probably twice the ordinary price.

Mr. McNAMARA. It seems to me that a better example of what I am talking about is cortisone. It is sold under three or four different names. The price varies, but basically all the products are the same. I do not believe it will be possible to get at the problem until it is possible to control that phase of it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is possible, of course, always to get a better price by better salesmanship. I understand that. That is nothing, however, compared with what can be done by preventing another man from getting the same product here and selling it.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has cited a product which is manufactured in Italy and sold for 18 cents a hundred tablets.

He said that that same product is sold over here for \$7. Is that a case in which the U.S. Government has supplied any money for research, or is it an isolated case, independent of the matter that is pending before us?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a comparison of what a product sells for when it is sold competitively and when it is sold on a monopolistic basis.

Mr. PASTORE. No Federal funds are involved?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe that should be adequately explained, because we can dramatize a situation, take an isolated and not related incident and after a while people will believe that the situations are identical. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I should like to get the issue straight in my own mind.

Insofar as the Senator's objective is concerned, protection of the public interest, I agree with him completely. This is a matter that involves the public interest. The last time the Senator brought up his amendment, it was on the space authorization bill, I believe. At that time the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] made a very cogent presentation. He said that his committee was making a thorough investigation of the whole subject. It was on that presentation and with that assurance that the Senator from Rhode Island abandoned the position of the Senator from Louisiana, although he agreed with the Senator's main objective.

The Senator from Louisiana has made an exhaustive study of this problem. Can he now state a case in which Federal money was granted for research and the same thing happened as happened in this pill case?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will tell the Senator of one case. A grant was given to a Dr. Guthrie, a dedicated man working in the field of mental retardation. He discovered a disease called PKU. It is a disease that involves vitamin deficiency. When a child is born with this disease, and it is not discovered within 30 days, that child will be mentally retarded. It is one of the most damaging forms of mental retardation.

Dr. Guthrie was not interested in any patent on the product. However, some lawyer suggested that he ought to take a patent on it so that someone else would not get it. After that patent had been granted, the Miles Laboratory representatives said that they wanted to be licensed to produce a little kit with which children could be tested to see whether they had this disease. The doctor did not want any compensation or rewards. He said, "Put anything you get for it into a foundation for little children who are retarded." Miles Laboratory put out the kit and charged 40 or 50 times the cost of the production of that kit. When Dr. Guthrie heard about it, he was horrified. Of course, there was nothing he could do. He had been victimized. He did not want anything out of it. He had done the work with Government money. He was happy that he had been able to do that and to produce that product. He was producing a little kit for the benefit

of hospitals that were testing the children. However, Miles Laboratory was in the position of being able to exploit the public and to exploit the parents of these little children.

Then someone in HEW read the fine print.

After he read the fine print on the forms he said, "Wait a minute. We are entitled to the patent rights on it." They said, "You cannot do this. The patent rights belong to us." They told Miles, "If you want to produce this kit, all right, but you will have to have some competition in this field."

So far as LSU is concerned, the New Orleans hospital can go ahead and make its own kits rather than buy them at that price. The same is true in Massachusetts, where they are producing their kits. Only a small amount is involved. The difference is between charging 1 cent and 50 cents to test children for PKU. Anyone who has that dread disease knows that the child would be mentally retarded.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I can see the problem. I believe all Senators can see the problem. The problem is precisely as follows: How far should we go in preserving in the public domain the results of research supported by Federal funds and at the same time not follow procedures which will in any way discourage initiative and creativity? That is the problem. I do not believe that any Senator disagrees with the objective that the Senator from Louisiana is trying to accomplish. But this is an intricate field. It is very complex. What disturbs the Senator from Rhode Island is the fact that he does not believe we can resolve it in the way we have been going about it.

I do not believe the Senate Chamber is the place to analyze this proposal rather than a Senate committee.

I do not believe that such an amendment attached to a measure for facilities rather than research itself is the proper procedure.

The Senator in charge of the bill exemplifies in better style than any man I know the eternal commandment of brotherly love and public responsibility, as well. A man such as Lister Hill does not wish to see these great companies become rich as a result of such research, especially when human misery, pain, and suffering are involved.

Why should this amendment be the constantly recurring presentation in the Senate chamber? Why should we continue to wrestle every week or so over the subject in the proposed amendment? Why should we not take the word of the Senator from Arkansas? Then if the Senate Judiciary Committee does not do its job in due time, or if it does not do it correctly as we see it, we can then have a debate as to what should be done. But we are constantly getting into this problem. We are taking sides dictated by logic and orderly procedure when our hearts are dedicated to the objectives of the bill.

As I have said before, stories are written about what side we happen to take,

for the bill or against the bill. That is not the question at all. Our disagreement is on procedure, not on objective.

What I am saying at the present time is that we should not get into this very intricate field in a superficial way. It is a delicate situation. We must preserve initiative; we must preserve creativity. Without initiative and creativity research would not be worth anything. At the same time we must protect the taxpayers, the public, and the dollars that they invest in research.

I understand that the Senator from Louisiana is investigating all those questions; I know the job he has done where the public interest is involved. But I dare say it will not be done in the way in which the Senator is attempting to do it. I understand the Judiciary Committee has already considered and is considering the issue. The committee has taken the position in this particular case that the policy should be an overall policy. If that is the case, why do we continue to wrangle? Why do we not assume the leadership that should be assumed by the leadership and say, "All right, gentlemen; let us wait for a reasonable period of time. Let us establish a good overall national policy, and then let us join ranks and follow it." Why can we not do that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to answer that question. There was a time when there was practically no general law which provided how patent rights would be handled. During that time perhaps the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior were acting under laws which stated patent rights on Government research could not be given away.

There was no law stating that the Department of Defense, including the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, should not give away rights resulting from Government research to private companies. That is how it was for the first hundred years or more, up to World War II.

No one even dreamed of giving away private patent rights on research paid for by the Government of the United States, whether the research was done by Government employees in a Government laboratory, or by Government contractors working on a guaranteed project.

But that policy was changed during World War II. From that time forward the Department of Defense has been granting private patent rights on research contracts.

To change that policy is beyond my power. It is beyond the power of any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives to change. Why? Because both large political parties depend for financial support upon people connected with big business and such people are numerous in both parties.

They have friends. They have votes. They are powerful and influential. I predict that neither I nor any other Senator will be able to obtain passage of a law which would prevent the Department of Defense from giving away

private patent rights to those who do research work for the Department of Defense.

I make that statement because I know the realities of public life.

Whether we like it or not, politics is the name of the game. When we are contending with politics and with the big industries and all the investments involved—and I am talking about legitimate investments—we know that those elements will do anything within their power to fight to see that they preserve what they have in the Department of Defense, which is a \$9 billion a year investment in research. Those industries and investors have control over that research. Under those circumstances we shall not be able to pass a law because there will be too many friends of those people voting on their side.

On the other hand, if an attempt is made to enact a law which would provide the giveaway of patent rights resulting from work in agencies that are not giving away such rights at the present time, the Senator from Louisiana and his group will fight as hard as we know how to fight.

If the bill gets through the Senate, it will then be taken up in the House of Representatives. There it will be referred to a committee headed by EMANUEL CELLER, who does not believe in giving away private patent rights. He will fight the issue as hard as he knows how to fight it. Then the bill would go to a subcommittee over which presides Mr. WILLIS, of Louisiana, who is a great constitutional lawyer and who has the public interest at heart. He will fight the bill in his subcommittee, as chairman of the subcommittee, as hard as he knows how to fight it. Nothing will happen.

Can the Senator from Rhode Island tell me of a single law which has been passed in the 150 years of the history of this Government that has provided what should happen to private patent rights? Can the Senator name a single general law that provides what should happen to private patent rights resulting from Government research?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Louisiana sells himself short. I realize that he attended the dinner last night. He went to the Hilton Washington. I went to the Arena. The President of the United States visited us at about 10 o'clock. He paid high compliment to the great qualities of leadership of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall follow that type of leadership. I have a great deal of confidence in the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana in bringing about justice in these cases.

The things about which he is speaking are rather historic. A highly competent man is chairman of the committee which is making a thorough study of the problem. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is making that thorough study. I am only saying to the Senator from Louisiana that such a study needs to be made; and I am all for it.

However, I do not wish to be placed in a dubious position today. I am told by the Senator from Arkansas that the question will be straightened out in a

national policy and therefore I vote against the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I certainly am not voting to charge people \$7.95 for 100 pills when they can buy 100 for 18 cents. That is the position in which the Senator from Louisiana is seeking to place us. The Senator is setting the background today so that if we do not go along with his amendment, it might be inferred that we want the public to be gouged.

I want nothing of the kind.

I want our patent protection in the public interest to follow the pattern set out by President Kennedy. I do not want it formulated on the Senate floor by an amendment opposed by the great mass of the scientists and institutions dedicated to research.

I do not want the public to be gouged. In the protection of the public interest, let us not destroy initiative. Let us do the job required, and let us do it correctly. That is why the committee is going into the question. If the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] does not through his committee achieve a result which I think is fair, naturally I shall stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Louisiana. But we have been going through this same futile process month after month. Let us get back on the track so we can make progress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On an annual basis, \$15 billion is involved. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] realizes it? Does not the Senator believe that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] realizes it? Does he not believe that I know it? Does the Senator believe that he is more careful about the people's money than I am?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not saying that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is implying that. The Senator is implying that because we do not go along with the amendment today, we desire to throw away \$15 billion. I do not want to throw it away. I am as careful about the people's money as is any other Senator. There is a time and a place and a committee for every action and issue in the Senate. The forum for this important problem is the committee and the committee is prepared to deal with it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Every provision in law that deals with the results of Government research is in a bill authorizing research in a particular field. That is how it is with the Department of Agriculture.

That is how it is in the Department of the Interior. That is how it is in a number of other agencies. That is how it is under the Saline Water Act. The Senator from Rhode Island helped me to make it apply to the Pollution Act. That is how it is under the Appalachia Act, passed this year. I was happy to see that the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, and himself a great defender of the public interest, voted with us. The Senator from Rhode Island gave us valuable help by making his magnificent speech, say-

ing that if the public was to pay for the program, the public should have the benefit of the research. So we voted in that bill to authorize research for the cleaning up of pollution in water and said that it would be a program in which there would be no private patents.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that the Government would pay for practically all of the program; that being the case, there were very few instances in which the waiving of patent rights could be justified.

The amendment I am offering has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Those in that Department think it is a good idea.

The people who are now in the department would not waive the patent rights. But all that would be necessary would be to have one President—I do not say that the present President would do it, nor would the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze—appoint a Secretary who would sign an order providing that from that time forward private patents would be granted on research, reversing the policy of the department.

We should close this stable door before the horse is stolen. Now is the time to do that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. That is where we are in disagreement. I did support the Senator on a previous occasion, until such time as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] stated that his committee was making a complete and thorough study of the entire subject.

I do not disagree in the slightest with the objective of the Senator from Louisiana. But even the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the present Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], found vagueness in the Senator's amendment. We cannot legislate in this haphazard way on this important matter on the floor of the Senate. The Senator knows that as well as anyone else; otherwise he would not be the whip.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment I am offering is the one I offered to the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. The committee did not accept it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand; but the amendment is the result of advice I have received. It has been worked out not only by our own legislative counsel, but by those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would have the responsibility of administering the program. The department favored the amendment. There was consultation about it. We had the advice of Mr. Hornig, of the White House, on this subject. We had the consultation and advice of the heart, cancer, and stroke organizations. Their representatives advised us that they thought it would be a good amendment if it were modified. So we modified it as they desired, to meet the objections we believed they had. We provided all the flexibility that was desired by both

the White House and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Last month, we received word from the heart and cancer associations that they were opposed to the amendment. Where is the bug under that rug? I do not know, but I know there is one there. One does not have to eat the whole piece to tell that it is tainted. I merely say that someone must have put pressure somewhere, because they sent us a letter saying something different from what they said previously.

Mr. PASTORE. Pressure was not put on LISTER HILL. The man who decided this question was LISTER HILL. Nobody is putting a bug under his rug.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. LISTER HILL is one of the greatest men of all time. I have to say so. I have known him and admired him for a long time. So far as I am concerned, the Senator from Alabama has voted with me on a number of these questions.

I am not casting any aspersions. Nevertheless, in my opinion, if we want to close the barn door, we ought to close it before the horse is stolen.

I tried to do something along this line with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I was chairman of a small committee, and we were discussing patent rights so far as space was concerned. What happened? Mr. Johnson came to visit us. He was a lawyer for the Space Administration. He asked us to pass a law to provide that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration could waive patent rights before they knew what they were.

I said, "No; that would be against the law. I shall fight your proposal if you attempt to do that." As I recall, such a bill passed the House, but got nowhere in the Senate.

Later, NASA got a new Administrator, Mr. James Webb. He announced that he would proceed with their plan anyway. But we absolutely raised the rooftop, and before we got through, he called off his policy.

But now we have an announcement that he has gone ahead anyway, even though lawyers for the agency advised against it.

It is said that it has so far affected only seven inventions. That may be true, but once the door is open, anything can be done.

If I had known that the National Space Act would be interpreted so patents would be given away to private contractors, I would have opposed it.

If I had known that the NASA Administrator would find it in the public interest to waive the public's rights, and would interpret the language to mean that a monopoly was in the public interest, I would have opposed it. If one buys that argument, he can argue that a monopoly is in the public interest; that patent rights can be waived because monopoly is in the public interest.

I submit that when a new research program is started, that is the time to say whether the patents shall be private patents or not.

A similar problem will confront us when the nomination of General McKee to be Administrator of the Federal Avi-

ation Administration Commission is before the Senate. He comes from an agency which has interpreted the words "in the public interest" to mean that patent rights can be waived without knowing what they are.

General McKee is being considered for appointment to an agency which will finance the construction of a supersonic bomber. That agency proposes to spend a billion dollars for the development of the new bomber. General McKee will be coming from the Air Force to the Federal Aviation Agency. If the FAA is not stopped, it will let private industry have its patents. The policy ought to be that private industry would not get Government patents on this type of research. The Government should maintain its patents and grant licenses to use them upon payment of a royalty to the Government. The license fee that would be charged would be such that the Government would get \$2 million in licenses and royalties for every supersonic transport that was produced. In that way, we would hope to get back the \$1 billion we would spend upon the development of the transport. That may sound farfetched, but that is the policy that the British pursue; and in pursuing it, they developed one of the finest aircraft, the Viscount, and at the same time got back their entire investment in the building of the plane from license and royalty fees from those who purchased them.

I want to know if General McKee is going to go to the FAA and change patent policy, because the people who are now working there do not want to change it. All that is necessary, if a change of policy is necessary, is to send a man there who wants to change it. He will have the authority to do so, and those in the Department will have to go along with it, because they will have no choice.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When the Long amendment was offered to the NASA authorization bill, my recollection is that NASA fought that very vigorously. They were opposed to the Long amendment to protect the public's patent rights. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. This amendment is offered to a bill through which public money would be granted for research in the field of public health. It is my understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare accepts the Long amendment and does not oppose it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The representatives of the Department stated that they were willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, that is not unanimous in Government. The Department of Commerce has Mr. Hollomon from the General Electric Co. He is over there looking after business.

That man has all the power available to him to make sure that each agency gives away its patent rights on research.

People like that in Government are too powerful. They have an assistant in the White House, an adviser, who is doing all he can to push the policy of helping general business by giving away patent rights.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in one instance, the Senator from Louisiana had the governmental authority opposing the proposal as an impediment in their research. In this instance, the Senator from Louisiana has the authority willing to accept the proposal and saying that it would not be an impediment to research, such as it would object to under the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those who would have to administer the bill wrote the amendment. Mr. Celebrezze was in favor of the amendment. Mr. Wilbur Cohen was in favor of the amendment. They helped me to prepare the amendment. They think that is how they would like to do it. They could be compelled to do otherwise by somebody in the Department of Commerce. General Electric Co. and other giants have enough people in Government to influence the policy.

A short time ago General Electric went before the court and pleaded guilty and in some instances nolo contendere, which means, "I will not defend myself."

It was charged that for 10 years that company was systematically conspiring to defraud the Government on everything that it sold as an electrical contractor. Nine other companies were involved, including the Westinghouse Corp. They were engaged in a conspiracy to steal from the U.S. Government. What happened? When the Justice Department caught them stealing, they had to pay back all they had taken from the Government. Their private customers sued them. The private customers said, "You admit that you overcharged the Government. You have been overcharging us. You have been charging us the same price." They were then liable for \$300 million because of treble damages imposed as a result of having been caught engaging in this kind of activity.

Having been caught in a conspiracy, they obtained a ruling from the Department of the Treasury that they could deduct the money that they had to give back, that they owed, including the penalty, on the ground that it was an ordinary and necessary expense of doing business.

When a company is stuck for treble damages, if it happens to be \$300 million, the first \$100 million is merely given back to the people from whom it was stolen. The other \$200 million is the penalty that the company must pay for having stolen it in the first place.

When the ruling came through that those involved were entitled to deduct this as a business expense, it meant that Uncle Sam, the taxpayers, had to pick up 75 percent of the fine that General Electric paid. That was done, even though the Justice Department advised against it.

Some of their own lawyers were saying that they should consult Congress before that happened. That is the reason why we should not place those people in

a position of power so that they can make rulings. The companies are so powerful that their lawyers, and others in Government, such as Hollomon, are in a position to press for and get private patents on research.

There was a cartoon published in this morning's Washington Post. I had nothing to do with it. I have met Herblock on one or two occasions. Sometimes I agree with him. Sometimes I do not.

I am pleased to say that this time the cartoonist agrees with the Senator from Louisiana. The cartoon portrays what appears to be a machine. At one end, the United States is stuffing its money into what appears to be a furnace. The machine is eating up our money. The cartoon portrays the United States putting \$15 billion into that part of the machine. From another part of the machine, a pair of mechanical claws reaches into our pocket and removes the patent rights at the same time that we are pouring the money into the machine.

A character labeled as the private patent lobby is standing there watching the operation. They have finally invented a machine that will take our money and pick our pocket at the same time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator from Louisiana is speaking of the cartoon by Herblock printed in the Washington Post of June 25, 1965?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Some say that it is too complicated to figure out. However, I believe that I can figure it out. It is a pickpocketing machine which consumes our money and steals our patent rights at the time. The patent rights would then be passed on to somebody who would be in a position to use them to advantage. I am sure that they do a very effective job of it.

The United States has no safeguards of any kind for the protection of the public against a patent monopoly. This was brought out in the drug hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly under the chairmanship of Senator Kefauver, and is covered in the subcommittee's report on drugs.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED RESEARCH

Now, on top of this there has been an increasing tendency to give to private industry the fruits of Government-financed research in the health field. You are all familiar with the policy adopted by HEW in 1957 on the cancer chemotherapy contracts of NIH. In simple terms, the drug manufacturers went on strike until they got what they wanted, and what they wanted was a monopoly to any of the patentable inventions which might arise from the Government-financed work. All the Government was to get for the tremendous expenditure of public funds was a royalty-free license to use for governmental purposes only, whatever that means, plus a feeble and highly circumscribed right to move in if the private monopoly exploitation was too ruthless. In the meantime the public could pay exorbitant prices for drugs, for which it paid the costs of development.

Take, for example, the case of vitamin D which was the result some years ago of a research grant by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Title to the Steenbock patent was allowed to be lodged with the Wisconsin Research Alumni Foundation. Apparently it was thought that an organization connected with a university—the University of Wisconsin—would consider the public welfare. Instead, a tight patent monopoly was established. The prices charged were exorbitant because of the restrictive provisions in the foundation's licensing contracts, and the whole thing culminated in an antitrust suit by the U.S. Department of Justice for violation of the Sherman Act. This was in the mid-1940's.

The same thing is happening today. Take the case of the new cancer compounds 5-FU and 5-FUDR which were the subject of an investigation and report of the Comptroller General in 1960. The cancer drug was first developed largely at Government expense, after which NIH wanted to subject the compounds to clinical testing to determine their usefulness on patients. Acting on the supposition that title for the discoveries would be lodged with Hoffman-LaRoche—a pharmaceutical company—NIH made no attempt to engage in competitive procurement of these compounds for clinical testing purposes. Instead, it bought the drug from Hoffman-LaRoche at monopoly prices. In 1958, NIH was paying \$60,000 a kilo, according to the report of the Comptroller General; and of five contracts negotiated in 1958 and 1959, the lowest price was \$29,000 a kilo. Altogether, in those 2 years, NIH contracted for 17 kilos at a total price in excess of \$700,000.

Could this material have been bought at \$60 a kilo or even \$600 or \$6,000 instead of \$60,000 a kilo? Nobody knows, because NIH acted on the policy embodied in the cancer chemotherapy program under which patents for Government-financed research can be handed over to the private contractor.

This case represented such a flagrant abuse of private exploitation of patent rights that, after the Comptroller General's report, action was taken. The Government now has a one-fourth undivided interest in the patent, following negotiations with Hoffman-LaRoche and the American Cancer Society. And another company or two have been licensed to manufacture and sell the drug. Thus far, though, I have heard of no attempt on the part of the Government to attempt to renegotiate the purchase contracts to get some of its money back.

Why is all this important? Because, according to the National Senior Citizens Education and Research Center, there are 18,000 senior citizens who spend nearly a billion dollars a year for drugs and medicine. The average person over 65 spends 3½ times as much on drugs as is spent on the average child. And this occurs at a time when his income is the lowest. It is inhuman for the Government to permit price gouging of these elder citizens—and it is even worse if it is these very citizens who have contributed the funds for the drug's initial development.

But let us look at children for a moment. There are many serious children's diseases which are currently the subject of attack. On May 17, I brought to the attention of the American people a case study of what happens when a private company gets a monopoly and does not hesitate to use its power. I have previously discussed, as a result of the expenditure of public funds, a simple blood test was developed for the pinpointing of a metabolic deficiency which occurs in some children. If not detected quickly the result is mental retardation.

The Children's Bureau and the Public Health Service spent about three-quarters of a million dollars, with certain States also spending considerable funds, to develop this relatively simple device to ascertain whether new babies suffer from this metabolic deficiency. The treatment for its cure is known; the real problem is in locating the babies in sufficient time to start the treatment before permanent mental damage is done. Obviously, the market was there, waiting eagerly for the development; some States had already made the test mandatory, and in other States most hospitals incorporated the test as a normal routine with their newborn babies. Could there have been any rational purpose served in handing over a monopoly on such a development to a private company for monopoly exploitation? As the public records show, the hospitals in Massachusetts and in other States were producing a kit for testing 500 infants, including all costs, for \$6. The granting of a monopoly to the Miles Laboratories would not only have prevented the production of such kits by anyone except Miles Laboratories, but the price would have been \$262, a price over 40 times the cost to Massachusetts, Louisiana, and other States. This is a classic example of the ruthless exercise of monopoly power. Fortunately, the Public Health Service determined that ownership of the invention should reside in the U.S. Government and should be used for the benefit of our children and not to enrich private monopolies.

In order to protect its citizens, most European countries would not permit the issue of a patent even if the company developed it with its own funds. Can there be any defense for handing over monopoly rights in this country to a private company who made absolutely no contribution—financial or otherwise—to the development of such a test?

Or take the case of a single inexpensive test to determine whether a person is a diabetic. At the present time there is a good deal of Government-financed research being conducted on this problem, and it is only a question of time before it is worked out. Should the private contractor, financed by the Government, be permitted to have a monopoly on such a development? Should he be allowed to set monopoly priced on a discovery which has been paid for by the people and which should be priced at a level that permits everyone to have access to it? Is not the need rather for the Government to be so concerned about the welfare of its citizens that it take steps to insure that important discoveries

in the field of health be made available at prices that people can afford to pay?

ANIMAL AND CLINICAL TESTING

Now, I want to turn for a moment to the Government's role in the animal and clinical testing of new drug compounds. Under the Kefauver-Harris drug statute, passed in 1962, every new drug which a company wishes to market must be first cleared by the Food and Drug Administration both for safety and efficacy.

Much of this testing work—both on animals and human beings—is done at the expense of the U.S. Government. Under the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, the Public Health Service has supplied the funds for the actual constructing and equipping of facilities for research in the sciences related to health. This money—for years it has been at the rate of \$30 million a year—has gone to non-Federal public and nonprofit institutions. Thus, organizations like Sloan Kettering Institute, the Mayo Clinic, and others, which engage in research are heavily supported by Government funds.

To a considerable extent the work of individual clinical testers is underwritten by NIH grants. I have on my desk two volumes of the *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* containing the reports of clinical investigators which were used by the drug companies sponsoring the symposium for securing clearance of their new drug applications through FDA. A sizable majority were financed by NIH grants or carried on with assistance from the Veterans' Administration. This kind of data is essential for clearance of the drug compound for marketing purposes. Why should this research work, paid for by the Government, become the private property of any drug company? Clearly, this knowledge developed with public funds should be made available to any person or organization interested in its use. Small companies, particularly, find a great barrier in the expenditure of funds for clinical testing. The costs can be as much as \$100,000. Why should not small companies have ready access to the data as quickly as possible—published or unpublished? After all, they helped to pay for it.

It may be argued that these little companies would in any event be prohibited from selling the compound because the product is patented by a major company. But in some cases new uses are found for old drugs on which the patent has expired. If the compound is still classified by FDA as a "new drug," evidence of safety and utility must be supplied by the company if it wishes to market the product for the new uses. Or there may be an interference fight in the Patent Office as occurred in the case of one of the important drugs for arthritis. This drug—prednisone is the name—was involved in an interference fight for roughly 10 years, from 1954 to the spring of 1964.

During this period any company was free to engage in its marketing because no patent protection existed. In addition, irrespective of the existence of a patent, sales can always be made to the U.S. Government. Indeed, this is exactly what happened in the case of tetra-

cycline, the leading antibiotic drug, involved in an action by the Federal Trade Commission. Here the patent was held by the Pfizer Co. which licensed only a couple of the major drug companies in this country. After investigation, the FTC found the companies guilty of rigging high prices on this essential drug in violation of our antitrust laws. Two companies—Pfizer and American Cyanamid—were also found to have engaged in misrepresentation of the facts in filing their patent applications in the Patent Office. The Medical Military Supply Agency, buying on behalf of the U.S. Government, acted long before the findings of the Federal Trade Commission came out; it simply disregarded the patent and went abroad for its purchases, paying 1½ cents a tablet instead of the 17 cents which was being demanded by Pfizer and its licensees. This is all contained in the Kefauver committee hearings, and the numerous speeches Senator Kefauver made on the subject on the floor.

Much of the testing work used by the big companies in getting their new drug applications through FDA is paid for by the Federal Government. The Long amendment merely provides that if the Government has paid for this research work, the results should not be monopolized and exploited by the private contractor. The new information should become public property and be made available to anyone who cares to use it.

I believe this policy would tend in the direction of more reasonable prices for essential drugs to the public. It should have that effect since it would invite the entrance of other companies wherever possible and insure the benefits of competition to the public. In addition, there is need—particularly in the health field—for the widest dissemination of knowledge in the interest of unlocking more and more doors to the conquest of disease, the infirmities accompanying old age, and the accidents of nature which cripple and retard the physical and mental development of so many of our children.

I am not today advocating a change in our patent laws to prohibit product patents. I am only explaining their use under existing legislation. Fortunately, the fact that there is a different situation in Europe which brings about much more effective competition permits me to bring out the manner in which some monopolies operate. Perhaps it is justifiable for companies to receive product patents on products developed by their own research, but what we are talking about today is the handing over of exclusive rights to private contractors on processes and products which are developed with public funds.

Let us take a look at chlorpromazine, which is a very potent tranquilizer widely used in all of the mental hospitals in this country. The French firm of Rhone Poulenc developed this drug. The European bulk price today is approximately \$20 per kilo, which makes the ingredient cost of a bottle of 100 tablets of 25 milligrams each approximately 5 cents. When we add the 25 cents for tableting and bottling, the total cost is approximately 30 cents. In this

country, this drug is sold exclusively by Smith, Kline & French under the trade name of Thorazine. What do you suppose the public is paying for Thorazine? Generally, the public is paying approximately \$10 for a bottle of 100 tablets. The cost to the druggist runs approximately \$6 per 100 tablets of 25 milligrams each.

Usually, Mr. President, the big hospitals can purchase drugs in large quantities at prices considerably lower than those charged the retail druggist. In this case, however, this situation does not prevail because there is only one seller. Smith, Kline & French have been charging the hospitals practically the same price as is charged the druggist. Of course, this means that the monopoly prices are borne by the general public because most of our mental hospitals are supported chiefly by public funds.

Phenmetrazine, which is of Swiss origin, is another example. It is widely prescribed by doctors as an appetite depressant for those who are overweight and trying to do something about it. Certainly, we can agree that there is a large potential market among the American people for this product, Mr. President. Perhaps I should be using it myself. It is sold by the Geigy Co., which is the U.S. subsidiary of the Swiss company by the same name, under the trade name of Preludin. In Europe, under similar calculations as we have made for the other preparations mentioned, the total cost would be approximately 33 cents per bottle of 100 tablets. In this country, the druggist pays approximately \$4.50 for 100 tablets of 25 milligrams each, and the price to the public is approximately \$7.50 for a bottle of 100 tablets.

Another one of European origin is chlordiazepoxide, which is a mild tranquilizer prescribed by the doctors for anxiety, tension, and similar problems. It is something like Miltown or Equanil, which I have seen on occasions around the Capitol, even in the offices of some of the Members of this body. This new compound is sold in this country only by Hoffman-LaRoche, the U.S. subsidiary of the parent Swiss company which developed it.

Here, the public is paying in excess of \$15 per bottle of 100 tablets. In Europe, the product in finished bulk form is available for approximately \$56 per kilo. When it is tableted and bottled, the cost per bottle of 100 tablets comes to approximately 41 cents. Mr. President, it is really outrageous how much this monopoly situation is costing the American people. I do not wish this to happen to any product developed by private firms under contract to our public health agencies. If we do not adopt my amendment, however, there is no way at all that we can be sure it will not happen.

In the field of public health, there is the most urgent of reasons why we should insist that the Government retain title to the discoveries which are to be financed in the future by the tax money of the American people. Exclusive rights assigned to private contractors is certain to mean monopoly prices, which means that the essential drugs and medicines

are placed beyond the reach of many of our citizens. Particularly, the older members of our society are affected by these artificial and cruelly high prices. Among older people, chronic diseases are common. There is a high requirement for medication on a regular, even a daily basis, or several times a day.

Mr. President, there are unfortunately altogether too many examples of this nature. I do not believe it is necessary to take the time of the Senate to discuss each one in detail.

Drug price comparisons, European and United States

Generic name	Price per kilo	Ingredient cost per 100 tablets	U.S. trade name	U.S. price to druggist per 100 tablets
Tolbutamide.....	\$3.65	\$0.18 (0.5 gram).....	Orinase (Upjohn).....	\$7.70
Nitrofurantoin.....	18.20	\$0.19 (100 milligrams).....	Furantin (Norwich).....	29.00
Phenmetrazine.....	26.00	\$0.07 (25 milligrams).....	Preludin (Geigy).....	4.50
Chlorothalidate.....	5.00	\$0.25 (500 milligrams).....	Diruril (Merck).....	6.00
Hydrochlorothiazide.....	5.00	\$0.025 (50 milligrams).....	Hydrodiruril (Merck).....	6.18
Chloridazepoxide.....	56.00	\$0.16 (25 milligrams).....	Librium (Hoffman-La Roche).....	10.00
Chlorpromazine.....	20.00	\$0.05 (25 milligrams).....	Thorazine (Smith, Kline & French).....	6.06
Tetracycline.....	40.00	\$1 (250 milligrams).....	Tetracyn (Pfizer).....	17.60
Sulfamethoxyypyridazine.....	6.75	\$0.34 (0.5 gram).....	{Kynex (Lederle)..... Midicel (Parke Davis).....}	8.82

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me note that the prices in the extreme right-hand column are to the druggist, not to the consuming public.

Mr. President, the foregoing chart gives some idea of what happens to drug prices where there is monopoly control.

Is this what we want to have happen with drug discoveries which are actually financed by the U.S. Government?

This kind of price gouging by the drug monopolies is scandalous even when they spend their own funds on research to develop the products. It is beyond all standards of decency and morality when the money for the research comes from the Government.

Some of these companies are recipients of contracts from the National Institutes of Health cancer chemotherapy program. These include Upjohn, Pfizer, Merck, and Parke Davis. Senators may recall—believe it or not—that in connection with the cancer program the major drug companies actually went on strike. They refused to participate in the program unless they got title to the discoveries.

There are many small- and medium-sized companies in the drug industry which are fully qualified and eager to market the discoveries flowing from the research financed by the Government. We talk and talk about the desirability of maintaining a dynamic competitive economy in this country. It is time to do a little something about the situation, and we can do so by adopting my amendment. Let us do a little something to establish the kind of conditions which will at least make possible a more competitive situation in the drug industry.

Mr. President, the chart shows a comparison of European and American prices—rather hastily computed—where the European price was regarded as competitive and the American price was protected by a patent monopoly on the part of those who developed it. Although it does show a great degree of profit for those protected by patents, I have not attempted to average out the difference in the price.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a simple table containing a number of additional illustrations.

The prices originally were given in terms of kilos and were converted by my staff assistants into bottles of 100 tablets. Although I do not vouch for its precise accuracy, it does give, I believe, a reasonable comparison of the European and U.S. prices.

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

I have already mentioned Tolbutamide with an international price of 18 cents against a price of \$7.70 for a bottle of 100 tablets.

Here is another drug, very much used, with an international price of 19 cents for 100 tablets compared to a price of \$29 wholesale, or \$48 retail in the United States.

Here is another widely used drug, with a price of 7 cents compared to \$4.71 to the druggist and \$7.50 to the consumer.

Here is another drug with a price of 2½ cents and \$6.18 for the same drug wholesale, or \$9 at retail.

These are illustrations of the difference in prices charged for drugs, where drugs are sold on a competitive basis, or where the protection is only on the process used to produce the product, rather than on the protection existing with regard to the product itself.

Mr. President, Congress has acted on this subject many times. Each time it has acted, I have offered amendments and have followed the precedents of previous occasions.

I went to the extent of urging President Kennedy to sign an order that there would be no private patents on Government research. I was not successful in accomplishing that, even though I was successful in bringing about a policy statement which at least, so far as I was concerned, would mean that no private patents would be given on health research.

I thought at that time that something had been achieved. On page 3 of that statement, which I hold in my hand, there is the statement that no private patents will be granted if the principal purpose of the contract is for exploration in fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare.

The Senator from Louisiana thought that meant that in the Department of Defense, where private patents were awarded on all Government research contracts, if they were looking for something that related to the health of the

individual and something might be discovered in relation to preserving human life in high altitude, for example, it would be available to the public generally.

The statement also went on to state that this did not attempt to bind the existing agencies.

In any event, here is a statement of policy, which is six pages of legal typing, single spaced, in the form of a memorandum from the President of the United States addressed to the heads of the departments and agencies of Government. The best I can make out is that there are agencies like the Federal Aviation Agency, which in my judgment is carefully scrutinizing everything in the public interest and insisting that their policy should not be one of giving away private patent rights.

Then there are agencies like the Defense Department, where private patent rights are being given away in almost all contracts. In NASA and in other agencies they are giving away some and saving some. They insist on following that policy.

This subject has been studied at great length in various agencies, and as a result HEW has decided to continue following the policy which I advocate. I am happy to say the HEW has had a very great Secretary in the person of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. He studied this question, and he concluded that large amounts of money were being spent. As a matter of fact, he found that practically all research was being financed with Federal money—and that the patents should not be waived.

I submit that when we finally get down to determining what the patent policy of an agency should be, it all depends on the circumstances. We should either have a flat prohibition on any private patents on the results of Government research or we should permit some type of flexibility, geared to the particular agency.

The amendment that I am offering is what HEW is doing and what it thinks should be done. I am not quarreling with that agency. I am in support of the position that it has followed.

I do not wish to take the risk that this program, which is such a fine program and is following such a worthy purpose, and which is being offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee, should become subject to efforts of those who would exploit the public interest and bring about a change in that policy.

In my judgment a change in that policy would be a very great detriment to the public interest.

I am pleased to note that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is in the chair. He is the former Attorney General of the United States, and was in that office at the time this patent policy was discussed with all the agencies.

The spokesman of the Justice Department at that time was the gentleman who now is Supreme Court Associate Justice White. The policy of the Justice Department at that time was that the agencies should not waive patent rights unless they knew what they were waiv-

ing, and that in any event there should not be a waiver in the contract itself, but the matter should wait until the product had been developed and identified.

On the whole, it was the feeling of the junior Senator from Louisiana that there was more support for the position he is advocating in the Justice Department than perhaps in any other agency, except perhaps in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or in the Federal Aviation Agency.

My position is also strongly supported in the Department of Agriculture, where that policy is pursued, and also in the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as in a number of other agencies of Government.

The Senator from Louisiana is convinced that this is a very important subject, in the public interest. I believe other Senators would like to discuss it. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTROYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I strongly favor the bill. In the course of the hearings there was an important interchange of memorandums with the New York Academy of Medicine, consisting of a letter which they wrote me on certain problems which will arise in respect to such a bill so far as doctors and medical practice is concerned, and to which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare replied, giving answers to the professional and practical problems which the Academy believed would arise.

In addition, I have the answer of the Academy of Medicine to the views expressed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange, which will be critically important in the administration of this measure, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE
New York, N.Y., June 1, 1965.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Here is a copy of a statement by the New York Academy of

Medicine on the report entitled "A National Program To Conquer Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke," issued by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke; and on the bill S. 596 to implement the program.

I hope that the academy's statement will be useful to you in your consideration of the bill.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. MADDEN, M.D.,

President.

STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE ON THE NATIONAL PROGRAM TO CONQUER HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

The New York Academy of Medicine shares the objectives of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke "to reduce the incidence of these diseases through new knowledge and more complete utilization of the medical knowledge that we already have." But the academy finds some vagueness in the national program as outlined in the Commission's report.

For the New York Academy of Medicine the proposed national program raises a number of questions which it would bring to your attention.

1. Will the emphasis on heart disease, cancer, and stroke in a program on such a vast scale have an adverse effect on the attention, time, and funds devoted to other illnesses?

2. Is the asserted major deficit in present medical care in the acquisition of new knowledge, or in the application of available knowledge? Today, with the decline in family doctors, more than a majority of practicing physicians are specialists, many board certified, presumably able to handle difficult diagnoses, and provide known treatment.

3. Is there a shortage of medical complexes of such magnitude that it is the major limiting factor? Existing medical care centers are not negligible in number and with modern transportation are not inaccessible.

4. The need for continuing education of all physicians is perpetual and generally recognized. But will more medical complexes fulfill the need? Is expansion of their number the most feasible method of maintaining the proficiency of physicians? Is there not a simpler system of continuing education of physicians?

5. Is not the problem of reducing incidence of heart disease, cancer, and stroke as much, if not more, a matter of educating the vulnerable groups to seek an examination upon indication? Control of cancer of the breast and venereal disease in the past demonstrated that persons suspecting these conditions must seek medical attention. Unless the patient comes for an examination no physician or medical complex can help him. Furthermore, if the patient does not come early enough, the physician cannot render most effective care.

Public education has a record in the past of having worked in cancer of the breast and venereal disease. It is much less expensive than expanding a network of medical complexes. It is basic to the mass approach to disease. It has not been applied fully to heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

6. Medical care and its facilities have developed out of local needs, local responsibility, and local support, including voluntary organizations. Will the proposed Federal participation on a vast scale in planning and decisions on medical care affect local responsibility and support?

7. Is any existing Federal department prepared or could it be quickly readied to administer the proposed program? Is it wise to formulate huge Federal health programs to be imposed on departments already taxed to the utmost to discharge their present responsibilities?

8. In area and regional planning, which groups at the State and local levels are to

wield power and authority in decisions and administration? Already this question has led to the emergence of rival groups.

9. What will be the basis for allocation of funds? Local need or influence and power? Are new medical centers to be created on the basis of demonstrated need or are existing ones to be strengthened?

10. The plan envisions fusing the four worlds of medical education, medical practice, hospitals, and research. Is it more likely to succeed in this endeavor by a program of expansion? Is this the best solution to the problem?

11. Does the program rely too heavily on the thesis that money is a sovereign remedy, that it can buy anything? Even if the program were sound, can the Nation by practical view, furnish the financial support?

12. Although the report takes medical manpower into account, is there sufficient skilled professional manpower to effectuate it? Congress now has under consideration another vast health program, medical care of the aged, that would increase utilization of hospitalization and medical services in the face of a limited supply of physicians.

The report does not provide clear or convincing answers to these questions. But the questions need answers. The report is a valuable document in stimulating attention to these matters. It should form the basis for careful consideration and planning toward the reduction of disease, especially heart disease, cancer and stroke.

Companion bills S. 596 and H.R. 3140 have already been introduced into the Congress as the first step to implement the report. Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testifying at hearings on the bills, has given his interpretation of them and answered other questions than those raised here.

He said the bill is not intended to provide Federal medical care programs. "What, basically, we are seeking to do for victims of these diseases is to equip existing hospitals and their existing medical staffs to provide care of quality that is available today only in a handful of places in the country.

"We are not proposing that the Federal Government pay for this care—either hospital costs or physicians' fees—except as the Government already pays for care that is part of federally supported research."

According to the Secretary, the proposed establishment of regional medical complexes by linkage of medical schools, research institutions and hospitals, and thus coordination of education, training, diagnosis, treatment and research, would afford to physicians, and to the health institutions at which they practice, the arrangements for them to supply the latest advances in diagnosis and treatment.

He asserted that the proposed program would accomplish these objectives without interfering with the traditional patterns of patient care, professional practice, the administration of hospitals, or the methods of financing health care.

But the New York Academy of Medicine does not find the answers to its questions either in the pending bills, or in the Secretary's interpretation.

The New York Academy of Medicine wishes to make clear that it has long been interested in ways and means to improve the quality of medical care. It too would welcome practical and effective steps to reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

But it does advocate careful consideration before taking precipitous steps on a vast scale. It would strongly urge the committee members in both the Senate and the House to deliberate deeply on the questions which the academy has raised before embarking on what promises to be a very expensive venture that might not produce the desired results.

Approved by the executive committee of the committee on public health, May 24, 1965.

Approved by John L. Madden, M.D., president, the New York Academy of Medicine, May 24, 1965.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I have prepared the attached comments on the statement recently made by the New York Academy of Medicine on the report of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

In general, the academy's committee seems to have taken a position that public health measures are threatened by programs designed to support diagnostic and treatment procedures. Personally, I think this is not so. Public education in venereal disease control would have been useless if therapeutic agents culminating in penicillin had not been available as treatment; encouraging women to seek examination for uterine cancer is futile without diagnostic stations with trained technicians; without the facilities, equipment, clinical laboratories, and trained specialists, physicians can offer little to patients who seek them because of their afflictions caused by heart disease, cancer, or stroke.

The President's Commission consisted of 28 public-spirited physicians and laymen. It and its 8 subcommittees held 45 meetings, interviewed 166 expert consultants, took more than 7,500 pages of testimony and published a report in two volumes totaling 758 pages. The Commission earnestly sought answers to the many questions stemming from the President's instruction to "recommend steps to reduce the incidence of these diseases through new knowledge and more complete utilization of the medical knowledge we already have." It gave the most careful consideration to steps intended to be, not precipitous, but adequate to the scope of the problem. It recommended the most meticulous attention toward utilizing fully all existing resources, facilities, and manpower, including avoidance of interfering with the existing patterns of patient care, professional practice, the administration of hospitals, or the methods of financing health care. At the present time I know of no alternative plan designed to reach the stated objectives and to harmonize with present trends and achievements in medicine.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. DEMPSEY,
Special Assistant to the Secretary,
(Health and Medical Affairs).

COMMENTS ON THE STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE ON THE NATIONAL PROGRAM TO CONQUER HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

1. No proposal has been made to decrease support to programs combatting diseases other than heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Moreover, many of the recommendations of the Commission which have been embodied in the administration's program provide support for medicine in general. This is particularly true of the proposals to increase support for manpower, teaching and research construction, communication, and information. In any event, in assigning priorities, the fact that 71 percent of all deaths are represented in these three categories demands that great emphasis be assigned to heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

2. Major deficits occur both in adequate knowledge and in application of presently available knowledge. The Commission recommendations took both into account. The Department has recommended a supple-

mental appropriation of \$44.1 million for the next fiscal year, much of which is to support further research and training.

3. The informed opinion, that a lag does exist in applying present knowledge, indicates that there is not an adequate system for making this knowledge available. By linking community hospitals to existing medical centers, this system will be improved and extended.

4. To be meaningful, continuing education must be intertwined with research and service. For continuing education of the highest quality, there is probably no simpler system.

5. True enough, unless the patient presents himself to a physician, he cannot be helped. The Commission's report, and the proposed supplemental appropriation, recognizes the need for improved public information. But without facilities organized to treat the patient little would be gained by having him recognize his disease.

6. The current proposals are for local organizations to prepare plans and applications. Federal participation has not stultified medical research, but has improved it. A partnership between Federal and local organizations can provide greater support tailored to meet local needs.

7. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is prepared to assume this responsibility, and assignment of the program to the National Institutes of Health has met with approval by a large number of informed leaders in medicine. Moreover, as provided in S. 596, local institutions or agencies would prepare applications which would be reviewed through procedures thoroughly familiar to NIH. Thus, no large involvement of federally employed skilled manpower would be required. The major responsibilities would be assumed by the applicant institutions or agencies.

8. Groups formed through local or regional enterprise would prepare and submit applications and would form the advisory and administrative organizations. The fear that rival forces might emerge in each locality is probably only a fear—in fact, the Vermont Legislature has authorized a statewide committee appointed by the Governor with representation from the university, the State health department, the medical society, and other groups; the three medical schools in North Carolina have agreed to cooperate in formulating a statewide plan; the University of Wisconsin and Marquette University are discussing a similar consortium, as are institutions in California, Virginia, and many other places. It would seem, therefore, that trends toward cooperation are strongly evident.

9. Funds would be allocated by the Surgeon General acting on the advice of the authorized Council, just as other grants are awarded. Awards would be based upon the merits of individual proposals.

10. The plan envisions expanding the involvement of existing institutions, particularly medical schools and their hospitals, into the area of patient services. This plan introduces a new dimension into programs for health care and represents a solution providing physicians with resources of the highest attainable quality.

11. It is difficult to define what is meant by relying "too heavily on the thesis that money is a sovereign remedy, that it can buy anything." Money is a medium of exchange; it is needed to provide the necessary facilities, services, and manpower. As to whether the Nation can afford this program, the economic advisers consulted by the President's Commission, by the Wooldrige Committee, and by the AMA Commission on the Cost of Medical Care all agree that health investments return more to the gross national product than they cost.

12. Recognizing critical needs, the Commission recommended programs to increase

support for existing programs involving education and training of health manpower, including direct support of medical education. A bill, S. 595, has been introduced into Congress for this purpose. The Commission also recommended programs to utilize present manpower and other resources in the most effective ways possible. The provisions for increased and improved community planning, for centralization of expensive equipment and of procedures requiring extensive and sophisticated teamwork of organizations to assure effective utilization of community resources—all these were directed toward the efficient use of highly skilled manpower. In short, the medical complex is a means toward this end.

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE,
New York, N.Y., June 23, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of June 14 in reply to my letter of June 1 which contained the statement by the New York Academy of Medicine on the program for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

The academy appreciates your enclosing a letter from Dr. Edward W. Dempsey and his comments on the academy's statement. Dr. Dempsey attributes to the academy the position that public health measures would be threatened by programs designed to support diagnostic and treatment procedures.

Apparently misled by the name, Committee on Public Health, the academy's committee that prepared the statement, Dr. Dempsey has indulged in an erroneous assumption. Actually there is not a professional public health man on the committee. All are practicing physicians or medical educators.

As you know, the New York Academy of Medicine is an independent medical organization that is 118 years old, with a fellowship of more than 2,000 physicians. More than 50 years ago its committee on public health, which prepared the statement, was formed in the public interest, a principle to which it has tenaciously adhered.

The academy is well aware of the reputation of the members of the Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. It is also familiar with the source material on which their report was based. As it has demonstrated on innumerable occasions, the academy is qualified and able to reach its own conclusions independently.

The present issue is open to more than one line of reasoning. Furthermore, the academy holds that some of Dr. Dempsey's assertions are unproved. It therefore finds his comments unconvincing.

The academy sees no reason to change its position that much further thought be given to the proposed program and to the provisions in S. 596. The academy considers the Commission report a desirable stimulus and working paper for further consideration rather than the last word on a debatable subject.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MADDEN, M.D.,
President.

SOME POINTS IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMY'S STAND CONCERNING A PROGRAM ON HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

1. The vast majority of patients across the country are not in hospitals affiliated with medical schools, nor have the majority of physicians in the community access to these affiliated hospitals.

2. How are community hospitals to be linked to existing medical schools when many existing schools consistently refuse to accept or foster any such linkage even in large cities?

3. The program does not provide any method for continuing medical education of

the practicing physician. The use of centers which Dr. Dempsey mentions will not attract or reach the local doctor. Therapy will be directed away from the practitioner into the medical schools and their hospitals.

4. The academy doubts that pouring of additional funds into areas already well provided with research funds will effect any great changes.

5. The academy questions whether there is sufficient personnel to staff expanded existing centers or new centers without resulting dilution of existing supply.

6. There is no proof that any great number of patients suffering from heart disease, cancer, and stroke are not getting proper and prompt medical attention because of lack of facilities. There are other reasons for delayed medical care.

JUNE 23, 1965.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to point out that the New York Academy of Medicine is a most distinguished body of doctors; it has the reputation of being a great organ of public spirit and in the public interest. I therefore express the hope that the departmental authorities may, at the earliest opportunity, if the bill becomes law—and I hope that it will—confer with the officers of the New York Academy of Medicine under the leadership of its president, Dr. John L. Madden, so that the greatest benefit to the implementation of the program can be obtained from the fine expertise which is represented by this organization.

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

If there is no amendment—

AMENDMENT NO. 298

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, since I have already explained the amendment, I do not believe any further explanation is necessary at this time. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is as follows:

On page 12, line 4, immediately after "SEC. 906.", insert the subsection designation "(a)".

On page 12, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(b) (1) No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this title for any scientific or technological research or developmental activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all developments resulting from that activity will be made freely available to the general public. The Surgeon General shall include in each grant or contract made or entered into under such authorization for any such activity provisions under which the United States will acquire exclusive right in and to any such development. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity, without his consent, of any right which that owner may have under that patent.

"(2) The Surgeon General may enter into an agreement with any charitable public

health organization for the equitable disposition (for such period not exceeding three years as the Surgeon General may prescribe) of proprietary interests in any development which has been made through research or developmental activity for which such organization has made substantial financial contribution if the Surgeon General determines with the concurrence of the Attorney General, after according to all interested parties an opportunity for public hearing upon such proposed agreement, that such agreement will affirmatively advance the interests of public health. Each such agreement shall be subject to the provisions of paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(3) Any grantee or contractor who has made any development in the performance of any obligation incurred under any grant or contract made or entered into subject to the provisions of this subsection may apply to the Surgeon General for the transfer to him of exclusive right (except against the United States or any Federal, State, or local governmental entity) to exploit such development for commercial purposes for such period (not exceeding three years) as the Surgeon General may prescribe. Before any such transfer is made, the Surgeon General shall comply with the requirements herein-after set forth in this paragraph. The Surgeon General shall cause to be published in the Federal Register notice of the making of such application and a full and complete statement concerning the circumstances under which that development was made and the justification asserted by the applicant for such transfer. At such time (not earlier than 30 days after such publication) as the Surgeon General shall prescribe in such notice, opportunity for a hearing on the record upon such application shall be accorded under such regulations as the Surgeon General shall prescribe to each person who would be affected thereby, including any State or local government and any representative of an organization or segment of the public legitimately concerned therewith. Upon the basis of evidence received in such hearing, or if no such hearing has been requested upon the basis of such evidence as the Surgeon General shall obtain by full and complete investigation and preserve as a public record for not less than five years, the Surgeon General may transfer the proprietary interest for which application was made or any lesser proprietary interest to the applicant if the Surgeon General determines, with the concurrence of the Attorney General, that the making of such transfer—

"(A) is clearly justified upon equitable considerations by the contribution made or to be made by the applicant to such development apart from the financial contribution made or to be made thereto by the United States;

"(B) will affirmatively and substantially promote the utilization of such development and the interests of public health or welfare within the United States; and

"(C) will not result in or contribute to any material restraint of the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States.

"(4) Each transfer under paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) shall be made subject to—

"(A) the termination thereof at any time at which the Surgeon General determines that the recipient thereof has failed without adequate justification to (i) take prompt and effective action to bring the development to the point of practical application, or (ii) make the development available, upon terms and conditions determined by the Surgeon General to be reasonable, for use or exploitation by other parties within the United States for public benefit; and

"(B) such other terms and conditions as the Surgeon General shall determine, and specify in making such transfer, to be required for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(5) The Surgeon General shall transmit to the Congress annually a full and complete statement concerning—

"(A) the identity of the recipient of each transfer made during the preceding calendar year with respect to any proprietary interest in any development subject to the provisions of this subsection;

"(B) the terms and conditions under which each such transfer was made;

"(C) the facts and circumstances relied upon in justification for the making of each such transfer; and

"(D) the use which has been made of all developments with respect to which such transfers have been made under this subsection at any time before the date of such report.

"(6) Whenever any development resulting from any research or developmental activity conducted in whole or in part with appropriated funds expended under authorization of this title or any proprietary interest in any such development is withheld or disposed of by any person, organization, or agency in contravention of any provision of this subsection or any condition imposed pursuant to this subsection, the Attorney General shall institute, upon his own motion or upon request made by any person having knowledge of pertinent facts, an action for the enforcement of such provision or such condition in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which any defendant resides, is found, or has a place of business. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action, and to enter therein such orders and decrees as it shall determine to be required to carry into effect fully such provision or such condition. Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action instituted under this paragraph may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States Marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

"(7) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'development' means any information, copyrightable material, use, process, invention, patent, improvement or innovation resulting from scientific or technological research or developmental activity; and

"(B) the term 'charitable public health organization' means any organization described in section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which (i) is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a) of such Code, (ii) derives its income wholly or chiefly from charitable contributions made by the public at large, and (iii) expends its revenue chiefly for the promotion of public health or the alleviation of human suffering arising from floods, earthquakes, fires, explosions, and similar disasters affecting residents of the affected areas."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are any copies of the amendment available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is a typewritten amendment; printed copies are not available.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I said, I have explained the amendment. I have additional copies

available if any Senator wishes to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I oppose the amendment because we do not know how it would affect the productivity of research and development. We do not know how it would ultimately affect the health and welfare of the American people.

The proposed amendment was rejected in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and it was rejected by a large margin.

As the Senate recalls, when the Senate considered a similar amendment to the NASA bill, the amendment was defeated by the Senate by a vote of 59 to 26.

It has been implied that pharmaceutical companies represent the only opposition to this amendment. I assure the Senate that nothing could be further from the truth.

As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have heard opposition to the amendment from many of the foremost scientists and educators throughout the country. The Chairman of the President's Commission on Heart, Cancer, and Strokes, the recommendations of which we are now trying to carry out in the bill pending before the Senate, is Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, an outstanding surgeon. He strongly opposes the amendment.

Dr. I. S. Ravdin, vice president for medical affairs of the University of Pennsylvania, which is now celebrating its 200th anniversary, also opposes the amendment. Dr. Ravdin is a former president of the American College of Surgeons, and for many years was chairman of the board of trustees of the American College of Surgeons. It may be recalled that when President Eisenhower had his operation for ileitis, it was Dr. Ravdin who was brought to Washington for that purpose. Dr. Ravdin strongly opposes the amendment, as do many other leading physicians and surgeons.

During the administration of President Eisenhower, Marion B. Folsom was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. As I said earlier, he was one of the finest and best Secretaries I have known in all my years in Washington.

One of his advisers on health matters was Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, now vice president of the University of Chicago. Dr. Coggeshall strongly opposes the amendment.

Also in opposition to the amendment are Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, president of the University of Pennsylvania and Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University.

As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have received letters and other communications from the deans and professors of leading educational institutions. I shall not read all of them, but they include Boston University, Creighton University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Loma Linda University, Medical College of Georgia, Northwestern University, Purdue University, Rice University, Rutgers University,

Stanford University, State University of New York at Buffalo, Southern Illinois University, the Catholic University of America.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree with me that money never discovered any new process?

Mr. HILL. It never discovered any new process.

Mr. ERVIN. Are not new processes which are the subject of patent rights usually discoveries made by humans which have been developed by years of study and research?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if this amendment might not handicap the discovery of new processes in that it would deny brains the opportunity for study and research to make discoveries and would deprive departments of any power to enter into contracts which would enlist those brains in the public service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. That is why distinguished educators, scientists, and other leaders are opposed to the amendment. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment could bring about a situation in which the persons who are able to make discoveries because of the experience gained by many years of study and research would be denied any share whatever in the profits of their brains except as a matter of extreme grace on the part of the Government.

Mr. HILL. That might well be true.

Mr. ERVIN. Even though the Department which was administering the Federal program might recognize that it would be impossible to obtain scientists or technicians whose services were necessary, unless they were given the right to receive some part of the fruits of their brainpower and long experience in research, the Department would be forbidden to make a contract to that effect.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Instead of promoting the public interest, the amendment might well result in the hampering and impeding of the development of the public interest.

Mr. HILL. And denying the public interest. It might deny the public interest.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Alabama believe that the Senator from North Carolina might, in the exercise of intellectually honest judgment, be uninfluenced by the influences the Senator has named?

Mr. HILL. Knowing the Senator from North Carolina, I am absolutely sure that he would be uninfluenced by them. In the naming of universities we have heard from in opposition to the amendment, I was about to mention the name of the University of North Carolina. I had not named that university yet, so the Senator from North Carolina has reached his conclusion entirely on the basis of his own intelligence and under-

standing. As we all know, he is one of the ablest Members of this body.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I heartily oppose the amendment. I strongly favor what the Senator from Alabama has said. I am also heartily in favor of what the Senator from North Carolina has said. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question from another point of view. I read from page 9 of the committee report, under the heading "Provisions of the bill," where it states:

The primary thrust of the bill—

I wish to emphasize "primary thrust"—

is to provide for the planning, establishment, and operation of regionally coordinated medical complexes for heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases which will link together medical centers, categorical research centers, and diagnostic and treatment stations located in community hospitals or other health facilities.

The report continues:

To carry out these purposes, the bill authorizes grants (1) for the planning and development of regional medical complexes and (2) for the establishment and operations of such complexes.

Then, again, it states:

A distinctive feature of a complex would be arrangements for the coordination of the activities of its component parts in a manner calculated to achieve the purposes of the bill.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is peculiarly wrong as applied to this bill. I feel certain it is the wish of the Senator from Louisiana to stimulate research through his amendment—for we have discussed the amendment, and I do not agree with it—this is not the bill through which this should be done. This is so because the great proportion of Federal money to be provided under the bill is for the construction of facilities, for coordinating complexes, and for physical purposes rather than for research.

Mr. HILL. Its primary purpose relates to the dissemination of knowledge which has been obtained. As the Senator from Massachusetts says, the bill is not primarily for health research; it is to disseminate knowledge that is now available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is also a purpose of the bill to build health complexes. It is designed to provide money for construction of better research facilities, but not for the research itself.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, as I see it, from the point of view of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Alabama, it is particularly unfortunate that the Senator from Louisiana offered his amendment. If this bill were for pure research, it would be another matter.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Are we not now debating S. 596?

Mr. HILL. Yes; we are debating that bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is not that a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct, but it does not primarily authorize support for research.

The bill pertains largely to the collaboration of the different health agencies for the dissemination of medical information we possess, so that anyone who needs the information may have it at the time when he needs it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I gathered from the debate of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that we were discussing the other bill.

Mr. HILL. No.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I refer the Senator from Louisiana to the bottom of page 9 of the committee report, the last paragraph. It reads:

The bill authorizes Federal funds to pay up to 90 percent of the costs of renovating and remodeling existing space and for new equipment and facilities and the replacement of obsolete equipment.

On the basis of building up complexes, it is my feeling that the amendment would not provide funds which would go specifically into research. It would be more in the nature of facilities.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the primary purpose of the bill is not what we generally speak of as medical research.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the point that I tried to make.

Mr. HILL. The primary purpose of the bill is not what we term medical research.

Along with the dissemination of knowledge, there might be some research. However, this is not primarily a bill for research purposes.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had the great privilege of being at the side of the Senator from Alabama when we discussed the matter in both the committee and subcommittee.

In that vein, I should like to ask the Senator a question. We have already had a helpful explanation of the amendment and the initiative demonstrated by the Senator from Louisiana.

I feel exactly as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] does about what the Senator from Louisiana has started. We should look at not only one side of the coin, namely, What is the United States getting for the research money? But also the other side of the coin, What are the people of the country receiving in terms of benefits? No invention or discovery means any-

thing until it is worked out and perfected.

We must provide the carrot and the stick—the stick in the form of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, and the carrot in the form of flexibility so that the public can get the benefit of having research pursued.

I believe that on this amendment, as in the case of the previous amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, I would be perfectly willing to let the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be a member, work the matter out under the subcommittee chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. HILL. Let the Judiciary Committee work it out.

Mr. JAVITS. Of all the bills that we have had before us, this bill deals with the most complex operations, in each of which, or in a combination of which, there may be inventions or discoveries. The purpose of the bill is to establish—and this word is really a word of art—regional medical complexes. Each complex would include a medical school, a research center, hospitals, doctors, and professional technicians of various kinds. There may be a great variety of people and institutions who would participate in a particular invention or discovery.

If I ever saw a bill in which we should maintain flexibility, especially in regard to a department which has shown such a desire to conform to the public interest, it is this one. In this instance, we really have a very complex program to accomplish a purpose; and unless we retain a reasonable area of discretion in the Secretary, quite apart from the carrot and stick idea to which I have referred, we would run the risk of doing a great injustice in many cases. We would have to be wiser than Solomon to solve the problem on the basis of this amendment.

I believe that this goes to the very essence of the bill. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] intimated that the essence of the bill is really such as to make it most inappropriate to include this amendment in the bill.

I honor the initiative of the amendment. I have pledged, along with other Senators, to carry out the public objective. We shall make it a policy which can cover the field in an intelligent way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New York is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which has the subject of patent rights before it. The Senator serves under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The Senator from New York is correct.

At the time that I yielded, I was speaking of the letters and communications which I had received.

I do not want to take up a great deal of time. I will mention a few of the others. Correspondence was received from such universities as: The Florida State University, the Jefferson Medical College, the Ohio State University, University of Alabama, University of California, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, University of Maryland, University of

Michigan, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, University of North Carolina, University of Rochester, University of the Pacific, University of West Virginia, Vanderbilt University, Wesleyan University.

Mr. President, in addition to those colleges which I have named, other institutions have written in opposition to the amendment.

Opposition to the adoption of the amendment has also been expressed by the American Council on Education, by the American Heart Association, by the American Cancer Society, by the Association of American Medical Colleges, by the National Academy of Science and by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy.

Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, opposes the amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has enumerated many institutions of medical learning which have expressed opposition to the amendment. Is the Senator able to inform me which institutions of responsibility, in the mail that he has received, have approved the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I have checked with the clerk of the committee who keeps tab on the mail. The committee clerk informs me that we may have had one or two letters in support of the amendment, but that the overwhelming majority of the correspondence expresses opposition to the amendment.

I do not recall any correspondence in support of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is quite significant that a long list of institutions of higher learning which are looked upon with great respect oppose the amendment, but only a small number, which the Senator from Alabama has not been able to recall—but he was informed by the committee clerk that there were possibly one or two—which support the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps one or two, but no more.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not certain then that there are even one or two.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Let me emphasize this point. Virtually all of the opposition that was expressed in letters to me was based on convictions that any changes in existing Government patent policy should be adopted only after careful consideration and after there was the opportunity for a full and fair presentation of the views of all interested organizations and individuals.

Let them come in and present their case. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee is present. The committee is studying the matter. Let these individuals and organizations state their case. After the committee heard from the interested parties, it would be in a position to come to the Senate with a recommendation.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would not the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama indicate that the simple attributes that have been ascribed to the problem do not exist and that the problem is so complex and so deep that we cannot, in this perfunctory manner, dispose of the issue on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Speaking frankly, as the chairman of the committee, I tried to see if we could draft some kind of amendment that would be satisfactory to the Senator from Louisiana. However, the more I got into it, the more I was like the man in Victor Hugo's great book "Les Misérables," when he got into the quicksand. He kept getting deeper and deeper into it and finally drowned. He was smothered because he went so deep into the quicksand.

This amendment is a subject that must be thoroughly studied after hearing from the many experts who want to come before the committee to express their views and give their opinions. We must have additional knowledge in order to solve the problem.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not want to speak at length, but I wanted to make one observation.

We have heard, in 3 days of hearings, 18 witnesses. I had to recess those hearings because I needed to get on with the work of the Appropriations Committee. I have been holding appropriation hearings ever since this question was raised on the other bill.

A few days ago, when I saw light as to when we would get through the appropriations bill, I gave notice that the Patent Committee would resume hearings on the 6th of next month, immediately after the Fourth of July recess. We have scheduled testimony by representatives of the Defense Department, Justice Department, the General Accounting Office, HEW, and witnesses from the public. We have so far agreed to hear everyone who has asked to be heard. I know of no reason why the committee should not hear anyone who is interested on any side of the controversy. So far as I know, we shall hear anyone who has any stature in this field who wants to be heard in support of the position now being presented, or in opposition to it.

That is all I want to say for the record, to reflect what is being done or what we are trying to do. I am not trying to settle the question.

The first time I saw the pending amendment was 5 minutes ago. It has 131 lines in it. I do not know what the nature of it is. I cannot determine that here.

I would like to see the Senate exercise its judgment. If it wants to legislate in this way, there is no use of having witnesses come and take up a great deal of time. We have all the work we can do. If this is the way the Senate wants to legislate, why not take the bill that the Senator has before the committee, offer it as a rider to the bill, and vote on it? That is the way to expedite, if we do not want

to legislate in the regular, established legislative processes of this body.

This is a sloppy way to legislate. It ought to be done in the other way. However, if the Senate does not want to do it that way, if it wants to do it in a piecemeal way, it can do so. A better way than the piecemeal way is to propose the bill that the Senator has in committee, have it debated as a rider to this bill, and have the Senate vote on it one way or the other. That is the practical way. That will end the matter one way or the other. But if we want to do business in the regular way, let us give an opportunity to witnesses who have something to contribute to the question.

I have no preconceived ideas about the matter. I have introduced measures in line with what two Presidents have recommended. Perhaps they are wrong. Perhaps the Judiciary Committee will say they are mistaken, after hearing all the facts. I do not know. But I am not prepared to accept anything that is offered here today in this manner and feel that I have done my duty to my country and to this body.

I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has answered the question I had in mind.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I have one question. Last time, when the same issue came up in the Senate a few weeks ago, I voted against the position of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], because my understanding was that the whole patent policy question on the part of the Government's and the public's rights was before the committee of the Senator from Arkansas. It seemed to me much better to treat it as a whole, and not in bits and pieces.

Am I correct in my assumption that the Senator expects some sort of proposed legislation to be reported from his committee in this session of Congress?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me answer the Senator from Rhode Island in this way: I see no reason at all why it will not be. Of course, we have the problem of marking up the bill, but, so far as hearings are concerned on the four bills pending before the committee, I assure the Senator that, if providence does not intervene, the hearings will be concluded in time for the subcommittee and the full committee to act.

I have not tried to delay action. I am as much interested as anyone else in resolving the issue. There is no manufacturing company in my State to protect. I do not believe there is one in my State. The University of Arkansas may do a little research for the Government.

I understand from the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the agency is carrying out his policy now, so I see no urgency. Perhaps we can arrive at an overall policy, which I think is desirable and needed. There is an issue presented here. I am willing to help resolve it. But if the way to resolve it is by piecemeal action, I suggest that we go

all the way, take the bill the Senator has introduced, make a rider of it to this bill, act on it, and relieve the committee of any further work on it.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is wrong with the Senator from Louisiana offering his bill as an amendment to this bill, as new matter, without paying any further attention to it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a question for the Senate to decide. There is a great deal of opposition to the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is wrong with it is that it would involve disposition of a bill without having hearings on what is a complex issue.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is exactly what I said. It is a sloppy way to legislate, but if the Senate wants to do it that way, let us go the whole way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arkansas mentioned the fact that the recommendations of two Presidents are embodied in the bill of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In general, this is correct. That was the concept of the bill. As I understand, the bill was to carry out those policies. I am not committed to them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which Presidents were they?

Mr. McCLELLAN. President Kennedy who issued the policy directive; and I understand the present President is supporting that premise. I cannot give a quotation, but that is my understanding. At least, I have nothing to indicate to the contrary. I think the bill I have introduced is generally what the administration wants.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PELL. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas if the general philosophy that is embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is expressed in the bills that the Senator's committee is presently considering and planning on reporting out of the committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are expressed in the bill.

Mr. PELL. Is it in the bill the Senator introduced?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is some difference in that there is more latitude in the bill I have introduced, in accordance with the expression of President Kennedy. That is the issue. Shall we have a firm, rigid, inflexible policy that the Government take all, or shall we resolve the issue somewhere in an area that is considered equitable?

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of the last answer, I ask whether the bill follows the concept of the Senator from Louisiana or that of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that the bill which I introduced was in line with their concept and with the directive that was issued, but the committee will have to work it out. I do not know

which way it will resolve the issue. It may accept the Long bill.

I do not mind. I am not prepared to say. The members of the committee are present. There may be differences of opinion, but ultimately I hope that the Judiciary Committee, the parent committee, would report the bill with such amendments as—in its wisdom—it is willing to recommend to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, speaking of the existing Government policy which was adopted by the late President Kennedy, and which I understand is supported by President Johnson, President Kennedy brought together the recommendations of 20 Federal agencies on this problem, which shows how complex it is. The policy was carefully formulated after more than a year of inter-agency discussion and consultation with those outside the agencies. In conformance with this policy, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare included provisions in its grants and contracts to insure that the grantees and contractors who would receive exclusive rights could be compelled to issue licenses. As a general rule, however, no exclusive rights are granted. Only in exceptional cases would an exclusive right be granted. Then, those who obtained it could be compelled to issue a license to the other party.

In testifying before the Judiciary Committee, Dr. Hornig, of the Office of Science and Technology, aptly summed up the situation concerning exclusive rights when he made this statement:

Although no exclusivity may superficially appear to be desirable in all situations, it is clearly inadequate where risk must be taken and substantial additional investment is required for development. Otherwise, what is available to all may, in effect, be available to none.

In other words, we may not get that which is needed and which we should have for the health of the American people.

Recently, the Senator from Louisiana spoke in praise of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and its administration of the present Kennedy-Johnson patent policy.

In his remarks on the floor of the Senate regarding the PKU testing kit for mental retardation, and the developments made by Dr. Guthrie, the Senator stated:

The Public Health Service determined that ownership of the invention belonged to the United States, and the proper action was taken. Credit for this action on behalf of the public must be given to Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General, to Dr. David E. Price, and all of the staff connected with this action.

In other words, acting under the policy laid down by President Kennedy and supported by President Johnson, the public interest has been protected and has been taken care of, according to the words of the Senator from Louisiana.

When he spoke about a pill costing so much overseas and much more in this country, there is no evidence whatever that Government funds had gone into the production of that pill overseas.

I understand that we can go to any country in Europe today and buy a neck-

tie, a shirt, or a suit of clothes much cheaper than we can in this country.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. There are many countries, are there not, which—unlike the United States—do not have constitutional laws establishing patent rights?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. One of those countries, as I understand, is Italy, which has no patent rights. If the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Alabama, or anyone else made a discovery in Italy, it would be perfectly legal for anyone in that country to steal that idea from him; is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I therefore ask the Senator from Alabama if the history of those countries which do not have patent rights does not show that very little money is spent in research and development and making new discoveries, for the very reason that the man whose brain power, research, energy, and hard work discovers something important, can be robbed of his discovery by anyone in that country and it would be legal.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. There was a time when students went to Vienna, Berlin, Paris, or Rome for their medical education, but now where do they travel? They come to the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. That is because we have a system which is a part of our Constitution to try to give men a reasonable share of the fruits of their labor.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. We have the private enterprise system.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that there should be a flexible condition in this field, allowing the departments and agencies to do whatever they believe is best, not only to protect the public interest, but also to stimulate research which will enable us to bring about the Great Society and alleviate human suffering, and deal with all the conditions against which we are fighting?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The president of the American Medical Association has said that we have made more progress in improving the health of the American people through developments in medicine in the past 25 years than we did in the past 20 centuries.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree with the Senator from North Carolina that in the very nature of things, if we progress in this field we shall have confidence not only in the wisdom, but also in the integrity, of the administrators of the departments and agencies of Government?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. They are the ones who live with, investigate, and study the subject and who have the judgment and knowledge to speak on the subject.

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

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Alabama just stated that no one knows how much of a Government subsidy goes into the production of various products in foreign countries.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the Senator whether this situation does not parallel what he said. About 2 years ago, I was told that one could travel 60 kilometers in Argentina for 2¼ pennies in American money.

Mr. HILL. That is a perfect illustration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not believe it. Mr. HILL. It is hard to believe; nevertheless, it is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had a check made on that—

Mr. HILL. It turned out to be true, did it not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It turned out to be true. But consider the conditions in Argentina today, economically and socially.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, Dr. Arthur Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association stated that the progress of the American druggist has been great only in the past 20 years. That is what he told the Kefauver committee. Yet, we have had patent laws granting monopoly rights on the drug processes and products since 1793. If those patent laws have brought us progress in drugs only during the past 20 years, why did they not bring us that same kind of progress from 1793 to 1940? If patents are of such strategic importance in promoting drug discoveries, how come it took so long before this country got going?

Mr. HILL. There is a great deal more in the pending bill besides discoveries and patent laws. The Senator knows that we have moved into a new era only in recent years. We did not even have the airplane until December of 1903, when the Wright brothers made their first flight at Kitty Hawk in North Carolina.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason we had so much progress in the last 20 years and so little in the past 150 was not the initiative stirred up by the patent laws but because of the vast expenditure of Federal money urged by the Senator from Alabama, which made available huge facilities, and huge operations such as the pending bill calls for, and the vast activities to spend these great amounts of money to obtain the fruits of research. It was Federal money which made these great breakthroughs in America possible.

In other countries, where they have not made a breakthrough, they did not have Federal grants, and they have not had the incentive.

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

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment. I am opposed to the Senator's amendment because we do not have enough knowledge about it at the present time.

We hope to get more information from the McClellan committee. We are not prepared to act wisely. We do not want to hamper or hinder progress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator's committee has the responsibility of informing us how we can get the best results with this research money.

Mr. HILL. Our committee does not have jurisdiction over patents. That jurisdiction lies in the Committee on the Judiciary. The subcommittee dealing with this matter is headed by a man in whom we have full confidence, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is not the Senator from Alabama interested in knowing whether the public will get the benefit of this research? Should the benefits go to a relatively few, or should all the people have the benefit of it? The public is spending the money for this purpose, and I am sure the Senator would not want a few to get the benefit of it.

Mr. HILL. Of course, everyone will have the benefit of this legislation that we are considering. The impression has been created that those of us who oppose the Long amendment may have some interest in pharmaceutical houses. The truth is that these pharmaceutical houses do not like the John F. Kennedy-Lyndon B. Johnson plan.

Let us retain the Government patent policy which was adopted in 1963 until the McClellan committee can have an opportunity to investigate the whole subject, to hear all sides, and get all the facts. Then, that committee can bring us a bill which will recommend to the Senate the patent policy in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if Thomas Edison and scores of other people did not make great discoveries prior to the past 20 years?

Mr. HILL. Of course. Alexander Graham Bell gave us the telephone. The Wright brothers can be cited. There were many others.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator if it is not true that virtually all the discoveries that have been made from the dawn of history have been made without the benefit of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I might add without either the benefit or the handicap of that amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Jonas Salk did not get any patent rights for developing his product, which is used to fight polio. He obtained no patents on it, and it is thus made available at the lowest possible price.

The Senator said that the pharmaceutical companies do not like the Kennedy-Johnson plan. Mr. President, they have their own plan, and I do not want them to get it.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the Senator is not trying to draw an indictment against the whole Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we pass the bill as it stands now, all that the

pharmaceutical houses will need is to get a President who will name a Secretary of HEW who will do their bidding.

Mr. HILL. I am sure that the present President will be here for some time to come. I hope the Senator feels that way, particularly as the assistant Democratic leader in the Senate. I am sure he feels confident that the President will not act in any way adverse to the interest of the people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope not. I hope the next President will not, either.

Mr. HILL. I am sure we can have faith in President Johnson. Let us stay with the patent plan of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson until the McClellan committee can have an opportunity to go into this subject and hear witnesses and experts in this field, and then give us its report and tell us what the committee recommends. We should not be jumping up here in a haphazard fashion changing this carefully thought-out patent policy.

The pharmaceutical houses do not like that plan. I have before me a copy of the Medical World News of June 18, 1965. It contains a letter written to Chairman OREN HARRIS of the House Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the legislation under consideration. The letter is written by Dr. Smith, executive director and spokesman for the American Pharmaceutical Association.

He states that the present HEW policy is "confiscatory and unrealistic." He said that it had brought about "the accelerating decline in medical research co-sponsored by industry and Government, coupled with an increased strain on the traditional university-industry bonds, which have been such an important segment of this country's research efforts."

This in itself, with other statements, confirms the fact that we ought to let the proper Senate committee investigate this subject. Let the Judiciary Committee have the opportunity to hear testimony and to search out the facts, and then to bring us recommended changes in the Government's patent policy.

Mr. President, I know that Senators wish to vote this afternoon. I wish to add merely this word: If we are to change existing patent policy, the Kennedy-Johnson policy, we surely ought to have it considered by the Judiciary Committee, the committee which has jurisdiction and has the duty and obligation and responsibility in this matter.

I urge the Senate to reject this amendment. Let us proceed in an orderly way.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate I should like to get some definite information, if it is at all possible to do so. The Senator from Louisiana came to me this afternoon and suggested that this matter be postponed until Monday. I said, "No. Many Members of the Senate have stayed on the floor in the hope that a vote would occur."

The Senator from Louisiana graciously said that there would be a vote and that he would forgo his personal inclination.

The hour is growing late. I believe that Senators and the Senate as an institution are entitled to some considera-

tion. I ask the Senator from Louisiana what his situation is insofar as this particular amendment is concerned. Can the Senate vote on it tonight at a reasonable time? Can we agree to a time limitation? What can we do?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In answer to the Senator's question, I feel very strongly about this matter. I am sure the Senator knows that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had the responsibility of being chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business. I have studied this subject. I believe I have raised this issue on four or five occasions. I have been fighting this matter ever since, because I believe this to be in the public interest.

I understand what the Senator's problem is, because I have tried to share some of the responsibility with regard to other items when Senators felt just as strongly as I do.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote tonight. I realize that today is Friday, and that on Friday evening Senators have made plans to go home. They have made train or airplane reservations, so that they can be with their families.

I feel some apprehension—the same apprehension that occurs to other Senators—but when I am right about something, if enough Senators are present to listen to me, I may prevail. Of course, sometimes I am disappointed. That is true of other Senators also.

However, Senators who find themselves in my position indulge themselves with the thought that as right as they are, if only they can get other Senators to listen to them, they may prevail.

I should like to have this subject discussed and have the RECORD available, so that Senators may read it before they vote on the issue. I believe if they were to do that it might strengthen my case. However, so far as I am concerned, I would be willing to vote on the amendment, but without entering into any unanimous-consent request, because to do so at this time would prejudice my case, I fear.

I would be willing to enter into a short limitation on Monday to dispose of the matter after, perhaps, 3 hours of debate.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator say "shortly"?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With the time to be equally divided.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator agree to 2 hours of debate, to be equally divided?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With 1 hour to each side; yes. We could discuss the matter tonight, and then vote after 2 hours on Monday. If that cannot be arranged, we shall have to remain here and debate the matter this evening.

In my judgment the Senator from Montana is one of the greatest majority leaders we ever had. As the Vice President said the other evening, he is the greatest majority leader since Lyndon Johnson.

Perhaps except for Lyndon Johnson, the Senator from Montana is the greatest majority leader in the history of the country. Perhaps when he is through with his service, we shall conclude that he was the greatest of all time.

I say to the distinguished majority leader that we would be willing to remain here and debate the issue, for some Senators have anticipated a vote on the issue. They will be cursing us under their breath. Still, Senators will have to hear us. We might persuade a few and get our point across. So we give Senators a choice. If we are kept here, we shall debate the issue and vote sometime tonight. If accommodation of Senators is preferred, give us a 2-hour limitation on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, to which I hope there will be no objection.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business on Monday, 2 hours be set aside to consider the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], 1 hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the other hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and that the debate on the amendment be no longer than 2 hours.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the majority leader advised as to what hour he wishes the Senate to commence business on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall make a request that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a.m.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was that included in the request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be after the present request is agreed to, if it is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it has been said that there have not been enough Senators on the floor to hear the debate. The argument has been repeated about five or six times. I am deeply convinced that nothing more can be said that will have any impact on Senators than what has been said in the past. With my deep love for the Senator from Louisiana, I must say that he has extravagant expectations that Monday, in 1 hour, he will be able to change the minds of some Senators who may not agree with him today. But I shall be glad to listen to him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall get at least one more vote, because today WAYNE MORSE is out of the city.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Delay has changed votes on more than one occasion. It is true that a number of Senators who would support the amendment are out of the city. The longer the afternoon wanes, the greater the number who will be going out of the city. But that applies equally on both sides.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Does the Senator expect the Senate to come in at 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the approval of the Senate.

Mr. BASS. I have remained here all afternoon expecting to vote on the amendment. I must leave town, and my plane will not return to Washington, D.C., until 12 noon on Monday. May we have some assurance that the vote on the amendment will not come until 1 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will not come by noon; I can assure the Senator of that. I know the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BASS. But unless there is an agreement, he might run down between noon and 1 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator does not know the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BASS. Would the Senator revise his request so that under the agreement the Senate would not vote before 1 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; not up until 1 o'clock. The Senator can be sure that he will be protected if he is not due back until 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Would it be possible for the Senate to convene at 12 noon? I shall be here. I am not leaving town. The request would not suit me in this case. But some Senators have expressed apprehension that their planes will not arrive in Washington until 12 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. We have a great deal of work to do. What I should like to do would be, with the approval and the assistance of the Senator from Louisiana, to clear as much of the calendar as we can before we take the Fourth of July recess. I am sure the Senator thinks in that same direction.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall strongly favor the agreement—how would it be for the distinguished majority leader to revise his request so as to provide that the morning hour and other business would run up until 12 o'clock noon, and that the vote on the amendment would therefore come at 2 p.m.?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I would prefer to do it as I have outlined, if the Senator would not mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective after the prayer on Monday, June 28, 1965, further debate on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], No. 298, to the bill S. 596, to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and

controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. ON MONDAY, AND THE TIME FOR DEBATE ON THE AMENDMENT TO START RUNNING AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING PRAYER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday, and that the time allotted for debate on the pending amendment start running at the conclusion of the morning prayer.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object. During the debate on the amendment I would hope that Senators will be present. I shall cooperate 100 percent when the Senate convenes on Monday. I do not wish to impede the work of the Senate, but I wish to have more Senators present. Today I had hoped that more Senators would be present to help in the debate. I have been fighting this battle for 5 years.

I feel like the late Senator Henry Fountain Ashhurst when, as district attorney, he had a case involving a man who had been caught stealing a carload of butter. Every time the district attorney wanted to prosecute, the defense attorney asked for a continuance. Finally he said, "Continue the case as long as you want to, because the longer the case is delayed, the stronger my evidence will be."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the question of committee meetings, I point out that Mr. Shriver is scheduled to appear in relation to the poverty program. We would like to have permission for our committee to meet.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed the subject with other Senators, and I believe that I should reconsider my position. I ask unanimous consent that all committees may meet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is still the pending question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is a unanimous-consent request pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not any longer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has a request been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A number of requests have been agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is sometimes very difficult to understand what is going on on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for them again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first unanimous-consent request was it agreed that the vote should not come until after the discussion on Monday next?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not later than 2 hours—up to 2 hours on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the yeas and nays are ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT— AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 596) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have a right to discuss some of the issues that have been raised here for the purpose of the Record.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DURING THE RECESS, AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the recess of the Senate until Monday, June 28, and that the Vice President, the President pro tempore, or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the recess.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT— AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 596) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the statement has been made that a large number of associations, universities, and other groups are opposed to the amendment. I think it is fair to ask: Why are they opposed to the amendment? If what we are talking about relates to the health and safety of people, and to helping unfortunate people, why should the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society favor an arrangement that could mean that the public might have to pay 40 times the price that should exist for a medicine to protect them from heart disease? Why should the American Heart Association take that attitude? At one time, the Heart Association indicated to me that it would support the position taken by me. I had a letter stating as much. I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 29, 1965.

Mr. BENJAMIN GORDON,
Select Committee on Small Business,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: We are most grateful and appreciative of your good offices in assisting in the preparation of an amendment to Senator Long's amendment to Senate bills Nos. 512, 596, and 597.

The attached has been reviewed by our president, Dr. Carleton B. Chapman and Dr. James V. Warren, the chairman of our legislative advisory committee and we feel that in our combined judgment this represents a very satisfactory solution to our problem. We hope Senator Long will consent and be willing to consider this as an amendment to his present amendments to the Senate bills.

Again may we express our thanks to you and through you to Senator Long for consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROME A. BETTS,
Executive Director.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment that the Heart and Cancer Societies indicated they would be willing to agree to, and that they thought was in good order, did not provide as much flexibility as the amendment I am now offering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the American Cancer Society, under date of April 30, 1965, so that Senators may see what the position of the society was prior to the last minute when, I understand, they proceeded to urge Senators not to vote for my amendment.

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

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 30, 1965.

BENJAMIN GORDON, ESQ.,
Select Committee on Small Business,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: The American Cancer Society and I wish to express our appreciation for the courtesy and attention to our problems in the area of the multiple support of research that you and the legislative staff for Senator LONG have extended. We are particularly grateful that the proposed amendment No. 14 to Senator Long's amendment to bill S. 512 recognizes the different status of charitable public health organizations and preserves their proprietary interest in the results of research developments under which they have made substantial financial contributions.

In accordance with our discussions, it is understood that, in presenting this amendment, statements will be made for purposes of legislative history indicating the intent that this exception will be made automatically operational and effective by providing that the determination of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be prompt and that the Attorney General's approval will also be promptly furnished. Also, unless objections or unusual problems are raised, hearings will normally not be held or required.

It was also discussed, and we believe sufficiently important, that the legislative history of Senator Long's proposed original amendment make clear that the requirements for information and other details will not in any way include material which would be contrary to, or interfere with, the established doctor-patient relationship which might underlie some of the research activities.

Thank you again for the cooperation and understanding that you have shown. We feel that these proposals will resolve a troublesome problem which otherwise would have had an adverse effect upon the progress of medical research in fields of vital importance to us all.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. WILCOX,
Chairman of the Board.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One might ask why the universities oppose my amendment. I do not know the answer. I suspect that if an investigation were made, it would develop that the universities are privately endowed or have received pressure from someone connected with the endowment, or perhaps because of the research grants made by private groups, and that the groups with which they are working have importuned them to express themselves in the way they have.

On the other hand, it may be that they have made their recommendations in the open, without any pressure or any suggestion by any of those who have made contributions to the support of the universities, or by the industries that may have representation on the boards of universities, or who are connected with various and sundry organizations.

We should realize that we are talking about an issue on which large numbers of people, representing all branches of American industry, have an interest. This problem involves an expenditure of as much as \$15 billion a year. This would be spent in ways which would

enable certain private interests to gain an advantage, while the public could be denied the full benefit of what was developed. The patent policy of the Department of Defense is the kind of policy that pharmaceutical firms want. What is that policy?

The patent policy of the Department of Defense is that the Government will pay for research and development, saving only to the Government the right to a nonexclusive license of that which is developed under the Government research activities. The contractor is guaranteed a profit in any event, whether he develops anything or not.

That would be the same as the Government awarding a single contract for \$200 million to build a bridge over Chesapeake Bay. The Corps of Engineers, which would handle the contract, would guarantee the contractor a profit of \$14 million a year, even if the bridge fell in the middle of the bay, and then proceed to say, the bridge having been built, that U.S. Army trucks would have the right to cross, but the taxpayers, who paid for the bridge, and wanted to drive across it, would have to pay whatever the contractor wanted to charge. The taxpayers might be charged \$5 a car to drive across the bridge, even though they had paid for the bridge, while the contractor who built it would take no risk and would be guaranteed payment for building it.

The kind of exploitation I have been referring to occurs when the public pays monopoly prices for medicines rather than to pay what would be an appropriate price on a competitive basis.

I am not complaining about a system under which someone develops a product with his own funds and is in a position to charge the public 40 times as much as the public ought to pay. If he develops his product with his own money and his own research, that is one thing. But what do we find? Under the great incentive of the private patent system, which existed from 1793 until 1940, a period of almost 150 years, the patent system resulted in small achievement in the field of medical research. Since that time great advances have been made. The Senator from Alabama has played an important part in those advances. Important advances have been made in developing better drugs, better cures, better facilities, and better means of applying drugs. So American medicine has made great advances.

But the advances have been made with the taxpayers' money. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIVICOFF], a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said today, his experience in that Department with the efforts being made to develop private cures was in areas in which public money was so fantastically greater in amount than private money. There is very little equity for the private concern.

Some time ago a person engaged with one of the great private foundations of the country told me that in earlier years his foundation had spent large amounts of money in research to find cures for diseases. He said they had greatly reduced their expenditure in the area because of the

Federal Government doing so much work that they thought it would be best to put their money into something else. Incidentally, I believe that the attitude taken by that foundation is somewhat typical of most of the foundations. This is one of the great ones. They felt that, inasmuch as what they were doing was done with money intended for charitable purposes, this should not be an area in which private patents should be used to exploit the public. Insofar as possible, the fruits of the research were made generally available to the people.

It was said that we should refer the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary. Let us look at the history of our legislation with regard to patent rights. Every statute on the books, to my knowledge, that provides what should happen to Government patent rights relates to the act that created the research. In other words, when a bill is presented to provide that the Government shall pay for research, the act providing for the research also provides for disposition of the fruits of that research. Almost without exception, those bills provide that the public, having paid for the research, should have the benefit of it.

I once asked an executive of one of the great corporations of America, who was in Washington to serve an agency which was doing a great deal of research, what he thought about the issue. He did not want to discuss it forthrightly for awhile. However, finally he gave me a simple answer. He said, "Whoever pays for the research ought to have the patent rights."

That is a simple, honest answer. We hear people in business advocating that we should operate our Government the way they operate their businesses. Sometimes that is a good idea. Sometimes it is not. This is a case in which we advocate that we run our Government and handle our policy in the same way that a businessman would do were he handling this matter for his business.

For example, suppose a lawyer represented Procter & Gamble in an endeavor to develop a new soap. The lawyer would proceed to write the contract and provide that after the better soap was developed, Procter & Gamble would have the right to use it in their own bathrooms, and that the stockholders in the corporation could use it in their bathrooms, but that whoever developed the better soap would have a complete monopoly and the right to sell it to the entire public. They would fire the lawyer immediately. They would say, "How ridiculous can you be?" The lawyer would have to prove either that he was insane or that he belonged in jail.

Yet, that is the kind of contract that is being written in the Department of Defense to the tune of \$9 billion a year. That is the policy to which the Senator from Alabama referred when he said that the pharmaceutical firms do not like the Kennedy policy or the Johnson policy. They do like the policy of the Department of Defense. They want to adopt a policy whereby the public pays a great amount of money and receives practically nothing. They want the benefit of the private enterprise machine to which I referred that was portrayed

in Herblock's cartoon in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. President, it is suggested that we should wait for the Committee on the Judiciary to tell us what to do. In the first place, I do not know of any committee which understands the problem of health and health research better than does the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has been preeminent in this field. He has led the way and worked for research. He has brought before us a great number of bills with respect to research.

I am not particularly concerned or upset about the way in which these programs have worked out, except with respect to the cancer chemotherapy program. In that instance, we hoped that the drug firms would cooperate with the national research workers and do some research. However, that crowd ganged up on us and said that they did not want to do it unless they could have private patents on the product.

The solution would be very simple. What should have been done is that the Government should have found someone to do it. They should have gone to some university which would be willing to do it. If the university did not want to do it, the Government itself could do it. It could go ahead and hire the same scientists, the same chemists, the same research doctors whom these companies would have hired with Government money and made a profit with it.

The Government could have hired the same people to do the research in cancer chemotherapy and find a cure for cancer. Then the cure would belong to the public at the lowest possible cost, instead of letting a private firm be put in a position to be able to charge monopolistic prices.

We have heard much discussion of the Kennedy program and the Johnson program. That is nothing more than a simple memorandum indicating what the policy should be. I submit to anybody that we can read that memorandum and arrive at almost any conclusion. So far as one can detect, it is not really being followed now. It never was intended to be. It was intended to set down certain guidelines. However, even then, it provided that normally the rights to health research should not be given to any private contractor.

Mr. President, concerning incentives, Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, has stated in the Kefauver subcommittee, that American drug progress "has been great only in the last 20 years." Yet our patent laws granting monopoly rights on drug processes and products have been on the statute books since 1793. If patents are of such strategic importance in promoting drug discoveries, how come it took so long before this country got going?

And how does it happen that countries like Germany, France, and Switzerland, which grant patents only on processes and not on drug products, have for centuries been at the forefront in drug discoveries? In these countries, if a new

method of manufacture is devised, the company can produce and sell any drug; until 1950 this was also true in England. Not so in the United States from 1793 to the present. For example, Abbott Laboratories devised a cheaper method of manufacturing meprobamate, known as Miltown and Equanil, but it could not market it because Carter holds the product patent.

Even in the past 20 years, many of the important drug discoveries have emanated from abroad. An examination of the important drugs in use today shows the following:

Oral antidiabetic drugs are a German development, although some American companies later developed molecular modifications of the original German compounds. Tolbutamide, sold by Upjohn under the trade name Orinase, was developed by Hoechst Co. of Germany, and is exclusively licensed to Upjohn for manufacture and sale in the United States. Orinase is the largest selling oral antidiabetic drug in this country.

Potent tranquilizers used in our mental hospitals are a French development. Thorazine and Compazine, the biggest selling potent tranquilizers to mental institutions in this country, are sold only by Smith Kline & French. They are exclusively licensed in this country by Rhone Poulenc, the French company which originated the compound. Needless to say, Smith Kline & French is taking full advantage of its monopolistic position in this country.

Miltown is the largest selling mild tranquilizer prescribed routinely by physicians to patients suffering from temporary anxiety and tension. This is a slight modification of mephenesin and is of English origin. Dr. Frank M. Berger, a Czech physician, developed the original compound in England during World War II, migrated to the United States, and worked out a slight modification. He subsequently assigned the patent to his employer, Carter Products.

Reserpine, the largest selling drug for hypertension, is a refinement of rauwolfia used in India and the Far East for centuries in raw root form for a number of illnesses. Much of the basic work in isolating the important ingredient in the root was done by Indian physicians and chemists; the final step was taken by a Swiss firm, CIBA, in its laboratories in Switzerland. CIBA has secured worldwide patent rights on the refined derivative, reserpine.

Original work on cortisone was the result of university research in the United States. Prednisone—the most significant step taken in 1951 and still very important for treatment of arthritis—was credited by PMA to the Syntex Corp., then a small independent Mexican company. The product was involved in an interference fight in the Patent Office from 1954 until May 1964, when Schering Corp. secured the patent. A number of modifications on prednisone have since been developed and have been subjected to patent control. They are more potent in that less of the essential ingredient is contained in a tablet; but their therapeutic usefulness and side effects are no different than prednisone.

The original discovery of penicillin was made, of course, by Sir Alexander Fleming in 1929; commercial production methods were then developed by Peoria Laboratory of the Department of Agriculture. From the midforties, the U.S. drug companies have engaged in a race in simply ferreting out other microorganisms after the way was pointed out by the university researchers. The first development was streptomycin, discovered at Rutgers University, and then chloromycetin, at Yale. Others quickly followed, and although the microorganisms are products of nature, patents were issued by the U.S. Patent Office. The U.S. companies contributed terramycin, aureomycin, and tetracycline. Penicillin V widely used in the United States, is an Austrian development; the so-called "synthetic penicillins" are English; one of the most important recent innovations is griseofulvin—for skin diseases—and is also of English origin.

Diuretics are a U.S. development, although they originated outside of the drug companies. According to John T. Connor, the work of Dr. Shartz of Boston "set off a race between several pharmaceutical companies to see which one could reach the goal line first." Merck got there first with its product diuril—chlorothiazide—in the late fifties, but has been involved in a patent interference fight for years with other drug companies as to which first made the invention.

Antihistamines are of French origin, stemming from work associated with its strong position in the tranquilizer field. Much German work followed; Chlortrimeton, for example—Schering's specialty, and very widely sold—was secured from its German parent company just prior to seizure by the Alien Property Custodian during World War II. Neosynephrine is also a German contribution.

Searle, a U.S. company, developed dramamine and has a patent monopoly on this drug. On the other hand, the competing product sold only by Pfizer—donine and bonadettes—is a Belgian development. The Belgian firm, Union Chimique, granted an exclusive license to Pfizer for sales in the United States.

Mr. President, what I have just stated shows the developments that have been achieved. What will be achieved under this legislation will be developed either for the benefit of 190 million people or for the benefit of the few.

Congress can make the choice as to which direction it will take. In this legislation we set the pattern for medical research and development for the entire Nation.

Those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today follow a policy of protecting the public interest. They would be in a stronger position to do so if they had the legislation the Senator from Louisiana is recommending.

They are under pressure from other departments, especially the Department of Commerce. I assume that pressure is not from Mr. Connor—he is a former director of Merck & Co.—because he has said so. I assume that the pressure is not coming from him, because he could be accused of favoring someone, but that

does not stop officials in his department from bringing pressure on others in Government to grant private patent rights that properly should be in the public domain.

It is our feeling that both Mr. Eaton and Mr. Holloman in that department, and certain other people in Government, are doing the work of the few who seek to profit at the expense of the many. If private pharmaceutical firms are permitted to obtain private patent rights on Government research, it is not going to be the stockholders in those firms or the presidents of those firms that will do the research. They will be merely the ones to take Federal money and pay someone else to do the research. In some cases they will be paying universities, and I gather that some of the universities would like to be helped and get some of these grants.

In some cases, they will pay a particular research group to make the study, but wherever the pharmaceutical firms can do so, they will gain control of the product. If not directly on the research contract, they will obviously have a secondary interest. They would see to it that there was not much competition in the development and merchandising of the product. So far as the pharmaceutical firms are concerned, they could make more money if they could manufacture the product on a licensee basis, or on a basis that only one or two companies would compete with them. They could conceivably conspire to violate the law, as some major contractors have done already. They have benefited greatly from Government contracts and could overcharge the public—even the Government itself—on the products they are selling.

I am not saying that they will do so. I am merely saying that that sort of thing has happened in other industries.

Thus, here we have the issue. Here we have the opportunity to lock the stable door before the horse is stolen.

This issue is as old as government. It is as old as the American Revolution. It is as old as the fight against King John at Runnymede. It is the question of whether the Government should be operated for the benefit of the many or for the benefit of the few.

This is the same issue that separated Thomas Jefferson from Alexander Hamilton. It is the same issue that caused Andrew Jackson to make his fight against the Bank of the United States. It is the same fight that Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt waged against the monopolies of their day.

It is the same fight that created the Populist Party which breathed life back into a dead and defunct Democratic Party. It is the same issue that William Jennings Bryan took to the people of this Nation by word of mouth. Had he had the benefit of radio and television, he would have won the Presidency by a landslide. As has been stated, had he had an honest count, he would have won by a landslide.

This is an issue as old as government. When we tax the people and extract large amounts of money from them, who should get the benefit of it, the many or

the few? There is no other issue involved.

Some of the major officers and stockholders of various pharmaceutical firms like to talk about big government, that America is turning into a giveaway government. They talk about high taxes. When we study the taxes they pay, we find that they have found so many loopholes in the tax laws that 26 percent of those who had a gross adjusted income exceeding \$5 million a year owed no Federal income tax to their Government.

Those people talk about big government. They say that government is capturing control of business. What major business corporation can continue to be free and independent if the Government is parceling out \$15 billion of research money to its favorites, without any competition in bidding for the product? Corporations such as General Electric, which has over 15,000 patents to protect against competition, could be broken in its monopolistic power by simply parceling that research money out to someone else.

Then we find that other corporations come to Washington, become Government favorites; and, like the Aerojet-General Corp. grow from \$7,500 to over \$300 million in value in 10 years, doing business exclusively with the Government, almost entirely under research and development contracts.

There are many other companies in that general category which have grown primarily on Government money.

Does this not put the Government in a position to dictate what those companies will do?

Does this not tend to destroy the concept that the Government should be for the benefit of all, and that industry should conduct its affairs for the benefit of its stockholders and its owners?

If I had my way, I would keep Government out of business. I would also keep business out of Government. I would also keep labor out of both. Then I would keep all three out of the ordinary day-to-day life of the American citizen insofar as his private affairs are concerned.

This big bonanza for business, the vast expenditure of public funds which results in huge giveaways tends in many respects to undermine the integrity and independence of business. It tends to make business a captive of the Government.

In other respects, we find that the Government becomes so big, interferes in so many things, that the same problem develops with regard to the relationship of labor and Government.

This sort of thing can be avoided; and my amendment is an attempt to avoid it.

Mr. President, there was a time when no agency in Government gave away private patent rights on Government research, but that was over a period of time. Since then, for selfish reasons, many people have been able to persuade the Government to give them research contracts and patent rights on Government research.

From that small acorn a giant oak has grown. If we are to prevent that oak from extending and expanding ever larger, we must ask the Government: Who is to benefit from this research? Will it be for the benefit of 192 million Americans? If so, let us draw our lines of determination together and make sure that it will be.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. ON MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 28, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 25, 1965:

U.S. NAVY

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 2 years, effective August 1, 1965.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated and in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admirals, Medical Corps

Edward P. Irons
John W. Albrittain
George M. Davis, Jr.

To be rear admirals, Supply Corps

Henry L. Beardasley
Kenneth R. Wheeler

To be rear admiral, Chaplain Corps

Henry J. Rotrige

To be rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps
Walter M. Enger

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown O16761, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore 1836A, Regular Air Force.

The following officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

To be general

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., 555A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Gen. Mark E. Bradley 552A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., 547A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John D. Ryan 1418A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, currently serving as general under recess appointment.

Lt. Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson 616A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway 1336A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade 1872A, Regular Air Force, currently serving as lieutenant general under recess appointment.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark 1218A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell 1286A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter III 1647A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Lael J. Abbott to be major, and ending Ida M. Beam to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 7, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Facts, Not Myths, on Reds"—"The Radical Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an important editorial from the State, of Co-

lumbia, S.C., dated June 12, 1965. The editorial is entitled "Facts, Not Myths, on Reds." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a newsletter entitled "The Radical Left," which I published on May 31, 1965.

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

[From the State (Columbia, S.C.), June 12, 1965]

FACTS, NOT MYTHS, ON REDS

Knowledgeable J. Edgar Hoover has issued a warning that this country faces a growing

menace from the resurgent Communist Party, U.S.A., but many ears will be deaf to his words.

For one thing, it has become politically fashionable to denounce rightwing extremists. Those who have spent all their time decrying activities of the right cannot admit so quickly they were swatting at flies while the termites were eating away the foundations of our political system.

In addition, it has also become fashionable in many circles to say American Communists are so few they represent no danger. There has been no end of talk about good Communists such as the Russians, and bad Communists such as the more militant Chinese.