



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Joshua 3: 4: *Ye have not passed this way heretofore.*

Eternal God, whose days are throughout all generations, humbly as we dwell in this house of time, we turn to Thee in prayer for light and love, beseeching Thee that we may be wiser and more trustful on each succeeding day.

Let us not miss what might be done with the gift of a new day or fall of the good that might be made of it.

Teach us to see clearly, to walk uprightly, to endure patiently and ever to accept life as a great gift, a grand opportunity, and a capacity for heroic endeavor.

May we be blessed with insight, with judgment, and a sense of values, and may we always take counsel of the mind of the Master as to how best to advance humanity.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 15, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5768. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; and

H.R. 7984. An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT, 1966

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes,

with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 through 36 inclusive and amendments Nos. 42 and 43.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

SENATE

Compensation of the Vice President and Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and Senators, and expense allowances of the Vice President and leaders of the Senate

Compensation of the Vice President and Senators

For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, \$3,285,985.

Mileage of President of the Senate and of Senators

For the mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$58,370.

Expense Allowances of the Vice President, and Majority and Minority Leaders

For expense allowance of the Vice President, \$10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, \$2,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, \$2,000; in all, \$14,000.

Salaries, officers and employees

For compensation of officers, employees, clerks, to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from the appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

Office of the Vice President

For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in basic multiples of \$5 per month, \$155,440.

Chaplain

Chaplain of the Senate, \$15,000.

Office of the Secretary

For office of the Secretary, \$1,323,000, including \$145,000 required for the purposes specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1965, the Secretary may employ one chief reporter of debates at \$24,024.40 gross per annum, seven reporters of debates at \$8,880 basic per annum each, one assistant reporter of debates at \$6,120 basic per annum, two clerks at \$4,200 basic per annum each, and six expert transcribers at \$3,900 basic per annum each: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is hereafter authorized to obtain, by contract or otherwise, emergency reporters and transcribers as may be necessary, payments therefor to be made from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that Senate Resolution 196, agreed to August 21, 1961, and Senate Resolution 170, agreed to July 15, 1963, are hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1965, the basic compensation of the assistant to the Majority and the assistant to the Minority may be fixed by the Majority and Minority Leaders, respectively, at not to exceed \$8,160 per annum each.

Committee Employees

For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, \$3,236,145.

Conference Committees

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$95,980.

For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, \$95,980.

Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators

For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, \$15,653,785.

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper

For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$3,051,230: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1965, the basic per annum compensation of the foreman of skilled laborers shall be \$2,340 in lieu of \$2,100; the basic per annum compensation of two skilled laborers shall be \$2,100 each in lieu of \$1,920 each; and the Sergeant at Arms may employ six additional laborers at \$1,680 basic per annum each.

Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and the Minority

For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, \$160,885: *Provided*: That effective July 1, 1965, the respective secretaries may fix the basic compensation of the assistant secretary for the majority and the assistant secretary for the minority at not to exceed \$8,820 per annum each.

Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips

For four clerical assistants, two for the majority whip and two for the minority whip, at rates of compensation to be fixed in basic multiples of \$60 per annum by the respective whips, \$17,815 each; in all, \$35,630.

Office of the legislative counsel of the Senate

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$308,000.

Senate procedure

For compiling, preparing, and editing "Senate Procedure", 1964 edition, \$4,000, of which amount \$2,000 shall be paid to Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate, and \$2,000 shall be paid to Floyd M. Riddick, Parliamentarian of the Senate.

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Senate Policy Committees

For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, \$197,525 for each such committee; in all, \$395,050.

Automobiles and Maintenance

For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President pro tempore, one for the majority leader, and one for the minority leader, \$42,540.

Furniture

For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, \$31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government.

Inquiries and Investigations

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including \$392,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, \$4,777,390.

Folding Documents

For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding \$2.17 per hour per person, \$39,300.

Mail Transportation

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$16,560.

Miscellaneous Items

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, \$3,222,755 including \$246,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961.

Postage Stamps

For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, \$140; and for air-mail and special delivery stamps for office of the Secretary, \$160; office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$125; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, \$90,400, and the maximum allowance per capita of \$610 is increased to \$800 for the fiscal year 1966 and thereafter: *Provided*, That Senators from States partially or wholly west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$200 each fiscal year; in all, \$90,825.

Stationery (Revolving Fund)

For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$242,400; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, \$13,200; in all, \$255,600, to remain available until expended.

Communications

For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U.S.C. 46d-1), \$15,150.

Administrative Provisions

Effective July 1, 1965, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46c), is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, toll charges on not to exceed twenty-four hundred strictly official long distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, aggregating not more than twelve thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator and the Vice President of the

United States: *Provided*, That not more than twelve hundred calls aggregating not more than six thousand minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence. The toll charges on an additional twelve hundred such calls aggregating not more than six thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator from any State having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall also be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That not more than six hundred calls aggregating not more than three thousand minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence."

Effective July 1, 1965, the paragraph relating to payment of toll charges on official long-distance telephone calls, originating and terminating outside of Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46d), is amended by striking out "\$1,800" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,200".

Any Senator may have the Sergeant at Arms compute his total maximum long-distance telephone allowance. The minutes and calls allowance shall be computed on a formula at the maximum rate with all calls considered as being person-to-person from Washington, District of Columbia, and terminating within the Senator's State. Any Senator or group of Senators may then request the Sergeant at Arms to contract for flat-rate long-distance telephone service such as wide area telephone service. All such contract costs shall be charged against their respective telephone allowances, and in no event shall the total cost of any contract service exceed the allowance of the Senator, or the group of Senators sharing any such service; any excess costs to be billed to the Senator. No change from the original form of the allowances or from any contract service shall become effective except upon the first of a month.

The third paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the appropriations for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as amended (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by striking out "two" where it first appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

Effective July 1, 1965, the second paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962 (Public Law 87-130, approved August 10, 1961; 2 U.S.C. 127) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Two additional mileage payments each fiscal year may be made, under the foregoing, to employees in the offices of Senators from States having a population of ten million or more inhabitants."

Effective July 1, 1965, the third paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (Public Law 624, Eighty-fourth Congress; 2 U.S.C. 53), is amended by striking out "\$150" where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300".

The legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is hereby directed to study the manner in which stationary allowances are utilized, including the commutation thereof, and to make a report on its findings and recommendations to the Standing Committee on Appropriations no later than February 1, 1966.

Senate Office Buildings

For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and

for personal and other services; including eight attendants at \$1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, \$2,458,700.

Senate Garage

For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, \$53,800.

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

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee briefly explain the procedure we are going to follow on this conference?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, my request conforms to the routine followed in such matters in the past. It has been traditional for the Senate to write in its own so-called housekeeping items, and the House does the same for its housekeeping functions. The House, as the gentleman knows, omits the Senate housekeeping items when it first considers the legislative appropriation bill.

The amendments to which we have asked agreement relate solely to the Senate.

It has been traditional for the Senate and the House to decide their respective provisions for housekeeping purposes.

For instance, as I understand it, one of the amendments here increases the annual airmail stamp allowance for the Senators from the present \$610 to \$1,000 in the 24 States west of the Mississippi River. It increases the amount for stamps from \$610 to \$800 for those from States east of the Mississippi.

Another of these provisions inserted by the Senate has to do with long-distance telephone calls outside the District of Columbia. The present allowance is \$1,800. Under the pending amendment the Senators have increased that amount to \$2,200.

The allowance for official trips back home by Senators has been increased from the present allowance of 2 per year to 6 per year.

There are one or two others. They are all set out in the bill and explained in the committee report.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Under the rule of committee, the other body may decide what its expenditures will be and propose them in this bill, and we are also permitted to do the same thing here in the House. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. That has been the practice in these annual

legislative appropriation bills, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there is one significant difference in the procedure of handling the so-called housekeeping bill on the part of the other body and the House. The House lays before the other body its requests and asks them to approve, but we seldom on this side have an opportunity to know what the other body is doing. Yet we are called upon to put our stamp of approval upon what they do. Insofar as the House is concerned and what we do, they have this laid out before them.

While I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Alabama has given us some insight into what the other body is doing, I still hope that somehow or other, at some distant day in the future, we may have the opportunity really to go into what the other body presents to us and which they ask us to approve.

Insofar as the rule of comity is concerned, I have looked long and hard in the rule book to find the rule of comity, and I do not believe it exists, certainly not under that title.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments referred to were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the remainder of the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 8775 and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, STEED, KIRWAN, SLACK, FLYNT, MAHON, LANGEN, REIFEL, and JONAS.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8775

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

SALINE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 24, to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, O'BRIEN, ROGERS of Texas, SAYLOR, and REINECKE.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 7984, to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, MULTER, BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, FINO, and Mrs. DWYER.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Small Business Committee have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There is no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the Committee on Immigration?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING TITLES 10 AND 14, UNITED STATES CODE, AND THE MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964, WITH RESPECT TO THE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR DAMAGE TO, OR LOSS OF, PERSONAL PROPERTY INCIDENT TO THEIR SERVICE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5024) to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

PROVIDING THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR SHALL CONVEY CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3433) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the colloquy last week, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5519) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By adding the following new section: "§ 2002. Dependents of members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps: language training

"(a) Notwithstanding section 1041 of title 22 or any other provision of law, and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary

of Defense, language training may be provided in—

"(1) a facility of the Department of Defense;

"(2) a facility of the Foreign Service Institute established under section 1041 of title 22; or

"(3) a civilian educational institution;

to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in anticipation of the member's assignment to permanent duty outside the United States or while the dependent is accompanying the member outside the United States as a result of the member's assignment to that duty.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the word 'dependent' has the same meaning that it has under section 401 of title 37".

(2) By inserting the following item in the analysis:

"2002. Dependents of members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps: language training."

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes language training to the dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of their sponsors' assignment to permanent duty outside the United States, or while they are accompanying members outside the United States as a result of the members' assignment to such duty.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Dependents of members of our military forces perform an important role in projecting a true image of the United States abroad. Their ability to speak the language of the country increases the effectiveness of their military sponsors and generates inestimable good will for the United States.

Congress recognized the contributions wives can make when it amended section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1041) to permit the Secretary of State to provide appropriate orientation and language training to members of the families of officers and employees of the Government in anticipation of their sponsors' assignment abroad or while abroad.

Although section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 specifically established the Foreign Service Institute and as amended authorizes language training for dependents of military personnel, it limits such training to that which is accomplished at the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State. The facilities of the Foreign Service Institute, in the United States, are located only in Washington, D.C. On the other hand, facilities of the Department of Defense are located in various places in the United States including the Defense Language Institute West Coast Branch at Monterey, Calif., and at other Department of Defense education centers. These facilities provide language training

to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of their assignment to duty outside the United States. So far as the Department of Defense is concerned, the requirement that dependents may be provided training only at the Foreign Service Institute would cause greater transportation costs than those resulting from having a number of locations, including the Foreign Service Institute, to which members and their dependents may go for training.

In those instances in which it may not be possible to provide language training to dependents in the United States, but in which such training is desirable, the proposed legislation would authorize the training to be given outside of the United States.

COST

In providing foreign language training under the proposed legislation, priority will be accorded to the wives of attaches, military assistance advisory group and mission personnel, and the personnel of international headquarters. It is estimated that the average annual input into this program will be 750 trainees. The first year cost of operation will be approximately \$200,000, and it is considered that the annual recurring cost will not exceed this amount.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Defense recommends enactment of this legislation.

COMMITTEE POSITION

The House Armed Services Committee unanimously approved this legislation.

I am pleased that the House has enacted this measure.

SALE OF UNIFORM CLOTHING TO THE NAVAL SEA CADET CORPS AND STATE AND FEDERAL MARITIME ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1856) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 647 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new section after section 7541:

"§ 7541a. Uniform clothing: sale to Naval Sea Cadet Corps

"Subject to regulations under section 486 of title 40, the Secretary of the Navy, under regulations prescribed by him, may sell any item of enlisted naval uniform clothing that may be spared, at a price representing its fair value, to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps for the sea cadets. The cost of transportation and delivery of items sold under this section shall be charged to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps."; and

(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"7541a. Uniform clothing: sale to Naval Sea Cadet Corps."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, insert after the word "cadets" the following words: "and to any Federal or State maritime academy having a department

of naval science for the maritime cadets and midshipmen".

Page 2, line 3, insert after the word "Corps" the following words: "and to such Federal and State maritime academies".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3788) to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if this is the customary commission agreed to on any navigable stream between the two States involved?

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Missouri asks if this is customary?

Mr. HALL. Is this the regular and established precedent for such commissions, which must be established?

Mr. BLATNIK. In this instance it is. This bill is identical with the bill passed by this body last year. This is necessary. The original authorization was back in 1944, and a subsequent bill was passed in 1946, the General Bridge Act of 1946.

Mr. HALL. This will merely continue the same Commission?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. It is without any authorization or appropriation or expense to the Government, but merely authorizes this and establishes the Commission therefor?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. It extends the life of the Commission.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This likely will be a toll bridge, is that not correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Illinois, as heretofore amended, be, and the

same is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this Act shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless actual construction thereof be commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of approval of this Act.

SEC. 2. That section 5 of said Act, as heretofore amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connections with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 per centum per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this Act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed twenty-five years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. Subject to the provisions of any prior contracts or obligations the commission may disburse any available bridge revenues or other funds or borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges under this Act and acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, provided that all notes evidencing the funds so borrowed, if not previously paid from such bridge revenues, shall be repaid from the proceeds of the bonds of the commission when issued for account of such new bridge or bridges. In the event the commission issues notes as hereinbefore in this section provided and said notes have not been otherwise paid and a new bridge or bridges are not built, said notes shall be paid from revenues derived from the operation of any other bridge or bridges owned by the commission, subject to the obligation of payment of all outstanding indebtedness for which said revenues have been theretofore pledged. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds, and to pay any other indebtedness of the commission, at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption, and may include, as a part of an issue of bonds to provide for the cost of a bridge to be constructed under this Act, sufficient additional bonds bearing interest at a rate or rates not exceeding 6 per centum per annum to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement,

setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"Said bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for at least two consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for twelve months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge, as well as the cost of abandonment or dismantlement of any existing bridge to be replaced thereby. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act of December 21, 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "the bonds and interest," and inserting in lieu thereof: "the bonds, the notes issued under section 5 of this Act, and the interest."

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

EMERGENCY HIGHWAY RELIEF

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6790) to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is

amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,"

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,"

SEC. 2. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than \$50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section, except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than \$50,000,000, the unexpended balance of such amount shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 6790. This is needed and necessary legislation. It has the full support of the Committee on Public Works and was reported unanimously by the committee.

H.R. 6790 amends title 23 of the United States Code to provide additional funds for the use of the Bureau of Public Roads in repairing and reconstructing Federal aid and other highways or bridges damaged by storms, floods, earthquakes, or other similar disasters. It also makes eligible for relief under section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code "parkways, public lands highways and public lands development roads and trails." These three systems of roads are not covered under the existing law at the present time. There is absolutely no reason for their exclusion from this program and, for that reason, the committee amended the existing law to include them under benefits of this program.

At the present time there is authorized an annual expenditure of \$30 million to be used by the Bureau of Public Roads to repair Federal aid roads which have suffered the damage I have described above.

The experience of the Bureau of Public Roads in administering this program in the last few years clearly indicates there is a need for the additional money authorized by this bill.

The Committee on Public Works is well aware of this fact. In the past 6 months three special subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works have

made field trips to investigate at first-hand flood damages in the Pacific Northwest, the Mississippi Valley States, and in the States of Colorado and Kansas. The subcommittee making the trip to the States of Colorado and Kansas just returned from that flood damaged area and is now in the process of writing a report of its findings. However, their verbal report to me, as well as reports of the two previous subcommittees indicates quite clearly that one of the heaviest sufferers of any flood are the highways in the local areas. We are all well aware of the part roads of all types play in our daily life. They are essential to all phases of the national well-being. It is therefore quite logical that they should be repaired as soon as possible, once a natural disaster occurs, so that they can play their vital role in restoring the economy and well-being of any stricken area.

The administration is well aware of this problem and earlier in this session, in an executive communication to the Speaker of the House, recommended legislation along the lines of that which is before us today. Part of their recommendation has been taken care of in a previous bill which the Congress only recently passed and which has been enacted into law. This is the Pacific Northwest disaster bill, and in that legislation the Congress provided an additional \$50 million for this program for fiscal year 1965 and an additional \$20 million for fiscal year 1966.

H.R. 6790 contains the balance of the recommendation of the administration with necessary changes made by the Committee on Public Works which the committee believes will implement the operation of this program. Beginning with fiscal year 1967 the \$30 million under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, is increased to \$50 million annually. Sixty percent of the funds that will be used under H.R. 6790 will come from the highway trust fund, and the balance of 40 percent from the general funds of the Treasury. Under present law the \$30 million is an annual expenditure allocated to the Bureau of Public Roads and expires at the end of any one year.

This approach is inconsistent with the normal Federal aid highway program authorization of funds, for under that program funds are available for a 3-year period. The committee believes that the money to be used under this program should be available in like manner and has made the necessary change in the law to see that beginning in fiscal year 1967 any funds not used in a particular year will be available for the next succeeding 2 years.

This legislation affects each and every one of our 50 States. It is a program that we hope will not need to be used, but if the need arises, the money should be there at once. For this reason the increase of money authorized under H.R. 6790 is a necessary one.

I strongly urge this body to pass H.R. 6790.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland has given a correct and adequate explanation generally of the legislation. This is a bill concerning

which the committee has no controversy. There is no difference of opinion. We all recognize and acknowledge the fact that properly financed disaster relief must be provided for highways. There must be adequate authorization and financing should be on an orderly and planned basis. At the present time the procedure is inadequate. The funds are initially expended from any appropriations that are available for expenditure under title 23, United States Code, and then at a subsequent date these appropriations are reimbursed. Reimbursement for repairing Federal aid highways come from the highway trust fund, and uncertainty exists as to how, and from what sources, reimbursement should be made for the several classes of Federal domain roads which are also covered by section 125 of title 23, United States Code. This does not make sense.

This bill, thus, provides an orderly procedure, with a fixed percentage of the funds for reimbursement coming out of the trust fund—60 percent, of \$50 million, or up to \$30 million annually, which equals the amount presently coming out of the trust fund. The additional \$20 million will come out of the general funds of the Treasury. In order to provide for an orderly procedure, the Public Works Committee amended this bill to provide that all funds expended under authority of section 125 of title 23 shall be reimbursed, 30 percent from the highway trust fund and 20 percent from the general fund, meaning that all the money will not be expended out of one fund or the other. The objective is that the 60- to 40-percent formula shall apply to all funds expended. So this bill attempts to get orderly procedure into this emergency financing, which admittedly is needed, particularly—and this is on a nationwide basis—in view of the ravages of nature in the northwest flood disaster area, in the Upper Mississippi River Valley, and in Colorado and Kansas, where the committee sent special subcommittees to investigate recently. This bill provides for nationwide expenditure authorizations for emergency highway reconstruction throughout the Nation at an increased rate, from \$30 to \$50 million annually, starting with fiscal year 1967, it being realized, of course, that the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of this year provided for an increase from \$30 to \$80 million for the fiscal year 1965, and from \$30 to \$50 million for 1966, because of the several bad floods throughout the Nation. This bill also promotes careful planning and orderly procedures in the repair and reconstruction of highways damaged by natural disasters by making the annual expenditure authority of \$50 million available not only for the fiscal year authorized but for the following 2 fiscal years also.

So, Mr. Speaker, this means a \$50 million annual expenditure authority hereafter, which is consistent with what we did in the Pacific Northwestern Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], in that he has instituted

a procedure which I wholeheartedly endorse of sending committee members out into the fields to investigate the damages of these acts of nature where they occur, to evaluate them, and to make an on-site, on-the-spot inspection of them so that our committee will be wholly knowledgeable of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful—and I understand this is the case—that the chairman likewise will authorize committee members sometime in the future to look into some of the public works projects, particularly multipurpose water resource projects, which have such an impact on the economy and the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is one that should be supported unanimously, and I recommend its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6790.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 302(c) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 482, Rept. No. 625) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 482

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1153) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

TO CORRECT INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO THE BASIC COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged

resolution (H. Res. 483, Rept. No. 626) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 483

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 470

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 9075, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the military services.

H.R. 9075 will, first, provide a much needed increase in the basic pay authorized all uniformed services personnel; second, authorize the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus; and third, establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and a corresponding quadrennial review in

respect to the principles and concepts of military compensation.

The gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RIVERS, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BATES, and the members of the Armed Services Committee are to be commended for the many days and weeks they have devoted to the hearings and work involved in presenting this complicated pay increase bill for the various commissions and grades provided for in our Military Establishment.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, along with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, all appeared before the Armed Services Committee and outlined in detail their recommendations and the necessity for a substantial increase for the enlisted personnel of our Defense Establishment. The critical shortage of capable personnel in the Navy Department is serious on account of the particularly low wage scale. Representatives of the Navy informed the Armed Services Committee that they now have a shortage of more than 40,000 petty officers. In the electronic equipment repair category, they are now operating on a shortage of approximately 20,000. A relative shortage of career petty officers also exists in the Navy Establishment.

Witnesses appeared from the Department of the Army and set out that in 5 years' time the enlisted personnel has been reduced from 41 to 37 percent. More than two-thirds of the enlisted personnel on active duty with the Army today have less than 4 years' experience. The Secretary of the Air Force testified before the committee that the present inadequate military pay presents great difficulty in the retention of highly qualified officers and enlisted personnel. Secretary Zuckert said that since 1959 the proportion of ROTC graduates with engineering and scientific background has decreased from 47 to 33 percent.

The comparison of the military pay and the civilian pay in commercial and industrial establishments throughout the United States is astounding. In 1964 the average wage or salary in civilian life was \$445 per month. A recruit in the existing military structure receives only \$78 per month, which is 17.5 percent of the average monthly wage or salary in the United States.

Chairman RIVERS and Congressman BATES appeared before the Rules Committee last week and outlined in detail figures and facts in behalf of the pending bill so convincingly that I do hope this legislation, as recommended by the Armed Services Committee, is passed without amendments.

Chairman RIVERS gave an outstanding and lengthy detailed explanation of all phases of military personnel compensation when he appeared before the Rules Committee last week. I do hope that the Members will remain on the floor and listen to his detailed analysis of all angles concerning our inadequate policy toward ample compensation of our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 470.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 192]		
Andrews, Glenn	Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fulton, Tenn.	Murray
Ashley	Grabowski	Nix
Bingham	Grover	Pasman
Bolling	Gubser	Pelly
Bonner	Gurney	Powell
Bow	Halleck	Pucinski
Brock	Harsha	Reld, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Harvey, Ind.	Reinecke
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Mich.	Resnick
Cederberg	Henderson	Rivers, Alaska
Clark	Holland	Ronan
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Pa.	Roncallo
Cleveland	Kelly	Roosevelt
Cohelan	Keogh	Rostenkowski
Collier	King, N.Y.	Ryan
Conte	Kluczynski	Schlesler
Conyers	Kunkel	Scott
Devine	Lindsay	Shipley
Diggs	Long, Md.	Stephens
Dingell	McDade	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	McDowell	Toll
Dwyer	McMillan	Vanik
Edwards, Ala.	McVicker	Waggonner
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Watkins
Farnum	Mackay	Weltner
Fino	Mailliard	Whalley
Flynt	Martin, Ala.	White, Idaho
Fraser	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Mathias	Wylder
Friedel	May	Yates
	Michel	Young
	Mosher	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY ACT OF 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 470 will permit the consideration of H.R. 9075, a bill authorizing an increase in the compensation of uniformed services personnel. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate.

H.R. 9075 would authorize an increase in uniformed services compensation which would result in an increased annual expenditure of approximately \$1 billion. The pay increase as recommended by the administration is less than one-half of the amount recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. It is interesting to note that the committee recommendation is particularly directed toward enlisted personnel. Actually, 88 percent of the total difference between the pay increases recommended by the Committee on Armed Services and those recommended by the Folsom Panel for active military personnel is found in the recommended salary for enlisted personnel. In other words, the Committee on

Armed Services has attempted to provide realistic pay increases for enlisted personnel, while the increases recommended by the Folsom Panel are believed inadequate.

As emphasized in the committee report, enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service have not received a pay increase since 1952—a period of 13 years. During this same span of time, the consumer price index has increased 16.9 percent. Yet, the increase recommended by the Folsom Panel was a mere 2.7 percent. On the other hand, the Committee on Armed Services provides an average 17.3 percent increase for enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service.

Mr. Speaker, I am mindful that the cost is a substantial amount of money. But I am personally convinced that this increased expenditure is essential to the proper maintenance of our Military Establishment.

When we consider that for fiscal year 1966 the administration has requested approval of legislation which would permit the support of foreign aid programs of one kind or another costing an excess of \$3.3 billion, it is difficult for me to understand why the administration refuses to endorse an appropriate military compensation increase costing less than one-third of this amount. I firmly believe that we should take better care of our own deserving citizens and not waste so much money by way of foreign aid. In fact, I have heard statements indicating that some of our foreign aid money may be used to pay servicemen in other countries more money per month than we pay our own servicemen. If this is true, it seems hard to believe.

The uniformed services personnel are the men and women who are committed to the responsibility of guarding our way of life. They should be adequately compensated. Tomorrow we will start on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, with the request for an authorization of some \$1.895 billion. In my opinion, that program could be done away with, and in so doing, we would have the necessary \$1 billion to take care of this increase and would save almost another \$1 billion, which could be used for essential expenditures rather than wasting it on a dream program like the war on poverty.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RIVERS], on his forthright stand in demanding that the uniformed services personnel be adequately compensated, and I commend the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their action. Minority views are set forth in the committee report by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 9075. It was unanimous in the Rules Committee. I know of no objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 9075 by the Congress is dictated if we are to have our servicemen and their families live as first-class citizens. The revelations that were made in the course of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee were shocking.

Since 1952, the adjustments made in military pay have been grossly inadequate; they have failed to keep pace with the pay adjustments for civil service personnel in business and industry.

President Johnson has said:

There can be no class system separating the men and women who are committed to the service of their fellow men or to the defense of their country.

It is our President's announced intention to "take what ever steps both human equity and national defense require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us."

Failure of this Congress to enact H.R. 9075 must be interpreted by our servicemen as indifference to their plight and as a willingness to consign them and their families to the ranks of second-class citizens.

It is a shame and disgrace when we permit the economic plight of our military to sink to the point where some enlisted families receive pay below what has been estimated as the poverty level, some have actually had to take relief, and many were eligible for relief but were too proud to accept it. It is a shame and disgrace when almost one in every five servicemen must "moonlight" and many service wives must work to provide the necessities for their families.

Those who suffer most from low military pay—and those who will benefit most from this bill—are the enlisted men.

It is nothing less than a national disgrace to find that we pay unemployed, unskilled youths in the Job Corps more than we do the three lowest grades of the services, or when a third-class petty officer on active duty with 4 years of service receives less pay than the compensation paid to the unemployed in New York City, or when a messenger makes more than a military pilot.

The increases contained in H.R. 9075 will provide a decent wage that will give our service people and their families a just standard of living.

I support the bill. My conscience would not let me oppose it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9075, with Mr. BURKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me the greatest possible pleasure to recommend to this body approval of H.R. 9075, a bill which has been conceived and developed in its entirety by your Committee on Armed Services.

This bill will provide a critically needed increase in basic pay for more than 2.6 million uniformed services personnel.

H.R. 9075 has three fundamental objectives:

First. It will provide a much needed increase in the basic pay authorized all uniformed services personnel.

Second. It will authorize the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus.

Third. It will establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and a corresponding quadrennial review in respect to the principles and concepts of military compensation.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Enactment of this legislation is necessary to insure that all uniformed services personnel will, now and in the future, be provided a level of compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private sector of our economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of truly qualified career personnel.

This inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel has, in turn, created serious personnel manning problems in all the military departments. Consequently, to insure the maintenance of our full military operational capabilities it is absolutely essential, in the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services, that we provide military personnel with a substantial increase in compensation.

In addition to the military requirement for an immediate pay increase, simple equity demands that Congress act promptly to restore to military personnel the relative comparability in wage levels which previously prevailed with respect to other Federal employees.

Our committee hearings indicated that since 1952 military pay increases have

amounted to 33.9 percent, while during an equivalent period Federal civilian pay increases have amounted to 46.3 percent. Thus, there is reflected in these statistics an overall short-fall in military pay increases of approximately 12.4 percent. It is this discrepancy in the general level of military pay as contrasted to pay levels enjoyed by other Federal workers that requires immediate correction.

In summary, this adjustment to military pay as recommended in H.R. 9075 is necessary to provide our military personnel with reasonable comparability in pay levels with their civilian contemporaries.

Our military personnel cannot lobby for a pay increase. They cannot go on strike. They cannot bargain with their employer. They cannot, as do other workers, threaten to transfer to a competitor of their employer.

None of the persuasive ordinary bargaining devices are available to military personnel. In short, once committed to a military career, these personnel become victims of the system and can look only to Congress for equitable pay treatment.

Congress, and particularly the Committee on Armed Services, has been given this responsibility under article I, section 8, of the Constitution which states, among other things, that Congress alone shall have the power "To raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

I sincerely believe that this bill, H.R. 9075, fully and fairly meets this constitutional responsibility.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The bill proposed by the Committee on Armed Services would provide an average 10.6 percent increase in the basic pay of uniformed services personnel. The cost of this bill for active duty Defense Department personnel is \$824 million annually. With the addition of personnel of the other uniformed services, that is, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey and other related costs, the total annual cost of this legislation is \$996 million.

Under the terms of the bill, every member of the uniformed services on active duty would receive an increase in pay. Thus, the bill affects all of the 2.6 million members of the Armed Forces presently on active duty, as well as more than 4 million military dependents who look to their military sponsors for financial support. In other words, this bill will have a direct effect on the financial future of almost 7 million Americans.

In order to understand the proposed pay increase for military personnel incorporated in H.R. 9075, it is necessary to analyze separately the changes recommended for personnel with over 2 years of service and those changes recommended for personnel with less than 2 years of service.

In the case of personnel with over 2 years of service, officers would be given an average increase of 6.4 percent and enlisted personnel would be given an increase of 11.1 percent in basic pay.

On the other hand, in the case of personnel with less than 2 years of service, officers would be given an average in-

crease of 22 percent and enlisted personnel would be given an average increase of 17.3 percent.

Enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service have been given substantially larger percentage increases than their contemporaries since this group of enlisted personnel has had no increase in compensation since 1952. Thus, for example, the average increase of 17.3 percent in the basic pay of enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service will, generally speaking, simply compensate for the rise in the consumer price index during the same interval which is 16.9 percent.

The increase for officer personnel with under 2 years of service similarly attempts to provide for the substantial increase in the consumer price index since 1952 and also would include an incremental increase to insure that the entry pay for junior officers at the ensign and second lieutenant level will be comparable to that provided as entry salaries for college graduates entering Federal civilian employment.

The proposed increases in basic pay for typical officers and enlisted personnel in the military departments are set out on pages 27 and 28 of the committee report and reflect monthly increases in basic pay for officers ranging from \$162—8.9 percent—for a general officer—O—10—to \$23—5 percent—a month for a first lieutenant—O—2—with 4 years of service.

In the case of enlisted personnel, the increases in monthly basic pay range from a high of \$58 a month—15.3 percent—for a sergeant first class—E—7—to a \$10 a month increase—13 percent—in basic pay for a recruit with less than 4 months of service.

FOLSOM PANEL AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

As Members of the House are aware, the President's Panel on Federal Salaries, chaired by the Honorable Marion Folsom, recommended a substantially smaller increase in pay for military personnel. The recommendation made by the Folsom Panel would have provided an average compensation increase of 4.8 percent for all uniformed personnel except enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service who would receive a 2.7 percent increase in basic pay as a cost of living increase.

The Folsom Panel apparently reached its conclusions as to the size of the required pay increase on the basis of assumptions and evidence which, in the opinion of the Committee on Armed Services, are completely invalid.

The Panel stated:

Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level, in relation to civilian pay levels, sufficient to attract, and retain adequate numbers and quality of personnel in the Armed Forces.

The printed committee hearings on these military pay increase recommendations completely refute this statement by the Folsom Panel.

It is significant to note that not a single witness who appeared before the committee accepted the Panel's conclusions that there was no retention problem in the military departments. The evidence

developed by the committee completely contradicted the Panel's contention in this regard.

The mere fact that the Department of Defense included in its pay recommendation a request for authority to allow the use of a new and additional flexible reenlistment bonus "to retain people in skills that are in short supply" clearly establishes the existence of a "retention problem" in the military departments.

In this connection, it is important to note that this retention problem which would presumably be partially corrected by the variable reenlistment bonus affects almost one-half of the total enlisted grade structure.

The Panel reportedly reviewed the Armed Services Committee recommendations on Military pay but rejected the committee's recommendation because of its view that the military departments had no retention problem. Consequently the Panel was of the opinion that current military wage levels required only a minor adjustment comparable to that recommended for civilian employees of the Federal Government. Thus, the Panel recommended an adjustment to military pay that apparently was designed to match the 3-percent increase recommended for civilian employees of the Federal Government.

Stated another way, the Panel was of the view that in 1963 military wage levels were sufficiently high to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified military personnel and, therefore, 1963 was the base year from which any adjustments in military pay were to be made in the future.

SELECTION OF BASE YEAR

The Committee on Armed Services maintains that it would be a serious error to use 1963 as a base year for making future adjustments to military pay since it would simply perpetuate the present and existing disparity between military wage levels and those provided other Federal civilian workers and workers in our economy.

Stated very simply, therefore, the essential difference between the Folsom Panel recommendations and those made by the Committee on Armed Services arises from the unwillingness of the Folsom Panel to recognize that there does exist a significant disparity in military wages as contrasted to those provided Federal civilian workers. Therefore, if the Panel had used 1952 as a base year from which to begin a statistically sound comparison of wage increases provided military personnel as contrasted to those provided Federal civilian workers, it, too, would have come up with the same general conclusions as those developed by the Committee on Armed Services.

At this point it is worthy of note that Secretary of Defense McNamara disagreed with the statistical analysis of previous wage increases utilized by the Committee on Armed Services and offered his own set of statistics to prove that military personnel, particularly officers, had fared better than their Federal civilian contemporaries in congressionally approved wage increases since 1952. The committee took issue with the Secretary in this regard and, therefore, accepted

his recommendation that the committee hire an "outstanding actuary" to determine the validity of the statistics used by the Secretary.

The committee report contains the complete actuarial study made in this connection by one of the leading actuarial firms in the country. Very simply, the actuaries advised the committee that the statistical analysis developed by the Department of Defense of previous wage increases was invalid and overstated the percentage increase in compensation received by military personnel since 1949 by 28 percent for officers and 15 percent for enlisted personnel.

The Folsom Panel unfortunately utilized these Department of Defense supplied statistics to reach its conclusion on its military pay recommendations.

Despite the fact that I totally disagreed with the Folsom Panel recommendations, I introduced the legislative proposal sent to the Congress by the administration. The bill H.R. 8714, therefore represented the Panel's pay recommendations.

The committee conducted hearings on both the Folsom Panel pay recommendations embodied in H.R. 8714 and the committee recommendations initially developed in H.R. 5725. At the conclusion of these hearings, 34 members of the Committee on Armed Services were firmly convinced that the original committee recommendations were valid and consequently endorsed the bill you have before you today, H.R. 9075.

The committee report provides a detailed comparative analysis of the two bills as they affect all active duty military personnel. This analysis of comparative cost is reflected on page 40 of the committee report. It indicates that the Folsom Panel recommendations would cost an estimated \$369 million, while the committee's recommendation would cost an estimated \$825 million—a difference of approximately \$455 million.

Also reflected on page 44 of the committee report is an analysis of the comparative cost of the Folsom Panel recommendations and the committee recommendations in respect to personnel with less than 2 years service.

A review of the cited tables indicates that there is relatively little difference in the two pay proposals as they affect officer personnel.

The committee proposal would raise all officer personnel an average of 7.2 percent at an estimated annual cost of approximately \$174 million.

The Panel's proposal would raise all officer personnel an average of 5 percent with an estimated annual cost of approximately \$120 million.

Thus, the difference between the two proposals, as they affect officer personnel, is only \$54 million. This amount in relation to the total \$1 billion cost of the bill is, therefore, relatively small.

On the other hand, a review of the tables relating to the proposed increases for enlisted personnel indicates that 88 percent of the \$455 million difference in the two pay proposals is found in the enlisted grade structure. Thus, the bulk of the savings reflected in the Folsom Panel proposal is the \$401 million which

the Panel would deny to enlisted personnel.

It is worthy of note that every statistic available to the committee, including those provided by departmental witnesses, indicated a very serious short-fall in the enlisted pay structure as compared to their contemporaries in both Federal civil service and the private sector of our economy.

Yet, despite these statistics, both the Folsom Panel and the Department of Defense stubbornly refused to recommend adequate adjustments in the enlisted pay structure. Perhaps the clearest indication of the inadequacy of the proposed increases for enlisted personnel as recommended by the Folsom Panel is reflected in the comparison of the overall percentage of dollar increases.

The Folsom Panel recommends an average of 4.6 percent in compensation for all enlisted personnel which amounts to an average of \$8.98 monthly. On the other hand, the committee, in H.R. 9075, recommends an average increase of 12.1 percent in enlisted compensation which results in an average monthly increase of \$23.48.

Let us make the issue clear. This is a bill for enlisted personnel—the Folsom Panel recommendations largely ignored our enlisted personnel. My committee refuses to buy this type of recommendation, and therefore we recommend for House approval H.R. 9075.

In addition to the change in basic pay for Uniformed Services personnel, this bill would also provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to pay a so-called variable reenlistment bonus. This variable reenlistment bonus would be paid at the time of first enlistment only and is designed, as explained by the Secretary of Defense, to provide a critically needed monetary incentive so as to permit the military departments to retain experienced military personnel in critical skills. The Secretary testified that this additional management device would cost an estimated \$21 million during fiscal year 1968 and would affect approximately 19,000 personnel. The variable reenlistment bonus would permit the departments to pay an additional amount over and above the regular reenlistment bonus not to exceed four times the amount of the basic reenlistment bonus authorized the service member upon his first reenlistment. The committee felt that this administrative device might be of particular assistance to the Department of the Navy and therefore granted the Secretary's request in this regard.

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS AND CHANGES IN PAY AND ALLOWANCES

The bill recommended by the Department of Defense and the President included a provision which would authorize the President to make annual adjustments to military pay and allowances without the necessity of legislative action by the Congress.

The provision recommended by the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries would authorize the President to increase the pay of uniformed services personnel whenever he "determined that

the rates of any pay or allowances" are inadequate.

The committee wholeheartedly endorses the concept of an annual review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances, together with a report concerning possible adjustments to military pay and allowances. However, it does not subscribe to the concept that these adjustments to military pay and allowances would become law unless either body of the Congress, within a 60-day period, passed a resolution vetoing such a recommended adjustment.

The committee is of the strongest conviction that the recommended change in the law would constitute an abdication by the Congress of its legislative responsibility in this area. Consequently, the committee modified the language so as to require an annual review by the President of the adequacy of military pay and allowances, together with a report to the Congress. However, the normal legislative process would continue to apply in order to effect a change in the rates of pay and allowances authorized uniformed services personnel.

The committee also incorporated in its legislative language a provision requiring a quadrennial review of the principles and concepts of military compensation. This broad review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of uniformed personnel would be conducted by the President whenever he considered it appropriate, but in no event later than January 1, 1967, and not less than once each 4 years thereafter. This legislative provision, therefore, adopts the general concept recommended by both the President and the Folsom Panel.

This then, in brief, explains the provisions of H.R. 9075. It is a very carefully developed legislative recommendation which I hope and know will receive the unanimous approval of this body.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me for this observation, which is one I assure you that is not perfunctory nor idle but which I believe is demanded at this particular time. The only hesitancy I have in making the observation is because of the known affection which I have for the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, my colleague of almost a quarter of a century. Further, I believe it proper and fitting at this time, Mr. Chairman, that this House should recognize what is taking place at this particular moment.

Mr. Chairman, standing in the well of the House is the gentleman who has distinguished himself for almost 25 years in the cause of his country and in the cause of his own constituency.

Mr. Chairman, since the day he came to this Congress and since the day he first found himself on the old Naval Affairs Committee, the welfare of the individual man in uniform has been his

mission in the Congress and in his life. His entire career has been dotted with legislation lending and tending to benefit that man in uniform. Calling to mind at the moment is the creation of the Dental Corps for the military which I believe is one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it was he who in the last pay bill led the fight for readjustment of salaries of men in uniform. At that time he advocated, and he is advocating today, and only reluctantly submitted to the wisdom of his chairman and the desire of his chairman at that time, by indicating that at the first opportunity he would bring up the subject matter again. Today he finds himself in that position.

Today, Mr. Chairman, Members of this body witness here legislation in its purest form. Since the gentleman from South Carolina became the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services he has stood before you on two major pieces of legislation, both of which had his stamp and the stamp of his committee, but both were initiated in the manner of legislative business by the Defense Department.

Here today, my colleagues, stands the gentleman from South Carolina offering to us legislation to which he himself gave birth, which he himself nourished, which he himself persuaded the members of his committee, with few exceptions, to join him in presenting to this body, for he himself found his courage tested in a crucible which tests the mettle of any courageous man.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services of the House I pause in this observation to pay a most sincere tribute to the leadership which has been demonstrated by the gentleman from South Carolina. Of course, critics may come and critics may go. But I believe that in the ultimate, leadership that has been demonstrated will continue to be demonstrated by the gentleman from South Carolina and will see these critics fade away into a pale insignificance, while his deeds and his actions remain.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from South Carolina, my dear friend for whom I have the deepest affection—and I believe expressing the sentiments and the feelings of every member of the House Committee on Armed Services, the joy that we feel today in seeing him here presenting to this House his first original major piece of legislation as chairman of the committee and thereby demonstrating so vigorously and so energetically his ability and his justification in leading us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course I am deeply touched by the sentiments expressed by my dear colleague with whom I have labored for 25 years. But let me say, Mr. Chairman, in my time in this body I have not had a more dedicated group with which to work or a more indefatigable and tireless group of men motivated by only one thing—the service of our country—and to carry out the mandates of this body.

I have not asked this committee to do one thing which they have failed to do. We have worked days and nights on our legislation; even the new Members, Mr. Chairman, have worked. Everyone has responded, and by example they have inspired us who are charged with this responsibility.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana from the very bottom of my heart.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my distinguished chairman, although I am not on the committee, we are proud of you in South Carolina, and throughout the Nation. People everywhere I go ask me what can be done to strengthen the military position of the United States of America in these critical days through which we are passing? I think the gentleman, my beloved colleague from South Carolina, and his great committee are answering that question here in the well of the House today.

We are committed in the Vietnam war, we are in South Vietnam in the monsoons and quagmires of southeast Asia to stop the aggressor in his tracks. We are on the road to Berlin, we are in Santo Domingo, we are committed all over the world. The gentleman and his great committee is giving that ruthless group the answer today.

You are strengthening the morale of our Armed Forces committed throughout the world.

I want to thank the gentleman and tell him that the American people are behind you and your great committee. This is the answer to those who would subvert and destroy our way of life.

This is a good bill, it is a fair bill, it is a psychologically important bill. We cannot stand idly by and see our Armed Forces drained of its power. This is the time to act, not react.

I commend the people for acting on behalf of the Armed Forces of our country committed throughout the world.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with those to whom the distinguished chairman of our committee yielded in paying due respect to a man who has performed nobly, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. His leadership has been exemplary.

May I say that he is an arduous worker. There was a time early in January when our committee met at 10 o'clock, then in February at 9 o'clock, then in March we started to meet at 8 o'clock. In April and May we came in at 7:30 o'clock. Now we even have meetings at 7 o'clock in the morning. I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will not hold meetings sooner than this fairly early hour.

Mr. Chairman, I fully concur in the remarks made by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL

RIVERS, in outlining the action of the Committee on Armed Services on H.R. 9075.

The members of the committee on my side of the aisle unanimously approve and endorse the bill as reported by the full Committee on Armed Services.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this legislation. Its enactment is absolutely essential to the proper maintenance of our military forces. Our military leaders, and indeed our civilian Secretaries, have advised the Committee on Armed Services that they are faced with a constantly expanding problem in their efforts to attract and retain competent career personnel.

The pay increase for uniformed services personnel recommended by the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 9075 averages 10.6 percent at a total cost approximating almost \$1 billion annually.

Now, the Members of this House might very well say, "Did you not provide a substantial increase for military pay in 1963 and a minor adjustment in 1964, and was this not enough?"

The simple answer is—it was not enough.

My chairman has mentioned some of the background relating to the 1963 Pay Act. It was pointed out that the pay recommendations developed by the Department of Defense in the 1963 Pay Act were based upon studies made by the Department of all pay increases provided military personnel since 1952.

The studies made by the Department indicated there was indeed a wide disparity in the pay increases provided military personnel and Federal civilian personnel during the period. Unfortunately, the pay increases recommended by the Department, together with reductions forced upon the Committee on Armed Services because of budgetary limitations, resulted in a pay increase at that time which did not bridge the gap.

I have reference to the committee report at that time which stated:

Even with the increases recommended in the proposed legislation, the average increase in total compensation for members of the uniformed services since 1952 will still be substantially less than the increases obtained by workers in the private economy and civil service employees (p. 2 of H. Rept. No. 208, 88th Cong., 1st sess., in H.R. 5555).

I was a member of the subcommittee which initially recommended a substantially higher pay increase for military personnel in 1963 than was reported by the full committee. The members of the subcommittee reluctantly accepted the action of the full committee since to do otherwise would have risked the possibility of a Presidential veto.

In short, we did not think the 1963 Pay Act would do the job. It is evident that it has not. Reenlistment and retention rates have simply continued to fall.

The committee report, on page 3, outlines the declining performance of the military departments in the recruitment and retention of enlisted personnel. This decline has been steady since 1962.

As a former paymaster in the Navy and as a Member of Congress I have been dealing with compensation problems for

military personnel for over 25 years. I am convinced that the failure of the military departments to attract and retain the type personnel they desire is largely due to the inadequacy of their pay.

In 1962, the reenlistment rates for first term and career enlisted personnel in the entire Department of Defense were 57.3 percent.

In 1963, they declined to 53.1 percent.

In 1964, they declined to 50 percent.

In the first 6 months of 1965, they declined further to 48.2 percent.

The military departments had similar difficulty in attracting and retaining the type of officer personnel that they desire. For example, General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, in his appearance before the Committee on Armed Services, stated:

The Army's experience with the retention of junior officers for the fiscal years 1961-65 is as follows: * * * In fiscal year 1965 it is projected that only 2,523 will elect to stay on active duty compared to our minimum requirement of 3,616 from the total number eligible of 10,216. Failure to retain an adequate number of trained, experienced personnel is a serious handicap to the maintenance of operational readiness in our tactical units.

The Navy and the Air Force are also experiencing the same difficulty in retaining junior officer personnel. I am deeply concerned by the significant inability of the military departments to exercise the proper selectivity in the personnel who they accept as career officers and enlisted military personnel. It is inevitable that in the absence of any genuine opportunity for selectivity our military departments will be confronted with the inevitable development of mediocrity in both the commissioned and noncommissioned officers who are responsible for safeguarding our national security.

We cannot accept even the slightest possibility that our nuclear Navy—our supersonic Air Force—or our mobile Army—will be directed by mediocre commanders in the future. Therefore, a realistic increase in military compensation must be effected now.

The disparity between civil service and military compensation was graphically brought to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services during its hearings on the various military pay proposals. On page 2714 and 2715 of the printed hearings, General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, identified the compensation differential provided an officer and enlisted man in South Vietnam as compared to a civil service employee.

Those figures indicate that an Army lieutenant colonel engaged in combat in South Vietnam with over 18 years of service receives a total annual compensation which is \$6,000 less than a GS-14 with whom he is usually compared. On the same basis, an E-7 enlisted man with 18 years of service, receives \$2,000 less than his counterpart, a GS-7. This difference is due to the allowances provided civilians in that area.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the military departments are having difficulty retaining career military personnel?

The pay bill recommended by the Committee on Armed Services would provide an average increase of 10.6 percent in pay. However, this average does not tell the entire story. Actually, the committee's recommendations for increases are on a selective basis and, therefore, the percentage increases vary substantially. For example, officers with over 2 years of service would receive an average 6.4 percent increase in basic pay, while officers with less than 2 years of service would receive a 22-percent increase in basic pay.

Enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service would receive an average 11.1-percent increase in basic pay, while those with under 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 17.3 percent.

Now, I would like briefly to examine some of the rationale used by the committee in establishing the percentage increases recommended in H.R. 9075.

In the case of enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service the committee was aware that they had not received an increase in basic pay since 1952. During this interval the consumer price index had risen approximately 16.9 percent. Therefore, the committee provided an increase in basic pay for this group of personnel which would approximate the rise in the consumer price index. This increase, therefore, averaged 17.3 percent.

In the case of junior officer personnel the committee attempted to provide an entry salary for these personnel equivalent to the lowest salary paid college graduates who enter Federal civilian employment. College graduates who enter Federal civilian employment enter at the grade GS-7, which provides annual compensation amounting to \$6,050. The increase in basic pay recommended by the committee for individuals entering military service as commissioned officers was 22 percent, which therefor permitted these individuals to enjoy annual compensation approximating \$6,000 a year, which is equivalent to a grade GS-7.

Now, some may question the increases provided flag and general officers in this pay bill. Let me point out that in the Military Pay Act of 1963 flag and general officers received only a 5-percent increase in basic pay. This represented an average increase of less than 1 percent a year when prorated over the period since the 1963 pay increase. To illustrate the cumulative long-term effect of such increases, it is in order to point out that the basic compensation of one- and two-star officers has been increased since 1952 by 42.7 and 41.3 percent, respectively; whereas the salary increases which employees of the classified civil service in comparable grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18—the so-called supergrades—have been increased over the same period 63.8, 69.6, and 65.5 percent, respectively.

The effect of the increases provided these officers in H.R. 9075 is, therefore, simply to reduce such imbalances and to restore a more reasonable relationship in the pay increases provided for military and civilian personnel of roughly comparable levels of responsibility.

Now, why did not the Folsom panel reach the same conclusion concerning

these disparities in military pay as arrived at by the Committee on Armed Services? The answer, as was briefly given to you by the chairman, is that they have failed to use the proper base year from which to begin their comparison and also the fact that the statistics provided them by the Department of Defense concerning previous military pay increases were unfortunately inaccurate.

The statistical evaluation of previous military pay increases utilized by the Folsom panel was analyzed by an independent actuary employed by the Committee on Armed Services. This actuary, whose report appears in its entirety as an appendix to the committee report on this bill, states categorically that the Department had overstated the percentage increase in compensation received by military personnel since 1949 by 28 percent for officers and 15 percent for enlisted personnel.

In view of the misinformation upon which the Folsom panel had based its recommendations, it is not surprising that the pay increases proposed for military personnel are grossly inadequate. However, it is interesting to note in passing that even if the Department of Defense statistics regarding base pay increases were utilized, enlisted personnel would require a wage adjustment comparable to that recommended by the committee in H.R. 9075 to make them whole.

For example, the index utilized by Secretary of Defense McNamara, measuring the increases in enlisted compensation since 1949, indicated that enlisted personnel had received compensation increases amounting to 65.6 percent, while at the same time, Classification Act clerical and technical personnel had received percentage wage increases amounting to 72.1 percent. These figures indicate a substantial shortfall in military pay adjustments. Using these same indexes, which overstate previous military pay increases, the increase recommended by the committee in H.R. 9075 would only raise these indexes for enlisted personnel to 73.5 percent, thus, for practical purposes, equating them to kindred workers in the Federal family of employees.

This illustrates further my inability to comprehend the Department of Defense's reluctance to support the military pay adjustments recommended by the Committee on Armed Services.

I could go on indefinitely to recount to the Members of this House the tremendous amount of evidence compiled by the committee supporting this pay adjustment. However, in the last analysis, we do not need a lot of fancy formulas to develop an appropriate wage increase. The only real test is whether the wage we are providing is getting the job done.

It is obvious to me, and I am certain to all of you, that we are not getting the job done. Let us get on with it and provide this increase to see whether it will accomplish our purpose. If it does not, obviously we will have to be back again and ask for more. Certainly, we cannot ask for less. Those fighting today in Vietnam are inspired patriots and others in the Armed Services are dedicated Americans as well. They are constantly reminded of the obligations of citizen-

ship—let us remember that they have families to support.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] as much time as he may require.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have too long indulged ourselves in false economy in the treatment of the military pay problem. We have broken faith with our service personnel. As our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, just pointed out, we have permitted pay scales to be increased far more in other segments of our economy than to those who have dedicated themselves to the service of our country. Quite apart from keeping faith with our people in uniform, however, the cold economic facts show that this failure to provide fair and equitable compensation is a gross practice of false economy.

Using the Air Force training costs as an example, the investment in training costs for an Air Force pilot is \$96,000. It costs some \$268,000 to train an F-1 pilot and \$600,000 to train an F-105 pilot and more than \$1 million to train a B-52 commander. The total investment cost of training just one electronics specialist is \$23,000, one ballistic missiles launch officer \$49,140.

The services in this complex missile-space age have an ever increasing requirement for officers trained in science and engineering. Likewise, the greatest requirement for enlisted personnel is in the technical fields.

It is in these very fields that the costs of training are the highest.

The Air Force alone spends \$1,207 million to train replacements for the skilled men who leave.

Confronted with these figures, it takes no great venture in mathematics to prove that the failure to provide adequate compensation is false economy.

The existing military pay scale, in addition to creating problems in numbers of personnel, encourages mediocrity in quality. To use the Air Force as an example again, the inability to recruit adequate scientific and engineering officer personnel has led that service to reduce its standards. In 1959, 47 percent of the total officers entering the Air Force from ROTC were in the scientific and engineering category. By 1964, this percentage was reduced to 33. There has been a corresponding drop in the quality of officer candidates for the Air Force ROTC. In 1957, the average percentile score for entrance into the program was 63, but by 1962 this average had been reduced to 52.

Taking into account these staggering costs, we can readily see how foolhardy it is to maintain a pay scale that will neither attract nor retain skilled manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the enactment of H.R. 9075 will enable the services to compete in the marketplace for qualified personnel. Comparing the costs of this pay bill with the staggering costs of training replacement personnel, the passage of H.R. 9075 is just plain economic commonsense.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my words of commendation to those expressed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in applauding the actions and performance of the chairman of our great Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Truer words were never spoken than those of the gentleman from Louisiana. In the short period since January, our chairman has demonstrated very clearly his ability to lead this great Armed Services Committee and do the kind of a job that we independently think should be done in the interest of our national security.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] the ranking member of our committee, has likewise made a great contribution in behalf of our committee and I applaud both of them for the actions they have taken and the leadership displayed.

As I stand here I note with interest that a former Member of Congress is in our midst, who at one time was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Dewey Short, of Missouri. Dewey Short did a splendid job as chairman of our committee when he was with us. I wish, Mr. Chairman, there was some way we could permit the gentleman from Missouri to now speak for 10 minutes so that he might in his own way emphasize to the House his support and loyalty to the Armed Services of our country. His presence here indicates his continuing interest to that end.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask all my colleagues, in preparing to vote on this most vital piece of legislation, to keep their eyes on the doughnut and not the hole. There has been emphasis here, naturally enough, on the disagreement with the executive branch and the dollar differences.

But let us keep in mind the agreements. And let us keep in mind where the differences lie.

Everyone agrees a military pay raise is needed. The committee agrees to that, the pay panel agrees to that, the Defense Department agrees to that—an even our prodigal son, the gentleman from New York, who filed a minority report agrees to that.

Everyone agrees that there should be an attempt at comparability of military pay with pay of civil servants and pay in private industry.

Everyone agrees there should be a variable reenlistment bonus to spur retention of enlisted men in critical skills.

Everyone agrees there should be an annual pay review to assure that the military does not again fall seriously behind other groups.

Everyone agrees that the pay of draftees, of enlisted men with less than 2 years service, should be raised for the first time in 13 years. And the prodigal son from New York is with the committee all the way on that one.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement that there should be a pay bill. The question is: How much?

Now, where do the differences lie?

The administration feels that following annual review it should have author-

ity to increase salaries automatically, subject to a 60-day veto period for Congress. The committee feels that the responsibility of deciding whether or not there will be a pay raise lies with the Congress and in all cases requires legislation. I do not think this House is going to have much difficulty deciding its constitutional responsibilities on this point.

The committee believes there should be a decent raise for men with less than 2 years service who have not had a pay increase since 1952. The administration proposed only a 2.7 percent increase for them. The difference in cost is approximately \$150 million. Let me just point out two facts about the Department of Defense position on this point: In 1963, Defense recommended pay increases ranging from 9 to 30.8 percent for men with less than 2 years service. No increases were approved by Congress. There were no increases for enlisted men with less than 2 years service in 1964. But this year, the Defense Department came back and recommended only 2.7 percent for the under 2-year men. Secretary McNamara frankly told the committee that the 2.7 percent represents the increase in cost of living since 1963. They just forgot the cost of living increase from 1952 to 1965.

Where is the rest of the difference? You have probably heard it mentioned already that 88 percent of the difference is in the pay of enlisted personnel. Let us look more closely.

For officers with more than 2 years service, the difference between the administration proposal and the bill reported by the committee is only \$31 million.

For enlisted men with over 2 years service, the career enlisted men, the difference is \$374 million. This is where the big difference lies—in the pay of the career enlisted ranks.

Leaving out the top two enlisted grades, E-9 and E-8, which account for only about \$11 million of the difference, the enlisted pay raises range from about \$15 to \$57 a month under the committee bill for the bulk of career men, from \$5 to \$18 a month under the administration proposal.

Your committee found that the President's Pay Panel based its low pay raise proposal for this group of career enlisted men on the erroneous assumption that there is no retention problem in the enlisted ranks. We found a serious retention problem, attested to by the leaders of all services, attested to by Defense's own request for special reenlistment bonuses.

Your committee found the President's Panel based its recommendations on the erroneous assumption that pay legislation in 1963 brought these men up to comparability with civil servants. The panel took no cognizance of how military pay had fallen behind since 1952.

Military pay stood still from 1958 to late 1963, while civil servants received raises in 1960, 1962, and at the beginning of 1964.

Mr. Chairman, it comes down to a simple question. Is this House going to turn its back on the career enlisted man?

I do not think it will.

When the vote comes tomorrow, I hope the bill will pass unanimously, but if not unanimous—then almost so. This is indeed a good, objective legislative proposal.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the President's Pay Panel report states that "in recent years the armed services have met with increasing success in attracting and retaining high quality military personnel." I am certain that every person in this Chamber wishes that were true. I am equally certain that the facts are almost directly opposite. Time after time discussions with high ranking witnesses on the military appropriations bill told of the serious retention problems which are now being experienced. Secretary McNamara, Secretary Zuckert, Secretary Nitze, Secretary Ailes, all told of the increasing difficulties of the services in keeping the type of trained personnel who are needed. In an effort to encourage enlistments, there has been a lowering of voluntary enlistment standards—something which always is done with reluctance.

The present turnover in personnel is much higher than that in any private business. This is clearly an indication that military careers are not as attractive as they should be. As a result, the Government is paying out \$3.5 billion a year in costs of procuring and retraining replacements, largely for those who drop out of the military services. I think it obvious that retention of trained persons is the No. 1 problem throughout the Department of Defense. If the bill now before the House should reduce by one-third the cost of securing and training new personnel, the Government would have to make a profit on the pay raise which is proposed.

There is another side to this question which disturbs me very much. For a long time we have been concerned with competition by industry for military personnel. There is now a new problem—that of competition for personnel by the economic opportunity program—the poverty program. There are cases where it is more advantageous financially to join the poverty program than it is to join the military services, and, in addition, it is safer and less exacting. For them, there are no Vietcong bullets. To join the military a man must meet basic requirements of mental and physical competence that the average Job Corps enrollee would fail. But, if the Job Corps enrollee uses his training as a way to qualify for enlistment, he will have to take a pay cut to join the military service.

This is not a matter to be taken lightly. We cannot afford a decline in armed services enlistment. Yet enlistments are down. And now there is competition at both ends of the line for the men who are needed in uniform. A sense of high value is imperative in the training of our youth. We are not encouraging this sense of values when we place a premium on non-achievement.

Even unemployment compensation in some States pays more than military

service. Unemployment compensation in New York State pays an unemployed person \$50 per week for no productive work, and it is tax free. This totals \$216 per month for no hours of work. A Polaris submarine 3d class petty officer, with submarine pay, base pay, and all allowances, working 70 to 80 hours a week at sea—on station for America—earns \$192.10 per month and pays taxes as well.

The director of the laboratories in the New York Naval Shipyard is a captain earning less than \$12,000 per year. His civilian assistant, a GS-16 earns \$24,175 per year. The captain also has 150 other civilian employees who earn more than he does. Something is wrong.

There is still another side. American servicemen are exposed to mounting dangers all over the world. There is for America a new responsibility for carrying forward the torch of freedom. No longer do the British, the French, the Dutch, or other world powers bear the brunt of conflict when fighting is required. The American serviceman is the one who must stand guard over freedom's portals and the casualty lists are mounting. This is only the beginning.

How do you pay a man for this? What kind of value do you place on the life of a man in uniform? Can you compensate him for the dangers he must incur for you and for America? Do you really think for a moment you are compensating him properly even in those instances when he is only required to stand ready to incur the risks of war? No one can say what tomorrow may bring. Isn't it time that we make his life and that of his family a little better and a little happier? Now—while there is time.

Approval of the Rivers bill—it is the same bill that I and many others have introduced—with an immediate effective date, will be a long step forward in improving the attractiveness of career military service. The Nation owes a big debt of gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, for his courageous and worthy fight for America's servicemen. He is helping to reestablish also the image of a strong and respected Congress.

I congratulate him and I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader of the committee, who also has done outstanding work. I congratulate the Committee on Armed Services that so ably and effectively backs their work for a stronger defense—for a stronger America and for a stronger free world.

Please remember, my colleagues, the military man has no lobby to speak for him. He has to wait and hope that injustice and inequities will be eliminated or eased. Here is our chance to place a new premium on the picture of career military service. Here today is a way to reward those who are safeguarding the safety of our Nation in these times of continuing peril.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentleman of the House, at the very outset I want to state I consider

it a distinct privilege and honor to serve on the committee that is led and chair-maned by so distinguished a gentleman as the gentleman from South Carolina. I am most proud and happy to serve on the committee with him. When the Nation's history is written it will be written that the gentleman from South Carolina is without a doubt the greatest chairman that the GI's have ever had in the history of the Congress of the United States.

Let us consider the income level set by the authorities in our Government as income needed to support a family of four so as not to be classified as a poverty level. That is \$3,000. Using that as a standard of income, I believe it is a tragedy when we pause to reflect that nearly one-third of the members of our Armed Forces are living in a state of poverty. We have a condition in this country under which one-third of the members of our Armed Forces are forced to moonlight—that is, to hold a second or even a third or even a fourth job—in order to support their families, or they must send their wives out to work so that they can pay their bills while in the Armed Forces trying to defend our country, or they must sponge or borrow or get money in some other manner from parents, sisters, brothers, or in-laws in order to remain in service so that they can serve their country, merely to pay their bills.

When a condition such as that prevails I believe it is high time for the Congress of the United States to pause and reflect on the condition.

Our great martyred President, in his inaugural address, stated:

Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask instead what you can do for your country.

I should like to elaborate a little more fully on this and to give you more specific details on the point brought out by the gentleman from Florida. There is a condition prevailing in this country under which those who are doing something for their country—doing the supreme, offering their lives—are paid less than those who are letting the country do something for them. I refer to the condition which exists in regard to our poverty program.

When the Defense Department authorities appeared before our committee I brought out the point that a dropout or a juvenile delinquent can actually get more pay from the Government than a member of the Armed Forces who is drafted into the service. The members of the Defense Department denied those figures. They said, "That is not true."

I should like to document those figures and put them in the RECORD, to show this is actually true and that a juvenile delinquent or a dropout who joins the Job Corps receives more.

I know of a case of two brothers. One was a valedictorian of his class. He is now in the Armed Forces. His brother, who was 1 year younger, was a juvenile delinquent who beat up his mother, beat up his teacher, and even tried to beat up the sheriff. That juvenile delinquent in the Job Corps today is getting more money than his brother who was drafted into the Armed Forces.

When a condition like that prevails I believe the Congress of the United States ought to do something about it. This bill proposes to do something about it.

I should like to answer the material which was put into the Record, whereby the Defense Department authorities stated it was not true that the juvenile delinquents are getting more money than the enlisted people in our Armed Forces, particularly those with 1 year of service.

I should like to clarify this once and for all and to put this into the Record, so that Members may examine it.

During the course of committee hearings on the proposed pay increase for military personnel, a great deal of discussion was had concerning the comparative pays of enrollees in the Job Corps as contrasted to that provided recruits in the military departments.

Defense Department witnesses, in response to a question concerning this comparison, included in the record on pages 2567-8 a comparative breakdown on compensation paid these personnel. On the basis of the comparison presented by the Secretary of Defense one might well receive the impression that entrants into military service do, in fact, receive greater compensation than that provided Job Corps enrollees.

Unfortunately, when one inspects these figures with a critical eye, it is evident that this is not the case.

Let us examine the first comparative table used by Defense Department witnesses on page 2567. Here we find that in the first 12 months a typical soldier will receive a total annual compensation of \$1,875.40, whereas a typical enrollee for the same period will receive \$1,871.78. Now the first basic error in this comparison is that in the case of the typical soldier the Department has moved him from pay grade E-1 to pay grades E-2 and E-3 within the 12-month period. However, for some strange reason the Department has failed to move the typical enrollee beyond his original classification as an enrollee. Now, if we are speaking of a typical enrollee, as we are a typical soldier, certainly we expect him to receive the additional increase in compensation which is available to him after 3 months of training, \$10 a month, and 2 months later another additional increase of \$10 a month—20 percent of Job Corps enrollees eligible for promotion to assistant leader after 3 months and 10 percent eligible for promotion to leader after a total of 5 months. Unfortunately the comparison does not reflect these increases for the typical enrollee.

Another important deficiency in the comparison provided the committee by the Defense Department is the failure to include, except as a footnote, the supplementary payment of \$25 a month that is provided Job Corpsmen. This amounts to \$300 a year, which will thus raise the annual compensation of a typical Job Corps enrollee to \$2,171.78. Thus, this omission alone results in a \$300 short-fall in the pay of a typical soldier as compared to a typical enrollee—60 percent executive allotment.

It is also interesting to note that the Defense Department charges every typical soldier with an annual retirement

accrual cost of \$53.69, whereas no similar charge for retirement or disability benefits is provided for the Job Corpsman. However, section 106(c)(1) of Public Law 88-452 specifically provides that Job Corps enrollees will be covered for disability and death compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees Compensation Act at an assumed pay of \$150 monthly. Now, since the Defense Department is so anxious to identify every cost for a typical soldier, I would imagine that he would be similarly interested in identifying the comparable cost for a Job Corps enrollee. Again, unfortunately, the computer overlooked this part of a Job Corps enrollee's compensation.

It is inconceivable to me that today a young recruit who meets the high standards of the armed services will receive less pay than that provided a dropout recruited by the Job Corps. To use the terms of the late President Kennedy, we are paying less to the one who is doing something for his country than to the one who is letting his country do something for him.

The bill before you today, H.R. 9075, will provide a substantial increase in compensation to the recruit entering the military. On the basis of the advancement of a typical recruit in the military as indicated by the Department of Defense, the annual dollar increase in pay for the typical soldier under H.R. 9075 will be \$260.52. Thus, after enactment of the bill, a typical soldier will, in the first 12 months, receive compensation amounting to \$2,135.92 rather than the \$1,875.40 presently payable to him.

I urge your support of this bill.
Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, support H.R. 9075. The Committee on Armed Services has worked hard. It has come up with a fair and equitable bill and I think the House can approve it without change and with good conscience.

I would like particularly to emphasize one aspect of this bill which has not received much attention. That is simply the fact that members of the Reserve and the National Guard share on an equal basis in the benefits of this bill. Military reserve pay, both for active duty training and for weekly drills, is based on present active duty rates. This will continue to be so under H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult for the Congress to get across to the Secretary of Defense that we want fair and equitable treatment for our military reservists. In its proposed pay bill of 1963, the Defense Department excluded reservists and national guardsmen from the raise. The Armed Service Committee and, subsequently, the Congress revised the bill so that reservists were included as they had always been in the past. The Congress made clear it supports the principle of basing reserve pay on the latest active duty rates.

In 1964, when the Defense Department submitted its 2½-percent military pay raise bill, it excluded reservists. The Congress again rejected that approach

and included reservists in the bill. But again this year in submitting the pay proposals, the Defense Department tried once more to exclude reservists. Our distinguished chairman, in his colorful way, said during our hearings that "there is no education in the second kick from a mule."

It would appear that for the Department of Defense there is no education at all on principles laid down by the Congress.

The members of the Reserve components have been buffeted around quite a bit by the present leadership of the Pentagon. They seem to have an almost fierce passion for reorganizing, reducing, and underpaying reservists. The cost savings that would be affected by leaving Reserve drill pay out of the pay bill would be miniscule.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no way to more effectively damage the readiness of our Reserve units than to tell them that they are not important enough to share in the latest pay increases. I know of no quicker way to create second-class status for the reservists than to tell them they are second class and pay them second-class rates.

Just recently, a distinguished Senator of high rank on the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees urged the Secretary of Defense to make an immediate review of the Defense budget to see if significant additions are not required—the Senator suggested that the Defense Secretary request a supplemental appropriation of some \$1 billion—because of our additional worldwide commitments, notably in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. Who of us can say what our military requirements will be a year from now if the world situation moves closer toward that black future which some predict? Who of us can say that within that year we may not have to call some of our Reserve units back to active duty again? In such a world, many of us believe it is foolhardy to greatly reduce the size of our Reserve, as the Defense Department planned to do. I hope all of us will agree that it would be doubly foolhardy to reduce the pay, and therefore the morale and readiness, of the remaining Reserve units we do have. Let us make it crystal clear to the Department of Defense that the Congress wants to continue the historic practice of basing Reserve pay on present active duty pay scales.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee are now considering the proposed pay increases for our Federal civil service employees, as recommended to us by the President, based on the report of his Panel on Federal Pay. I am not knowledgeable as to the details of the current deliberations by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. However, I do know that the members of the committee will do their usual thorough and comprehensive job. The President has initiated a strong program to insure that our Federal civil service is an attractive

and rewarding career which will draw topflight people. I give my full support to this program of the President. I am sure that the Congress will support, as a minimum, the civilian pay increases currently recommended by the President. The Congress has done so frequently in the past 20 years.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, we have not been quite as munificent with our military personnel as we have with our Federal civil service. The administration maintains that its proposed civilian and military pay increases which we are now considering will continue an already achieved comparability between the two and with the civilian economy. The detailed hearings recently concluded by our Armed Services Committee have proved that this is just not so. Our own actuarial studies support this conclusion.

Notwithstanding the claims of the administration, compensation for our military personnel has fallen behind that of our Federal civilians, and markedly behind that of their contemporaries throughout the American business and industrial community. If the Congress approves the civilian and military compensation levels now proposed by the committee, we will be going a long way toward eliminating the now existing disparity between military and civilian compensation.

I believe that the military pay scales recommended by our committee are the very minimum required to put our military personnel of all grades and ranks on a par with their civilian contemporaries. I also believe that, through our own fault, we have allowed this disparity to develop and to be maintained. We have therefore incorporated provisions into our bill which will prevent such an unfortunate situation in the future. The requirement for annual study and recommended adjustments, and for quadrennial comprehensive review and recommendations by the administration, will restore military compensation to the place it rightfully deserves.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in recommending unanimous approval of this legislation without amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, according to the Bible, it is reported that there is more rejoicing in Heaven for one sheep who is lost and is found again than for the 90 and 9 who never strayed from the fold in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this admonition applies as well to the distinguished Committee on the Armed Services, but I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to advise the Members of the House that as the one member of the committee who voted against reporting this legislation from the committee to the House, I rise now to indicate my intention to vote for this measure and to support it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to lead in the rejoicing of the return of this sheep back into the fold.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Hallelujah.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my friend from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, Members are aware of the fact that at the time the vote was taken in the committee I drafted certain minority views and circulated these views to the membership of the House. Those views are also contained at the present time in the committee report on page 63.

Mr. Chairman, because these views are set forth in some detail and because they have already been circulated, I do not believe there is any particular point in reiterating them at this time, except to emphasize, first of all, the point that I made in those views; namely, that as a member of the committee and as one who has spent some time in the armed services myself, I am not opposed and was not opposed to a pay increase. The only question that seemed to be before our committee and before the House of Representatives this year was simply the question as to what kind of a pay increase we were going to give and how much that increase would be.

Mr. Chairman, very frankly I felt that the alternative offered by the President was a better approach, that it was fairer in the long run to the members of the services and fairer to the taxpayer as well. Therefore, I cast the lone vote against the committee bill simply because I felt if the administration itself and the leadership of the House desired to have an opportunity to fight for the President's position, they should have that opportunity. I felt that the President's proposal deserved to be fairly and fully considered by the House. But I said very clearly then that if the decision was made not to make that fight, then because I was after all in favor of an increase, I intended to support the Rivers bill, H.R. 9075.

That, of course, is the situation that has now developed. There is no intention on the part of the leadership, I am informed, to fight for the administration alternative. The intention instead will be to have the bill go over to the other body. Presumably there will be some adjustment in the resulting conference that will bring the final measure somewhat closer to the President's position, and I think it is entirely likely to predict that there will be an increase of 7 or 8 percent in military pay. That figure would be fair to our people, and it would be a compromise between the committee and the President. It is also a figure I would gladly support. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I will support the bill and intend to make no effort to amend it or defeat it.

There are two other reasons for my action I might indicate. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] indicated one of them a moment ago. The first reason is that with the stepped-up fighting in Vietnam, the increase in draft calls and the possibility of a callup of our Reserves, I think it

would be somewhat unseemly at this time to quibble over the pay of our armed services.

The second point is, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, there are increasing indications that some kind of a compromise is being worked out in the field of pay for civil service and postal employees, so that this year their pay would be increased about 5 percent with a further commitment for one or two additional increases in subsequent years.

One of the points which the committee made, and one on which I have always been in agreement, is that there is a lag between military pay and civil service pay. Certainly it would be unfair to support an increase in military pay which would be exactly the same as that now being proposed for civil service personnel. Therefore, if the civil service pay is going to go up by 5 percent, we certainly ought to support a still larger boost for the military, because of this past lag.

I am still somewhat unhappy about the way in which we handle various pay bills here in Congress, both in the military and the civilian fields. Our experience this year has well demonstrated the need for us to put pay on a regular, predictable, and rational basis, so that we can move in a scientific fashion from year to year to provide those regular increases that may be necessary to keep Government pay in line with civilian pay on the outside.

The committee has incorporated into H.R. 9075 a number of features recommended by the President that would move us in this direction. In adopting this legislation today I hope these features will help us move more quickly toward the day when pay matters can be handled on this regular, predictable, and rational basis, so that the members of the armed services, and for that matter the civilian employees of the Government too will not have to live on a feast or famine basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by paying tribute to the chairman of our committee for his fairness and courtesy in having had to bear over these past months with one lost sheep in the herd. He has given me every opportunity to express my views and to make my position known to the committee though my position was diverged from his. I respect his courtesy and his fairness. I do not think he has ever had any doubt, and certainly I never had any doubt, that when it comes to the basic issue behind this bill, namely, the desire to build a strong, effective and successful military force in this country, we are all united together.

I feel sure that this bill will contribute toward this objective, and for this reason I intend to support it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his change of point of view and his decision to support this legislation. Neither I nor any member of the committee has ever questioned the high motives of the gentleman. No-

body ever accused him of doing anything but having arrived at his own convictions and conclusions in a most laudatory and commendable manner. I thank him for his statement. I want to say to him neither I nor any member of the committee has ever had any disagreement with him because he had the temerity to disagree. Surely, I hope he can disagree with me and I do not have to be disagreeable to him. We welcome you aboard and thank you for your statement. I do not regard the gentleman as a lost sheep. I think he is as white as the driven snow and we welcome you home. Now stay with us, for our committee has use for unanimity and we do not feel good when anybody is not with us. We welcome you back. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for his very generous remarks. It has been and continues to be an honor to serve under his leadership.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks made earlier by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] concerning our chairman. Not only is he the champion of servicemen, but it is fortunate for our committee and it is fortunate for the Congress and it is fortunate for the country to have him as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services during these trying times. He is a tireless worker. He is strong in his zeal to build the best possible Defense Establishment. He is strong in his zeal not only to safeguard the prerogatives of the Congress but to see that the Congress properly and effectively carries out its responsibilities to the Nation with respect to our Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, I am really happy and pleased to be working closely with our distinguished chairman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 9075, represents the carefully considered judgment of the committee—taking into full account the views of the administration. It is, we believe, as equitable an adjustment of military pay scales as can be worked out at this time.

In President Johnson's message to the Congress of May 12, 1965, transmitting his proposed pay legislation for Federal civilian employees and uniformed members, he said:

We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States, one standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted; in the long run it costs more.

H.R. 9075 provides a basic pay increase averaging twice that which the President recommended for military personnel, the difference is soundly justified the committee believes—even by the administration's ground rules. The recent history of civil service pay increases re-

flects an average increase of 46 percent since 1952. The two raises in the calendar year 1964, amounted to more than 8 percent.

Perhaps studies now going on may show that wage rates in private employment suggest the present need for additional adjustments in civil service pay rates and retirement benefits, but without regard to this, to even approach comparability, we must enact the bill before us.

Our servicemen have received an average 34-percent increase since 1952. The last pay increase for the military in 1964 was only 2.5 percent of base pay in comparison to over 8 percent granted civil employees that same year. These figures speak for themselves. H.R. 9075 is needed simply to restore comparable pay to the 1964 level.

The President stated that we have not achieved full comparability by the standards adopted by the Congress in 1962 and this is supported in detail in the Folsom Panel report. This is a time when high morale in the military services is most important—and high morale will contribute to higher reenlistment rates and thereby reduce training costs. And you can be sure that morale will get a boost from a pay raise that will put the military personnel on a comparable basis with civilian personnel, the average salary of the classified civil service employee after his 1964 pay raise is \$7,368 annually. The average military salary equivalent, including his food and housing and whatever tax advantage exists, is \$4,477 annually. These figures directly reflect the extent of difference in the buying power between civilian and military personnel. The proposed increase for our serviceman will raise his average annual salary equivalent by \$314 to a total of \$4,791. Certainly no one can consider this an extravagant increase.

I urge your support for H.R. 9075.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, like the other members of the House Committee on Armed Services, I would like to say what a pleasure it is to serve with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] as chairman of this great committee. I feel that I have been exposed to more of the decisionmaking process which produces military policy under his regime than in my entire 13 years as a Member of the Congress. I deeply appreciate this and I am proud that the Committee on Armed Services is fulfilling the legislative function which the Constitution of the United States intends that it should have. And in this age there is great need for a Congress which fulfills its constitutional responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, this is the age of the statistician. The eyes no longer have it. We are not to believe our eyes and the evidence of our senses, but only what the statisticians tell us.

Listening to Secretary McNamara and his minions testifying before our committee on this pay bill, I found myself thinking of the story of Pat, the Irishman, who was hit by a truck. And, as he lay in the road, the doctor came and

examined him and pronounced him dead. Pat opened his eyes and said, "By all the Saints in Ireland I'm not dead." The doctor examined him again and said, "This man is dead." Pat looked at his friend, Mike, and said, "Mike, tell them I'm not dead." And Mike said, "Pat, my boy, lie down, the doctor knows best."

Secretary McNamara presented a string of statistics to prove to enlisted men that they are not underpaid. Of course they all know they are underpaid and, particularly, their wives know they are underpaid. And that is why the well-trained ones are not reenlisting. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but Secretary McNamara cannot fool the good wives of our servicemen with his statistical pyrotechnics.

It has been said that a statistician is a man who determines that if you have one hand in the fire and the other hand in a pitcher of iced water, on the whole you should be reasonably comfortable. Secretary McNamara's statisticians go through the exercise of telling enlisted men that because they are going to get retired pay 20 or more years from now, and because they will get all sorts of benefits if they die, they are therefore reasonably comfortable while they are living right now.

Mr. Chairman, there is a sentence in the report of the Wyatt Co.—the actuaries who analyzed Defense's statistics for our committee—which should be tattooed on the forehead of all the employees on Secretary McNamara's staff.

It reads as follows:

In any case mature judgment need not take a back seat to any arcane actuarial formulas. The appropriateness of the military compensation levels will continue to be measured in the long run by their ability to attract new recruits and retain the best military personnel in service within the framework of any budget limitations on aggregate compensation and any estimated military manpower requirements.

Mr. Chairman, it is remarkable how often the people, some members of the press, and even some Members of the Congress, are overawed by the razzle-dazzle of statistics. It is dismaying how often the newspapers will quote statistics on cost savings and other programs without analyzing them to see if they are valid. The Members of this House do not have to deny the evidence of their senses. The Members of this House know there is a retention problem. The Members of this House know that servicemen are underpaid. You all know enlisted men from your home districts. You all know parents of enlisted men in your home districts. You all know that you and your constituents have always realized that these enlisted men are on the low rung of the economic ladder.

We have had cases in the last 2 years of enlisted families being eligible for relief or surplus food program. We know that a high percentage of enlisted men "moonlight" and that a high percentage of service wives work. We know that the average boys in our district who come home from service soon make a good deal more money than they made in service and rarely show any desire to go back into service. We all know that our

draftees have not had a pay raise since 1952. We all know that we could probably not name another section of the economy that has gone that long without an increase in pay. We all know that both the cost of living and the American standard of living have gone up markedly since 1952. We know from figures presented to our committee that the number of hardship discharges has increased about 25 percent over the last 2 years. We have all been besieged with letters from servicemen about a pay raise. The President's Pay Panel invited opinions from servicemen and got something on the order of 35,000 letters—which in many cases they did not even read. We know the Secretary of the Navy recently put out a special plea asking all officers and enlisted men to extend their periods of active duty. We have had testimony from the military and civilian heads of all departments that they had a retention problem. We have the draft. We found that just a discussion of the possibility of ending the draft seriously hurt recruiting in all services. We have had the frank admission by Defense Department people themselves that the cost of ending the draft would be something on the order of \$5 billion additional every year. We have the Defense Department's request for an additional reenlistment bonus to spur retention.

We know all these things, and yet we have the Secretary of Defense with a lot of statistical razzle-dazzle telling our committee that the average serviceman is not underpaid.

We have all this evidence before our eyes and yet we have the President's Pay Panel telling us there is no retention problem.

They do it all with mirrors. The President's Pay Panel, made up largely of high-level Federal civilian officials who have no responsibility for, or knowledge of, the running of the military departments, attempted to prove there is no retention problem with a set of statistics showing that the mental level of enlisted men and the percentage of high school graduates in enlisted ranks had improved and that the percentage of officers with college degrees had risen. Gen. Omar N. Bradley—who was the only military man to get within earshot of the Pay Panel—and whom, I suspect, knows a good deal more about what the Army needs than the Postmaster General or the Secretary of Labor—demolished the Panel's ridiculous reasoning in one paragraph. He pointed out that the Army had raised the mental standards in 1960—a step necessitated, incidentally, by the increasing complexity of military weapons. The Panel had said that 87 percent of enlisted men were in the top three mental groups during the 1960 to 1964 period, compared with only 78.2 percent in the 1952 to 1959 period. As General Bradley explained, they did not bother to point out that the Army had stopped taking the lowest category mental group in 1960. The Panel said that the percentage of enlisted men who were high school graduates increased from 55 percent in 1956 to 72 percent in 1963. General Bradley pointed out that in the population as a whole between those

years the total of high school graduating classes rose 37 percent. The Panel tried to show improvement in officer quality by stating that the percentage of college graduates in the officer corps rose from 55 percent in 1956 to over 70 percent today. General Bradley merely pointed out that in 1956 there were still many officers who had been called up during World War II or Korea, most of whom have since been replaced by recent college graduates.

The President's Pay Panel made this flat statement:

Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level in relation to civilian pay level sufficient to attract and retain adequate numbers and quality of personnel in the Armed Forces.

They made no effort to support this statement except to present the education figures I have just mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, this is a beautiful example of doublethink. If pay levels are sufficient to attract adequate numbers and quality of personnel, why do we need the draft? Why does the President propose a variable reenlistment bonus which would pay up to four times additional bonus to men with scarce skills? Why does the Defense Department, in urging this special bonus, say "in these skills, additional reenlistment incentives are clearly needed"? Why have requests for hardship discharges increased? Why did the Secretary of the Navy plead with people to extend their enlistments? Why did the heads of all the services submit figures during our committee's annual posture hearings which illustrated their retention problems? War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength, the draft is voluntary. Doublethink all the way. But they did have a pretty set of statistics—and so they believed them.

It has been pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that a Job Corps enrollee gets more pay than a private or seaman recruit in the service. In his testimony before our committee, the Secretary of Defense said no, this was not so. His analysis, and his figures, showed that the serviceman actually got more. And he included a set of statistics to prove it. As usual, of course, the figures included all conceivable benefits, such as death benefits, but that is not point. When Mr. McNamara added up all of his figures, assuming they were justified, what did they show? They showed a total annual income for the military enlistee of \$1,875.40 and a total annual income for the Job Corps lad of \$1,871.78—a difference of \$3.62. Now, what is remarkable is that Mr. McNamara's people felt they had disproved the point and that everything was fine because they had shown statistically that a draftee had a total annual income greater than the Job Corps enrollee. But what had they actually shown? They had shown that the draftee—who was brought into service by compulsion, who may be ordered to Vietnam where he would get shot at, who has to be physically fit, who has to be above the category IV mental group, who may have been otherwise capable of getting himself a well-paying job—this draftee is getting exactly \$3.62 more a year than the Job Corps enrollee who is probably a

high school dropout and is experiencing adjustment problems.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of how thoroughly intelligent men can lose themselves in statistics, and of how a passion for figures can block out a concern for equitable treatment of human beings.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, there is also the question of how valid the figures are. They tell the story of the mountaineer who came down to the village and went to the grocery store to pay his monthly bill. When the grocer read it to him, he said, "That is too much." And the grocer said, "Well, look at the books. Figures do not lie." And the mountaineer said, "Figures do not lie, but liars sure do figure." In making his equation comparing Job Corps enrollees and draftees, the Secretary of Defense left out of the totals the optional allotment that the Job Corps boy can make to his parents. This allotment would add \$300 to the annual cost of the enrollee. About 60 percent of the enrollees make the allotment.

In arriving at his conclusion that enlisted men are paid as much as the average male high school graduate, the Secretary of Defense used the system which takes in all compensation; that is, fringe benefits as well as base pay. For the civilians, they added a flat percentage on to the base pay, using a figure that the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Social Security Administration say are the national average. For the military, the Secretary included the actual cost of all fringe and special benefits of military personnel—in effect taking the total cost and dividing it by the number of people in the service. Is this equitable? Does this statistical approach give a true picture of what the man gets? Well, in the first place, Mr. Chairman, it should be mentioned that out of the total compensation cost figure of \$16 million which is used to get average military income, only \$7.8 billion is basic pay. So, to strike an average all are being credited with pay that only a few get. Proficiency pay, for example, only goes to a small percentage of enlisted men. Not all men get hazardous duty pay or sea pay or hostile-fire pay or family separation allowances. Thus, here is a real question as to whether an average figure has any meaning. Of course, we can understand the Secretary was trying to strike an average and that these were benefits for which men were eligible. And, admittedly, in the civilian economy too the cost of fringe benefits includes some things that are not reflected in actual income, such as cost of insurance. However, the Secretary's list for military men has an unusually large number of items that do not accrue to the average individual. In addition, the use of some items in the equation is very questionable indeed. For example, all men are credited with a small amount of income because of the annual expense of burial costs. Suppose a man is assigned to Vietnam and gets killed. Can you picture an official explaining to a serviceman's widow that his active duty pay was reduced while he was alive, by however a small amount, because of the burial cost or because of the cost of the death gratuity?

ity that the Government pays to his widow after his death in combat?

The most expensive element by far in the supplemental benefits is military retirement. Leaving aside that 90 percent of the men who go through military service never stay until retirement, and leaving aside such considerations as the fact that a man cannot possibly get both retirement and a burial though some reduction is made in his pay, for both, there are fundamental questions as to how to credit retirement in computing the value of a man's pay. The members of our committee, simple folk that we are, made a reduction equivalent to a 6½-percent contribution because we wanted to put the man on par with the civil servant who contributes 6½ percent and we wanted to be fair to the individual. On this point the Secretary of Defense engaged in his most remarkable statistical gyrations. I would hold up his equation for computing retired costs for you, but I'm afraid the Chamber is not wide enough to show it all.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who were raised in happier times, when two and two still equaled four, do not pretend to understand the Secretary's algebraic acrobatics. But it seemed to us the retirement factor that he had arrived at was extraordinarily high. For example, all servicemen suffer a reduction in their active duty pay because of the amounts cranked into the retirement factor to pay for disability retirements. By contrast, disabilities of civil service employees are paid under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, or other workmen's compensation laws, and are not charged to the civil service retirement system.

Secretary McNamara, himself, suggested that if we did not accept his figures we get our own actuary. So, we did. And what did our actuaries find? They found that the Secretary's system was not valid. I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read this report which has the unique distinction of being written in understandable English. Let me read you this one part:

The application of the retirement adjusting factors had the general effect of allocating an aggregate increase in pension cost back to the individual members, present and future, in the form of a uniform discount on their pay increase. There are inequities inherent in this aggregate process that are hard to justify. For example, the individual who retires a month after the pay increase and who thus adds most heavily to the past service pension cost, receives the lower increase in basic pay for the shortest period of time. On the other hand, the new entrant who adds the least in pension cost—and nothing to the increase in past service cost—ends up paying the most by receiving lower basic pay for the longest period of time. At any rate, an obscure factor such as the retirement adjustment factor must not only be better understood, it must be recognized by the individual whose pay it affects as being both necessary and right. As actuaries, we have serious misgivings on both counts.

The report points out that in equating military retirement to civil service retirement the Defense Department adopted a basic hypothesis that is contrary to fact. It assumed that the actuarial liability for past service of civilian

employees is fully funded, although in point of fact the funds actually available in the civil service fund are only enough to pay for benefits of employees already retired. The report then makes this interesting observation on how the Defense Department builds a conclusion on this contrary-to-fact hypothesis:

On this contrary-to-fact basis it then becomes reasonable to require that the increase in past service liability due to an across-the-board pay increase must also be funded in a limited number of years. The general value of conclusions drawn from any such contrary-to-fact hypothesis may be illustrated by consideration of Dingle's query—first posed by the British Astronomer-Philosopher Herbert Dingle—which asks, "What would be the color of an elephant's eggs if an elephant laid eggs?" While, under certain circumstances, such contrary-to-fact hypothesis may result in valuable insights, the conclusions are generally used as a reason for changing the condition contrary to the hypothesis and not as a basis for reasonable action to be taken while that condition remains unchanged.

This quotation merely summarizes what the Secretary of Defense has spent a good deal of time doing, deciding what the color of elephant's eggs would be if elephants could lay eggs.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the case for an inadequate military pay raise either the Secretary of Defense, or his Univac has laid an egg.

Let us not join him. Let us do what we all know in our hearts is right and provide the pay rates for our Armed Forces that are necessary and that are part of our moral responsibility to provide.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his courtesy in yielding me time, and, secondly, to congratulate him and the committee for producing a much better bill than that suggested to them by the administration.

Yet, for all the work of the committee I must in some particulars disagree with it for I think H.R. 9075 is inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, many of us, after last year's pay raise and the pay raise of the year before for the armed services, felt that 1965 should be the year for the dogface, the recruit, the new man. It has turned out to be somewhat less than this.

Mr. Chairman, we here today have heard about poverty levels. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] pointed out how it compared with another program. Indeed, if there are poverty levels, and I believe there are in the armed services, this bill does not extinguish them.

Mr. Chairman, we are also interested in getting rid of moonlighting in the armed services. Must this go on? This is another question, I believe, the bill does not answer.

Mr. Chairman, I do think that the pay review and enlistment bonus features of the committee bill are excellent and ought to be preserved. While

we have heard of the increases in pay for enlisted personnel in terms of percentages, in real dollars, there is something else. We are not talking about a bill which some of us had hoped might be able to ultimately enable the country to do away with the draft. The Members will recall that the Republican nominee for President last fall, and many in the administration, indicated interest in how we might be able in time to phase out the draft system. But let us face the facts. We will be unable to do that so long as the pay at the bottom of the scale is inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, how has the recruit fared since 1946? There have been six pay raises.

On October 1, 1949, he got no increase from the \$75 which he was receiving.

On May 1, 1952, he got a \$3 pay increase.

On April 1, 1955, he got nothing.

On June 1, 1958, he got nothing.

On October 2, 1963, and August 12, 1964, he got nothing.

Mr. Chairman, he does get something in this bill, \$9.90. But if there is to be a bill for the bottom end of the scale of the military service, let us examine how it does with respect to others.

Under the committee bill a lieutenant colonel with 16 years' service receives an increase of \$53.10, an individual who has also been given six increases in pay over a period of time during which the recruit has received \$3.

Let us look at a major general with 26 years of service. Is he given a monthly increase of \$9.90? No. He is given an increase of \$171.60.

So, Mr. Chairman, for whom is the bill designed? In this respect I would like to refer to the committee hearings and to the testimony of Secretary McNamara which appears on page 2535. The Secretary having given a table says:

As you can see from this table, the earnings of the average military officer substantially match or exceed those of the average college graduate, even those in the engineering or scientific professions.

This table indicates that military officers in the period of 3 to 27 years of service have salary aggregates in excess of engineers, natural scientists, and all aggregates at every level.

Notwithstanding this testimony perhaps our officers do need an increase. But if we are to increase them can we honestly say that we should increase our recruits only \$9.90 a month or \$10.30?

Will this take them out of the poverty classification? My answer, Mr. Chairman, is "No."

Mr. Chairman, I do have an amendment which I shall offer which I believe will alleviate this condition somewhat and I will urge its adoption.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of H.R. 9075. The members of the Armed Services Committee were faced with a difficult but crucial choice between two bills. One, introduced by the chairman himself and co-sponsored by a most impressive majority

of the members of the committee, proposed to provide a substantial increase in the basic pay of all uniformed personnel. The other bill emanated from the President's Pay Panel. The latter bill, H.R. 8714, proposed modest adjustments of the basic pay of uniformed personnel with over 2 years' service, similar increases to officers with less than 2 years' service, and barely perceptible increases to enlisted men with less than 2 years' service.

I would like to direct my remarks to what we are proposing to do for our enlisted men, particularly those with less than 2 years of service.

My information is that slightly over 789,000 enlisted men have less than 2 years' service. This group, some of whom are now under fire, and whose grade ranges from private through sergeant, would have received an average increase in pay of \$2.51 a month under the administration's bill. About 48,000 of this group are, in fact, corporals and sergeants, or their equivalent. The average increase contemplated in H.R. 8714 for these corporals was \$3.40 per month and for the sergeants \$3.86 per month. Expressed on an annual basis, the increase would have raised the sergeant's—pay grade E-5—annual salary by slightly over \$46.

What would H.R. 9075 do for these boys with less than 2 years of service? Well, take a look at page 44 of the report and you will note, for example, that under the Rivers bill, the corporal—pay grade E-4—would get an annual increase of \$494—or \$41.20 per month; the sergeant—pay grade E-5—would get an annual raise of \$586—or \$48.86 per month. This is something more than a few packs of chewing gum. This is a raise that can be understood—that has some meaning.

Now, who are these men who make corporal and sergeant during their first 2 years of service? In most cases, of course, they are the more outstanding men, the men with a little something extra on the ball. They are also the men we would most like to keep in service. Of course, we are not going to keep them in service with a raise of less than a dollar a week.

I know it will be pointed out that after 2 years, a man's pay jumps a bit. But how would you like to explain this bill to one of our young soldiers now fighting in Vietnam? Think of being in that one, unique group where pay is so low, where there hasn't been a raise in 13 years and where service is by compulsion. Then think of being told that you are getting a raise of \$3.86.

It is basically unfair. And the more intelligent enlisted man who makes sergeant in his first 2 years is going to know it is unfair and is going to turn sour on the service.

We have to treat men fairly from the beginning if we are to encourage the best type of manhood to choose a career in the military services. The competition for good men is getting harder. Our services must be competitive too, or our services will deteriorate.

Because our servicemen should be compensated on a par with those in what is called the private sector, and because we have neglected our responsibility to

adjust the pay of our servicemen, I support the provision of the bill calling for annual pay reviews and a major structural analysis every 4 years.

I could not, however, support the administration's version of the provision which would have made raises automatic if not vetoed by Congress in 60 days. I will oppose any such proposal, however well intended, which has the effect of diminishing congressional control. The responsibility of the Congress for maintaining the Armed Forces is founded on the Constitution and I am one of those people who does not think we have a right to set aside the Constitution. This is our job. It is up to us to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who joined with our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, in sponsoring this legislation, and I want to commend him for his leadership to provide adequate pay for the servicemen and women of our country. I supported this bill before our special subcommittee went to South Vietnam last month, but after seeing what our boys are up against out there my support is even greater. I wish that every Member of this Congress could have had the opportunity to learn firsthand of the efforts of our soldiers and sailors in this red-hot war. I would like to know how those who feel this bill is too generous with our servicemen would explain their position to the chaps I saw in the hospital in Saigon, or on the beachhead at Chu Lai, or with the Marines at DaNang, or for that matter, any of our some 75,000 chaps who are now committed to the protection of our interests in that troubled area of the world where war is so real.

While none of us may like it, it is our responsibility to request some of the prime years of the lives of our boys of service age, but it is also our responsibility to see that these young men are treated fairly. This H.R. 9075 would do. I urge that you support this legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today a matter of vital concern to the security of this Nation. While the loyalty of our servicemen is not dependent upon a pay raise, the economy and efficiency of our fighting forces will be best promoted by the retention in the service of trained personnel. Further, the morale of the career man will be lifted if he is assured that he will be compensated in a manner comparable to other employment.

This is an age of advanced weaponry. Long periods of study, plus on-the-job training, are required before our troops can properly service and use the complicated machines and systems upon which our defense is built. If we are to lose these technicians to industry as soon as we train them, then the service will remain a training school never acquiring the level of competency which is required. Even a brief tour of any military installation will demonstrate the significance of this statement. The loss of these skilled persons has plagued each of the services for a long time. Everyone acquainted with the situation admits the

seriousness of the problem and the necessity for prompt corrective action.

The Armed Services Committee feels a great responsibility to the servicemen and to the Nation. The measure passed in 1964 did not reflect our best judgment as to the action required. It was merely a gesture of recognition, a stop-gap effort. Now we are committed to doing the job right. We are ashamed that men in uniform are expected to give their all, if necessary, while being compensated close to so-called poverty levels. We are determined to do something about it and to do it now.

The bill which you are asked to support will cost \$996 million. The administration proposal was less than half that sum. Why the larger amount? Certainly most of my colleagues on the committee have not established any records as spenders. The reason that they were so nearly unanimous in the reporting of H.R. 9075 is because they honestly feel that halfway measures will not suffice particularly as to the pay of enlisted personnel. Therefore, sound economy requires us to deal adequately with the problem without further delay. Our fighting forces will be more efficient at a lower cost if we can retain a substantially higher percentage of men in uniform beyond their period of obligated service. We believe this bill will move decisively in this direction.

Our committee, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman the gentleman from South Carolina, studied the problem with great objectivity and determination. It concluded that the President's Pay Panel had not properly evaluated all aspects of military compensation. It submitted the analysis of the Secretary of Defense to an independent actuarial firm and received advice that the Secretary had greatly overvalued one key element of military compensation, namely, retirement provisions. Since the Pay Panel had used the Secretary's figures without adjustment, it inevitably understated the amount of raise needed to bring military men to a scale of comparability.

Our chairman has presented a most forceful and detailed explanation of H.R. 9075. His dedicated determination to correctly solve this problem has been an inspiration to the entire committee. We sense that world conditions make this decision more than academic. It is vital and urgent. The peace, and indeed the safety, of the free world may well depend upon the morale and competency of our men in uniform. Yes, at this very hour they are being tested in distant lands. We are counting on them not to fail us. We will not fail them.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support this measure. Your action today can encourage career acceptance of the service. Men who are devoted to their work and to their country will feel that their service will not deprive their families of acceptable standards of living. In other words, although we rely upon the loyalty and patriotism of our servicemen, we will not exact a penalty for that attitude. If anything, it should be rewarded. Yet, this bill does not go that

far. It is not special treatment but it is an effort to provide fair treatment. I hope this House overwhelmingly will approve and likewise the other body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for this opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 9075, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, the morale and the quality of our military forces may be the principal reason for the importance of this measure we are considering today. However, my reason for rising today to add my comments to this debate in support of this bill, is to place emphasis upon the families and children of our servicemen for whom this pay increase will be of immense help.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Hawaii has long been privileged to have large numbers of men from the various branches of our military organization stationed within our shores. With these men have come their wives and their children. We in Hawaii have had the opportunity to see firsthand some of the difficult conditions under which these families often must live. We know of the problem of servicemen having to moonlight. We know of the problem of some of our enlisted personnel having to receive public assistance help; and many whose children qualify under programs sponsored for the poor under the Economic Opportunity Act. I know of so many personally who are having a difficult time making ends meet. I believe that these families deserve a break and that is why I am supporting this bill.

I have received scores of letters from individuals, some telling me of their personal hardship, and all urging me to speak on their behalf. Five military wives organizations in Hawaii, the Schofield Barracks NCO Wives Club, the Hui O Na Wahine Officers' Wives Club, the Submarine Officers' Wives Club, the Navy Wives Club Aloha Chapter No. 28, and the NCO Wives Club at Hickam Air Force Base have all written urging that I speak on their behalf, in support of this measure.

Hawaii's deep concern for the welfare of the military families presently in Hawaii is reflected in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 55 of the third State legislature which was adopted on April 6 of this year by the State senate and on April 24 by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii. This resolution strongly supports the pay increases recommended in this bill and urges its passage.

I believe that we have a great responsibility to our service personnel and his dependents. Statistics presented to the Armed Services Committee indicate clearly that a career in the Armed Forces today is a married man's career. Therefore, when we vote for this bill today, we are not only voting for an adequate standard of living for the 2.6 million men in the Armed Forces, but we are also voting for the improvement in the lives of more than 4 million dependents as well.

In the last decade the number of dependents for each military man has almost doubled, according to Defense Department figures. In 1954 we had 3,127,366 persons on active duty and they had a total of 2,591,777 dependents. Today, we have 2,645,964 persons on active duty, and they have 4,009,487 dependents. While our active duty force has dropped by a half million, our number of dependents has increased by about a million and a half.

The population explosion has affected our military families as it has affected the general population, and these families need this increased pay to maintain an adequate, decent standard of living. Devotion and dedication to the service and defense of our country should not have to include their sacrifice of the well-being of their families but rather insure their ability backed by the resources of this Nation to maintain a decent life for their loved ones. Just as we are working to improve the welfare of all families across America, I believe that we must give full consideration to the special needs and difficulties of the military families. This indeed is our obligation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965, H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the earliest of times, man has been rewarded according to his effort and responsibility. Today, throughout the free world, American men and women in uniform are protecting our freedom. Yet, despite their effort and responsibility, these servicemen are receiving salaries that make them second-class citizens here at home.

For example, a young American who enters the service and accepts the hardships and risks of military life receives only \$78 a month in salary. However, at the same time, another young American joins the Job Corps here at home where he receives the same lodging, clothing, food, and medical care plus a total monthly salary of \$105.

It seems slightly ridiculous that many defenders of our country are receiving 25 percent less than a Job Corps trainee. Either the Job Corps trainees are overpaid or our servicemen are grossly underpaid.

The fact of the matter is that the pay scale for servicemen with less than 2 years of service has not been increased in 13 years. Can you think of any other field of employment in the United States today that has not received a pay increase in 13 years? This bill before us now will provide the greatest percentage increase in salary to servicemen with less than 2 years of active duty.

If one looks at this proposed military pay increase realistically, he is forced to the conclusion that the proposed increase is actually an economy measure. Presently, because of the low military pay, the vast majority of highly skilled men leave the service at the earliest opportunity resulting in a constant turnover in military personnel.

Each year we are, in a sense, wasting more than \$3 billion spent training

draftees and first enlistment men who leave after serving only the minimum term of duty. One of the basic reasons for this mass exodus from the military is the poor pay scale. Men filled with pride and patriotism for their country leave the service because more money, shorter hours, and a higher standard of living is easily found in civilian life.

We cannot pay the men and women of our Armed Forces salaries that make them second-class citizens and expect to attract either the best that our country has to offer or retain those who have been trained at great expense. We must pay on a scale that induces young men to enter the armed services. We must pay on a scale that encourages men to remain in the military and to regard it as a profession so that the cost of their training will not be lost and their skills will be available to promote the security of the United States.

The military pay bill that I am supporting today will put our servicemen on a level more nearly comparable to civil service employees in the United States and thus make a military career more attractive to the youth of America. It is a significant step toward a volunteer Army and the end of the draft.

If Congress fails to support this necessary adjustment in military compensation, it could be interpreted by America's fighting men as evidence of public indifference to the future of our national security. I urge wholehearted bipartisan support of this important legislation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this military pay legislation and a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want to emphasize the importance of passing H.R. 9075 as reported by our committee.

In Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic and throughout the world, American troops are on active duty. Our defenses must be commensurate with this increased responsibility. The men in the armed services are willing to sacrifice their lives and family for their country. This pay bill will bring them a portion of the improved standard of living that our civilian work force now enjoys but which they have been denied. We must assure them treatment as first-class citizens.

Today there are more than a million members of the Armed Forces who fall within President Johnson's poverty category with annual incomes of less than \$3,000—including their allowance for food, clothing, and shelter. The military has not been appraised of or affected by the Great Society's war on poverty. A young man is paid more for joining the Job Corps than he is for enlisting in the Armed Forces, without the risks and hardships that accompany his military tenure.

President Johnson has said that he wants "our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect." But he has failed by his actions to give meaning to his words. This pay bill fulfills the President's unkept promise. It gives the military a base pay it does not have to be ashamed of.

The bill reported by the Armed Services Committee provides a 10.7 percent increase in basic pay for all uniformed servicemen. The \$825 million annual cost will benefit 2,723,000 personnel on full-time active duty. The increase in pay for enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service ranges from 13 to 33 percent, or an average of \$16 a month. For enlisted men with over 2 years of service, the average increase would be 11.2 percent, or \$28 a month. Officers with under 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 22 percent, or \$55 a month. And officers with over 2 years of service would receive an average increase of 6.4 percent, or \$42 a month.

Defeat of this bill would deflate the military's morale. No paltry substitute measure will halt the widespread moonlighting by Armed Forces personnel. If we are to end the low retention rates that forced the Secretary of the Navy recently to request all active duty Navy personnel to extend their service for 3 to 6 months to allow our fleets to meet their readiness requirements, we must pass a bill that grants a substantial military pay increase.

I am especially pleased that this pay bill includes a sizable increase for the 844,000 enlisted men with less than 2 years service. In 1949 recruits received food, shelter, and clothing, plus \$75 a month. Today they receive \$3 more a month. Every other Federal payee, military and civilian, has had between four and six raises since 1952. Enlisted men with less than 2 years service have received nothing. Military pay has increased an average of 39 percent, civil service pay, 51 percent, factory workers, 44 percent, and truckdrivers, 70 percent. There is no reason that the current recruit should be in a worse comparative position than his counterpart of 13 years ago. His increase in this bill is deserved and long overdue.

Last year the Armed Services Committee voted to table my motion by a vote of 21 to 9 to include draftees and enlistees with less than 2 years of service in the 1964 military pay bill. And the President and Department of Defense still oppose anything more than a token increase.

The future of this country could well depend on the morale and quality of its fighting men. We cannot tolerate the administration's archaic and ill-conceived notion that enlisted men with less than 2 years service are trainees and should receive apprentices' pay reminiscent of the medieval guilds. With industry and the Armed Forces in competition for the Nation's manpower and brainpower, we must provide incentives from the period of first indoctrination through retirement to attract good men to the services.

I am grateful, however, to the chairman of this year's Armed Services Committee. Last year the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] gave me a commitment that any new pay bill would include an increase for the enlisted man with less than 2 years service. That this bill contains the necessary increase is

testimony to the support I received from Mr. RIVERS.

There is no doubt that some military pay raise is warranted. Both the Department of Defense and the House Armed Services Committee agree on the need for an increase. The issue is merely how big that increase should be.

The President's Panel on Military Pay and the Department of Defense advocate a 2.7 percent increase for personnel with less than 2 years service and a 4.8 percent increase for personnel with service for more than 2 years.

Secretary of Defense McNamara testified for the administration before the Armed Services Committee that the proposed increase was so meager in order to save the taxpayer money. The administration's contention is a conspicuous example of penny wise, pound foolish shortsightedness. The plan to deprive the military of its fair share of the Nation's prosperity will ultimately cost us more than the equitable pay increase this bill provides. No one benefits from paying the military as little as possible. And no one loses more than America. We cannot afford to sap the military of its morale and efficiency. We must assure it the ability to attract and retain the best personnel it can find.

Lengthy committee hearings have convinced me that the military man's preference is for an increase in basic pay—not for discretionary and selective increases that he has no assurance of receiving. He knows that the shortfall in military to civilian pay for the period 1952-64 is about 12.4 percent, and he wants a return to the parity he had with the Federal civilian employee of 13 years ago. He wants and deserves equality now. This military pay increase will provide that equality.

Passage of this bill will not only benefit the military but also the taxpayer. Implementing this bill will cost \$825 million a year. Pay and maintenance of our 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces is about \$15 billion a year. The cost of training one Air Force radar electronic specialist is \$23,000; a ballistic missile launch officer, \$49,140. Presently, in the Air Force alone, between 60 and 70 percent of all skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year enlistment. And 54 percent of the officers leave as soon as they can.

The pay raise will help retain trained personnel. And if, by retaining more experienced men, the total manpower requirement could be reduced by 10 percent—together with wholesale slashes in training costs—resulting savings would exceed the pay raise by far.

The military and the Nation require passage of the pay bill as approved by the Armed Services Committee. Only the substantial pay raise provided by this bill will eliminate our paupers in uniform. Nothing less will suffice. I urge passage of this bill as reported to the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there was a man who went into a seafood restaurant and ordered lobster, but when the lobster came it only had one claw. When the man complained to the waiter, the waiter said it had lost its other claw in a fight. To that the gentleman replied, "All right, then bring me the winner."

Mr. Chairman, there were two military pay bills before the Armed Services Committee this year and we have brought you the winner.

It won in our committee by a vote of 33 to 1.

I suspect if a vote were taken among the members of the armed services the percentage in favor of our bill would be a good deal better than 33 to 1. The opinion of the people affected, of course, is too obvious a piece of evidence for any cost effectiveness expert to accept. You have to turn in your slide rule if you do that. But it is remarkable to me how often military people are told that the smaller raises proposed by the Defense Department would be better for them in the long run. If this is true, why do not the people in the services realize it? If the present approach is retaining sufficient numbers of qualified personnel, as the President's Pay Panel claims, why are not those qualified personnel able to accept the wisdom of the Department of Defense approach?

We have been told that the Department of Defense proposal for a major structural review 2 years hence and a modest raise now will, in the long run, be "the most encouraging development of all to our military career people."

Mr. Chairman, I know those who say this are sincere. We appreciate their trying to improve our understanding as we are trying so hard to improve theirs. Like the father in Luke 15:11:

We ever keep the fatted calf prepared in hopes that our prodigal boy will return.

But I submit to you that a bird in the hand is a much more encouraging development than two in the bush. And I submit to you that our qualified military personnel have figured that out.

I think they have figured out a few other things—things that go to the heart of the retention problem.

Mr. Chairman, the dialog on this pay bill was a little like a bullfight in which all of the matadors were getting into the bull's terrain. The committee moved into the whiz kids' terrain when it ordered its own actuarial study; we found the ground not quite as dangerous as the aficionados had warned us. Others were not as lucky when they moved out of their own terrain. I think the Secretary of Defense, so brilliant and so capable in so many areas, was moving out of his terrain when he got engrossed in the personnel field. It happens to be an area where our committee is uniquely equipped with experts. The Pay Panel members are brilliant men all. Given a year of actually working with the military pay system, they might have made more stirring contributions than any of us. But their time was brief. They were generalists moving into the specialists' terrain—and, oh, did they get gored.

When the Pay Panel discourses on the question of retention, they remind me of that ditty:

Last night I saw upon the stair
A little man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today,
Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

You can prove anything with statistics. You can prove on paper that there is no retention problem. I suppose if you try hard enough you can prove on paper that the sun rises in the west and sets in the east. It is a fact that in my native New Orleans the sun rises on the west bank of the Mississippi River and sets on the east bank. But the sun rises in the east and there is a retention problem. The evidence of a retention problem is being delineated here by other committee members—and you all know about it anyhow. But I would like to speak briefly to the retention problem of the future. Without being at all facetious, and not wishing in any way to be disparaging of the individual members of the Pay Panel, I think that the Panel created more of a retention problem than it solved. I think the nature of the Panel, and the manner of its functioning, is part of an approach which is in itself exacerbating the retention problem. Whenever anyone mentions the military retirement system, the Pentagon's cost effectiveness statisticians go through more gyrations than a teenager doing the frug. There are endless analyses of the future costs and the alleged future value of retirement benefits and of the long-range effect on the taxpayer. The actuaries hired by the committee proved that the Department of Defense statisticians had overstated and incorrectly computed the value of the retirement system.

But independent of that, think of the effect on retention, the long-range effect on the military individual, of the use of the Defense Department's method and the continual publicity that method receives. You just cannot measure the value of human beings with the same set of slide rules with which you determine the durability of cold steel or the fire power of a weapons system. I said before that I think the military personnel had figured out a few things that go to the heart of the retention problem. I think they have figured out that in the passion for scientific methods someone is forgetting the things you cannot measure with a computer, things like moral commitment and tradition and keeping promises and the place of the human heart in service to one's country. When men come up with statistical absurdities, it is because they have followed the slide rules to the point where they have forgotten beings. An example is the Pay Panel's bland conclusion that there is not any retention problem. That is not the first time this has happened. In 1962, when the Defense Department presented its quarters allowance increase bill to our committee, a statistical analysis worked up by representatives of seven executive branch agencies working together concluded that an E-4, that is, a corporal or lowest grade sergeant, needed \$17 a month less in quarters allowance than

he was receiving, although quarters allowances had not been increased for 10 years up to that point.

Nobody knows better than the Members of the Congress that we have to be concerned with cost. But we also have to be concerned with commitment. And the way we honor our past commitment will affect our future cost as much as anything that can be reduced to numbers and put in a computer. DOD statisticians talk endlessly of future accrued costs but they never mention the importance of keeping promises made. The compensation and benefits supplied military people, however high, are not going to solve the retention problems unless the military man can feel assured his benefits will survive the next study committee. The constant changing of systems is in itself something that can hurt retention if men begin to doubt the Government will live up to past promises.

The Secretary of Defense talks now of ending 20-year retirement. I am sure he will save a lot of retirement cost doing so. But I am sure we will spend as much and more in active duty pay to hold career men in service. When you break your promise to someone one time, how do you get them to believe you the next time?

Mr. Chairman, this is landmark legislation. It marks the point where the Pentagon statistical pinball machines rang "tilt." It marks the beginning of pay equity for the military men. Let it also be a landmark of the Congress' determination not to be afraid to trust the heart more than the computer.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, under the able and respected leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], a very strong case has been made out in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075.

Coldly looking at the pay bill before us today, the basic question is whether it will provide the means for our services to attract and retain sufficient numbers of qualified personnel to enable our military services to carry out their assigned missions.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, pointed out the vital importance of our military personnel when he stated:

The success of all our policies depends upon our ability to attract, develop fully, utilize and retain the talents of outstanding men and women in the military services.

I am in full accord with this view and with the President's conclusion:

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might.

We in the Armed Services Committee were startled and shocked to realize that our pay structure in the military had deteriorated to the point where so dedicated and loyal a soldier-statesman as Gen. Omar Bradley was obligated to

say to our committee that if a young man were to ask him to recommend that he enter the military service as a career, the best that he could do in good conscience would be to change the subject.

The security of our Nation today rests on highly complex weapons systems. The security of our Nation in the years ahead will depend on even more complex weapons systems. The jobs involved in the procurement, operation and maintenance of these complex systems involve highly technical skills which call for extensive education and experience. Each year the systems become more complex; the training required for personnel who man these systems becomes more extensive and more expensive.

Some 15 or 20 noncommissioned officer specialists are engaged in the complex systems of armament, engines, hydraulics, electrical and electronics of one aircraft, the F-105.

Despite this need, in the past 13 years service personnel have received increases in compensation totaling only some 34 percent, while classified civil service personnel have received increases averaging 46 percent, production workers in private industry have had increases of some 53 percent, and professional and technical workers some 56 percent.

What has happened?

Resignations in the Air Force in the past 5 years have increased 150 percent; the ratio of scientific and engineering officer personnel coming into the Air Force from ROTC has decreased from 47 percent in 1959 to 33 percent in 1964; the retention rate for engineering and scientific personnel in the Air Force is only 34 percent; and the reenlistment rate for certain enlisted Air Force technical personnel is only 12 percent. I use Air Force figures here, but let me point out that according to statistics given our committee attrition generally was better in the Air Force than the other services.

The military services are providing the training ground for technical personnel only to lose them to industry at the very time they become productive.

The members of the Armed Services Committee have so overwhelmingly endorsed the provisions of H.R. 9075 because we believe that it will provide the necessary incentive to attract and retain qualified personnel, and at the same time restore to our service personnel the first-class citizen status they so richly deserve.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the Armed Services Committee in a special kind of war on poverty. I invite the other Members of the House to join this campaign. It is at least as worthy as other notable wars on poverty and it is demonstrably less costly.

I am referring, of course, Mr. Chairman, to the poverty that afflicts the GI, the enlisted man in today's Armed Forces. Like his father and his brother before him, the GI of today is again being called upon to fight for freedom in combat. We may shortly learn that the

combat will involve large numbers of American troops.

The GI of today is different from those who have gone before him in one important respect. He has to be smarter and quicker. He requires a technical skill and an ability to learn a technical skill that many of his predecessors never dreamed of.

He is like the GI of old, however, in one respect: He is grossly underpaid. Someone has figured out that the enlisted man in today's Armed Forces is paid slightly over 49 cents an hour. This is assuming a 40-hour week which, of course, is unknown to the great majority of enlisted men, particularly the young draftees. It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the enlisted man with less than 2 years service today is worse off than his counterpart of 1940, who received \$21 a month. In 1940, when the new enlisted man received \$21 a month, the average wage in the United States was \$108 a month. So, the enlisted man got 19.4 percent of the average wage. Today, the average wage is \$445 a month, and a recruit receives \$78 or 17.5 percent of the average monthly wage.

I hope I may be excused for saying that I am proud that last March I became a coauthor of the military pay bill that is now before the House today.

I am not going to repeat what has already been stated here by members of the committee with respect to our seriously low retention rates and the loss of skilled personnel. Those facts speak for themselves.

We cannot afford to be second in the race for survival. We can afford nothing less than the best Armed Forces in the world. And one way of assuring that we are the best is to pass H.R. 9075.

In spite of the results that you might see from some of our computers—in spite of the promise of better things to come in the years ahead—the fact remains that a serviceman cannot cash a promise in a grocery store; he cannot pay a landlord with the promise of a pay raise that may become effective in a couple of years.

H.R. 9075 provides a badly needed, richly deserved, and vitally important pay raise for members of our Armed Forces now—and even now is not any too soon.

Like most Members of the House, I recognize the need for increases in all grades. But I am particularly impressed with the wisdom of the pay scales that have been proposed in H.R. 9075, as they pertain to enlisted personnel.

It is interesting to note that while the Special Panel on Federal Salaries, known as the Folsom Panel, recommended an average increase of 4.8 percent for all uniformed personnel, they made an exception for personnel with under 2 years of service. Enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service have not received any increase since 1952, were only to receive a 2.7-percent increase, based on the cost of living since 1963.

The controversial issue between the Folsom report and the committee's position is a very simple one. The Folsom Panel felt that 1963 was the proper base from which to make adjustments. The

committee felt that the 1963 pay increase only partially solved the problem.

It is interesting to note, however, that the Committee on Armed Services in 1965 and the Department of Defense in 1963 used 1952 as the base year from which to make adjustments.

The bill before us today provides an average increase of 10.6 percent for all military personnel, but that is only part of the story. The increases recommended for officers in the Folsom study are reasonably close to those recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, except for the officers with under 2 years of service. Under the committee proposal, all officers would receive an average 7.2-percent increase, while the Folsom Panel recommended an average increase of 5 percent.

The committee's proposal with respect to officers would involve an annual cost of \$174 million. The Folsom Panel cost for officers was about \$120 million, so the difference was only \$54 million.

So, there is relatively little difference between the committee's proposal and the Panel's proposal insofar as officers are concerned.

But let us look at the pay scales as they affect enlisted personnel. The committee recommends an annual increase for enlisted personnel of \$650 million. The Department's proposal would cost \$248 million annually. The difference between the committee's proposal and the Department's proposal is \$401 million.

Now, the difference between the committee proposal and the departmental proposal for all personnel is \$455 million, and out of this amount the Department would reduce enlisted personnel by \$401 million, or 88 percent of the total difference.

If we are going to start practicing economy, I assure you as far as I am concerned, it will not be at the expense of our enlisted personnel who are fighting in Vietnam, or who stand ready to go wherever they are needed in defense of our freedom.

If we can provide huge sums of money for recruits in the Job Corps program; and we can encourage dropouts to receive handouts that exceed the pay of a private, then it is time we increased the pay of every member of our armed services and particularly our enlisted personnel.

There is something wrong with a philosophy that puts a higher premium on failure than it does on success and patriotism.

The total cost of the basic pay raise for active duty personnel is \$824 million. The administration asks that much just for a beginning, experimental program in its war on poverty and it is already planning expenditures far above that amount. However worthy these programs may be, if we can afford to end poverty of high school dropouts, we can certainly afford to end the poverty in the ranks of our fighting men.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of the House to keep one more very interesting comparison in mind. The cost of the foreign aid bill this year will be something over \$3 billion, approximately four times the cost of this military pay bill.

Yet, some of our allies, including some who are receiving or have received aid from us, give their enlisted men higher basic pay than we do. I do not see how anybody could defend such a situation or how anybody could deny the need for a substantial pay raise for our GI's. I urge all of the Members of the House to join this noble war on poverty, poverty of our own creation, by voting for the Armed Services Committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I fully endorse H.R. 9075. I am proud of the fact that I was one of the original cosponsors of this proposal, and I hope that it will receive not just overwhelming approval, but the unanimous support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for his work in conceiving and giving birth to and nourishing and bringing this bill to its maturity, ultimately reaching the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, no man who is called upon to exercise judgment is invariably right, but as for me I would rather suffer some of his honest mistakes than have him blindly follow a course which he feels in his own mind to be wrong. On this matter I thought that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services was right and that the Secretary of Defense was wrong. Personally I would like to see a little more of this kind of work in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pride that I take the floor today in support of H.R. 9075, possibly the most equitable pay raise to come before us for our men in uniform in recent years. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and the great majority of the members of the committee have been the target of attack, from the executive branch of Government and from various sections of the Nation's press. We have been portrayed as congressional power-seekers because we dare exercise our constitutional responsibilities, review, and judgment. It takes a bit of courage to stand up and be counted, to practice your principles and to follow your conscience. The gentleman from South Carolina, particularly, has endured personal slanders, character malignments, and political disfavor to speak and act according to the dictates of his conscience. There, of course, was never any doubt about his courage but for the courage he has shown it is with great pride that I point to him as my chairman and my friend. No man who is called upon to exercise judgment is invariably right but as for me, I would rather suffer a few of his honest errors than to have him blindly follow a course of action laid down for him by others about which he harbors secret reservations. To often the Members of the Congress choose to delegate their enacting authority and responsibility to the other branches of Government. Our

system of checks and balances is slowly eroding. The legislative branch too willingly submits to executive pressure. When a Member of Congress promotes a program or an idea that finds its roots in the Congress or among the people he is criticized and admonished. It is too readily assumed that all legislation conceived in the executive branch is by its nature, good and representative of the peoples' will. Ladies and gentlemen, there exists nowhere in this land a group of individuals more truly representative of the peoples' will than this Congress.

The Armed Services Committee has taken its stand. We believe our bill is just. We believe it is necessary. We believe it is right. These judgments were made, not in haste, but after many long months of reflective study and research.

The primary concern with any legislation of this type is the maintenance of our national security through efficient, mobile, and effective Armed Forces. The simple harsh fact of the matter is this: We are losing highly skilled and highly trained military men due to unreasonably low rates of financial remuneration. When a man with 8 or 10 years of active service chooses to reenter the private sector, foregoing his much talked-about retirement pay, it is almost invariably because he cannot adequately exist, not live in luxury, but merely exist adequately, on the almost token salary we bestow upon him. For the most part he wants a military career but as a human being he needs to be a good provider for his family and in many cases his family lives in poverty. In fact, one-half million service people are, by our own standards, living in poverty. One of every four has an income level below the mark set by this Government as poverty status. He is grossly underpaid as an American citizen. What is worse, he has no recourse. He has no union. He cannot quit before the end of his term. He has no voice in where he works, the hours he works, whom he works for, and how much he is paid. He must depend solely on the wisdom and sense of justice of an already heavily burdened Congress. In effect, we are his employer. If any other employer in this land were to impose such working conditions and such inadequate remuneration on a citizen, the Congress and the Executive would literally pounce upon that employer and demand he change his evil ways. We have done so, in the mines, in the factories, and in the stores. Must we continue to practice this immoral double standard when judging our servicemen?

We spend our \$50 billion per year to keep this Nation strong and secure and we dare not risk this fantastic investment because we fail to recognize the needs of those who nobly and ably don their uniforms to defend our interests wherever and whenever necessary.

I will not cite to you the statistics regarding the low pay and the resulting decline in reenlistment rates. I will not cite the statistics proving the gradual elimination of selectivity and the resulting creeping mediocrity among our fighting forces. It is all before you in the

committee report and has been eloquently articulated by those distinguished Members preceding this speaker. I will merely say, we must face this problem head on. We must not explain away the issues. The problem will not go away.

As long as there are men in this world who wish to destroy our way of life, we must maintain the finest Armed Forces in the world and we can maintain such a team only by providing for them the means to live in reasonable comfort and security without undue economic deprivation. The men who wait to fight and die deserve at least this position.

I strongly urge the immediate passage of this measure.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support H.R. 9075. For my part, I have no reservations or questions about the merits of this measure. Beyond that, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of those who have paid tribute to our distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and particularly with one of my fellow Members from the minority side of the aisle who observed that when history is written in future years the gentleman from South Carolina, will have earned the description as the greatest champion of the GI that ever served on the House Armed Services Committee.

If called upon to cite the two paramount objectives of H.R. 9075, I would set them out as being first, to do justice to our service personnel and second, to strengthen the security of our country. Both objectives are important.

There have been military pay increase bills within the past few years but they have all fallen short of the concept of comparability which means the relation of the pay in the military with pay of their counterparts in civilian life.

Because former pay measures have been inadequate and lacking as to comparability, there has been a failure to attract and retain high-caliber personnel with the ability to perform at a high level of proficiency in our modern Army of today. A very different and a much better soldier is needed today than in the past. Weapons are more complex and sophisticated than ever before and will become increasingly complex in the years ahead.

There has been no doubt but what Congress has been remiss and neglectful in its concern or consideration of the pay for the fighting men of this country in the past. The Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 seeks to redress these omissions. Beyond the matter of immediate redress this same bill, H.R. 9075, which amends title 37 of the United States Code provides for adjustments in pay and allowances for future years. This bill provides that the President conduct an annual review of adequacies of pay allowances authorized by title 37 for uniformed personnel. It provides that not later than March 31 of each year the President will submit to Congress a de-

tailed report summarizing the results of his annual review together with any recommendations for adjustment. Then, not less than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall direct that there be made a complete and thorough review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of all uniformed personnel. It is important to note that while the Secretary of Defense, may have advanced similar proposals, Mr. McNamara proposed that the executive branch would submit to the Congress certain changes which would become effective unless the Congress exercised a veto within 60 days. It has been appropriately observed that the Secretary had the horse and cart in the wrong position while provisions of H.R. 9075 providing that the Congress itself would act following the annual or quadrennial review put the horse in front of the cart where it properly belongs, by making provision for Congress to exercise its constitutional powers concerning the pay for members of the uniformed services.

It seems to me that one of the best ways for a Member to determine whether this is a good or bad bill is to assess this pay raise in the light of the principle of comparability. You do not have to search very far to find that the Committee on Armed Services has very carefully considered this principle.

On page eight of the report which accompanies the bill, there is a chart which documents quite convincingly the fact military pay increases have not kept pace with others. The chart covers the years from 1952 to 1964 and points out that during these 12 years, military officers and enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service received pay increases totaling 36.6 percent. Compare with the following: Civilians in civil service 46.3 percent, production workers in manufacturing industries 52.7 percent members of the profession or those with technical training 54.2 percent, clerical and kindred work 62.1 percent, personnel subject to the Army-Air Force Wage Board—civilians—66.7 percent and finally motor truckdrivers 70.4 percent. To my mind this is proof convincing that the compensation of our military personnel has consistently lagged behind the compensation in occupations requiring similar skilled levels.

The President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries sometimes known as the Folsom Panel was supported by Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who is a member of the Panel. For some strange and almost incomprehensible reason that Panel concluded that the uniformed services have no retention problem. Apparently their conclusions were based upon the premise that congressional action on military compensation in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level in relation to civilian pay level sufficiently to attract and retain adequate numbers of high-quality personnel in the Armed Forces. May I emphasize and reemphasize the words of our own report which accompanied H.R. 9075, which characterized this conclusion by the Folsom Panel with these words—"simply not true." All of

the testimony before our committee refuted the Folsom conclusion. All testimony contradicted the Panel's contentions. So far as I know our committee did not go into the method of study used by the Panel. It is my understanding they sent out a questionnaire. It is hearsay and I have no way of knowing how reliable my information may be when it is reported that out of the 35,000 questionnaires returned only about 3 percent were opened. Is it any wonder that our great soldier, Gen. Omar Bradley, took such sharp disagreement with the findings of the Folsom Panel? No, there should be no wonderment when one learns not one single officer or enlisted man ever testified or was questioned by this panel and the sole representative of any of the military to be heard was the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara who happened to be a member of the Panel himself.

This measure will cost money. It is estimated it will have an annual cost of \$825 million. If there are Members who happen to be worrying about this cost, they should recall there was no great concern here in the Congress when we enacted a short time ago our annual foreign aid bill, which included money for military assistance to our friends and allies in the world. In some instances, it provided for the payment to these foreign troops at a higher rate of pay than we pay our own soldiers. Think of that. Then if there may be those who are worrying about voting such a great expenditure in one single measure, I would suggest that instead of regarding this as a spending measure, it could quite properly be regarded as an economy measure. Why is this so? I will not take the time to indulge in a lot of statistics but I will say that if we defeat this bill as being an extravagance we are engaging in false economy. Do you realize it takes \$23,000 to train an electronic specialist and \$49,000 to train a ballistic launch officer? In the years immediately past we have spent an estimated total of \$1,200 million upon training military personnel who have now left the service because we did not make the military service attractive enough in comparison with civilian occupations.

The truth is that the present military pay scales encourage mediocrity in the quality of our personnel which can neither attract nor retain the best people. Viewed in this light, H.R. 9075 is not a spending bill but really an economy measure which makes just plain ordinary commonsense. During the hearings I think it was brought out that just about everybody is in agreement that our uniform services should have a pay increase. The Folsom Panel agrees this is so, the Department of Defense was in agreement with the Folsom Panel.

The differences between the two estimates of need for military pay increases may be attributed chiefly to the different assumptions made by the Folsom Panel in criticizing the Rivers proposal.

Central to these differences are the estimates made by the two groups about the current degree of comparability between civilian and military pay within the Federal Government.

The committee has taken the position that if it was fair to use the base year 1952 in comparing civil servants with military personnel for purposes of drafting the 1963 Pay Act, then it is eminently reasonable to use the same base period in discussing further differences among the two groups of Federal employees.

The Pay Panel, on the other hand, insists that the 1963 Military Pay Act was such a perfect piece of legislation that civilian and military pay scales were brought into line with each other and any percentage comparison of increases in the two pay scales ought to proceed from that date as if the two were in equilibrium. Moreover, they take the patently ludicrous position that the military services are having no problems attracting and retaining qualified career personnel.

As a matter of fact, it is even hard to reconcile the pay differences between civilian and military employees within the Department of Defense itself. Even excluding servicemen with under 2 years of service from our consideration, an adequate committee proposal would have had to reflect a 19.6-percent shortfall in pay increases since 1952 between enlisted officers and professional and technical workers in the DOD, or the 30.1-percent shortfall between officers and the Army-Air Force Wage Board, or the 33.8-percent shortfall between officers and motor truckdrivers.

Unlike civilians, the military man has no lobby. He has only the choice to wait and hope that the injustice he has to suffer and the inequities he must endure will somehow, sometime be reduced or eliminated by the Congress. We have been careful to provide for increases for those in the civil service, but we have not been very munificent to our military. Our military should and must be put on a par with their civilian contemporaries. As the matter now stands, the enlisted man with less than 2 years of service is on the very lowest rung of the economic level. I have little doubt but the families of some of these service personnel would be eligible in some of our States to be placed upon the relief rolls. Perhaps that is the reason the number of hardship discharges has increased to about one-quarter in the last 2 years.

At the time of the last increase in pay for enlisted men with short-term service, we were just coming out of the Korean war. Now, after more than a decade of relatively inactive cold war, we are once more sending large numbers of enlisted men to battle.

Keeping in mind Napoleon's dictum that morale is to materiel as 10 to 1, in this present time of pending international crisis, there could be no more appropriate occasion for us to increase the basic compensation of enlisted men and officers.

In closing, I should like to quote our President's own words before the National War College a year ago in August:

I very much want our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect. I want their wives and children to know only first-class lives.

Mr. Chairman, that is a commendable, if seemingly unattainable objective. I

respectfully submit that H.R. 9075 comes far closer to the spirit of the President's own words than the proposal by the President's own Special Panel on Federal Salaries.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H.R. 9075.

Mr. Chairman, the lopsided vote to report H.R. 9075 should not be interpreted to mean that the bill has virtually unanimous support in the committee nor that those who voted affirmatively had wholly unmixed feelings about it.

I am one of those who voted in favor of H.R. 9075. I did so because I wanted the record clear that I strongly favor a pay increase for our Armed Forces this year. The evidence is quite plain, I think, that without an increase, military pay will lag the gains being made in the private economy and in the civilian sector of the Federal Establishment.

But I voted to report H.R. 9075 with considerable mental reservations, for I believe the bill has substantial defects. The most basic of these is its helter-skelter approach. I would like to emphasize, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] did in his minority view, that we have a duty to balance the needs of military personnel against our other obligations—in other sectors of our economy. It is not a question, as the testimony before the committee amply made clear, of whether our defense posture is in danger of imminent collapse. Everyone agrees that our personnel are capable and devoted. Everyone agrees also that a pay increase is needed to maintain military pay at levels relative to civilian earnings which will enable us to maintain a largely quite satisfactory military personnel situation. The issue is rather to whom the increase should be given and how much it should be. The defects of H.R. 9075 are that it raises pay more than necessary in some areas and it allocates increases among the various grades in the wrong proportions.

The committee's calculation of how much of an increase should go to which grades had no basis in science whatsoever. The development of the proposed pay scales was based on two highly questionable and totally unrelated assumptions: First, that it is possible to compare military and civilian jobs sufficiently to link them for pay purposes; and, second, that the traditional relationship—by which is meant 1952 relationship—between the pay levels of various military grades is the correct one which ought to be restored.

I know of no study, public or private, which has successfully linked military and civil service, that has successfully identified which jobs required equal work so that they could be given equal pay. The committee disclaimed attempts to do this, but it nevertheless did exactly that in selecting so-called anchor points at which pay levels were to be equated. No one knows if these anchor points have any validity whatsoever.

Taking off from this very shaky foundation, the committee next attempted to

adjust military pay to take account of fringe benefits. This adjustment, which certainly must, in the very nature of things, be enormously complex, was no problem to the committee. It simply charged the military individual a 6½-percent imputed contribution to retirement. Now it is certainly true, as both Secretary of Defense McNamara and the actuarial firm which the committee consulted on this point have said, that it is entirely appropriate to take into account the existence of retirement benefits in setting pay levels. But the proper calculation would take into account what the Nation contributes to the benefit. The Defense Department presented testimony that the Government contribution to support military retirement is not the 6½ percent used by the committee, but over 24 percent.

In addition to the pseudoscientific linkage upon which the committee's pay structure is based, another serious defect is its reversion to 1952 to determine the appropriate relationships of military pay grades with one another. What relevance the scales of 13 years ago have to today's military forces completely escapes me. In 1963, the Defense Department and the Congress came up with a set of pay scales that was attuned as nearly as humanly possible to the needs of our modern forces. These scales were arrived at after a year of intensive study. The committee would disregard the effort made in the 1963 Pay Act. Certainly, there is nothing sacrosanct about the structure established in 1963. But I am satisfied that it ought not to be changed capriciously and before proper careful study has been made.

I conclude, therefore, that H.R. 9075 is the wrong kind of a pay raise because, with no justification provided by the committee, it significantly revises the pay structure established in 1963. H.R. 9075 is also too costly. According to the committee report, the total increase in expenditures on a 12-month basis would be \$996 million—just under \$1 billion.

But this total is expenditures, not total costs. When we raise pay we increase our liability as a Nation to pay retirement benefits. These costs are real, even though they do not appear in this year's budget. We have to pay them eventually, and we are fooling only ourselves if we ignore them. The expected increase in retirement liabilities on an annual basis is \$557 million. Thus, the true annual cost of the committee proposal is more than \$1.5 billion. In fairness to the taxpayer, and in keeping with our responsibility to hold down the costs of Government, I do not believe we should incur such large costs without a very strong assurance that the Nation will derive a maximum benefit from this huge expenditure. I am not persuaded that H.R. 9075 does this. I intend to vote for this bill because I feel strongly that there is an immediate need for an increase in military pay and I recognize the realities of the likelihood of success in attempting, at this time, to offer alternative methods of providing for it.

I have criticized the serious weaknesses in H.R. 9075. It has two features which I enthusiastically commend. The

first, provision for a variable reenlistment bonus focuses directly on the most serious personnel problem the services have. Each of the Secretaries and the uniformed Chiefs emphasized the problem in specialized skills, where the costs of training are high and the opportunities in civil life are most attractive. The problem is that we are most likely to lose qualified people in just those skills where we can least afford it. The bonus would channel additional pay into these specialties. It offers the incentive toward career service at just the time that it will be most effective, when an individual decides whether or not to reenlist. Because it is variable, the service can pay more in those skills where it needs more reenlistment. For the same cost, a flat across-the-board pay increase will be nowhere near as effective in getting the right kind of reenlistments.

The other feature of the bill which I strongly support is the procedure for annual review and quadrennial major study. This is, it seems to me, and orderly and rational way to go about making pay changes. Once every 4 years the whole structure of military pay would be examined in depth. The appropriate level for two-star generals can be addressed; the relation of sergeants to corporals to privates pay can be studied; possible changes in the multitude of special pays and allowances can be examined, to see if they are meeting the specific needs for which they were designed. The major question which would be answered would be this: Is pay at a level sufficient to provide and retain the quality of people necessary to man our Armed Forces? And then, when appropriate revisions were made, we would not concern ourselves with such questions for another 4 years. In the meantime, the annual reviews would keep us posted on the changes occurring in the private sector of the economy and on the civilian side of Government employment. If and as necessary, upward shifts in military pay would be made to match upward movements in the wage level.

This procedure is valuable for two reasons: first, it makes it unnecessary to examine the entire pay structure in great detail and make extensive changes every time a pay bill is proposed. From the serviceman's viewpoint, its great value lies in the prevention of lags in the adjustment of pay. The longer pay increases are deferred, the larger the amounts required to keep pay equitable and the greater the reluctance of Congress to approve them. The systematic procedure provided in H.R. 9075 avoids problems for the committee, this House, and the individual serviceman, and it should be approved.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. I would like to say at the beginning, knowing the responsibilities that our chairman has had in taking over this committee this year, I want to thank him personally for taking the time and showing the patience to extend to all persons on

this committee the chance to participate in all of these deliberations.

Mr. Chairman, I join in wholeheartedly supporting H.R. 9075. This bill was drafted by the Armed Services Committee after the most searching review of economic factors and the most diligent attempt to get a full evaluation of military compensation that I am aware of. As you have heard, this included the hiring of a firm of professional actuaries. I would like to speak in my brief time, however, to one point of great importance that has not been extensively covered. This is the provision for annual review of the adequacy of the pay system.

The bill provides for an annual survey of pay rates and also a searching reanalysis every 4 years of the principles and concept underlying the whole military pay structure. The first such broad review would be made not later than January 1, 1967.

This provision is in a way similar to what is provided for in the civil service system for which an annual comparability review is now required. Please notice that our bill does not just permit this review of military pay, it requires it.

The executive branch proposed that it be given automatic power to put pay increases into effect following annual reviews. Under this proposal, the Congress historic authority to initiate would become merely a negative power to veto. That is, unless the Congress specifically repudiated the increases within 60 days, they would automatically go into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to review some of the reasons why I think this recommendation of the President was unfortunate and why I think the committee was wise in rejecting it. First, it has already been pointed out perhaps that this would be an abdication of Congress power under the Constitution. I think there is a serious question as to whether the Constitution would permit us to do this even if we wanted to. Since the Constitution says that Congress shall "raise and support armies," obviously, it is part of the duties of the Congress to determine the level at which they will be supported.

Beyond that, however, think of the confusion that could be caused by such a system. Having the administration determine that a certain pay raise is required and then initiating a 60-day waiting period to see whether or not the Congress vetoes such a raise would, in effect, be playing a game of "who's who?" Who is the Executive and who is the legislature.

Even if Congress did not veto the automatic raise in the 60-day period, funds would still have to be appropriated to pay for the raise. This would merely transfer the onus from the Armed Services to the Appropriations Committee. Now, if we determined that because this raise had not been vetoed in 60 days the Appropriations Committee would have to appropriate money for the raise, we would then have the absolute triumph of Executive spending over even the House Appropriations Committee. The Committee on Appropriations would be yielding up to the Executive its strongest

power under the Constitution, its control of the Federal purse strings.

Further, think of the sheer chaos involved if the Appropriations Committee did not concede that it had to honor an executive branch decision to raise pay merely because the legislative committees had not vetoed the action within 60 days. Suppose, for example, that in January the executive branch finds that a pay raise of \$400 million is required. The Armed Services and Civil Service Committees do not pass a negative resolution by the end of March. The administration then puts the raise into effect. In June, the Appropriations Committee reports appropriations bills which deny the \$400 million for the pay raise. Where are we then? If you say the Appropriations Committee cannot do this, then you are saying it has surrendered its power to the executive branch. Such a situation would make the Bureau of Labor Statistics a much more powerful unit of the Federal Government than the House Appropriations Committee. But if the committee can do this, and does do this, you have sheer chaos: An Executive order to pay military salaries which the Appropriations Committee will not fund.

One final point. Remember that the undertaking of review often creates the desire for positive results. The simple fact of the executive branch conducting an annual pay review tends to increase the recommendations for pay increases. While annual reviews are desirable for purposes of equity, there could be a tendency to overstate pay needs which the Congress has the responsibility to guard against. It needs more than a negative authority to properly do this. It needs the sole power to initiate a pay raise.

In summary, turning over the function of increasing Federal pay to the executive branch along the lines recommended by the administration would be unworkable, confusing, destructive of morale, possibly in violation of the Constitution, and certainly an unwarranted reduction in the power of the Congress.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. A significant raise in military pay was an important issue in my campaign last fall. I feel very fortunate that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I was able to offer my support to legislation introduced by the able chairman by introducing an identical bill providing for a raise of nearly 11 percent.

I have received letters from all over the country in support of this legislation. This is an issue that cuts across all partisan and geographical lines. From as far away as Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and as close as my neighborhood in Hyattsville, men and women have written asking for a substantial raise, not just a token increase.

There are many reasons to justify an across-the-board pay boost at this time. Besides the distressing situation in Vietnam, we have our servicemen and their families here at home living in conditions

not dissimilar from those being attacked by the war on poverty.

It would be harsh to say that our Federal Government has been fostering poverty in its Armed Forces. But studies show that thousands of servicemen receive less than the \$3,000 a year poverty level set by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I believe that it is absurd for the Government to concentrate on a program of wiping out poverty among civilians when large numbers of our military employees cannot earn a decent living.

Statistics show also that while general military compensation has increased 34 percent since 1952, civil servants have averaged more than 46-percent pay increases since then. At the same time, pay for truck drivers has jumped 70 percent since 1952.

Another distressing factor is the tremendous loss to the Government of trained military personnel who leave the service because of the inequitable pay. It has been pointed out that an enlisted man tending a nuclear reactor on a naval ship earns less than one-half of what his civilian counterpart receives.

Chairman RIVERS placed the whole issue in perspective when he said:

If Congress and the American public fail to give their wholehearted support to this necessary adjustment in military compensation, the results could be catastrophic since it could only be interpreted by America's fighting men as evidence of public indifference to the future of our national security.

I am in complete agreement with this attitude.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I think with respect to the pending legislation, we have to recognize some simple facts. The Great Society, including a better standard of living and a freer exercise of civil rights, the right to live, the right to work and to recreate where a citizen might desire—these things are just the antithesis of military life. In the latter, you work and you play where you are told. You are told where you may bring your wife, where you may go and live, whether you are to live in a stockade or outside one, what kind of allowance will be provided for you for living and eating, when you are going to eat and what you are going to eat and where you are going to eat. They are also told how to fight, and where to fight and when to fight. You are given rights to express yourself under the regulations, but we were presented with a case before our committee where an airman attempted to express himself on this very important legislation only to find himself censured under the regulations as interpreted by one of our commanders. That was true at least at that time in the western part of the United States.

In days gone by, we have poked fun at the man who worked for a lifetime and received a watch on his retirement. The watch presentation, of course, is very comical and, I think with the spiraling increase in the cost of living today, even the retirement as being the great

panacea for a successful and happy life is coming into disrepute.

I would also point out that when Secretary Nitze testified before our committee he pointed out that there were four factors which caused several hundred million dollars' worth of technically trained manpower to leave the military service and that caused poor morale. One of those was poor pay. The second was poor housing. The third was poor recognition and the fourth was being away from home too much.

I wonder how the concept of being away from home for 6 months in a Polaris submarine shapes up with our Great Society.

The passage of the pending bill which I can now report, on receiving my colleague's, Congressman STRATON's report, that he supports this legislation, I am pleased to say is unanimously supported by our Armed Services Committee, is an important step in restoring equity in everyday American life. Today, military men are among the most poorly paid of our Federal employees. This imbalance has increased with every military pay raise, because it has failed to keep pace with the raises given to other Federal employees.

The pending legislation is aimed at removing the disparity between the military men and other Federal employees and employees on the outside.

Mr. Chairman, the pay raises proposed in this legislation would lift military incomes to a level closely correlated with the present pay of other Federal employees performing comparable services with full consideration given to the so-called fringe benefits enjoyed by the military.

This legislation then is aimed solely at making into law the fundamental American dedication to equal reward for services rendered. It will serve to correct the course of our neglect during the past decade.

Mr. Chairman, for those who would say that we are perhaps being a little overly generous with our military through this legislation, I would suggest that they look at the testimony of the Secretary of Defense when he appeared before our committee. In that testimony he showed that with respect to our officer personnel there was a lag of something like 11 years, from 1952 to 1963, where we did very little if anything for this class of personnel and the enlisted also. Also, that during that period of time they were allowed to get better than 20 percent out of balance with competitive professional and technical personnel on the outside, or an average imbalance of better than 10 percent per year for that 11-year period.

Mr. Chairman, when one considers that in our defense effort we expend yearly on the average about \$15 billion and if we save 10 percent of that yearly for an 11-year period, it is readily apparent that we have saved \$1.5 billion a year or \$16.5 billion out of the hide of the American serviceman for the past 11 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the pending bill is an effort to restore some equity to this imbalance. I believe that certainly

our servicemen deserve the support of the Members of this Congress and I am pleased to see that there has been very little argument about that on the floor of the House here today.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that servicemen themselves cannot come here and express their plight. Certainly their future rests on the paternalism and foresight of the American Congress.

The administration has taken a positive approach to the plight of the military man and my objections to the administration's proposed military pay raise are entirely quantitative. The administration's proposed pay raise scale is simply not enough. Recent surveys conducted by the individual armed services have produced grim statistics concerning the low living standards of American military men and their families. According to an Air Force survey, approximately 71,000 members of the Air Force supplement their military pay with outside jobs and another survey reports that 32 percent of all marines have outside jobs. Perhaps the most striking finding of all is the fact that almost one out of every four men in the Air Force receives a basic pay below the poverty levels set by the Government. It is truly ironic that the Government's poverty program is in part a response to a situation the Government itself has created.

The lot of the American servicemen as revealed by these figures is quite shocking and borders on national disgrace, for our servicemen are the very defenders of the nations. In time of constant international unrest made dangerous by powerful enemies our military strength is necessary for the preservation of the free world. Indeed, the keystone of the foreign policy of the present administration is that military strength and national preparedness are the surest source of safety in an unsure world. In order to meet our political and economic responsibilities around the world today a strong Military Establishment is a vital necessity. In caution, I hasten to point out that this commitment to a powerful military can in now way be equated with militarism or offensive preparation on our part. This military posture is simply our only course in a divided and dangerous world not of our own making and pending further international agreements. This legislation is designed to strengthen our Armed Forces. Not only does it propose higher pay for all men in uniform but is specifically structured to reward excellence through the variable reenlistment bonus. With this device the Defense Department can offer men reenlisting in the service a bonus up to four times the present bonus rates. Perhaps with the passage of this legislation a military career will take on a new appeal to talented young men looking for a career in Government service. It is only by such incentive of selective reward that the armed services will be able to attract and keep the high quality of performance that is necessary for the Nation's defenses.

The effect of the passage of this bill upon local and national economic conditions is obvious. For example, in my

constituency, the Fourth District of California, where approximately 15 percent of the population lives under the military payroll either as servicemen or their dependents, a military pay raise would have a significant influence upon the general economy. And the legislation would have like results in many similar communities around the country.

The implications of this bill, however, extend beyond purely economic considerations. My support of the bill is based primarily upon its value to national security. The military, for a while at least, is here to stay. In view of this essential role played by the armed services we should make a determined effort to build a military system composed of men of high caliber. In this military pay raise bill I see a constructive first step toward this new kind of military structure. For not only would it make first-class citizens of the Nation's defenders but also do much to assure that the Nation retains first-class defenders.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of a pay raise for the Armed Forces of the United States. It has been made unmistakably clear to me by facts brought out at the hearings before the Armed Services Committee that our military personnel need more money. There is really no job in civilian life with which to adequately compare the duties, the disciplines, and the enforced sacrifices of the military man. But we underpay our servicemen even by any general standard of comparison, leaving out the extra burdens of military life.

We read and hear daily of horrors, indignities, casualties and deaths suffered worldwide by our service personnel in the defense of our country's commitments and ideals. Yet, we pay the soldier or sailor when entering the service less than we pay the high school dropout who joins the Job Corps. We pay many of the lower enlisted grades less to take care of themselves and their families than they could get on State relief or unemployment rolls. We pay the higher ranks insufficient money to keep them from accepting the monetary lures of private industry.

There is a serious retention problem. The enlisted and junior officer grades are far below subsistence levels of income and we must remedy this situation that presents problems not conducive to the retention of our skilled and trained personnel.

This Congress is obligated to increase the pay for our military personnel. Our uniformed men and women are defending democracy at outposts throughout the world and for this commitment we are obliged to adequately compensate those who defend us, commensurate with the inherent risks and responsibility of their task.

Since World War II our freedom as a Nation, as well as individual freedom, has come under serious attack resulting in a substantial diminution of national free-

dom and individual rights. The Congress of the United States has not hesitated in calling upon our military people to defend our remaining rights from Communist aggression, from threats to our national security and to defend our free enterprise system. We must not hesitate now.

In advocating the committee's military pay bill, I am not advocating a program authorizing huge sums of money for a pilot study; it is not a new or untried program; it is not a gamble, nor is it conjecture; but it is a program with approximately 189 years of experience and success behind it and the wealth of experience has taught that we must provide for our military personnel an income expectation suitable to support himself and his dependents.

I am personally convinced that the facts brought out in the recent hearings before the House Armed Services Committee fully support the need for the committee's bill. I am equally convinced that the administration's bill is inadequate because it is based on faulty statistics provided the Presidential Pay Panel by the Defense Department.

I hope Members who are in doubt will read the hearings before our committee.

I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that had the President time to consider this matter in detail he would agree with the committee's bill as he so wholeheartedly backed our servicemen during his time in Congress. Obviously, the President was unaware of the statistical inaccuracies in the DOD presentation to the Pay Panel. These inaccuracies were brought out in our hearings. This is what congressional hearings are for, to get at the truth. We have done our job. I pray the House will do its job and support this bill.

I ask that the House of Representatives support the Military Pay Act offered by the House Armed Services Committee, thus fulfilling congressional responsibility to our Armed Forces.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I wish my name to be listed among those calling for an increase in pay for the men and women of the Armed Forces. But to my colleagues who are pained by budgetary consideration, I would like to point out that we might refer to this pay bill as the last of the big ones.

Now, why do I say that?

It is no mystery as to why a military pay bill is required and why a big one is required this year.

Historically, military men had markedly lower pay but this was made up for by a high level of fringe benefits—a very good retirement system, medical care, including medical care in retirement, tax-free housing and subsistence allowances, post exchanges and commissaries, reduced recreational expenses, travel, and others.

What has happened in the period since World War II? The civilian economy has overtaken the fringe benefits

program of the Government. Free or largely paid for medical and life insurance benefits are common in private industry today. Industry spends an increasing portion of its personnel dollar for such things as company funded retirement systems, sick leave, long vacation periods, in many cases free meals and the privilege of buying goods at reduced costs. It is not commonly realized, but we have reached the point where industry's percentage of payroll going for fringe benefits is virtually the same as the percentage in the Government.

It should be noted that in addition private enterprise has many benefits that are not and cannot be given to military personnel, such as stock options, large cash bonuses, et cetera. Let us also note that there are not in private industry the time-in-grade requirements that slow promotion for even the best men in the military services.

While there has been a steady rise in fringe benefits in private industry and for civil servants, what has been the situation for military personnel? Military fringe benefits have actually gone down somewhat. The only new substantial benefits military people have obtained over the last 15 years are the family separation allowance—which merely provides small additional funds to cover added expenses when the serviceman is away from his family—and the Dependent Medical Care Act, which provides care in civilian hospitals for military dependents. Military dependents, however, had always gotten most of their care in military hospitals.

While these two benefits were being added over this period, the services have lost fringe benefits. Dependent dental care has practically ceased. Prices in the commissaries and exchanges have been increased for the individual serviceman and items available in exchanges have been severely limited. With the loss of recomputation—that is, the right to recompute retired pay on the latest pay scales—military retirement benefits have been reduced. In addition, temporarily at least, the serviceman has lost the traditional benefit of medical care in retirement.

Now, while the civilian fringe benefits were catching up and passing the military fringe benefits, military pay did not make any great leap forward to catch up with civilian pay. In fact, military pay fell far behind civil service pay in the years since 1952 at a time when civil service pay was gradually being brought up to a level with private industry. The reason for this is very simple. Congress voted a lot more raises for the civilian employees than for its military personnel. Up until 1958, it was traditional that the serviceman got a pay raise in the same Congress, generally in the same year, as civil servants did. This was true in 1952, 1955, and 1958.

In 1960, civil servants broke the sound barrier when they got a pay raise passed over the President's veto. Civil servants got another pay raise in 1962—in two increments, the first in October 1962, and the second in January 1964. Civil servants also got another pay raise in October

of 1964, which saw very large increases for the upper classes. And the honeymoon is not over yet, as we shall find out in a few weeks.

During most of this time, the military stood still. In 1963, the military services got a large pay raise costing over \$1 billion. And in 1964, they got a very small pay raise, averaging about 2½ percent.

The President's pay panel, in making their recommendations this year, assumed that the 1963 pay raise had put military personnel at a proper comparable level in relation to civil servants and that this year's bill merely would have to maintain them at the 1963 level.

Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the problem. The 1963 pay raise only closed a little more than half of the gap that had opened between civil service and military scales since 1958. Four or five small raises are better than one big one. As a matter of fact, as we all know, four 5 percent raises are better than one 20 percent raise. Roughly speaking, this is what has happened. The military got one big percentage raise in 1963, but the civil servants by them had gotten a series of raises that cumulatively added up to a higher percentage.

The great virtue of H.R. 9075, the bill brought forth today by the Armed Services Committee, is that it would finally close the gap. We are not, of course, making up for what the military man has lost over the years, but we are seeing that he will be on a par from now on. That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that this can be considered the last of the big ones. Once this bill is passed, we will in the future require only more moderate adjustments in line with rising living costs, such as is now contemplated for civil servants. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues, in the strongest possible terms, to vote for this bill and to assure, in the words of our highly esteemed and distinguished chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, that the members of our Armed Forces have "a standard of living at least as good as the standard of living they are defending."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, may I first state how proud I am to be associated with such a fine committee under such a dedicated and knowledgeable chairman and to work with individuals who approach the problems of national defense on a bipartisan basis. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle must be complimented for their dedication in placing the national interest above political consideration.

I am pleased to be associated with the remarks of my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, with those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable WILLIAM H. BATES, and others on both sides of the aisle who support the bill for the reason that it takes some intestinal fortitude to make an objective analysis of the problems of military pay which in some of its aspects are contrary to those of the administration as set forth by the President's Folsom Pay Panel.

I believe it was Branch Rickey, of baseball fame, who once said, "Never accept the negative without exploring the positive." What pleased me the most was the Armed Services Committee's positive approach to this serious problem. We would not be denied.

I am in such complete agreement with my fellow members of the committee on their conclusion on the matter of a military pay raise, that I introduced a bill identical to my chairman's bill, now under consideration in this Chamber.

The need for the enactment of H.R. 9075 is disclosed by a careful reading of the committee's report. At last the members of the armed services will be compensated at a level comparable to civilians in our economy.

The Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 will provide the first increase in 13 years of enlisted members with 2 years or less of service. Passage of this proposal would also provide an adequate adjustment for the 1963 pay bill which gave the first increase since 1952 for officers with under 2 years of service. Although the administration's proposal has many good points, it does overlook the needs of these two groups in favor of those with longer service. However, the time has come when we must assure these members with less than 2 years of service that they will be able to adequately provide for their families. If these men must resort to "moonlighting," heavy debt, or help from their parents, how can their Government ever expect them to reenlist when their initial tenure is completed?

I believe the testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, retired, of the Folsom Pay Panel, best describes the problem—the retention problem:

I would like to emphasize that my remarks in no way imply that our top service leadership today is mediocre. These men were committed to the services before the present discrepancies in pay arose. I am concerned about our ability to continue to attract men who will become our leaders of the future.

I believe that your present hearing will bring out the following facts:

1. Now that many industries send recruiting teams into the principal colleges and universities to interview the members of the graduating classes, the services are not getting their share of the outstanding men.
 2. That the salaries and other benefits offered as far in excess of those offered by the services.
 3. That we are losing many of our best potential leaders after they have served their obligatory service.
 4. That our training programs are very expensive and are made so because of the large turnover in personnel.
 5. That the lifetime total compensation of our leaders who reach the top positions, compares very unfavorably with that of those who reach top positions in other walks of life.
 6. That in many cases, the commissioned officer in charge of the project, and who is responsible for its success, receives less pay than some of the Civil Service employees in his office.
 7. That commutation of quarters is usually less than what the service member is required to pay for rent. Frequent changes of station and separation of families because of foreign service, add to housing costs.
- I would like to make one more point. That is, the effect of the whole compensation system on the continuing morale of the services. Of course, morale is not dependent

on pay alone, but adequate compensation is undoubtedly one of the elements.

Our committee report does, in fact, show that General Bradley's seven points summarize the basic problems of the various branches of the armed services today. A vast amount of testimony, tables, and statistics point to one obvious conclusion: An adequate pay raise is needed to bring all military personnel's total compensation up to levels equal to their civilian counterparts.

In the last analysis, the future of the military rests in the hands of the public. If we give servicemen secondary treatment, we tamper with the innermost fabric of military security as well as our own. If, through neglect, we lose the ablest and most skilled servicemen in the country, then the free world's future is truly in question.

I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in voting for H.R. 9075.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, out where I come from a critter roped and hogtied, you do not roll all the meat off him before you send him to market.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, and, of the chairman and Members who believe and defend the constitutional concept that the Congress shall raise, provide for, and establish policy in the military services.

Our able chairman of the Armed Services Committee has succinctly and with great force spelled out the need and justification for this pay increase for our military personnel. I should like to add my voice in urging the adoption of this legislation.

We live today in a world of crisis.

In this world, we have come to expect a complete dedication of our military personnel. We think nothing of asking them to live in and walk in space, to fight and die for their country in far-flung places such as the dense, rain-soaked, dangerous, and disease-ridden jungles of Vietnam, to be uprooted with their families at frequent intervals by station transfers, to be separated from their families for long periods of time because of foreign or sea duty, or to commit themselves to 24-hour-a-day call in tedious technical, but vital, tasks.

We have asked much—we have received from them even more than we have asked. They have given of themselves unstintingly. This is our Nation's tradition.

It is past time that this Nation reward that constant dedication.

I agreed with Secretary McNamara when he stated before our committee:

We cannot compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession, but we can and should see to it that he at least shares with the civilian population the rising standard of living.

But I disagree that a 2.7- or 4.8-percent increase in service pay will permit our men in uniform to share with the civilian population the rising standard of living. The evidence before our committee conclusively established the contrary.

The evidence garnered by our committee showed that a 10.6-percent increase will be a big step forward. It will not compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession; but it will, to some extent, permit him to share "with the civilian population the rising standard of living."

As Gen. Omar Bradley so ably told our committee:

Unlimited liability is inherent in the mandate from the people of the United States charging each person in uniform to stand ready to defend this Nation, when necessary, at the risk of his life. This charge exists for no other walk of life, profession or calling.

It is incongruous that these same men are being asked to do this much on a pauper's wage. The minimum wage rates in this country are \$1.25 per hour. Is the House aware that, in order to make this minimum wage, the typical serviceman must be at least a corporal or a third-class petty officer? This includes his housing and food allowance. It is gross injustice to provide Job Corps candidates a starting wage equal to or exceeding that of our servicemen. A "delinquent" who enters the Job Corps is as well provided for as a military recruit. Perhaps true equity in pay plus the training the military services are famed for, is the beginning of the end of need for the peacetime "draft."

H.R. 9075 would at least restore the serviceman's starting pay to a higher plateau than some of our youth welfare programs. The recruit's basic pay sponsored in this bill is \$87.90, an increase of \$9.90 per month. Remember, our draftee must serve 24 months, compared to other nations' 12 months "callups." This proposal represents the first serious step in 13 years to improve the pay of a recruit. As conservative as this increase appears, it will do much toward improving the lot of the serviceman and will, in my opinion, provide an impetus toward increased attractiveness of military service, and retention of technically qualified and needed personnel therein.

The increases proposed for the higher enlisted and officer grades are entirely justified. You have only to review the salary trends in the Federal civil service in the past few years to recognize the need.

The average increases in civil service pay since 1952 have been approximately 46 percent. The military increase in that same time has been 36.6 percent for those personnel with over 2 years service. If we include those men serving obligated service, the average military increase has been less than 34 percent. With these standards in mind, the bill before you proposes an average pay increase of 10.6 percent, and is designed solely to provide our military men and women parity with increases already provided to Federal civilians. The committee has accepted many good ideas and portions from the departmental bill. You can, in good conscience, provide no less, for those who serve.

Our military is no less deserving than any other faction in our economy to share in the wealth and productivity of

this Nation. I urge each of you to lend your support to H.R. 9075.

I shall ask, Mr. Chairman, when we are back in the Whole House, permission to revise and extend my remarks; and include a statement on this bill H.R. 9075, I made for the Seventh Missouri Congressional District on June 8, 1965.

This week, the House Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, began hearings on legislation to provide a pay increase for members of the armed services. One of these proposals, originated within the committee, is cosponsored by 34 of its members, including myself, and our chairman, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. The committee-backed bill would provide an average increase of approximately 11 percent in basic pay for all members of the uniformed services. The bill, sponsored by the administration, provides for a 5-percent increase for military personnel with over 2 years service, with a 3-percent base pay increase for those with less than 2 years service.

Although there is a very definite difference in the recommendations emanating from the executive and legislative branches, the fact is that both branches agree that a military pay increase is justified. The question, therefore, is, "How large an increase is justified, and where should these increases be placed in the military pay structure?" One of the first factors to be resolved is a comparison of pay structures for civil employees of the Federal Government with those in the military services. At one time, the job security afforded members of the military services was considered an additional benefit beyond those available to civil employees, and, therefore, a factor to be considered in setting pay scales. However, this is no longer true, since under civil service, civilian employees have virtually the same retirement and greater assurance of job security than those in the military. In some instances, they have even greater security than many military officers who may be involuntarily discharged because of age in grade, poor efficiency, or physical disqualification.

In 1949, the average annual pay of a classified civilian employee of the Federal Government was \$4,820. At that time, the average annual military pay—including quarters and subsistence allowances, amounted to \$3,846—a difference of approximately \$774. Today, this dollar differential has increased to \$1,676. The average pay of classified Civil Service personnel is now \$7,369, while average military pay, including all allowances, is only \$5,692. To restore the same relationship that previously existed with civilian Federal pay levels would require an 11.6 percent increase in military base pay. The year 1949 was selected as a starting point because it was at that time when the military compensation system was completely overhauled by the Congress in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. From these comparisons, it is quite evident that even in the "catching up process" military pay increases have lagged behind those provided civilian employees of the Federal Government.

But statistics alone do not fully portray the inadequacy of our present military pay structure. Today, 76,000 American soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen are facing hazards of war in Vietnam. In every corner of the globe, the members of the uniformed services represent our only sure line of defense against communism, subversion, and aggression. In addition, those who man battle stations around the world must often endure the hardship of long separation from family and loved ones, a sacrifice which few civilian employees are called upon to make. As our committee considers these many aspects (not to mention the question of locating sources of revenue to carry out these

adjustments), one thought must remain uppermost in our minds: In 1945, America's first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, was watching our forces prepare to land in Iwo Jima. As he saw many of those Americans going to what was to be a final resting place, he was moved to say:

"In the last analysis, it's the man with the rifle and the machine gun who wins the wars and who pays the penalty to preserve our liberty."

I know our committee will consider the Nation's debt to those who serve in time of crisis, as it undertakes to make needed pay adjustments for the members of our uniformed services. I hope we will also appreciate their willingness, devotion, and dedication.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, many times I have been before this body to speak for economy, for a balanced budget, and for reductions in runaway Federal spending. Today I find myself here in support of an additional spending program, yet one that differs from others and that is every way consistent with the goals of those who favor sane Government spending. Today I rise in support of a pay raise for our military men and women, a measure badly needed, Mr. Chairman, and one that I can truly feel is at last worthy of that catchall phrase "in the national interest." For I firmly believe that the adequate maintenance of our military is in the proper realm of Government spending, and the highest maintenance of our Nation's defense is the proper role of the Federal Government. When a man pays his taxes, Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of thing he wants to buy. He may not want to pay his neighbor's rent, but he wants to share in the cost of protecting himself, his family and his Nation.

Therefore, to scrimp on the pay of those who are serving in our Nation's defense would indeed be false economy. There can be no justification for compromising any area of our Nation's defense, and there can certainly be no justification for spending more on a high school dropout in the Job Corps than on a boy fighting for all of us in Vietnam. President Kennedy said:

Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.

Let us then do justice to those who are not asking, but who are doing.

But beyond this, Mr. Chairman, are overwhelming practical considerations in favor of this bill. Today our military departments are faced with the problem of attracting and maintaining adequate personnel. This fact was brought out in testimony after testimony by our military leaders. Surely the loss of qualified military men is not in the interest of the Nation's defense, and surely the cost of constant turnover and retraining is not in the interest of national economy. A pay raise, therefore, to keep our well-trained men in the services is not only the fair thing to do, but it is also the practical thing to do.

To the distinguished committee that guided and fostered this necessary legislation, I think that all Americans owe a debt of thanks. This committee knows,

as we all know, that our country has a military force of which we can all be proud. I have seen our men in action in Vietnam, and I frequently see them at Fort Benning and Robins Air Force Base in my district, as I did on an inspection tour just this past weekend. As they have throughout this Nation's history, Mr. Chairman, our armed services are doing a magnificent job. Their traditions, their victories, and their record is testimony to greatness that has never failed America. I only ask that America not fail them today.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. First, I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member, and the entire Committee on Armed Services for bringing to the Congress this foresighted proposal to increase the compensation of the members of the armed services.

This afternoon, we have discussed enough the humanitarian aspects of this bill and, in my opinion, not enough the basic management concept of this proposal.

For the past 10 years it has been my privilege to serve on the Advisory Board to the Air Training Command of the U.S. Air Force. This Board has been dedicated to the study of manpower development in the Air Force and toward the solution of other problems which burden this greatest of all educational institutions; namely, the Air Training Command.

Repeatedly, it has come to the attention of this Board that an increased investment on the part of our Government in the compensation of military personnel will unquestionably reap great rewards in terms of the quality of our people in the armed services.

I predict that shortly after this bill is enacted into law and the new pay schedule is enforced, we will begin to see the tangible results of this bill in terms of economy. I believe that the career motivation that will be generated among the hard core elements, specifically the highly technically trained people throughout the services, will more than make up in actual dollars saved for the cost of the legislation. Our failure to retain good people today is one of the biggest cost items of the military service budget.

Therefore, not only as a Member of this House, but as a taxpayer, I feel this bill not only is needed from a humanitarian point of view but is needed as part of sound management.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, but before I do that I would like to pay genuine and well deserved tribute to our chairman, MENDEL RIVERS, for the excellence of his

leadership, his courage, and his devotion to the adequate defense of our country.

I would like particularly to point out an important feature of this bill regarding enlisted men. Our distinguished chairman has already stressed that the big bulk of the cost of this bill goes to enlisted men. In addition, we have added to the bill a special feature called "the variable reenlistment bonus." What this means is that on top of the traditional reenlistment bonus additional sums can be paid, the amounts varying according to the retention needs of the various enlisted rates.

The Secretary of Defense told our committee that the retention problem was not uniform throughout the services and that in some rates the retention rate was more than adequate. But in about 40 percent of the total enlistment strength, additional reenlistments are needed to achieve proper service manning objectives. Generally speaking, of course, this 40 percent are the more critical rates where training time is extensive—electronics specialties, for example. The Defense Department advised our committee that in a few of the more critically undermanned specialties—making up about 5 percent of our enlisted strength—losses of \$10,000 or more occur whenever a first-termer fails to reenlist and operational capability suffers because of severe shortages of careerists.

Mr. Chairman, the variable reenlistment bonus, concentrating at the critical career decision points, is the answer to the retention needs in critical ratings. It is just plain good personnel planning to provide a \$4,000 bonus to encourage reenlistment rather than to pay \$10,000 to train a replacement.

The present reenlistment bonus, while being a longstanding traditional enlistment benefit which should be maintained, does not discriminate among skills and so does not help solve the selective retention problem.

To illustrate how the variable reenlistment provision for first-term reenlistees works, the present bonus for an E-4 or E-5 runs between \$800 and \$1,000. The variable bonus could add from about \$3,000 to almost \$4,000 to this amount. Thus, the maximum total bonus for a 4-year reenlistment could run between \$4,000 and \$4,950.

In using the Defense Department's recommendation for the variable reenlistment bonus, the committee provided that it would be paid in yearly increments rather than one lump sum. This lessens the tax bite on the enlisted man. It will probably make for more sound financial planning for the individual concerned. And it reminds him annually of one of the real benefits of career service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention briefly two other aspects which are not included in the bill but which bear directly on the matter of enlisted retention.

First, there is the question of proficiency pay, first authorized by the Congress in 1958, for enlisted personnel. Proficiency pay was designed to serve the same purpose as the variable reenlistment bonus, to provide additional pay on a selective basis for the outstanding

man without having to raise the pay of each individual. The Congress authorized proficiency pay up to \$150 per month and contemplated that it would go to approximately 15 percent of the enlisted force. The committee found, however, that it has been going to only 8.6 percent of enlisted personnel and that Defense has never allowed the full \$150 a month. The committee heard that each service had repeatedly requested additional funds for pro pay only to be denied its use by the Department of Defense. While there has been much criticism of proficiency pay by some enlisted elements, it might have been a more effective tool for retention if the Defense Department had allowed it to be fully used.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to point out the unnecessary problem the Army is having with enlisted insignia. Ever since the Pay Act of 1958, which provided the additional grades of E-8 and E-9, the Army has, for some strange reason, had trouble deciding the insignia to be used for enlisted ranks. Mr. Chairman, enlisted men wear their stripes, the symbol of their military rank, on their sleeve. To have to remove a stripe, for whatever reason, is an unpleasant experience which hurts the enlisted man's morale and which is very difficult for him to explain to his civilian friends. The Army's stripes plan would require over 40,000 noncommissioned officers to remove stripes. The flood of letters to service papers and Members of Congress makes it clear that this is having an adverse effect on retention and is making many enlisted men so disgusted with Army procedure that they are ready to leave the service. What makes the Army approach particularly objectionable is that in many cases the Army enlisted man would have one less stripe than the enlisted man of identical rank in the other services. You can imagine the difficulty an Army noncommissioned officer would have trying to explain that to his family or to a potential Army recruit. The committee has asked for a formal report from the Army on the matter and I sincerely hope the Army personnel planners will be big enough to admit a mistake and do what is best for the enlisted men.

Before closing I would like to quote from a few letters I have received on the question of sergeant's stripes legislation.

One enlisted man wrote:

The Department of Army stripe change effective in September is a terrible blow to the spirit and morale which have characterized our NCO ranks throughout American military history.

Another wrote:

There are many NCO's who have held their rank much longer than I who will be even more hurt. Even more important though is the fact that this is hurting reenlistment of the younger men.

Another wrote:

It is another example of how the U.S. Army defeats its own efforts to retain men in the service. My advice to young men considering the Army as a career—as a result of this latest directive by the Army to change enlisted grade insignia—don't stay in the

Army, go Navy or Air Force, but get out of the Army.

Another wrote:

I have served as a recruiter and am now serving as a career counselor and know firsthand the damaging effect on morale and retention of good quality personnel that the new stripe policy will have.

Another wrote:

Up until the change was announced we were reenlisting more than 50 percent of first-term RA's but for the last 2 months we have lost about 80 percent, and one of the remarks is they have no security and no respect for an organization that will demote personnel without reason.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, it was my great pleasure to support this legislation in committee and it is a greater pleasure today to support it on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the ranking minority member of the committee and all the members of the committee who have worked so long and so hard to bring this measure to the floor.

I think one could venture the assertion today that much of the legislation that is passed in this Chamber does not meet with general public approval. I believe it could safely be said and even assumed that the passage of this legislation today will meet the commendation and approval of a preponderant majority of American citizens because it does provide an equitable basic pay scale for our military personnel.

It was my pleasure recently to visit in a military hospital where one floor was occupied by casualties from both South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I wish every citizen of this country and particularly the Members of this Congress could have been with me as I talked to those young men individually and caught some of their enthusiasm and some of their love and affection for this country of ours.

There were young men there, who were asked, "How are you getting along, old fellow? How are you making out?" The answers were, "Well, I will be on this bed, they say, for 6 months. I will be on crutches for perhaps another 6 months, or perhaps another 18 months, but I will be back in the fighting lines someday."

That is the feeling I found. That is the response from the young men who are dying in Vietnam and who died in the Dominican Republic, and those in our hospitals today. It is a far cry from some of the expressions we hear in the intellectual-collegiate circles of America. It is a far cry from what we hear from some of the leadership in some of the movements going on in America today—that we ought to get out of Vietnam, that we ought to find a method and means to compromise our situation there.

What we are doing here today, in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, is bringing inspiration to the American people that at long last the Congress of the United States is meeting its responsibility in the well-defined areas of responsibility and authority of the Federal Government by doing something for men all over the world who are making freedom possible for us here.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, in any legislation dealing with military pay and allowances, we must give full consideration to two basic factors.

One is the adequacy of present pay scales for uniformed personnel in comparison to civilian pay. Since the end of the Korean war there has been a continuous exodus of the kind of servicemen we need to maintain our Military Establishment. Many of our skilled, highly trained military technicians are leaving the service after fulfilling their obligations, in search of higher pay and better living conditions in civilian life.

Another factor which we must fully consider is that of maintaining a pay scale which is sufficient to attract men to serve in the military on a career basis. Present military pay scales are not, obviously, sufficient to attract and retain qualified personnel. Statistics available to the Department of Defense indicate a steady decline since 1960 in the number of career personnel in the military. Likewise, the levels of compensation paid the military have consistently lagged behind the wage adjustments paid other workers in the economy. The military wage levels today are more than 10 percent behind the levels of compensation presently provided other Federal employees.

I do not believe there is any question that the men and women of the Armed Services are entitled to and require an increase in pay. Neither is there any question that such an increase is needed in order to make military service more attractive to prospective servicemen and to those already serving.

I fully intend to support H.R. 9075 as I believe the bill will not only help to correct present inequities but will result, through increased reenlistment, in substantial savings to the country. The costs of training new men are much higher than those involved in retraining experienced men now in the service.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, no issue facing this Nation today should bring greater concern to this body than that of adequate pay for our military personnel. This issue has attracted the attention of our Nation's leaders and have given cause to voluminous testimony, both written and verbal.

For many years the serviceman has been in many respects the forgotten man. We call on him and lionize him in our times of most desperate need, then tend to forget him when the shooting stops. Yet it often is his very presence in uniform which keeps hostilities from flaring up anew on an ever-widening scale.

The time has come to pay something more than a Fourth of July type of patriotic tribute to our military. I am as conscious as any of the need for fiscal responsibility in Government. Yet I am

convinced that we have engaged in false economy in the matter of military pay.

Military salaries will never be absolutely competitive with those of their civilian counterparts. It takes a highly motivated individual. We could never, of course, put a proper price tag on serving in Vietnam, on circling the earth in a spacecraft, or standing guard on the edge of rebel-held territory in Santo Domingo.

No longer can we deal primarily in numbers as regards our military posture, for this Nation is not one which possesses an inexhaustible supply of manpower. When we realize the overpowering numerical legion of men readily available in Red China and the Soviet Union, quickly we recognize the need to concern ourselves with perfecting and relying on brain power as well as brawn power. We simply do not have the brute strength in numbers nor was this Nation founded as—nor God willing will it ever become—an essentially militaristic power.

At a time of unprecedented national prosperity, considerable numbers of our military citizens are unable to keep their heads above the level of the financially disadvantaged. Those of us who have taken a good hard look at the military pay structure cannot experience less than a sense of shame toward the financial plight of many of the men who protect our country.

In the Air Force alone, of the 884,000 on active duty, some 153,730 are required to moonlight—to work full time on an extra job, if you please—in order to supplement their income. An additional 180,000 Air Force wives also must work in order for their families to survive financially.

These figures do not take into account those who would like to work after hours if they could do so. Many are stationed near small communities which offer no outside job opportunities; others work many overtime hours at their regular military tasks, precluding any extra work. And of course, in some cases regulations prevent moonlighting by military personnel where it would be in competition with local workers.

It has been stated that anyone making under \$3,000 a year is financially disadvantaged. In the Air Force alone, 169,000 receive basic pay below \$3,000 per year. Additionally, 5,000 Air Force men this past year lined up in front of local welfare agencies to receive relief benefits in the form of surplus food commodities. This fact should be a point of shame to the Congress. Approximately 55,000 more were technically eligible for such relief but far too proud to accept it.

The fiscal authorization contained in this bill admittedly is a lot of money. But in terms of the numbers of highly skilled, well trained, and carefully educated military individuals who annually leave the service to support their families at better pay on the outside, this figure is a veritable bargain. Consider the following figures. The total investment cost of training just one radar electronics specialist is \$23,000; for training a ballistic missile launch officer, \$49,140; for a B-52 commander, \$1,400,000, and for his crew another \$2 million. When these

men are forced to quit, all that investment goes down the drain.

Between 60 and 70 percent of all skilled enlisted men leave at the end of their first 4-year term. An average of 54 percent of the officers separate at the earliest permitted date. In the past 5 years, Army resignations have increased by more than 50 percent, and Air Force resignations by more than 137 percent. Just recently the Secretary of the Navy publicly pleaded with his personnel to extend their enlistments so that the Navy could retain adequate numbers of experienced personnel to cope with the world situation.

It costs \$1 billion to buy unit equipment for a B-52 wing of 45 aircraft and operate them with their required tankers for 5 years. It costs \$1 billion to buy 40 B-58's and operate them with their required tankers for 5 years. It costs \$1 billion to buy 6 Polaris submarines with a total of 96 missiles and operate them for 5 years.

Yet, no matter how much we talk about the wonder of new weapons systems, the common denominator is and always will be the men who make them work. Military service more and more requires intensive technical training. It requires a steady and dependable supply of men educated in the traditions of national service and trained to the ready acceptance of great responsibilities and to the discipline which such responsibility places on them.

As new and evermore sophisticated weapons systems and techniques emerge, the military must have the education necessary to assimilate the required training for these weapons systems and techniques. Today 94 percent of our commissioned officers have some college credit. Sixty-five percent have a college degree or higher. And 90 percent of all enlisted personnel have a high school diploma or better. In 1948, only 24.7 percent of all officers had degrees and in 1958, 48.4 percent had them. Times have changed, and the military brainpower requirements grow ever greater.

All this points up the fact that the present inadequate pay scale does not attract and retain sufficient numbers of qualified career personnel. Hardship discharges increased from 9,533 in fiscal 1963 to 12,668 in fiscal year 1965. In 1964, among personnel leaving the Navy, over 21,600 were men possessing critical skills in such crucial fields as electronics which require a vast amount of training and intelligence.

It is significant that, whereas our basic military trainee is paid \$78 a month upon entering his military service, an enrollee in the Job Corps receives \$80 a month and \$105 monthly if he possesses a dependent.

In my home State it is tragic but true that an airman second class—or corporal, if you please—with over 2 years service draws only \$10 a month more in pay than does an unemployed civilian. If this serviceman could obtain permission for discharge by his commander and if he were a legal resident of Texas, he could remove himself to a bench on the courthouse square and whittle away his time with a pay cut of only \$10 a month.

We talk of missiles in space and sophisticated weaponry unheard of just a decade ago; yet along with the inadequate service pay is coupled a subsistence allowance dating back before the Civil War. I wonder how many realize that an officer receives \$47.88 a month to eat on and an enlisted man \$31.50. Let me hastily add that these figures apply to both a single man and one with a large family as well.

Inadequate housing allowances also offer no relief for retention of our military. An airman first class draws \$83 quarters allowance from the Government, and for a man with a family it is a rare community, indeed, that affords him any type of housing for this amount.

Yes, to raise military pay will cost money. But compared to the billions of dollars a year wasted in unnecessary turnover and the incalculable threat to our protective strength and the safety of our country, it is a small price, indeed. I think it is easily demonstrable that this bill can more than pay for itself by the savings it will bring about in the high extra training costs caused by this inordinately high turnover.

Today our military are in danger of becoming forgotten men. The economy is leaving them so far behind that it is small wonder they are becoming disillusioned and embittered, unwilling to put up any longer with the status of second-class citizenship.

The military pay raise before this House will show these almost-forgotten men that we do value and cherish their service. The annual review of military pay each year will help motivate them to a military career, and the payment of additional moneys for critical skills will in many ways be the prevailing factor in retaining these individuals within the service. The similar increase for our Reserve and National Guard units is especially paramount at this time when many face possible recall to active service.

Many years ago, the following poem was scrawled on a sentry box. It is as fitting today as it was then:

God and the soldier all men adore
In time of trouble and no more;
For when war is over and all things righted,
God is neglected; the soldier slighted.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the military pay raise, bill, H.R. 9075, now pending. This bill authorizes much-needed increases in basic pay averaging 10.6 percent for all members of the uniformed military services. Providing the first pay increase since 1952 for enlisted personnel with 2 or less years of service, H.R. 9075 allows these servicemen an average pay increase of 17.3 percent. It authorizes an average increase of 11.1 percent for enlistees with over 2 years of service, a 22-percent average increase for officers with less than 2 years of service and an overall pay increase of 6.4 percent for officers with over 2 years of service.

In addition to raising pay, H.R. 9075, permits the Defense Department to pay a person, having a critical skill, an additional amount up to four times the bonus to which he is currently entitled upon re-

enlisting. Furthermore, it establishes a procedure to require the President to review the adequacy of the military pay system each year and report to Congress.

From the standpoint of the individual servicemen, H.R. 9075 authorizes necessary salary increases. I have received countless letters from constituents, servicemen, many of them servicemen's wives, who are finding it increasingly difficult to manage their households under the present military salary system.

On the other hand, if the armed services are to attract and retain the well-trained and qualified personnel vital to our defense system, it must offer salaries at least comparable to the compensation received in other vocations and by Federal civilian employees. The drop in reenlistment rates, the loss of qualified career personnel to higher paying vocations, costs the taxpayer many millions of dollars, as training costs of each new inductee vary from \$4,000 to \$5,000. The additional bonus provided in the bill will serve to retain the trained career personnel.

The House Armed Services Committee conducted a thorough and comprehensive study of the present military pay system and then reported H.R. 9075 favorably with a 34 to 1 vote. The only dissenting vote cast to allow even greater pay increases. The committee has recommended a thoughtful approach to much-needed revision of the military pay system and I urge House approval of H.R. 9075.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

Enactment of this legislation is necessary to insure that all uniformed services personnel will, now, and in the future, be provided a level of compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private section of economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. This fact is evident in that among the various reasons given by personnel who elect not to continue their military careers is, invariably, the inadequacy of military compensation.

The inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified career personnel is shared by all the military departments. While the problem is particularly acute in the Department of the Navy, as evidenced publicly by the recent plea made by the Secretary of the Navy in which he requested both enlisted and officer personnel who had completed their obligated service to voluntarily extend their period of service so as to enable the Navy to properly meet its operational commitments, it is nevertheless a problem faced by all the services.

Recent recruiting experience of the military departments also reflects the growing recruitment problem. For example, since July 1964 enlistments of new

recruits have fallen below corresponding 1963 levels by as much as 18 percent.

It is significant to note at this point that the Department of Defense has strongly recommended early enactment of a variable reenlistment bonus to help correct the career retention problem. Secretary McNamara, in his statement to the Committee on Armed Services, said authority for the variable reenlistment bonus was desired "to allow the use of the reenlistment bonus as a flexible device in helping to retain people in skills that are in short supply."

Information provided the Committee on Armed Services by Secretary McNamara indicated that additional reenlistments are needed in specialties accounting for about 41 percent of the total enlisted force strength in order to achieve all of services' manning objectives. In other words, the military departments are experiencing serious retention problems in almost half of the enlisted ranks, rates, and skills in the total structure. On the other hand, it does not mean that all is well with the remaining 59 percent since it is axiomatic that an actual excess in retention is required so as to permit the military departments reasonable opportunity for "selectivity" in the retention of the best qualified personnel.

The inability of the military departments to obtain selectivity in connection with the reenlistment of personnel has often resulted in the necessity to reenlist poor performers and borderline disciplinary cases in order to maintain force levels. Thus, when these marginal enlistees are retained there is an inevitable downgrading of the personnel capability of the military unit with the result that the remaining good men are required to carry a heavier load. This extra workload forced upon personnel because of poor performers again inevitably detracts from the desire of these competent personnel to continue their military careers.

During the past year, the press has carried numerous accounts of the large number of military personnel who were required to hold an extra job in order to insure additional financial income. The press referred to this second job activity as "moonlighting."

Testimony received by the committee confirmed the fact that an unfortunately large percentage of military personnel are forced to obtain a second job so as to provide their families with an adequate standard of living. Departmental statistics indicate that during calendar year 1964 approximately 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States, at one time or another, engaged in moonlighting activities.

Since uniformed personnel are part of the Federal family of workers, and since significant efforts have recently been made by both the Congress and the administration to place Federal civilian employee wage levels on a basis comparable to that of workers in the private sector of our economy, the Armed Services Committee initiated a study to determine the relative changes which have occurred in military and Federal civilian pay scales.

This effort was designed to measure the relative change in pay of these two

groups of Federal workers over a given period of time. Its primary objective, therefore, was to determine to what degree the salary relationship of all military and Federal civilian employees had been altered by pay changes in the respective personnel systems.

In order to accomplish this objective, it was necessary for the committee to identify the various elements of military compensation and the comparable elements of Federal civilian compensation.

The committee hearings contain a complete documentation of this study, the net result of which indicates that since 1952 military pay increases have amounted to 33.9 percent while during an equivalent period Federal civilian pay increases have amounted to 46.3 percent.

The compensation of enlisted military personnel has consistently lagged behind the percentage pay increase provided other workers in occupations requiring similar skill levels.

Mr. Chairman, none can question the need for a highly competent and dedicated personnel in our uniformed services. This is a time when that need is acutely apparent. Ironically, the present military pay structure places many of our military men within the poverty formula as established by the administration. Such an inadequate pay scale is a critical matter, particularly the compensation for men with less than 2 years service. Our Nation has been strangely stingy with its military people.

I commend the work of Chairman RIVERS and his entire committee. They have handled a somewhat delicate and highly technical matter with both dispatch and clarity. I join the committee in urging the passage of this legislation—not just for the sake of our military personnel—but for the sake of our Nation.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965.

In this connection, it is my firm conviction that Chairman RIVERS of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the members of this important committee, are to be highly commended for their detailed study, and their dedicated work in bringing this most urgent legislation to the floor of the House this afternoon.

During these uncertain times of international tensions, it is fitting and proper that the U.S. Congress pass this bill, H.R. 9075, without amendment. This is the one way that we can reassure the members of the armed services—upon whom we are completely dependent for the protection of our way of life—that their sacrifices, which they are making for us today, are recognized and deeply appreciated by a grateful Nation.

It is absolutely essential that America maintain skilled, qualified men and women of superior abilities in the hazardous task of being truly our first line of defense—our first line of protection.

These men and women are subject to the most hazardous duties, and their services are needed 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. Therefore, it is only proper that the U.S. Congress authorize this very equitable and fair increase in

their compensation, in order that our American people may benefit by their retention in our Armed Forces.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that we all owe a deep debt of gratitude to Chairman RIVERS for his leadership and, by passing the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 without amendment, our military forces, particularly those serving in combat today, will be reassured that the people of the United States fully realize the unsurpassed contribution that they are now making in preserving our way of life.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the Uniformed Services Pay Act, H.R. 9075. I think we all agree that an increase in military compensation is urgently required. Certainly those of us who heard the testimony and studied the statistics compiled during the committee hearings on the proposal are convinced of a clear and present need for a substantial upward adjustment in military pay levels.

I joined our distinguished chairman in introducing this legislation because of my conviction that the recommended increases, averaging 10.7 percent, are equitable and necessary.

The need for adjustments in Armed Forces pay has been surveyed in great detail. Although there is disagreement between the committee and the administration as to how much of an increase is in order at the present time, there seems to be unanimity in the conviction that present pay scales are inadequate to attract and retain the caliber of people necessary to meet current requirements.

In addition to the average increase in pay of 10.7 percent, the bill before us provides for both an annual and a quadrennial review of military pay, and a variable enlistment bonus designed to meet the specialized personnel retention problems currently being experienced by the services.

It is imperative that we provide a strong reenlistment incentive to first-term enlisted personnel whose skills are critically required by the military departments. The variable reenlistment bonus authorized by this bill offers a good approach which should aid us in retaining personnel possessing skills in short supply.

I am in complete agreement with the concept of an annual review of the adequacy of military pay and allowances and the mandatory quadrennial review of the principles and concepts of military compensation.

The Government cannot afford to pay its military personnel poorly. The exodus of good, skilled men from our Armed Forces must be stemmed in the interest of national defense. This is particularly true in the troubled and dangerous world in which we now live when we are engaged in a difficult struggle in South Vietnam, the outcome of which is most important for the future of the free world.

Seventy thousand U.S. troops are reported to be in Vietnam now, and it is expected that our strength there will be built up rapidly to between 100,000 and 150,000 men. We are even told it might

be necessary to increase our troop strength in Vietnam to 300,000 by the end of the year.

Clearly our daily needs for well-trained, brave and dedicated military men are increasing as the situation in Vietnam goes from bad to worse.

A young man entering military service knows that he will be required to make frequent moves, that he will often be separated from his family; that he may have to serve in isolated, unpleasant, and dangerous places far from home. He must forgo the relative stability and higher pay of civilian pursuits. All these factors contribute to the growing recruitment problem. In view of the many sacrifices that are inextricably linked to military service, we must at least not add financial sacrifice when this is a drawback of current military service that we have the ability to correct.

The bill now under consideration authorizes three necessary steps in the right direction and deserves the support of all of us. It is the very least we can do for the men and women who are doing so much for us.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee has given us a bill to provide our Armed Forces with a pay increase adequate to keep pace with the cost of living and which will recognize the need to obtain and retain competent personnel for the security of our country. I wish to go on the record in strong support of H.R. 9075 recommended by the committee.

We are told that it costs from \$4,000 to \$5,000 to train each man who enters the service. We are also informed that hardship discharges are increasing each year and that recruits are relatively more poorly paid than were the draftees of World War II. Where is the economy then in cutting corners, rather than granting a meaningful pay increase for the men and women who are responsible for our defense?

Many other areas come to mind where this Congress could practice economy with a great deal more justification. We are spending billions of dollars for hastily conceived domestic programs and will be asked to send good money after bad to continue programs where gross waste and mismanagement have already come to light. Should it be more profitable to be a "school dropout" eligible for the Job Corps in the "war on poverty" than it is to be a lower grade enlisted man in the Armed Forces?

H.R. 9075 also provides for annual review by the President to insure that military pay is in balance with civilian scales so that servicemen are protected against in the future being compensated at a rate below that which the administration defines as the poverty level. Another step in the direction of a more efficient defense effort is the provision for a variable reenlistment bonus in order to retain specialists whose skills are increasingly necessary to the function of the modern Military Establishment.

We are facing the need to commit increasing numbers of military personnel to the war in Vietnam. At few junctures in recent history when we were not actually at war has the United States

asked so much of its armed services, and provided so few incentives for service in any branch. It is no time for this Congress to turn suddenly tightfisted, neglecting the opportunity to provide American servicemen with compensation comparable to that which they could obtain in civilian life.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, a bill to increase the rates of basic pay for members of our armed services.

The evidence is convincing that our Committee on Armed Services, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has investigated exhaustively the question of granting pay raises for military personnel. I am satisfied that our committee's inquiry was carried to all facets of the question and covered it completely in depth as well as breadth. I am prepared to accept the committee's considered judgment in favor of a 10.6-percent average increase in basic pay for all military personnel, although I personally would have greatly favored the inclusion, in the reported bill, of the dependents' allowance concept which is found in H.R. 8779, a bill which I have introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased nevertheless that the committee has decided to provide, in the bill we are now considering, a more sizable pay increase for service personnel with less than 2 years' service. In this category, of course, are found our junior officers and our enlisted men in the lowest grades.

It is accepted fact that no private employer in the United States would expect any man to work for \$78 a month plus board and barracks for the first 4 months of his employment, and then at \$83 a month for the following 20 months. But the Federal Government expects the enlisted man in pay grade E-1 to do so.

No private employer in this Nation would expect any man to provide for a family of four, on a monthly salary of \$167.10, but curiously enough if a man is in uniform we expect him to do so.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the turnover among military personnel has been such as to constitute a serious item of cost in maintaining our Armed Forces. It is also not surprising to find that an unfortunately large percentage of military personnel are forced to obtain a second job so as to provide their families with an adequate standard of living. Department of Defense statistics show that during calendar year 1964 approximately 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States, at one time or another, engaged in this second job activity which is often referred to as moonlighting.

The record with regard to Army draftees during fiscal year 1963-64 indicates a staggering 58.2 percent turnover per year; to maintain an average draftee strength of 187,202, it was necessary to replace 210,791 losses of inductees with 225,000 gains, or an average yearly turnover of 108,967.

The Regular Army, as distinguished from the draftees, has a 50.1 overall reenlistment rate. Only 12.9 percent of the inductees, 22.5 percent of the first-

term enlistees, and 84.5 percent of the career men reenlist.

The Department of the Army estimates that, based on actual experience through March 1965, and programed change thereafter, there will be a 14.4 percent officer personnel turnover of 16,000 out of 111,000 officers. There will also be a 25.6 percent enlisted personnel turnover based on losses—excluding reenlistments—of 231,100 and gains—excluding reenlistments—of 204,200.

Based on fiscal year 1964 data, the total costs of bringing an enlisted man through basic combat training and a common specialist skill during the first 21 to 25 weeks of his service will average \$3,269. This is the minimum training required for a first duty assignment in an operational unit.

If the man is given basic combat training in a technical specialty, the total costs of his first 21 to 31 weeks in the Army, will average \$5,486.

While I do not have comparable figures for the Navy and Air Force, the per man cost of turnover must necessarily be as high or higher, due to the highly technical nature of the training required in those services.

It is probable that we do not save any money at all through our present penurious military pay scale. On the contrary, it appears that creating this pocket of poverty creates an additional financial burden for the Federal Government.

It is indeed a sad commentary that the U.S. Government has through the low pay scales for members of its armed services made it necessary for them to resort to moonlighting and created a pocket of poverty for more than 3 million military dependents.

The proposed pay increases are essential if we are to lift our military personnel and their dependents from this pocket of poverty and to raise them to an economic level which approaches that of first-class citizens.

These pay raises are indeed just and equitable. For example, for officers with 2 or less years' service, of whom about 50 percent have families, the proposed average increase of 22 percent means that a second lieutenant or an ensign will receive additional pay in the amount of \$53.40 a month. When we recall that during the past 13 years officers in this grade have received only one basic pay increase of \$18.90 a month, there is certainly no necessity to present arguments to justify the proposed increase.

It is evident that our Committee on Armed Services has appropriately examined with great care the ancillary problems of comparability, retirement adjustment factors, and pension costs, in making its recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, in urging a favorable vote for H.R. 9075, I should like to quote General of the Army Omar N. Bradley who before the Folsom Panel testified in part as follows:

Substantial increase in current pay at this time appears to be the simplest, most effective, and in the long run, cheapest solution if the services are to retain the hard-core professionals which the Nation so desperately needs.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075. I wish to emphatically endorse this most important piece of legislation. Enactment is absolutely essential to insure that all members of the armed services will now—and in the future—receive compensation comparable to that enjoyed by other workers in our economy.

The failure of military pay to keep pace with wage adjustments of other Federal civilian employees is unpardonable. As has been pointed out in the debate this afternoon, there are even instances of recipients of welfare, and various programs under the so-called war on poverty, receiving more compensation than certain grades of enlisted men who are serving and dying for their country.

It is high time we give these adjustments to our active service personnel and reservists.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, as representative of a community with the Nation's second largest naval establishment, I suppose it is not surprising that I speak in support of a military pay raise. A boost in the spending power of service families would of course stimulate the general economy of my district, and would help offset the effect of protracted unemployment.

However, if it were to stop there, I concede that my argument would lack force. The case for this pay increase must stand or fall not on the benefits it promises my district or any other Member's district, but on its importance to the security of the United States.

Measured on this scale, the legislation can be as vital to Hutchinson, Kans., as to San Diego, Calif.

The facts, Mr. Chairman, are that the Navy is experiencing a critical manpower shortage. It was necessary, this spring, to enlist 38,000 men—just to keep up with the rate of discharges.

And in the Pacific fleet, as of today, 10,000 men are needed to bring our forces there to a normal Manning level. A step-up of operations against North Vietnam could accentuate that need.

The answer by no means lies in new enlistment alone.

As was pointed out recently by Pentagon Correspondent Less Bell, of the Copley News Service, the costliest drop in manpower has been at the level of junior officers and petty officers—trained men who, as in a business organization, carry the load of leadership below the command level.

A number of solutions have been proposed. Congress might be asked to extend present enlistments, or call up reserves. I do not need to explain the acute political sensitivity of such steps as these.

Another suggestion has been to transfer manpower from other areas to the Pacific Fleet. What, then, if new troubles should develop in the Caribbean, the Mediterranean, or elsewhere? Obviously, this is no solution either.

Shore establishments already have been strained to provide replacements at sea. And overseas tours have been stretched, with crews on some vessels working 12-hour watches. The carrier

Ranger recently operated for 70 consecutive days without touching port.

Men of the Navy have never minded sacrifices like these, if satisfied they are necessary. The patience and understanding of Navy wives, too, are a constant source of inspiration.

But human endurance has its limits. All of us long to be appreciated. And there is one very practical way to demonstrate to servicemen and service families that we share their determination and sacrifice—that we want them to stay at their post.

A substantial boost in pay levels is the answer, Mr. Chairman. I hope this committee will send to the floor a bill that addresses itself not to the query, "Can we afford to pass it?" but to the more challenging question, "Can we afford not to?"

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075, legislation I consider essential to restore financial security to our servicemen in uniform. The Committee on Armed Services has held extensive hearings and has conducted research to determine the disparity of compensation to members of the Armed Forces as compared with civilian employment. During the past 12 years it was discovered that the pay of military personnel has increased an average of 33.9 percent; Federal civilian employment pay, 46.3 percent; and wages in private industry 60 percent.

On the average, a graduate engineer will begin his career in civilian life at a salary of \$7,152, while a first lieutenant in the military would receive approximately \$3,500. This same military pay deficiency may be found in any step of military classification when it is compared to a similar position outside the service.

The proposal now before us would increase the wages of members of the armed services 10.6 percent; with officers receiving an average 7.2 percent, and enlisted men, 12.1 percent. The pay of the first lieutenant I mentioned earlier would be increased nearly \$1,000 under this plan.

In the light of our apparently increased commitment in Vietnam, it is absolutely essential to our national security that this country be able to maintain at the highest possible level, an experienced, well-trained military force. And yet the committee report clearly shows that under present pay scales it has become increasingly difficult to induce servicemen to reenlist. In 1962, 20.1 percent of all Army inductees reenlisted upon completion of their obligation. By 1964 the reenlistment figure had dropped to 3.6 percent. These are men in whom we have invested thousands of dollars worth of training, and as the committee points out: "It is evident that this continued drop in the reenlistment rate of inductees is costing the taxpayers of America many millions of dollars." Figures show that the same unhappy situation prevails in the Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

The minority report points out that the retention problem differs among the

various services. In particular, the report cites the problem of the Navy where skills are more marketable than in the other services. This, however, is no argument against the across-the-board pay increase. The situation is specifically dealt with by the variable reenlistment bonus proposed by the President and adopted by the committee. Indeed, the committee has improved upon the recommendation by providing that the bonus be spread over the term of reenlistment thus softening the tax blow. Certainly this variable reenlistment bonus gives the services the needed flexibility to allow each service to tailor bonuses to their individual needs.

The proposal also allows for an annual review by the President of the entire military pay scale, and for a comprehensive review every 4 years. These reviews are necessary to avoid any future substantial lag in the military pay structure.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the First District of New Hampshire. In that district we have servicemen of the Air Force, Navy, and Marines at bases in the seacoast area. Many of them and their families have written me and discussed personally, the hardships they encountered as servicemen, both enlisted men and officers, in the face of the spiraling cost of living. It is no secret that in many parts of the Nation members of the Armed Forces require relief food in order that their families might subsist.

I cannot stress too strongly, the importance of this legislation. Our military need for trained personnel are higher now than for any period since the Korean conflict. It is absolutely necessary that we take every step to insure that we are able to maintain the high level of skills necessary to meet our commitments in Vietnam and throughout the world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9075 and I commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking minority member as well as the other members of the committee for their legislative efforts.

There can be little argument that the men and women serving in the military are entitled to and should receive an increase in pay. It is due them by reason of their service for our country, particularly at a time when crisis challenges and confronts us. It is also due them because, in almost no other industry in this Nation do so many people do so much for so little.

A private who may be called upon to risk his life in battle receives no more than someone working in the poverty program here at home.

In fact, a private in our Army does not even receive \$1.25 an hour, the minimum wage scale across the United States.

The increase called for in H.R. 9075 will raise the pay of our military to a more reasonable level. It will help bring pay scales more in line with the present cost of living. It will help establish a pay scale which will help keep competent trained men and women in the military.

It is good legislation, it is needed legislation, and it is legislation which I am pleased to support. Our military deserve no less than what they will receive as a result of its passage and indeed it can be argued that they are deserving of a good deal more.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support of H.R. 9075, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965. The issue raised by this bill is not a limited one of concern to only a small group, but rather one which will affect all Americans. At stake is the defense of the United States and the entire free world and on trial is our willingness to bear the burdens which this task involves.

We have spent, and will continue to spend, vast sums of money for the development and production of new guns, planes, ships, and missiles. But dedicated and capable personnel are no less important than the weapons they employ for the defense of ourselves and our allies, and the deterrence of would-be aggressors. Thus, just as we have been prepared to bear heavy expense for new armaments, so must we be realistic in our appraisal of the expenses which must be borne if our Armed Forces are to attract and retain men and women of the caliber required by a modern military force-in-readiness. The advance of modern technology does not lessen this need; on the contrary, it increases it. There is little hope of attracting skilled and specialized personnel if salaries of the Armed Forces are held below those for comparable civilian jobs, or if increases in military pay lag behind the yearly increase in the demand for such qualification, or behind the rise in the cost of living.

While this bill entails an increased Federal expenditure, in the long run it will lead to considerable saving, for it will help reduce the waste involved when the armed services spend large sums of money in training personnel who subsequently leave the forces because of inadequate salaries.

During the last century, we have fought two world wars, expended hundreds of billions of dollars on defense, and suffered huge numbers of casualties in the cold war, all for the preservation of our freedom and our way of life. At this very moment, in South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, our fellow Americans are risking their lives for the preservation of our liberty.

The expenses entailed by the bill I am supporting are negligible compared with the losses which would be involved if, by an immoderate desire for economy, we jeopardized all that we seek to preserve. We cannot buy a 20th century defense with 19th century wages.

Passage of this bill is not only crucial to the national interest, but is essential if we are to give fair and equitable treatment to those serving in our Armed Forces. The bill seeks to do no more than give them wages comparable with those which they would receive for their skills in civilian life. In view of the greater risks, responsibilities and importance of the military jobs which they hold, this

criterion of comparability is a moderate one indeed. Let us give a fair salary today to those who may give their lives tomorrow.

We cannot juggle the books with our national security, for they will be mercilessly audited by the Communist aggressors. We must not shrink from the burden which both justice and self-interest demand we bear. Eternal vigilance, the condition of liberty, means Armed Forces composed of capable men receiving just compensation.

Passage of this bill is demanded by our responsibilities to our fellow citizens, and by our obligations to those Americans who are bearing and will continue to bear arms in the common defense.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my wholehearted support for H.R. 9075, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the U.S. uniformed services.

My only objection to this bill is that it does not, in my opinion, give sufficient increases to the lower pay grades, to the men who are the bones and sinew of our military machine.

The need for pay increases is graphically shown in reenlistment figures for recent years. Each of our military departments has shown a steady and consistent downward trend in the number and percentage of men who have reenlisted after completing their required service.

The greatest weakness of our Armed Forces is their inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. We can solve this problem only by offering compensation which compares with that offered by private industry.

Our Nation's defense efforts have definitely been hampered by our failure to raise military pay. Because many of the best qualified men leave the armed service, it has been necessary to reenlist second-rate personnel and borderline disciplinary cases in order to maintain force levels. This has put an extra burden on the remaining qualified men, and has been another factor in the decision of competent personnel to quit the service.

The Army reports that more than two-thirds of all enlisted men on duty today have less than 4 years of experience. The Navy has reported a shortage of more than 40,000 petty officers. The reenlistment rate among first-rate Air Force personnel has dropped to 25 percent.

There are other indications of the need for military pay raises. In the past year, the Nation's press has carried many accounts of the large number of military personnel who are forced to obtain second jobs to provide their families with adequate standards of living. It has been estimated that, during 1964, 34 percent of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States had outside employment at one time or another.

Another telling factor is the number of hardship discharges granted to military personnel. The figures rose from 9,533 in 1963 to 10,924 last year, and it is expected to reach 12,600 this year.

A significant provision in H.R. 9075 is the variable reenlistment bonus plan, which will provide the armed services with a flexible device to help retain personnel with needed skills.

This bill also will establish an annual Presidential review of the military pay situation, and a review each 4 years of the entire concept of military compensation.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that an increase in military pay is urgently needed, and I strongly urge adoption of this bill as a vital tool in our national defense program.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 ¹	\$1,417.80	\$1,467.60	\$1,467.60	\$1,467.60	\$1,467.60	\$1,523.70	\$1,523.70	\$1,631.00	\$1,641.00	\$1,757.70	\$1,757.70	\$1,875.00	\$1,875.00	\$1,992.30	\$1,992.30
O-9	1,266.60	1,299.60	1,328.10	1,328.10	1,328.10	1,361.70	1,361.70	1,417.80	1,417.80	1,536.30	1,536.30	1,654.50	1,654.50	1,772.40	1,772.40
O-8	1,168.50	1,203.30	1,231.80	1,231.80	1,231.80	1,233.30	1,233.30	1,386.30	1,386.30	1,443.90	1,506.90	1,564.20	1,627.20	1,627.20	1,627.20
O-7	974.70	1,041.60	1,041.60	1,041.60	1,087.80	1,087.80	1,151.10	1,151.10	1,208.70	1,329.30	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70	1,421.70
O-6	739.50	770.10	820.20	820.20	820.20	820.20	820.20	848.40	848.40	952.20	1,032.30	1,054.80	1,116.30	1,210.80	1,210.80
O-5	591.60	644.70	688.50	688.50	688.50	688.50	710.10	748.20	797.40	857.70	906.90	933.90	966.90	966.90	966.90
O-4	526.50	562.80	600.90	600.90	611.70	639.00	682.50	720.90	753.90	786.60	808.20	808.20	808.20	808.20	808.20
O-3 ²	427.80	473.40	505.80	559.50	586.50	607.80	640.20	672.30	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80	688.80
O-2 ²	342.60	403.50	484.20	500.40	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20	511.20
O-1 ²	294.60	330.00	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50	412.50

¹ While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is \$2,140.20 regardless of cumulative years of

service computed under section 205 of this title.
² Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	\$559.50	\$586.50	\$607.80	\$640.20	\$672.30	\$699.60	\$699.60	\$699.60	\$699.60	\$699.60	\$699.60	\$699.60
O-2	500.40	511.20	527.10	554.40	575.70	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60	591.60
O-1	412.50	440.40	456.60	473.10	489.60	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80	511.80

"Warrant officers"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	\$435.60	\$507.00	\$507.00	\$518.70	\$542.70	\$566.10	\$589.50	\$631.20	\$660.20	\$684.30	\$701.70	\$725.40	\$749.10	\$807.90	\$807.90
W-3	396.00	468.90	468.90	474.60	480.60	516.00	546.00	563.70	581.40	599.10	617.10	640.80	664.50	688.50	688.50
W-2	346.50	388.50	388.50	399.90	422.10	444.90	461.70	478.50	495.30	512.40	529.20	546.30	568.50	568.50	568.50
W-1	288.90	347.70	347.70	376.50	393.60	410.40	427.50	444.90	462.00	479.10	495.90	513.30	513.30	513.30	513.30

"Enlisted members"

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9						\$492.00	\$503.40	\$514.80	\$526.20	\$537.30	\$548.70	\$577.20	\$633.30	\$633.30	
E-8						417.90	429.00	440.40	451.50	462.60	473.70	501.90	557.40	557.40	
E-7	\$261.00	\$324.90	\$336.90	\$348.60	\$360.30	372.00	383.70	396.00	413.40	425.40	437.10	442.80	472.80	531.90	
E-6	225.00	276.30	287.70	299.40	311.10	322.50	333.90	351.30	362.70	374.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	380.10	
E-5	194.10	242.10	253.50	264.90	282.00	293.70	305.10	316.80	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	322.50	
E-4	163.50	200.70	211.80	228.30	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	239.70	
E-3	117.90	160.20	171.60	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	182.70	
E-2	97.50	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	
E-1	93.90	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	121.80	
E-1 (under 4 months)	87.90														

SEC. 2. The enactment of this Act does not reduce—

(1) the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under section 411 of title 38, United States Code, that any person was receiving on the day before the effective date of this Act or which thereafter becomes payable for that day by reason of a subsequent determination; or

(2) the basic pay or the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of a uniformed service was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 19, title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1008. Presidential recommendations concerning adjustments and changes in pay and allowances

"(a) The President shall direct an annual review of the adequacy of the pays and allowances authorized by this title for uniformed personnel. Upon completion of this review, but not later than March 31 of each year, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed report summarizing the results of such annual review together with any

recommendations for adjustments in the rates of pay and allowances authorized by this title.

"(b) Whenever the President considers it appropriate, but in no event later than January 1, 1967, and not less than once each four years thereafter, he shall direct a complete review of the principles and concepts of the compensation system of all uniformed personnel. Upon completion of such review he shall submit a detailed report to the Congress summarizing the results of such review together with any recommendations he may have proposing changes in the statutory salary system and other elements of

that ought to be at other levels. It ought to be for the major general with 26 years of service, who has had six raises in 19 years, and who under this bill will get \$171 a month more.

For those of us who voted ourselves last year a \$625-a-month raise, it seems ill becoming to applaud our efforts to raise these men \$9.90 or \$10.70.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would go at least somewhat further in the direction of making this more equitable for those with less than 2 years' service.

The committee bill would raise a recruit from \$78 to \$87.90. My proposal would raise the recruit's pay to \$102, to start with, for men with less than 4 months' service.

The committee bill would raise the E-1's, at the bottom of the scale, with less than 2 years' service, from \$83.60 to \$93.90, or \$10.30.

My bill would strike out the 2-year distinction and such men would immediately qualify for \$121.80 or receive a raise of \$38.60. This is substantial, perhaps, but when one considers the other levels of Federal service and considers the 19 years that these people have subsisted on a \$3 raise, I think it is scarcely adequate in and of itself. The balance of the enlisted section would be the same as the committee bill.

The officers section in my amendment is taken from a bill submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin which would raise officers with under 2 years of service and would raise the officers immediately above them in terms of years of service in order to compensate somewhat for the difference but would keep high-ranking officers at a standstill level. We do that because it is certainly felt by the gentleman in the well of this House that until the men at the bottom of the scale are properly taken care of by this Congress the others can afford to wait.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The instincts of the gentleman from Wisconsin are good, but I am afraid his knowledge of the military compensation system is not.

Under the proposed amendment, as I understand it, military pay scales would no longer differentiate in terms of service or longevity until after military personnel had completed more than 3 years of service. Thus, the longevity principle, which is inherent in all statutory pay systems for both Federal civilian and military employees, would be abandoned.

Under the Federal civilian pay systems, pay differentials are provided in each of the first 3 years of service. That is, there are three pay steps, 1 year apart, for all civil service grades below GS-18.

The military system similarly provides these longevity increases since they are designed to recognize and encourage improved performance within the grade concerned.

Under the proposed amendment this concept would be abandoned.

If the proposed change were effected in our military pay scales, a second function of this longevity principle would be lost. This function is to provide creditable financial incentives in terms of pay increases for those who reenlist.

For example, the effect of the amendment would be to reduce the pay differential between those enlisted members having 3 years' service and those with over 3 years' service to about \$11 a month. This amount would obviously be inadequate as an incentive to reenlist.

It, therefore, in effect, compresses the military pay scales and would require a substantial further upward adjustment at all points in the pay scale to maintain a necessary, desired pattern of adequate pay differentials among and between the various pay grades.

Obviously, I cannot comment precisely on the cost of such an additional adjustment in military pay scales, but I am certain that it would exceed a billion dollars.

Now, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the gentleman from Wisconsin in attempting to provide more realistic pay scales for military personnel with under 2 years of service. I think we have done that in H.R. 9075.

For example, we are increasing the average pay scales of enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service 17.3 percent.

We are also increasing the pay scales of officers with less than 2 years of service an average of 22 percent.

In establishing these pay increases the committee was not unmindful of the fact that in the enlisted pay structure, promotion to pay grade E-3, with accompanying pay increases, is quite rapid in all the services.

For example, in the Army, which is the only service presently using inductees, the average total time in active service for military personnel promoted to pay grade E-3 is only 9 months.

Under H.R. 9075, the average young man who moves from pay grade E-1 to E-2 to E-3 in a total of 9 months would receive a rate of basic pay about 34 percent greater than his original entry basic pay. While the dollar amounts, as such, are relatively modest, the percentage of pay increase over the 9-month period is substantial and provides a rate of pay more closely in line with the remainder of the enlisted pay structure.

For example under existing law an E-3 with less than 2 years of service is paid \$99.37. Under the provisions of H.R. 9075, his basic pay would be increased to \$117.90 per month. This is an 18.7 percent increase in basic pay.

Now, since our recruit can and does achieve this pay grade within 9 months, the pay increases proposed for him in H.R. 9075 not only include the basic pay increase for a recruit at pay grade E-1—from \$78 to \$87.90—but also the pay increases which he is almost certainly going to enjoy by virtue of his ultimate promotion to pay grade E-3 within 9 months.

Thus, an inductee who enters the service today will receive basic pay of \$78 a

month, but if this bill, H.R. 9075, is enacted into law, he will, within 9 months, be receiving basic pay at the E-3 level of \$117.90 a month. Therefore, his pay increases after enactment of this bill will approximate \$40 per month in basic pay.

This increase in his pay will still permit a reasonable differential to encourage him to reenlist upon completion of 2 years of service, since at this point he would again receive a longevity increase in base pay of \$42.30 a month. Under the gentleman's proposed amendment, this reenlistment incentive would be completely lost.

The gentleman from Wisconsin provided the Committee on Armed Services with his recommendations during committee hearings on these proposed changes in military pay. However, for the reasons I have indicated they were rejected.

Furthermore, the gentleman in his statement before the committee indicated that one of his purposes in recommending this change in the pay structure was hopefully the first step toward eliminating the draft.

Neither the rates of pay in H.R. 9075, nor those proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, could be expected to achieve in any substantial measure the goal of elimination of the draft and the substitution of a completely voluntary military procurement system.

The Department of Defense has made a study in this regard, and although the details of this study are not as yet available, it appears that a decision to go to an all voluntary military force would require increases in military pay scales amounting to more than \$4 billion a year.

I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for expressing in concrete terms his desire and effort to improve the lot of our men and women in uniform. Therefore, I am hopeful that he will continue to support H.R. 9075 after the House rejects his amendment.

For the reasons I have indicated, and since this amendment would increase the annual cost of H.R. 9075 more than one-third of a billion dollars, I recommend that the House not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, does not my distinguished friend have considerable concern about the probability that this proposed increase of another one-third of a billion dollars in the cost of the bill, which is almost as much as the administration's entire proposal, would very substantially increase the prospect of a veto so that no one would benefit by an increase in pay at this time, if the amendment were adopted and the bill were vetoed?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder whether he has described fully what my amendment proposes to do?

It strikes but one category and that is the category of "2 years and under." It does not destroy the whole concept of longevity, just one category. It merges the "under 2" and the "between 2 and 3" into one category. There is no other connection. It does not destroy the principle of longevity. In fact it is a complete reiteration of that principle in all other respects of the committee bill.

May I say to the gentleman from South Carolina that as far as the cost of the bill is concerned it is true that it will cost in the order of \$323 million more than the committee bill which, incidentally, is less than the committee bill costs more than the administration bill which the gentleman from South Carolina and others saw fit to make changes in.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are doing very well today on this bill. We have taken pretty good care of the G.I.

I have a letter here which I received the other day from the boys in Saigon. It says:

SEN: We the professional fighting men in Vietnam appreciate the hard work your committee has done and which you have expended toward the probability of a new realistic pay increase.

Mr. Chairman, these boys are for this. There are a lot of names listed on this letter. I am told there are 2,000 signatures on this list. They are for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to get this bill through. Let us not muddy the water and give someone, somewhere an opportunity to ask the President to veto this bill. Let us take care of these boys while the time remains.

They have a lot of loved ones here today and I do not want to start a man off at E-3. Let us let him do all he can for his country for that 9 months and merit this increase in pay.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] would not permit this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may be granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I do want to make it clear that in the event my amendment fails I shall of course support the bill, because I feel that even \$9.90 or \$10.70 must mean something to these poverty-stricken men. So I want to make the record clear on that. But I think we can do a lot better than the committee has done for this category of serviceman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. In our bill, Mr. Chairman, we require the President to make a realistic appraisal of not less than every 4 years and report to the Congress and review it every year—make a report of the basic change not less than every 4 years. So we have got a very good bill. The G.I. wants it. Let us get behind this and not try to change the basic structures which have been so orderly arrived at.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman yield to me at this point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman from South Carolina a few minutes ago referred to the fact that in the course of 9 months the inductee, whether he be a draftee or an enlistee, usually would move from an E-1 to an E-3 in approximately 9 months.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. About 90 percent of them do.

Mr. LENNON. If the gentleman will yield further, I was anxious to have the gentleman get that in the Record because that in substance answers the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I for one appreciate the concern of the gentleman but having heard this matter discussed in committee many times, about 90 percent of the young men who go into service at the E-1 rating move to the E-3 rating within a period of 9 months.

Based upon my way of thinking, it does answer the objective which the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to accomplish to an appreciable degree.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that it does not. You must realize that an E-3 under the committee bill gets \$117.90 a month. He does not get as much as the E-1 would get under the committee bill when he serves 3 years.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Then, when he gets over 2 years, the E-3 receives \$160 and over 3 years an E-3 gets \$171.60. Our bill is loaded with incentives and let us not disturb it. We have a fine bill and it can pass. I am not in any mood to compromise it at this time. Let us stick with what we have. We have an awful lot of support because we have an awful lot of good sense and a good bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to say that the gentleman and his committee have done an excellent job on this bill, recognizing the difficulties and the necessities of our servicemen.

I want to congratulate him and tell him that I am in full support of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear from the discussion that has thus far taken place that it is impossible to write a pay bill

on the floor. That is the reason why we bring a tax bill on the floor under a closed rule. I am sure the spirit that has motivated the gentleman from Wisconsin is a noble one, but we believe we have done as well as we can. This bill is some \$450 million more than the President recommended. In this particular area our increase is 17.3 compared to that recommended by the President of 2.7 percent. No one knows exactly how much this amendment will cost. Even within the last 15 minutes we have had figures appear that vary between \$300 million and a billion dollars. This has not been fully analyzed.

One more thought, Mr. Chairman, and that is during the first few months or the first few years of the service of an enlisted man in many cases this is the first time he has been away from home. The rigors that many of these people experience are difficult, therefore morale is of vital importance. There is nothing more significant, there is nothing more uplifting to these men than to have an increase in pay during this period. But if we should bring them all in and say from this time until 3 years henceforth you all shall get the same pay it seems to me would not be proper.

Here is an opportunity for men to improve their position, and to get more pay for the services rendered. I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would have a deleterious effect on the morale of the people in the armed services rather than actually helping them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The subject of draftees has been mentioned throughout this afternoon, and other issues in connection with this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman as to the period of service of the draftees of our foreign friends, whether anywhere in the world among these so-called friends they draft for 24 months?

Mr. BATES. I would be more interested in how many troops they are going to commit to Vietnam. As I understand it, some have 6 months, some 1½ years, and some 2 or 3 years: I am dealing here today with the problem of the American enlisted man.

Mr. GROSS. I understand perfectly, but the problem of the American serviceman ought to be wrapped up in their period of obligated service and it should be wrapped up with the fact we are getting no help or practically no help from our so-called friends around the world in Vietnam.

Mr. BATES. That is all the more reason why we should look after their welfare.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not think it is out of line to raise the issue today why, with Communist aggression being carried on in Vietnam, that we are getting no help from anybody around the world.

Mr. BATES. I know the concern which the gentleman has in this area, and which he has expressed many times, and I share his sentiments.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have those whose hearts are bleeding for our foreign friends tell some of us why we are getting no help from those who ought to be giving us help in the containing of communism around the world.

Mr. BATES. May I say in conclusion, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KASTENMEIER) there were—ayes 9, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9075) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to House Resolution 470, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in the consideration of the bill be suspended until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

U.S. CAPITOL PAGE ACT OF 1965

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the system that the Congress uses in educating, supervising, and housing its pages is archaic, cumbersome, wasteful, and, in many respects, detrimental to the young men it purports to benefit.

The system should be phased out and replaced with a new U.S. Capitol page system for college students who need financial assistance to continue or complete their education.

I am today introducing legislation, captioned the U.S. Capitol Page Act of 1965, to accomplish this change.

Under the present arrangement, youngsters between the ages of 14 and 18 years are set adrift, far from home and removed from proper supervision, in a large and fast-paced metropolis.

They are grossly overpaid. Pages earn more money than some commissioned officers of the U.S. Army fighting in Vietnam.

Their schooling, stuffed into a 3-hour period between 6.30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. is of debatable long-range value. They attend the Capitol Page School, an institution unique in that it cannot refuse to accept students who are deficient scholastically and cannot dismiss students once they are enrolled, no matter how poor their scholastic performance. This criticism in no way reflects on the ability and dedication of the school's staff; the school is the victim of the system, and so are the pages.

Capitol pages, once in Washington, are largely left to their own devices in finding housing and eating wholesome meals.

An evaluating committee of the Middle Atlantic Association for Secondary Schools summed up the situation very appropriately when it noted that—

It is one thing for a page to live at home or in the home of his sponsor, where he can be a part of normal family living so necessary at this stage in growth. It is something else again to give these youngsters the great opportunity to be of direct service to their Government, and at the same time, deprive them of the basic protections to which they are entitled at this stage in their development.

Clearly, this present system has some built-in dynamite which could explode in our faces at any time.

My bill provides that a page serving in the U.S. Senate, House of Representatives, or the Supreme Court shall be at least 18 years of age and less than 24 and shall have completed at least 1 year of college. They must be financially needy, and there are certainly many such students.

Eminent political science professors have noted that—

A college student is more likely to benefit from the experience of being a page than a high school student, and the problems of their leisure hours is likely to be of less concern.

Prof. Robert L. Peabody of Johns Hopkins University pointed out that such a system "could be developed into a congressional internship program for college undergraduates which would have rich benefits in the training of the Nation's future political leaders and informed citizenry."

In the 89th Congress, newly appointed pages are paid \$4,600 a year while returning pages receive the salary of \$5,050. For youngsters whose duties principally involve delivering documents and answering telephones, these princely sine-

cures are totally unrealistic. The salary received by some 15-year-old pages this year exceeds the total income in 1963 of more than 45 percent of this Nation's families.

Under my bill, page salaries would be reduced to about \$3,640 a year. With the savings effected, additional pages could be appointed and hours of page service staggered in such a way as to prevent interference with the college schedules of the pages.

Enactment of my bill would eliminate the need for the proposed construction, at great expense, of a new Capitol Page School and Residence. It would, in fact, eventually do away with the school entirely.

In establishing a program of benefit to deserving college students, my bill also would end the dubious practice of the Congress in employing high school students on a full-time basis. Almost no one else in the Nation could get away with such a system.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that not more than five States would permit boys to attend school and engage in general employment to the extent of 40 work hours a week.

In any job subject to the Federal child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it would be illegal for boys of 14 and 15 to maintain the work schedule of a congressional page. Under these provisions, employment of 14- and 15-year-old boys is limited to not more than 3 hours on a schoolday and 18 hours in a school week, and not after 7 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], chairman of the Select Committee on the Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages, and her committee associates, for their pioneer work in investigating the page system and exploring avenues for its improvement.

This system cries out for reform and my bill would provide it.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9912

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 "United States Capitol Page Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. Effective the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, a United States Capitol Page shall be appointed to serve in the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, or the United States Supreme Court, only if he or she:

(a) is at least 18 years of age and less than 24 years of age; and

(b) has completed the equivalent of at least one year or 30 semester hours at a college, university, or other institution of higher education accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education; and

(c) is determined by his or her sponsor, and certified by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as appropriate, to be in need of financial assistance in order to complete his or her requirements for a degree of bachelor of arts or science, or its equivalent, at a college, university, or other institution of higher education accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 3. Subject to the qualifications of section 2 of this Act, appointments of United States Capitol pages:

(a) to serve in the Senate shall be made by Members of the Senate;

(b) to serve in the House of Representatives shall be made by Members of the House of Representatives;

(c) to serve in the Supreme Court shall be made by the Marshal of the Supreme Court.

SEC. 4. (a) Thirty-two pages may be appointed by Members of the Senate to serve in the Senate.

(b) Sixty-five pages may be appointed by Members of the House of Representatives to serve in the House of Representatives.

(c) Five pages may be appointed by the Marshal of the Supreme Court to serve in the Supreme Court.

SEC. 5. All appointments of United States Capitol pages shall be made without regard to race, religion, or sex.

SEC. 6. Appointments of United States Capitol pages shall be made for not less than one semester and not more than one calendar year.

SEC. 7. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall perform their duties as pages:

(a) in the Senate during those periods in which the Senate is in session, with at least sixteen Senate pages on duty at any time that the Senate is in session;

(b) in the House of Representatives during those periods in which the House of Representatives is in session, with at least thirty-three House pages on duty at any time the House of Representatives is in session;

(c) in the Supreme Court during those periods in which the Supreme Court is in session, with at least three Court pages on duty at any time that the Supreme Court is in session.

SEC. 8. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall enroll at any college, university, or other institution of higher education of their choice in or around Washington, D.C., which has been accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education, in courses that will be accepted for full or partial credit by their college, university, or other institution of higher education of origin.

SEC. 9. United States Capitol pages appointed under this Act shall receive compensation for their services as pages at the basic annual rate of one thousand one hundred and forty dollars.

SEC. 10. This Act shall not apply to chief pages.

SEC. 11. Section 88 of title 2 of the United States Code (Mar. 3, 1901, ch. 830, sec. 1, 31 Stat. 968) relating to the limit of age of pages in House of Representatives, is hereby repealed.

MILITARY WITNESSES BRAND FEDERAL SERVICES FINANCE CORP. AS "VICIOUS"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been investigating the operations of Federal Services Finance Corp., a worldwide lending organization that is primarily

engaged in the business of making automobile and personal loans to servicemen.

During these hearings it was brought out that Federal Services is being investigated not only by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, but also by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Labor, the Internal Revenue Service, and the German tax authorities. Only a casual look at the operations of this company makes it clear why it is subject to so many investigations.

In light of the tactics that Federal Services uses to abuse servicemen, such as charges of nonexistent insurance, refusal to refund overpayments, mishandling of repossessions, excess interest charges, and numerous other sharp practices, it is my feeling that Federal Services should not be allowed to continue to take advantage of our servicemen.

Shortly the Congress will be asked to consider legislation increasing the pay of servicemen; but what good will it do to increase the pay of servicemen, if, at the same time, we allow companies such as Federal Services to take advantage of them and to flaunt military regulations.

Recently, I wrote to the Honorable Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, regarding Federal Services. Mr. Paul testified before the subcommittee in regard to Federal Services. He stated that the Department of Defense would look into the charges directed at Federal Services. I suggested in my letter that while this investigation was being conducted, that Federal Services be placed off limits to military personnel. A continuation of the subcommittee hearings on Federal Services has reaffirmed my belief that the company should be placed off limits.

Testifying at the latest hearing were Lt. Col. Clyde L. Griffith, judge advocate at Fort Myer, Va.; Lt. Col. Daniel Ghent, judge advocate at Fort Gordon, Ga.; as well as Mr. Paul Zurkowski, former judge advocate at Fort Irwin, Calif., and now an aid to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

I want to emphasize that both Colonel Griffith and Colonel Ghent are active-duty military officers, and Colonel Ghent has recently been promoted to head the Army's legal assistance program. Both of these colonels, as well as Mr. Zurkowski, told the subcommittee in response to my question that Federal Services should be placed off limits. Colonel Griffith categorized the lending and automobile financing practices of Federal Services as "unethical and vicious." Colonel Ghent testified that certain practices of Federal Services were, in his opinion, "extortion—pure and simple." Mr. Zurkowski branded the company as "camp followers" who prey on servicemen.

I asked all three of these gentlemen if they would be willing to finance a car through Federal Services. Without hesitation they all replied they would not finance a car with this company.

I have come before you today because I feel it is important to protect our servicemen from fast-buck operators. I am extremely upset that the Department of Defense has not taken action to make

certain that Federal Services does not continue to victimize servicemen. I might add at this point that out of a 12-man board of directors of Federal Services, 8 are retired admirals or generals. I am informed that one of the reasons for the Department of Defense's lack of action in this matter is that Federal Services' operations are no worse than other finance companies that prey on servicemen. I will not take issue with that statement, except to wonder aloud if this is so, why has the Department of Defense not done something a long time ago about these other companies that are as bad in their operations as Federal Services.

The Department of Defense's reason for inactivity rings as hollow as an empty barrel. The Department of Defense must act quickly in this matter so that a warning can be issued to finance companies that do not wish to play according to the rules when dealing with servicemen. It must be made clear to these companies that unless they are willing to operate in an honest, decent, and legal manner, they will no longer be allowed to deal with servicemen. There is no reason, either in law or logic, why Federal Services should not be placed off limits.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Paul on July 6, as well as a press release from my office concerning the letter. In addition, I am placing in the RECORD a story from the Washington Daily News of July 15, written by Rice Odell, entitled "Witness Blasts District of Columbia Finance Firm as 'Vicious.'"

I suggest that it is time the top brass of the Department of Defense take notice of what the field officers of the military have to say about Federal Services. In describing the Department of Defense's reluctance to place Federal Services off limits, we can use the old axiom, "Everyone is out of step, except John." Could it be that the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Labor, the Internal Revenue Service, the German tax authorities, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are out of step and Federal Services and the Department of Defense are in step?

The material follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

HON. NORMAN PAUL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower,
Department of Defense, the Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PAUL: When you testified before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance on June 17, I suggested to you that during the period that the Department of Defense was conducting its investigation into the operations of Federal Services Finance Corp. that the company be placed off limits to members of the military services.

I am fully convinced that this company should not be allowed to continue the abuses uncovered by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee and the easiest way to see that this is carried out is to prohibit Armed Forces personnel from dealing with the company. It will serve no logical purpose to investigate this company if at the same time the abuses that should be corrected are allowed to continue.

I would appreciate it if you would inform me as to the action taken by your office with regard to my suggestion of placing the company off limits while the investigation is being conducted. I would further appreciate it if you would provide a progress report on the "interservice committee" which you mentioned during your testimony. It is my understanding that this committee has been considering remedial measures to deal with companies that extend credit to our Armed Forces.

I would appreciate your early reply.

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO ASKS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FOR FOLLOWUP ON DECLARING FEDERAL SERVICES FINANCE CORPORATION OFF LIMITS

Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, Democrat, of Illinois, has asked the Department of Defense for information concerning his request that Federal Services Finance Corp. be placed off limits to military personnel while the Department is investigating the company.

The Illinois Democrat's request was contained in a letter dated July 6 to Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower). In releasing the letter, Congressman ANNUNZIO explained that, "I am fully convinced that Federal Services should not be allowed to deal with members of the Armed Forces until they have cleaned up their operation."

Representative ANNUNZIO is a member of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee which has been investigating the operations of Federal Services, a worldwide finance company engaged primarily in the business of making automobile loans to members of the military forces. The subcommittee has turned up hundreds of cases in which servicemen have been victimized by the company whose officers and directors include many former admirals and generals.

"I will say in all fairness," Representative ANNUNZIO remarked, "that most of the members of the Department of Defense and the three services have shown a willingness to cooperate in this investigation and to take the necessary action. However, there has been a reluctance to give more than fleeting consideration to the possibility of declaring Federal Services off limits. I can see no reason in law or in logic for not taking this action. It is in the best interests of the servicemen and the services. To continue to allow the abuse of our servicemen is only in the interest of Federal Services."

Congressman ANNUNZIO also asked Secretary Paul for a progress report on an interservice committee which Paul testified is currently considering remedial measures concerning companies that extend financing to servicemen. One of the proposals being studied by the committee would require finance companies to secure a seal of approval from the Department of Defense before they could deal with servicemen.

Congress ANNUNZIO concluded: "I have been assured by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, who heads both the subcommittee and the parent committee, that the investigation of Federal Services would not be closed until a full accounting has been made of the company's actions. Both Chairman PATMAN and I are in full agreement that the Department of Defense must make full use of its powers to insure that servicemen are protected from companies that engage in sharp practices."

WITNESS BLASTS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCE FIRM AS "VICIOUS"

(By Rice Odell)

The judge advocate of Fort Myer testified yesterday that he considers the lending and

auto financing practices of Federal Services Finance Corp. to be "unethical and vicious."

Lt. Col. Clyde Griffith was joined by two other witnesses before a House Banking and Currency Subcommittee in saying they think such a company should be placed off limits to military personnel.

The possibility of such action against the Washington-based enterprise, whose clientele is largely servicemen in this country and overseas, is currently being studied by a special Defense Department committee.

EXTORTION

Colonel Griffith appeared before the subcommittee with Lt. Col. Daniel Ghent, judge advocate of Fort Gordon, Ga., and Paul Zurkowski, former judge advocate at Fort Irwin, Calif., and now an aide to Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Colonel Ghent said he wrote higher authority 2 years ago that, in his opinion, cases showed there was a "deliberate attempt" by Federal Services to obtain money from servicemen in derogation of their own contracts.

"This is extortion pure and simple," he said he wrote.

Mr. Zurkowski said he would characterize the company as a "camp follower operation" in which soldiers are normally mystified at how they could owe so much money.

LEGALITY

The three witnesses generally agree that at least most of the firm's practices are legal, and also that they are generally followed by other firms in the field. These include small refunds when insurance policies are rewritten, the sale of unnecessary insurance, high interest rates, unwarranted late charges, etc.

Colonel Griffith said that, with limited income and plagued by such problems, it becomes very difficult for a man to be a good soldier. In addition to a number of specific cases cited by the witnesses, he described this hypothetical but typical example:

A soldier buys a \$600 car from a dealer, and has to finance it over a 2- or 3-year period. Since some States allow interest of up to 4 percent a month (and there are no restrictions overseas), he might well end up paying double the amount.

After adding insurance, which is usually sold at a high price, and other items, he said, say the soldier has to borrow a total of \$1,200 to buy the \$600 car.

Then perhaps he encounters financial problems due to illness at home or having another child, and so in all honesty he says that he can't pay for the car and asks that it be repossessed.

But the seller of the car meanwhile transfers the \$1,200 note to a second company, which becomes a legal holder in due course, even though its agent might be sitting at the desk next to the seller.

Then suppose the car is repossessed after 4 months, and \$200 has been paid on it. It'll probably be sold at a forced sale, perhaps with only one bidder. It might go for \$200, which is credited to the soldier's account, giving him a total of \$400 against the \$1,200.

So there's still \$800 unpaid on the note, even though the soldier no longer has a car and the insurance is of no value to him. Yet because the note is held by that second company, it can sue to recover the whole amount, and the soldier can't do anything about it.

"Obviously this is done intentionally so they can sue on the note and not on the contract," he said. If the military inquires about the unused insurance, for example, "they write back and say 'We don't know anything about that—all we have is a note.'"

"This is where the vicious part begins," Colonel Griffith said. The company starts a long campaign with the first sergeant and company commander, reminding them that their soldier is subject to court-martial for willful failure to pay a just debt.

"They write and ask, 'Why haven't you court-martialed this man?'"

BUSINESS

"They play on this question of the soldier's integrity. If he's a good soldier at all, integrity is one of the most vital things he has." (And if they don't get anywhere with a particular first sergeant or commander, they may salt the file away for years until a soldier is transferred to another post, where they may have more luck collecting, he said.)

In most cases, he said, the soldier doesn't argue—he just pays up. "For every one that bubbles to the top, there must be at least 20 that never get there."

Meanwhile, Federal Services reported that for the 9 months ending June 30, its volume of business was almost \$61.4 million compared to about \$49.7 million for the same period a year before. Net income, however, went down from \$699,889 to \$525,344, which President Clayton Norris said was due to higher taxes on income and higher expenses.

THE WISDOM OF CONGRESS IN CONSTRUCTING THE CHERRY CREEK RESERVOIR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works completed a 2-day inspection of flood damage in a two-State area where a major flood disaster recently occurred. The committee brought back a report of tremendous heroism on the part of the local people in fighting the devastation of the South Platte River and its tributaries and the Arkansas River in the States of Colorado and Kansas.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the most interesting observations was of a reservoir known as Cherry Creek Reservoir, an Army Engineer's structure which had been authorized and built by this Congress a number of years ago and which has been subject for a number of years to continuous criticism as a major boondoggle and an example of wastefulness by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the flood which devastated a good part of Denver last month, Cherry Creek Reservoir, which cost a little over \$14 million to build, prevented damages in excess of \$130 million in one single flood, demonstrating very well the fact that while it may take a while to pay off on some of these flood control reservoirs, the payoff can be very great indeed when disaster strikes.

SMOKESCREENS THAT SOMEHOW SEEM TO OBSCURE THE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in this morning's Washington Post, written by Mr. Hobart Rowen, dealing with the matter of the many smoke screens that somehow seem to obscure the right-to-work issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with Mr. Rowen's observation that both sides of interest in connection with the consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act are dealing in gross emotionalism that has prevented the general public from really acquiring a real understanding of the basic issue that underlies the question.

As a Member of the 89th Congress, it is my intention to support repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, for I am sincere in the belief that these so-called right-to-work laws have invited union harassment and have contributed greatly to the promotion of unrest on the American industrial scene.

As this article suggests, men of management of real industrial maturity do understand the advantages of the union shop under legitimate direction.

As the Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am particularly in agreement with Mr. Rowen's timely observation that these so-called right-to-work States seem to be engaged in an emotional campaign to keep wages low by keeping the union out; and these same people freely advertise and solicit industry on that basis.

I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to dwell on the thoughts expressed in Mr. Rowen's article, which follows:

ECONOMIC IMPACT: SMOKESCREENS OBSCURE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE
(By Hobart Rowen)

The battle over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—those unfortunate few words that allow an individual State to ban the union shop—is about to be resumed, this time on the House floor. The public will thus be treated again to an appalling amount of hokum and buncombe on this issue.

Those individuals and organizations that want to preserve the right-to-work laws permitted by section 14(b) ought to quit shadowboxing, and say forthrightly that they're against the whole idea of labor unions.

Right or wrong, at least that position would end the pretense that they are losing valuable sleep over the question of individual liberty.

At the present time, 19 States have taken advantage of section 14(b) by prohibiting any agreement between an employer and a union specifying membership in a union as a condition of employment. Even if a company and a union should desire a union shop, it would be illegal in these 19 States.

But while the chamber of commerce and others weep crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the other 31 States, the basic motive of the right-to-work crowd is to attract industry with the promise of cheap, nonunion labor.

And as the AFL-CIO has ably documented, the less respectable of the antiunion band have a close alliance with ultraright-wing John Birch types, whose bias on this score is merely one aspect of a longer record of antiquated, antisocial, 19th century prejudices.

Organizations like the chamber, which are eminently respectable, if behind the times, fail to see the inconsistency between their avowed support of the principle of collective

bargaining and their demand for continuance of section 14(b).

They are saying, in effect, that an employer should have to bargain with his workers (that's what collective bargaining means)—provided they haven't formed an effective union. If one can make sense out of the chamber position, it is that employers should strive to return to that nostalgic era when they could deal with their employees individually.

Well, maybe it would be nice—the way some people look at it—to do without unions. But the chamber better forget it, and take a look at the calendar. It is 1965.

Most of the really influential leaders of American industry have taken a more sophisticated approach. They know that the "individual freedom" propaganda is just that—a line created by the same imaginative public relations men who thought up the misleading "right to work" phrase.

Actually, the real leaders of American industry couldn't care less about repeal of section 14(b). Some, it is true, wish that President Johnson had staved off AFL-CIO President George Meany's request. But policymakers in the U.S. business community deal regularly with unions and the union shop.

By and large, they'd be panicked if they weren't assured of well-organized, responsible labor unions to provide a steady flow of manpower for them.

One of L.B.J.'s Texas aids confides: "When a big national company comes in down home, they generally ask: 'Where's the union?' If it's not there, they're disappointed. They want one right on tap."

But the local "wheels" are generally nervous. They are skeptical of union organizers, who are equated to "invaders," men who want to up-end previous States rights. Above all, the local men, often pillars of smalltime chambers of commerce, feel they can keep wages low if the union is kept out. They freely advertise and solicit on that basis.

The unions have floated their share of baloney, too. Repeal of section 14(b) is not a do-or-die proposition for union organization, because they can and do survive in the right-to-work States.

And despite denials, it is true that the notion of a union shop involves a certain element of compulsion. This ought to be freely admitted, because the compulsion is justifiable. Where collective bargaining is the law of the land, a man who is deriving benefits from union representation ought to join the union. At least, he ought to pay dues, which is all the law requires.

The unions want to do away with section 14(b) because it is "a bone in the throat." The Wagner Act established the principle of collective bargaining, and then the Taft-Hartley Act partially reneged. For 18 years this has invited antiunion harassment. Both management and labor could turn their attention to more useful and productive endeavors if section 14(b) were scrapped.

STUDY BEING UNDERTAKEN BY OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING CONCERNING RELIEVING RESIDUAL OIL CONTROLS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a letter I have dispatched to Gov. Buford

Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which deals with a study being undertaken by that Office concerning relieving residual oil import controls.

Mr. Speaker, these controls, if relieved, would have a disastrous economic impact on the economy of the great State of Ohio and would, in effect, destroy the coal industry, which plays such an important role in our overall economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope and trust that the distinguished Governor Ellington and his study group would, with great dispatch, end the speculation concerning this proposal to relieve oil import controls and reject forthrightly the entire idea.

The letter follows:

HON. BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR ELLINGTON: As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am deeply interested in study being undertaken by your Office of the residual oil import control program. I am interested in the continuance of the existing program of residual oil import controls as I feel that these controls are essential to the national security and military defense of the United States. I am equally disturbed about the adverse effect upon the economy of my State, were these controls lessened or relieved.

At present, coal is the principal source of primary energy for conversion to electrical energy and accounts for over half the total electricity generated. Since the end of World War II, there has been a decline in the coal industry, but yet coal continues to play a major role in the Nation's economy.

The coal industry means \$201,889,672 annually to Ohio. Many of our southern and eastern counties are coal-producing areas, and there are 17,029 Ohioans employed in the industry, earning \$104,379,893 annually. These coal wages are spent in Ohio as follows:

Food	\$29,330,750
Housing	28,391,331
Clothing	8,454,771
Transportation	12,212,447
Medical care	6,054,034
Recreation	5,740,984

Individual coal wage earners pay taxes amounting to \$10,416,237.

As congressional spokesman for those dependent upon the coal industry for their livelihood, I wish to indicate my opposition to any effort to eliminate controls on the importation of competing oil fuel products, which would have a tremendously adverse effect upon our local economy.

I am certain that you are mindful of the fact that section 202(c) of the Trade Expansion Act establishes the criteria laid down by the Congress, which should be considered before import controls are relieved. One of those criteria is whether or not the import control would tend to threaten or impair the national security and adversely affect the national economy of that region of the United States.

As you know, the 89th Congress has been seriously concerned with the problems regarding the rejuvenation of the economy in the 11-State region known as Appalachia. I happen to be a member of the special ad hoc committee which wrote that legislation, and I can assure you that any policy to relieve import controls on residual oil fuels would most certainly undermine the national effort to revive the economy in the Appalachian counties of my State.

It is difficult for me to understand how the United States could seriously relieve import controls which would completely dis-

rupt the coal transportation capabilities of the railroads in the eastern half of the United States that are highly dependent upon coal traffic, and encourage the elimination of coal as a primary fuel. To alter oil import controls would put this Nation in the position of absolute dependency to Venezuela and other oil-producing countries which have demonstrated varying degrees of friendliness and stability toward this country.

I am deeply concerned with the suggestion that the United States of America embark upon policies which would place us in the position of being excessively dependent upon foreign sources of energy, especially oil. The matter of the possible undermining of the coal industry, which so basically affects the citizens of my State, is one of deep concern to me and I wish to register with your office my strenuous recommendation that the idea of suggesting alteration of our import control policy be rejected.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. SWEENEY,
Member of Congress.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the three most dangerous individuals you can possibly find would be an alcoholic with a bottle of whisky, an arsonist with a box of matches, and a Postmaster General who likes to experiment all the time.

We have the ZIP code, in spite of the fact that presumably the schools have taught the students the names of the 50 States of the Union, the postal clerks now have to learn 50,000 Zip numbers. Everything has been replaced by a number. It used to take a letter overnight to come from Ohio to Washington. Now it takes up to 4 days.

We find now that the Post Office Department has done violence to the legal abbreviations of the various States. The Post Office Department has come up with a new abbreviation for Ohio, for instance, changing the abbreviation "O" to a new abbreviation "Oh." Heaven knows what happens in some other cases.

I do not know what this is going to lead to, but it does seem to me in a country of almost 200 million people we ought to find one fellow who would like to run and could run the post office with just plain commonsense.

CHASE MANHATTAN NATIONAL BANK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last week a surprise hit the banking community when Chase Manhattan, the Nation's largest State bank, announced its imminent conversion to national status.

This conversion to national status is part of a trend which has accelerated in recent months, and which commenced shortly after the present Comptroller of the Currency took office in 1962.

During the previous several years, there was no tendency for State banks to convert to national banks. The present trend has developed since the Comptroller has engaged the State regulatory authorities in a "competition in laxity," as Governor Robertson has termed it.

The reaction of Frank Wille, New York superintendent of banks, is pertinent. He was quoted as follows:

I regret the action initiated today by Chase Manhattan Bank to surrender the special charter of the Bank of the Manhattan Co * * * I will do all I can to secure changes at the Federal level which would substantially equalize the situation for State-chartered commercial banks.

By clear implication, Mr. Wille fears that unless regulations of State banks are further relaxed, our dual banking system will be threatened. It is pertinent, in this connection, to note that Chase National chose a State charter in 1955, when it merged with the Bank of the Manhattan Co. Changes in attitudes of the Federal regulatory authorities make it now reverse its earlier decision.

The distinguished chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has introduced H.R. 6885, which attempts to eliminate the fragmentation of supervisory authority over all banks which are federally insured. I am hopeful that in the course of these hearings the full implications of Chase Manhattan's decision upon the dual banking system can be explored, and fully related to the trends in the field of banking and their impact upon our economic life.

THE GOLD SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the gold situation of the United States has been of general concern to governmental, financial, and political circles for the past several years. Of particular concern has been the fact that severe drains had been made on the U.S. gold stock, especially since 1960.

Since 1933, Americans have not been permitted to redeem their dollars in gold. At that time, by Executive order, and subsequently by the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the domestic redemption of dollars for gold was suspended indefinitely. The holding of gold by Americans—even outside the United States since 1961—except for limited numismatic, industrial, professional, or artistic uses, is forbidden.

U.S. dollars owned by foreign governments, however, are directly redeemable in U.S. gold, and in recent years some foreign governments have redeemed so many dollars for U.S. gold that the ques-

tion of whether the United States may have a gold shortage has been raised.

One of the assigned functions of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations is to evaluate the efficiency and economy with which the Federal monetary agencies operate. In the performance of that obligation the subcommittee undertook study of the coin shortage situation which, in varying degrees, has plagued the country for the past half dozen years.

Contemporaneous with the subcommittee's inquiries into the coin shortage, news items and comments about drains on the country's gold stock through international transactions were being reported. Also communications received by the subcommittee indicated the considerable concern on the part of many citizens that the U.S. gold supply was being drained away, and that adverse effects were inevitable. Quite often the communications indicated that there was confusion and lack of understanding of the technicalities and even the nomenclature employed by the experts and technicians who deal with the problems.

The fact that the Treasury is fast running out of our other precious monetary metal, silver, undoubtedly heightened the public interest in the country's gold stock.

Because of this large public interest in the subject, as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, I am today announcing the release of a report which results from study of the gold situation of the United States. The report is entitled "The Gold Situation," and objectively and in nontechnical terms examines the U.S. gold stock, in the light of international demands.

Over the past 8 years about \$8½ billion worth of gold has been drained from the U.S. gold stock. The gold now in the Treasury, somewhat less than \$14 billion, is the smallest amount the United States has had since 1938.

By giving, lending, and spending more abroad than it has been receiving in payments from foreigners, the United States has been running deficits in its international payments balances since 1957. This has caused some countries to acquire more dollars than they need, many of which they redeem for U.S. gold. U.S. efforts to reverse the deficit trend of its payments balances are meeting with considerable success, as is indicated by the second quarter, 1965, results.

The United States now, in the second quarter of 1965, has had its first balance-of-payments surplus in 8 years. Although that surplus arose only in the second quarter of 1965, it augurs well for the future, for further favorable gains are expected. Foreign governments, therefore, should be left with fewer dollars that are surplus to their needs, with consequent reduction in conversions of such dollars into gold.

Lessening the flow of dollars going abroad, however, poses the threats of restricting the availability of capital in many foreign financial markets, reducing international trade and hampering development in some foreign countries. As stated in "The Gold Situation," these

possibilities point up the necessity for the free world to further seek long-term solutions to international monetary problems.

The time to do so is right now. If the United States had sought international conferences for that purpose even a short while ago, foreign governments might have misconstrued its actions as efforts to bail itself out of a pay payment balances situation. The nations now, however, face the possibility of an international liquidity squeeze, through the drying up of dollar availability. These prospects involve not only the United States, but the entire free world. Certainly the nations should jointly study the possibilities of modifying existing systems, to avoid any such disruptive effects.

President Johnson's recent action in authorizing the United States to participate in conferences to seek substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements is therefore a timely and very important step.

Many of the suggestions which have been advanced by leading economists for improving the international monetary system are discussed in the report.

In the course of its study the subcommittee received suggestions that speculation in gold could be minimized if the United States would announce that although it will continue to sell gold at \$35 per ounce, it will reduce its minimum buying price of \$35 per ounce by successive steps according to an announced schedule, thus appreciating, rather than devaluing, the dollar in terms of gold. A simpler version would have the United States continue to redeem dollars in gold—that is, to continue selling gold—at \$35 per ounce, but abandon the guarantee to buy it from foreigners at the minimum price of \$35 per ounce. Advocates of the suggestion say that although it is important that the United States support the international value of the dollar in terms of gold, by continuing to redeem dollars with gold at \$35 per ounce, there appears to be little reason for the United States to continue to support the world price of gold in terms of dollars. The pros and cons of these suggestions are quite fully treated in "The Gold Situation."

The suggestion has been made that it is the strength of the U.S. economy rather than the convertibility of dollars into gold which makes the dollar the world's major reserve currency; and that the dollar would be as strong as it is even if the United States had no gold whatsoever.

That suggestion also is examined in "The Gold Situation."

In rather recent times chronic deficits in U.S. balances of international payments, coupled with increased accumulations of dollars by many foreign governments have led to some rumors that the United States might be forced to devalue, that is, to cheapen it or to cause it to lose value in relation to gold. In fact, a noted French economist suggested that the United States should devalue the dollar by one-half, thus raising the price of gold from \$35 to \$70 an ounce, and doubling the dollar value of

the U.S. gold stock to almost \$30 billion. The history of the 1933 devaluation of the dollar, and the arguments for and against devaluation are contained in "The Gold Situation."

The report contains factual data on U.S. gold holdings, and their diminutions. It discusses the role of gold in international monetary arrangements, the determination of the United States to maintain the strength of the dollar, and the balance of international payments problem. Steps presently being taken to reverse our longstanding deficits balances are discussed, together with a review of the measures which were earlier taken, and the cumulative effects of such measures.

Because of the general public interest in the subject of gold I have sent a copy of "The Gold Situation" to every Member of the House and of the other body. Should any additional copies be desired, they are available from the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, or the House Committee on Government Operations.

It is my hope, as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, that the report will fulfill a need which was reflected in inquiries received by the subcommittee for a better general public comprehension of the U.S. gold situation.

AN OUNCE OF COMPASSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the people of our Nation have had occasion—without count—to have a great sense of pride in the leadership and compassion of our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The following editorial appearing in the July 18, 1965, issue of the Washington Post brings to our attention another manifestation of the deep and abiding humanitarian drives which guide the leader of this august body.

I should like to include in the RECORD, at this point, the following editorial:

AN OUNCE OF COMPASSION

The dignity and prestige of the House of Representatives were enhanced, not diminished, by Speaker McCORMACK's forbearance on Wednesday in dropping charges against 10 Mississippians on trial for illegal entry at the U.S. Capitol. The 10, members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, were arrested a month ago for refusing to leave a corridor outside the office of the Clerk of the House after the Capitol closed for the day.

No doubt these demonstrators were wrong to sit in at the Capitol. It appeared at their trial, however, that they had had considerable provocation. They had gone to the Capitol to keep a written appointment with the Clerk who acknowledged that he failed to keep the appointment because he "didn't see any point in talking to them." Listening to this testimony, freshman Congressman

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., of Michigan, relayed an account of it to the Speaker who promptly asked Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Murphy to intervene at the trial. Mr. Murphy told the court that in Mr. McCORMACK's judgment "the defendants were acting in good faith and belief that they had a right to be there to see the Clerk of the House at the time" and "were not in open defiance of the law."

We think that Mr. CONYERS, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. Murphy acted with great good sense as well as with magnanimity. The Mississippi demonstrators were bent upon no mischief and no disrespect for the House of Representatives; their errand at the Capitol was a lawful and proper one, and their response to the contemptuous brushoff they received from the Clerk of the House was, if not wise, at least thoroughly understandable.

It would have been unjust and unbecoming to the House of Representatives to have applied the letter of the law to these people. No purpose could have been served by punishing them. The compassion they encountered is much more likely than punishment to deter them from any future misconduct. We hope, in addition, that the Speaker will have a word or two to say to the Clerk.

A LIAR WITH SECURITY CLEARANCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released another report today and it is shocking to learn that although William Wieland, a former high-ranking Latin American expert, lied about his contacts with Fidel Castro he has been given security clearance by the State Department.

Testifying under oath before the subcommittee, Otto Otepka, the State Department's chief security officer, states that there is a transcript of the Wieland testimony which shows that Wieland insisted he had only one meeting with the Cuban Communist dictator when Castro was in Washington.

Otepka testified he has evidence that Wieland met with Castro on at least six occasions.

This is but one of the lies or misrepresentations by Wieland on material matters. He failed to list his former name of William A. Montenegro on his Government information and application forms. He misrepresented and gave evasive testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when questioned about the omission of this material, and the committee transcript was sent to the Justice Department to study for possible prosecution for perjury.

It is incredible, in view of the report made today by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, that the State Department now employs Wieland in the office of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration at a salary of more than \$24,000 and, according to newspaper accounts, he is being elevated to a high diplomatic post in Australia.

Meanwhile, William Crockett, the Deputy Under Secretary, is doing his utmost to fire Chief Security Officer Otepka

because the latter has given full and truthful testimony in response to the questions of the Senate committee.

The Wieland case demonstrates clearly and forcibly the bungling and worse that is taking place in the State Department with respect to security matters and the necessity for a full-scale overhauling in that Department of the Government.

TATTERED FLAG FLYING OVER HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this morning when I looked out my window to my great amazement I noted the flag flying over the Rayburn House Office Building was almost completely torn to shreds—enough so, Mr. Speaker, to constitute a disgrace to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this led me to ask two questions. First, was the flag left flying during the storm last night; and, secondly, if not why was it raised in such a condition this morning?

Laws and certain customs have been decreed to insure proper respect for the Stars and Stripes. I quote, Mr. Speaker, from House Document No. 104 of the 88th Congress, 1st session, which says on page 22:

When the flag is in such a condition, through wear or damage, that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, it should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

In getting back to my first question, was the flag left flying during the storm last night? It is my understanding that the flag can only be flown legally 24 hours a day in three places in this Nation, and the House Office Building is not one of those places.

These three legal places are Flag House Square in Baltimore, Md., Fort McHenry National Monument, Baltimore, Md., and Iwo Jima Memorial, Arlington, Va. By custom over the Capitol Building itself but not, as I understand, over Capitol office building, or at least that is the way it should be.

Mr. Speaker, precautions should be taken to insure that no reoccurrence of this type should ever again happen.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the reduction of nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government is a cause dear to all of our hearts. Recently the Secretary of Defense briefed the press and others on his cost reduction program. I

would like to assist in the Secretary's cost reduction efforts by suggesting that next year he refrain from indulging in the printing of an expensive booklet proclaiming his efforts. Forty thousand copies of a booklet, printed on expensive paper and using costly color transparencies were prepared at a cost of at least \$50,000. The delivery schedule was such that a considerable amount of overtime work was required. The booklet was sent by mail to Members of Congress in a White House envelope bearing 40 cents in postage while the Federal Government maintains a small army of messengers in Washington. If my suggestion is accepted, the Secretary will have a head start on next year's cost reduction program.

MORE ON TEACH-INS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an evaluation by John Evarts Horner, Director of Public Services at the State Department, of the teach-ins on college campuses with respect to our policy in Vietnam.

In his evaluation, Mr. Horner referred to the teach-in at UCLA as being "little more than a circus." This statement was challenged by Mr. Chandler Harris, public information officer at UCLA, who telephoned Mr. Horner to point out that he—Mr. Horner—should have referred to the teach-in at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, rather than to the teach-in at UCLA. Mr. Harris told Mr. Horner that the teach-in at UCLA was conducted in an entirely satisfactory and unbiased manner.

In all fairness to the students and faculty at UCLA, I want to correct any false assumption which may have been made because of this slight error in Mr. Horner's evaluation. The record stands corrected on this point.

Dr. James McCain, president of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., read Mr. Horner's statement on the teach-ins and its specific reference to Kansas State University, and wrote me to give me his own evaluation.

Dr. McCain's statement is most pertinent and I feel that it is worthy of the attention of my colleagues. Dr. McCain's letter follows:

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kan., July 8, 1965.

The Hon. CHESTER L. MIZE,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHET: I found your letter of June 29 and the clippings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on my desk when I returned yesterday from a 2-weeks' vacation. I am especially pleased that you called my attention to the letter by Mr. Horner in which he comments on his visit to Kansas State University. Unfortunately, I was not on the campus at the time of his visit and did not get to see him personally.

I find it distressing that so many people assume that most university students and faculty members share the views of the tiny minority who make the headlines. I think it safe to assume that more than 90 percent of our college teachers and students support our policy in Vietnam and not more than 2 or 3 percent vigorously oppose it. Some of our Kansas State students, for example, decided to picket our spring ROTC review as a protest against Vietnam. They were able to enlist only eight pickets from our own student body of 10,000 and imported 12 from a higher institution nearby. At Colorado State University last spring the student council unanimously passed a resolution supporting the policy in Vietnam, although vigorous opposition to our policy by splinter groups had been previously given widespread publicity.

Certainly, we can all take satisfaction from the growing interest of our students in foreign policy and public affairs generally. Public discussion in these areas should make for more enlightened citizenship. However, the inevitable tendency to play up to more sensational aspects of such discussion gives a distorted impression of university attitudes.

I appreciate your interest very much, CHET, and will welcome an opportunity to talk this over with you the next time we are together.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. MCCAIN,
President.

RIGHTS OF THE MOB VERSUS THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a perceptive letter from Mr. J. P. Humphreys, president of Tamko, Inc., of Joplin, Mo. The letter reflects the views of an individual citizen who is becoming increasingly concerned with the direction of Government at the Federal level. I believe it deserves consideration by those responsible for governing our Nation.

Therefore, I insert the letter at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JULY 7, 1965.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
U.S. Representative from Missouri,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I write you today because I am greatly disturbed by the direction taken by the leaders of Government at the State and National level. The key decisions being made and being amplified in the State capitols and in Washington I would describe as being concerned primarily with "the rights of the mob versus the rights of the individual."

The direction began as a snowball might have been carelessly thrown down a hill. Today the avalanche thus created is roaring out of control into the abyss of human degradation. Yet, seemingly unaware of the roar of doom, Congressmen, Senators, Supreme Court Justices, Governors, and Presidents are throwing ever larger snowballs in the same direction and with the same effect. We have uncountable Pontius Pilates who seemingly cannot wait to give the mob what they want as long as Pontius can remain in the exalted position of authority over the mob. Thus concerned, I write my thoughts to you.

First, I wish to consider "the rights of the individual." The first and key question that must be answered in this definitive is—"What is the nature of man?" For unless we first answer this question there is no guide, no goal, no direction.

The Bible gives one of the most concise answers to this question, "What is the nature of man?" in the allegory of Adam and Eve. In this Biblical writing, man was, or became early in time, different from other animals created by God. Man had, or was given, the faculty of reason. This faculty of reason permitted man the means of choice, of alternatives, of evaluations, of goals. No other living creature was given such faculties. Shakespeare said, "To be or not to be, that is the question." This is still the question when man has the freedom of choice. My point is that if man's faculty of choice is removed from him by the castration of coercion then he ceases to be a man. Man has an inner power of choice that has to be kept alive or he ceases to live as man.

To be or not to be what? What are the choices of man that are so important? Essentially, man has only two choices, which are—to be moral or not to be moral. Morality, or moral law, must be defined as the objective principles founded on truth which glorify, amplify, and exalt the life of man, the individual. Morality is behavior in accord with the order in the universe. The observance and selection of objective moral standards by man leads to peace and life. The rejection of objective moral standards by man leads to conflict and death. Truth includes the objective laws of man as well as the objective laws of nature. Cicero said, "True law [morality] is right reason in agreement with nature; it is of universal value, unchanging and everlasting. It is a sin to alter the law." Man must have the right of choice before he can be moral. Man may not choose the moral, but he must continually have the freedom of choice or he degenerates into an animal.

If man continually has the freedom to choose the moral, he will increasingly choose the moral since experience and history will increasingly point to the error of the non-moral (the false). The observance of moral law by man is in his ultimate long range self-interest. Man will choose the moral selfishly as he rids himself of ignorance. Thus the freedom to choose the moral gives the greatest impetus possible to the selection by man of peace and life (the end results of morality.)

The alternative to "the rights of man" is "the rights of the mob." The "rights of the mob" can be defined more easily by defining socialism since the two are synonymous.

Socialism is defined by the phrase, "might makes right." Socialism is the law of the jungle where the strong coerce or eliminate the weak. Socialism is the art of coercion. The term "socialism," can be used interchangeably with fascism, communism, welfare statism, collectivism, or majority (or minority) rule without moral standards. These systems hold that man's life belongs to society (the mob), that society (the mob) can dispose of him in any way it pleases, and that any freedom he enjoys is his only by favor, by the permission of society, which may be revoked at any time.

The "rights of the mob" preclude selection of the moral since individual choice itself is coerced and prevented. The greater the "rights of the mob," the greater the coercion to the "rights of man" the less chance there is to select truth. Ultimately, the "rights of the mob" are translated into complete moral degradation of the individual.

Only criminals and governments stand between man and freedom. Government is a more dangerous threat to man's freedom than the criminal. Government, by definition, holds the monopoly of coercion against

its citizens. The question arises then as to how government should use this force—in the interest of the individual—or in the interest of society (the mob)? In the interest of the individual, government should use coercion negatively. In the interest of the mob, government uses the monopoly of coercion positively. The negative use of coercion is moral—defending the rights of man against criminals. The positive use of coercion is immoral—seeking "legitimate ends" for those in "need" by coercive means against the individual. Let me point out here that the end result of an action, and the action itself, cannot be separated. If either is immoral (the result of coercion), both are immoral. Moral ends cannot be obtained by immoral means. End values resulting from coercion are immoral.

Freedom means the opportunity to face life, not the right to be protected from it. Freedom is the activating device by which man's potential for good is exploded into a fusion of energy. Freedom removes the roadblock to the massive flow of available human energy. The key to morality, or truth, is freedom. For a man to be free means to be uncoerced by other men except as he violates their (and his) God-given freedom. To be free means that man must pursue his own self-interest except to the detriment of another man's freedom. To be free means that man owns his own life and the fruits of his labor, which he may exchange voluntarily for the fruits of the labor of other men without coercion in either his buying or his selling. That man was born to be free is part of objective truth. Only by coercing, or being coerced, can man lose his freedom.

The Founding Fathers of this country uniquely understood the proper relationship of the individual to government. They uniquely understood the immorality of positive coercion as used by government. In the beginning, the most profound achievement of the United States of America was the subordination of society (the mob) to moral law.

Using the foregoing as a base, as a set of principles, it is now possible to evaluate the relative merit of each piece of legislation by simply asking the following question:

1. Whom does this legislation benefit?

(a) At whose expense?

If society (the mob) is to benefit at man's (the individual's) expense, how do you justify this immorality?

To be more specific, how can you justify a vote in favor of the repeal of 14(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act when the predetermined result of such action by you is to coerce man from exercising his freedom of choice.

The problem posed to many men concerned with freedom in this country today is that they expect their representatives to the Congress, their President, and the Supreme Court to act in an area within the confines of the Constitution of the United States which is a set of moral principles guiding the art of government. To their anguish and frustration free men find that their representatives, their President, and the keepers of the faith, the Supreme Court, seem to be more interested in the needs of the mob, than they are in determining the morality of an issue. Is one man never right against the mob?

If this concerns you and if you have any suggestions, I would appreciate hearing from you.

With best regards,

J. P. HUMPHREYS,
President.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as announced in the New York Times, a highway seminar is being held in Washington starting today to evaluate the Interstate System progress and problems.

I am unalterably opposed to the administration approach to the problem of additional money needed to complete the Interstate System which is to require a stretchout of the program so that it will not be completed until a year after the present completion date of 1972.

This evidences a deplorable lack of leadership on the part of the administration relating to one of the most vital programs in the Nation—completion of the Interstate System—particularly when evidence indicates that some 41,000 people are dying on our highways annually—largely because of lack of adequate highways. This system when completed would save 8,000 lives annually, and \$11 billion on travel costs annually. I am deeply disturbed that the administration is taking the easy and in my opinion the irresponsible way out of this problem—just refuse to request funding of the \$2.7 billion deficit—and thus stretch out the completion of the program another year. I call upon the administration to provide leadership to back up the Public Works Committee of the House that voted the needed authorization increases initially to complete the system by 1972. Instead the administration has recommended a \$700 million shortage in authorization for 1967; thus, the completion program will be \$700 million short in 1967 of completion by 1972.

Leadership is needed here badly.

CONFERENCE TO ASSAY PROGRESS ON \$46.8 BILLION HIGHWAY PROJECT—CONSTRUCTION NEARS MIDPOINT IN DRIVE FOR 16-YEAR GOAL

(By David R. Jones)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—More than 250 of the Nation's leading highway proponents, ranging from Congressmen and State officials to contractors and their suppliers, will gather here tomorrow for a 2-day conference to celebrate the nearing of the "halfway point" in the contraction of the \$46.8 billion National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

There is good reason to celebrate the interstate road program, which has been described as history's biggest public works project.

The Federal-aid program has unshared considerable automobile traffic, has enhanced the influence of its proponents, and has poured over \$10 billion into the pockets of contractors since it began in 1956.

This week's celebration, called by the Associated General Contractors of America, is manned by the fact that the 41,000-mile Interstate System is not half-completed, even though 9 years of the 16-year plan have passed.

Highway authorities are increasingly coming to the conclusion that the program will miss its 1972 deadline, perhaps by 3 or 4 years.

COST OF DELAY

Each year the program costs the public over \$3 billion a year in State and Federal taxes. Any delay would mean an extension and possible increase in that tax load.

Also, some economists expect the roads to have as great an impact on the Nation as the railroad-building boom of the 19th century.

The status of the Interstate System is particularly pertinent right now because the Johnson administration is seeking congressional approval for increased truck taxes and a 5-month stretchout of the tax period to help finance a \$5.8 billion cost rise.

However, key members of the House Ways and Means Committee have shown a decided lack of enthusiasm about the prospect. Many have voiced doubt that the committee will act on the legislation before 1966. This would delay the program.

The powerful road lobby is already planning to convince Congress to continue Federal aid to highway building and to maintain related taxes at least at the present level—and possibly higher—through 1985.

This is coming at a time when there is increasing talk here that the Johnson administration is groping for a unified transportation policy, which could conflict somewhat with the road lobby's interests.

PLAGUED FROM THE OUTSET

The Interstate System has been plagued from the outset by political bickering and corruption in several States. Federal investigators may disclose more evidence of scandal early in 1966.

The problem the system faces at the moment is keeping on schedule, particularly in face of mounting criticism from the public in urban areas where new roads are upsetting neighborhood patterns.

The interstate program was begun in mid-1956 to improve transportation, aid defense readiness, and buoy the economy.

By the time the vast project is completed, contractors will have excavated enough material to cover Connecticut knee deep in dirt. Enough concrete will have been poured to build six sidewalks to the moon.

The Bureau of Public Roads supervises the program, with private contractors doing the work under direction of State highway departments. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost, and the States pay the remaining 10 percent.

SCOPE OF PROJECT

The road complex will link 90 percent of U.S. cities having 50,000 or more population with wide ribbons of limited-access highway, thereby sharply reducing travel time.

The Bureau estimates that the completed system will save 8,000 lives and \$11 billion in travel costs annually, and will carry nearly 25 percent of all highway traffic on less than 1.5 percent of the Nation's road and street mileage.

The Interstate System was originally expected to cost \$27.6 billion. But that estimate has risen steadily to the present \$46.8 billion figure, and most experts expect the bill to run at least \$3 billion higher before it is completed.

The Federal share is financed by the highway trust fund, which pays for the program on a pay-as-you-go basis from a batch of highway-user taxes due to expire October 1, 1972.

This infusion of Federal funds into the Interstate System has raised total spending for highways and streets in the United States above \$14 billion a year, from \$9 billion in 1957. The total is expected to rise to \$18 billion by the 1970's.

UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT

Work appears to have been moving along at an impressive pace, mainly because ambitious States have moved aggressively ahead of normal schedules and consumed appropriations left unclaimed by laggard States.

Also, much of the work done to date has been concentrated in rural areas, where costs are lower and the building is faster.

The ability to divert money from laggard States to ambitious ones is being diminished as the latter States near completion of their programs.

Much work remains to be done in the urban areas, which will consume nearly half of the program's money and present more of a building obstacle. Militant antiroad groups have snarled progress in several key cities.

Rex M. Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, says the interstate program is "substantially" on schedule and will be completed by its 1972 deadline. But he adds that he is "not naive enough to think there may not be a mile or two uncompleted in 1972 in some urban area."

The Bureau estimates that about 19,470 miles, or nearly 48 percent of the 41,000-mile system, was open to traffic at June 30. This seems close to the halfway mark, but it includes over 5,200 miles of toll roads and other highways that for the most part do not meet present interstate standards.

This means that only about one-third of the mileage has been completed to full and acceptable standards in 9 years.

TASKS TO BE COMPLETED

The interstate mileage completed to full standard has averaged less than 2,500 miles annually since 1956. There remain 26,600 miles to finish to full standards by 1972.

The completion rate for the next 7 years would have to run 50 percent faster to hit the 1972 goal.

Most highway experts doubt this can be done because much of the work that remains is in such troublesome urban areas as New York, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C.

Less than 15 percent of the interstate mileage will lie in urban areas, but these roads will carry 41 percent of the system's traffic and represent 47 percent of its cost.

One Bureau official estimates it will take more than 5 years to build some urban highways after locations have been fixed.

Edward H. Holmes, the Bureau's director of planning, says he expects more rural sections and circumferential highways around major cities to be completed by 1972. He suggests it would be wrong to consider the system unfinished merely because some roads through the hearts of these cities had not been completed.

But Lowell K. Bridwell, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, disputes this.

"You build a highway system to meet the traffic requirements, and half of the national traffic requirements are in the urban areas," he says. "So merely supplying a superior highway facility to the edge of the city does not, in my opinion, meet the requirements of most of the people using the system."

Bureau officials report that, on average, the States have already obligated an average of 41 percent of their interstate highway funds for fiscal 1966, which began last July 1.

The figure is buoyed by several States—such as Texas, Florida, Missouri, Connecticut, Oregon, Ohio, and New York—which have actively pursued their goals.

But about 13 States are lagging in obligations, with New Jersey having obligated only 4 percent of fiscal 1965 funds, and Maryland, only 52 percent of fiscal 1964 funds.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 made it mandatory for cities seeking Federal highway money after the start of this month to have a comprehensive transportation planning process assuring cooperation between State and local interests. Fifteen cities covered by the interstate system have not yet complied.

Mr. Holmes says that where an interstate road needs only a bridge or small connection

for completion, the Bureau will provide aid even though there is no planning process.

ROADBLOCKS FOR STATES

But he predicts significant delays, and perhaps complete suspension of interstate road money, for any city that seeks new funds without such a plan. Those cities affected include New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Omaha, Shreveport, and San Francisco.

The Bureau has estimated that the program will cost \$5.8 billion more than the \$41 billion previously forecast. Increased revenues will bring in an added \$2 billion to the trust fund through 1972, the Bureau says, but an additional \$3 billion in Federal money is needed to meet increased costs.

Because interstate systems costs are already outstripping revenues, the quarterly apportionment set by the Bureau for the States last August was not released until last month, 3 months behind schedule.

Should the House Ways and Means Committee fail to enact legislation increasing taxes for the program until 1966, another 3-month delay in appropriations could result. This is slowing work in some of the more advanced States.

The House committee, which may hold hearings on the matter later this month, is reported reluctant to raise truck taxes.

Highway sources report that the committee might propose a patchwork tax program, including an extension of the tax period and use of 1 percent of the automobile excise tax to finance the added costs.

STRETCHOUT OF PROGRAM

Alfred E. Johnson, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, estimates that failure to obtain the \$3 billion in added money would amount to a 1-year program stretchout.

The prospect of a stretched-out interstate program does not appeal to State highway officials and contractors, who would face layoffs and reduced operations. They want to keep the project going full blast, and to follow it up with another massive road program.

Most experts agree future spending should be concentrated in urban areas. There is also considerable sentiment for standardizing the Federal share of Federal-aid highway projects at around 65 to 70 percent of costs.

The Government's share of federally aided road programs normally was 50 percent before the interstate project, and the Government continues to spend only 50 percent on most of its non-interstate road programs.

JOHNSON APPROACH

There are serious misgivings within the Johnson administration, however, about the propriety of this approach to determining transportation needs. Some transportation experts within the administration favor a comprehensive study of the proper balance of funds that should go into all modes of transportation.

Most transportation experts here believe that Alan S. Boyd, named last month as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, has been given a mandate by President Johnson to put transportation spending on a more rational basis.

Such a move, in the view of most economists, would include cost-benefit studies, which weigh spending against the value derived from it.

"I can assure you that we're going to build roads on the basis of cost-benefit studies, which I hope will be the logical and rational approach to it," Mr. Boyd has stated.

Most sources believe President Johnson to be an ardent Interstate System supporter. They doubt that he would shape any policy to bring about a sharp dispute with the strong petroleum, automobile, trucking, and construction interests in the road lobby.

NAM CIVIC AFFAIRS STUDY PROGRAM GIVES BUSINESS LEADERS BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE LAWMAKING PROCESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently several of my colleagues and I were privileged to participate in a new program instituted by the National Association of Manufacturers, the civic affairs study program, organized and developed by Robert D. Buehler, director of public affairs for the National Association of Manufacturers.

Because of the significance of the undertaking, I wanted to bring such to the attention of all Members of Congress.

The National Association of Manufacturers describes the public affairs endeavor as a 4-day, live laboratory study of the Federal Government process. The purpose is to give middle and top management of NAM member companies a firsthand practical and constructive observation and understanding of the three branches of Government. As Bob Buehler says:

Obviously, the participants cannot learn everything about Government in this program, but we are able to provide them with a realistic bird's-eye view and a better appreciation of the Federal Government process.

In order to acquaint the participants with the working environment, some sessions of the program were conducted in the Federal Government departments or on Capitol Hill. I am advised that the Department of Commerce was especially cooperative in its presentation at the Commerce Building. Presentations were given by Members of Congress of both parties, congressional staff personnel, White House aids, and Federal executive officers. Also, Washington business representatives lectured on the role of the business representative working with Government.

As I stated, it was my privilege to talk to a score of executives who participated in the program held June 13-17, 1965. I was impressed with the genuine interest and desire on the part of the businessmen to take advantage of this program to learn and gain a better understanding of the Federal process.

Those who participated were W. Scott Allan, assistant vice president and manager, public relations department, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Philip L. Baden, coordinator of citizenship activities, Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.; Russell M. Braga, vice president of finance, Standard Pressed Steel, Jenkintown, Pa.; Raymond M. Crockett, vice president, United Utilities, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.; James F. Dudley, vice president, engineering and public affairs, Commercial Solvents Corp., New York City; Richard C. Eaton, director, public relations, Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Mo.; E. B. Falk, director of adver-

tising and public relations, Twin Disc Clutch Co., Racine, Wis.; Clement E. Gardiner, manager of public relations, the Potomac Edison Co., Hagerstown, Md.; Fred M. Ginsberg, president, American Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.; J. Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to vice president, Chemstrand Division, Monsanto Co., Decatur, Ala.; Robert M. Kurtz, Jr., vice president of public relations and advertising, Kurtz Bros., Clearfield, Pa.; J. B. McMains, administrative assistant, Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; L. C. Michelin, director of public affairs, Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; A. W. Prenovost, Jr., senior tax consultant, Arizona Public Service Co., Phoenix; J. Robert Roe, special staff assistant to the senior vice president of Litton Industries, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Charles E. Stutenroth, assistant to the vice president, personnel and public relations, director of public relations, Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio; J. H. Tinsley, staff assistant to the director of industrial relations, the Warner & Swasey Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Gerald W. Vaughan, director of public affairs, Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp., New York City; John H. Welsh, Jr., assistant to the president, Texas Gas Transmission Corp., Owensboro, Ky.; and Charles G. Yeager, administrative assistant to the vice president and director of finance, Champion Spark Plug Co., Toledo, Ohio.

These participants were presented a highly condensed program. Each day they heard speakers at breakfast, lunch, and dinner in addition to the presentations given throughout the day. Before each session, the participants were briefed as to what to expect from the speaker. These business executives were encouraged to ask questions of each speaker after his presentation. The presentations were off the record to facilitate a free flow of ideas. The number of participants was kept purposely low so that each would have ample opportunity to ask the questions.

The program was strictly nonpartisan. Public issues and pending legislation were not discussed; rather, the presentations pertained to the mechanics, or "nuts and bolts," of how Government and those connected with it work.

Here is a list of some of the areas covered: "The Legislative Process," "The Role of Party Leadership in the House," "The Role of the Bureau of the Budget," "The Work of the Supreme Court," "Politics for the First Time," "The Congressional Committee Process," "Facing the Realities of Political and Economic Life," "The Operation of Congressional Offices," "The Job of the Congressional Liaison Official for Executive Departments," "The Current Challenges Facing Members of Congress," "The Work of the Department of Commerce," "Helping Business in Science and Technology," "Services for the Business Community," "Economic Data for Policy Determination," "The Development of Policy and Party Position on Legislative Issues," "The Role of the Independent Regulatory Agency as It Relates to the Legislative and Executive Branches," "The Responsibility of the News Media as It Relates to the Government Process," "The Work

of the White House Staff," and "The Role of the Washington Business Representative as It Relates to His Company and to the Legislative and Executive Branches."

One of the best ways to measure the success of the program in increasing management's knowledge and understanding of the Government process is to relate specific quotes made by the participants themselves:

It was very interesting to observe the reaction of the 21 businessmen participating in the program. During the first couple of sessions, they were obviously skeptical, had a relatively low opinion of both legislators and Government agency personnel and were obviously thinking that Government was not "in the same ball park" with American business. As the sessions continued, however, their attitude began to undergo a very real change, in the sense that the parade of competent speakers from all branches of the Federal Government began to demonstrate forcibly the sophistication and the caliber of Government personnel and of the legislators whom we send to Washington. More than that, there began to evolve a much clearer realization of the inherent problems of Government (which are not so dissimilar to those of business) and an appreciation of why it is increasingly necessary for business executives to know how to work with Government.

Other quotes follow:

A special opportunity not readily available to us as individual citizens to get a brief but revealing glimpse at the process of Government at the national level.

The program makes an excellent contribution to the necessary background of a non-Washingtonian who wishes to increase his potential as an effective spokesman for his company at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I played a very minor part in this study program but I was grateful for the opportunity to participate and assist these businessmen in getting firsthand information about the Federal process as I know it from my particular vantage point.

The National Association of Manufacturers and Robert Buehler, the director of public affairs, are to be commended for launching this worthwhile program. I feel certain that the NAM will get requests to arrange other study programs of this nature and it goes without saying that they will find Members of Congress and Government officials more than happy to cooperate in exchanging views and information which will make the governmental process more understandable and more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

JUSTICE AND LOGIC DEMAND THE REPEAL OF 14(b)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, early in May, after 4 months of careful study and analysis, I publicly announced my decision to support President Johnson and the 1964 Democratic Party platform

by voting for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I am fully aware that my decision is neither politically expedient nor popular with some people. Yet any other course would be an act of moral dishonesty, because I firmly believe that 14(b) is a bad law and should be stricken from the record.

Several powerful pressure groups in Arizona have already begun firing away with a barrage of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls. Most of these come from narrow interests who apparently have taken it upon themselves to speak for our working men and women who are directly affected by the so-called right-to-work laws.

IS "RIGHT-TO-WORK" A MAJORITY OPINION?

Arizonans voted on November 5, 1946, and again on November 2, 1948, to implement 14(b) by prohibiting employers and employees from freely contracting with each other and reaching collective security agreements.

Because of these votes I have been repeatedly accused of defying majority opinion. There is no truth to this accusation.

Supporters of the "right-to-work" law have argued that Arizonans clearly expressed their views in 1946, 1948, and again last year when the Full Crew Train Law (so-called featherbedding) was repealed by a vote of 199,650 to 178,762. In other words, the people reaffirmed their belief in "right to work" by knocking out the Full Crew Train Law 8 short months ago.

If we carry this logic to its conclusion, then my position on 14(b) was actually dictated at the polls last November by the people of the Third Congressional District. The simple fact is that they voted against repealing the Full Crew Train Law 27,660 to 21,553. In short, a majority of the voters of the Third Congressional District expressed their support for the workingman.

It is further interesting to note that only 5 of Arizona's 14 counties favored repeal, and that it was a 30,000 vote majority chalked up in Maricopa County that made the difference.

"RIGHT-TO-WORK" LAWS DESTROY FREEDOM

The controversy over repeal of 14(b) has aroused such bitterly emotional opinions that the facts either are ignored or are distorted to serve as a crutch for faulty arguments.

Stripped of all emotional coloration, the principal issue involved here is freedom of choice—the freedom of employees to vote on whether their interests would best be served by a collective bargaining agency. It is as simple as that. Section 14(b) permits the individual States to take away that freedom and 19 States—including Arizona—have done so.

Viewed calmly and rationally, the full significance of 14(b) can be more clearly understood by visualizing its application to the Voting Rights Bill of 1965.

Supposing that when Congress enacts the Voting Rights Bill of 1965, which guarantees the right of every qualified citizen to register, to cast his ballot, and to have it properly counted, it also inserts a short paragraph permitting each State

to make its own overriding laws on this subject.

The repeal of 14(b) will not, as some have suggested, automatically lead to the establishment of a union. It will not in itself force anyone to join a union. It is essentially a proposal that permits the employer and employees who are bargaining in a particular case to settle this matter as they deem mutually satisfactory.

Union security agreements, where they now exist, are the result of free and voluntary negotiation between the employer and the employees, and are not a condition imposed by law. Where State "right-to-work" laws are erased by the repeal of 14(b), no employee could be compelled to join a collective bargaining unit unless his employer voluntarily agrees to such a contract provision with the collective bargaining agent which has been democratically chosen by a majority of the employees.

"RIGHT-TO-WORK"—A MISLEADING SLOGAN

At this point let us dispose of the myth inherent in the phrase "right-to-work." James Mitchell, who served as Secretary of Labor under President Eisenhower, said:

They call these right-to-work laws, but that is not what they really are. In the first place, they do not create any jobs at all. In the second place, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon the conditions of work. I oppose such laws categorically.

During hearings on legislation calling for repeal of 14(b) 2 months ago, present Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, declared:

The real issue has been submerged beneath a phrase about right-to-work although no such right is either recognized or advocated by those who lean on this phrase. The issue has also been cast falsely in terms of individual liberties—when what is involved is only the effect which any group decision has on the position of a member who disagrees with it.

OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF 14(b) IS ON SHAKY GROUND

There are three major arguments advanced again and again by those who do not want 14(b) repealed. Whatever disguise they may be wrapped in from time to time, the basic arguments have remained unchanged for 18 years and more.

Before examining these arguments, however, perhaps it would be fruitful to briefly review some aspects of legislation pertinent to 14(b).

The Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. In 1935, Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act and assumed substantial jurisdiction to stop abuses on the part of both labor and management as they affect interstate commerce.

Then 12 years later in 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act became law. Generally speaking, this legislation imposed varying restrictions upon union activities. It banned the closed union shop. But the law also permitted the employer and the employees to enter into an agreement concerning collective security. It must be emphasized that such agreements can

only be reached after a majority of the employees have accepted an individual or a union as their bargaining agent.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, permits the individual States to prohibit all forms of employee's security agreements, even if the employer and 100 percent of his employees have agreed to such security agreements. Section 14(b) gave legal authority to the "right-to-work" laws now in effect in Arizona and 18 other States. Five States have repealed their "right-to-work" laws, and nine others have defeated efforts to have such laws enacted.

Section 14(b) is a contradiction in a national law. But it has an even more unattractive feature. Employees in the "right-to-work" States can work in an industry where the majority of the employees has decided, by a secret ballot, that it wants to be represented by a collective bargaining agency, but they do not have to contribute 1 cent to the costs of the collective bargaining process. Yet the Taft-Hartley Act requires each bargaining agent to represent every employee equally and without exception—in regard to working conditions, grievances, wages, hours of employment, and so forth.

Let us examine the arguments against the repeal of 14(b) and in favor of retaining the "right-to-work" laws.

First. Repeal of 14(b) would violate individual freedom and individual rights by making union membership compulsory.

Answer. This is simply not true. It is obvious that in those 31 States which have not prohibited collective security agreements, the right to work without joining a union freely exists. In fact, the overwhelming majority of nonagricultural workers in this Nation are not union members.

In Illinois, the most highly unionized State in the country, 64.2 percent of the working force is nonunion. New York is 68.1 percent nonunion; California 73.2 percent; Pennsylvania 66.2 percent; Michigan 67.2 percent. These employees have the right to work without joining a union but do not have the power to restrict the right to work of those who do want a union security agreement—source of above statistics: U.S. Department of Labor.

Just how much freedom is actually involved? In those States which do not have right-to-work laws a man can work in a nonunion shop, an agency shop, or a shop with a union security agreement. If he works in a shop with a union security agreement, he may be an active union member, or a person who simply pays his union fees and dues for services rendered. In a "right-to-work" State, however, he has no choice but to work in a compulsory open shop. I ask you, where does the greater freedom lie?

Second. Repeal of 14(b) would be an invasion of States rights.

Answer. This is a particularly deceptive argument, but one that has no merit for a number of reasons.

The Constitution of the United States specifically states:

Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among

the several States, and with the Indian Tribes (art. 1, sec. 8).

It is Congress that has the constitutional prerogative to legislate in the field of interstate commerce. In pursuance of the national public interest and under the powers granted it by the Constitution, Congress has passed a number of acts, among them the Taft-Hartley Act, the National Railway Labor Act, and the Transportation Act of 1958. These acts provide uniform regulations concerning interstate commerce relations and help promote the industrial tranquillity and prosperity of the Nation. If these acts are to be effective and nondiscriminatory they must apply to all States uniformly. Yet section 14(b) is the one clause in a piece of national legislation where national uniformity and unity is completely abandoned.

The National Railway Labor Act was amended in 1951 to permit employers and employees under the act's jurisdiction to reach a collective security agreement. Five years later, in *Railway Employees Department v. Hanson*, 351 U.S. 225 (1956), the Supreme Court of the United States held that labor-management relations came under the legislative power of Congress by virtue of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It held, also, that Federal law was controlling in this area and that a State could not ban any employer-employee agreement arrived at under the provisions of the National Railway Labor Act, as amended in 1951.

Finally, and I am not arguing for organized labor but to point out certain inconsistencies, it seems to me that if those who argue for States rights were really concerned about achieving States rights on the issue of compulsory union membership, they would demand that 14(b) be amended—not only to prohibit all forms of compulsory union membership—but to permit all forms of compulsory membership, including the closed shop. That would make 14(b) a two-way street with no limitation on the power of the State to act in either direction.

DO RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS FOSTER ECONOMIC GROWTH?

Proponents of "right-to-work" laws argue that these laws promote industrial growth and they cite statistics to prove their claim. On the other hand, the advocates of repeal of 14(b) can cite just as many figures supporting the claim that "right-to-work" laws do not help a State's economic growth.

In order to get an unbiased opinion, a group of Congressmen asked the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service to make a study answering this question: "Have right-to-work laws promoted economic growth?" This study reports that the growth of "right-to-work" States "reflects more the location of many of the States in rapidly growing areas of the Southeast and Southwest than any peculiarity of the right-to-work laws."

The significant conclusion of the Legislative Reference Service study is that no definite claims can be made for or against right-to-work laws, insofar as economic growth is concerned.

On the subject of per capita personal income, "the analysis has not isolated any effect of a State's having a right-to-work law on its total or per capita income."

Correlating a State's income as a share of national income, the study found that "there is no clear trend either way."

Its final conclusions are simple:

Efforts to measure economic effects of right-to-work laws in the various States were inconclusive. No consistent effects were found, either immediately after passage or over a period of time.

ARIZONA AND 14 (B)

One of the arguments frequently heard in Arizona to justify retention of 14(b) is that new industry has been drawn there by the right-to-work law. This has extremely unfortunate connotations because it implies the presence of an anti-labor climate with attendant low wage scales. On the surface, Arizona's almost phenomenal growth since 1948 would tend to bear out this argument.

But appearances are deceiving, and I believe that the facts do not support this spurious argument.

In attempting to arrive at the truth, I developed a questionnaire and distributed it to 73 of Arizona's largest manufacturing firms several weeks ago. Collectively they employ approximately 50,000 people. The great majority of these established operations in Arizona after 1948.

The first question asked was:

What major factors induced your firm to establish operations in Arizona?

Significantly, only two companies listed the "right-to-work law" as a factor. At the same time, they also emphasized that the removal of the manufacturers inventory tax in 1950—a State law—had an impact on their decision to move to Arizona.

Altogether, 37 percent declared that repeal of the manufacturers inventory tax helped persuade them to select Arizona; 37.9 percent stated that the tax repeal motivated them to expand their operations; 20.7 percent asserted that the removal of the tax on sales to the Federal Government in 1956 had had a great influence in determining their Arizona location and activities.

The numbers game is an interesting one, but not always of merit since anyone can make figures do virtually whatever he pleases. Yet there is one particular area in which statistics seem enlightening: the economic growth in Arizona stands below the national average in terms of per capita personal income. Not only is it below national average, but it is falling farther behind.

Arizona, in 1948, was \$178 below the national average. In 1963, the State's per capita personal income was \$298 below the national average—source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Precisely how sincere are the motives of those who claim they want Arizona's "right-to-work" laws retained because it benefits the working people? It is curious that in their protective zeal they have somehow failed to fight for a minimum wage law for Arizona.

To date, there have been only two Wage Board orders guaranteeing to experi-

enced employees the tremendous salary of \$18.72 a week, or 52 cents per hour, in laundries; \$21.60 a week, or 60 cents per hour, in drycleaning plants; and \$24.60 a week, or 55 cents per hour, in retail trades. There is no State law covering employees other than those doing manual or mechanical work for the State government.

In the final analysis, there is no way of knowing what the economic status of Arizona might have been without the right-to-work laws. We can arrive at some conclusions based on the lagging per capita personal income, but they would be assumption at best. The same applies to Arizona's great growth, which to a greater or lesser extent may well have been stimulated by the billions of dollars which were spent by the Federal Government in road construction and defense contracts.

The overriding issue in "right-to-work" and 14(b) is and remains freedom of choice and the will of the majority. These can only be accomplished by the repeal of 14(b).

I believe that the employee is the best judge of his own interests. I believe he should be permitted, through democratic processes, to determine for himself whether his interest will be best served by the establishment of union security or by no union at all. The repeal of 14(b) would give the employee this right of self-determination. Repeal of 14(b), by eliminating State "right-to-work" laws which deny this right, would return to the employees and their employer the right to determine, by the process of a secret ballot and negotiations, which arrangement they prefer in their particular situation. In good conscience, therefore, I have no alternative but to support the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ON UNIFORM DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State Legislature in a joint resolution petitioned the Wisconsin congressional delegation to seek Federal legislation on uniform daylight saving time periods.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the full text of Wisconsin Senate Joint Resolution 38 be included in the RECORD at this point.

The joint resolution referred to follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

Whereas the present crazy quilt pattern whereby each State determines whether or not it will institute daylight saving time and the period for which daylight saving time will be effective in that state results in a nonsensical jumble of varying times, inconvenient to travelers, business operations and the public in general; and

Whereas, the great progressive State of Wisconsin has an opportunity to pioneer again by seeking to bring order out of the chaos resulting from this lack of uniformity; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the legislature petitions Wisconsin's 10 Congressmen and 2 Senators to seek the enactment of Federal legislation to make the institution of daylight saving time and the periods for which effective standard throughout the United States; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

PATRICK GLUY,

President of the Senate.

WILLIAM P. NUGENT,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

ROBERT T. HUBER,

Speaker of the Assembly.

JAMES P. BUCKLEY,

Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

PRESIDENT SHOULD CLARIFY FACTS ON "SPY PLANE" CHARGE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the French Government has charged that a U.S. reconnaissance plane last Friday took 175 photographs of a secret French uranium plant.

President Johnson should immediately clarify the facts. The charge is a most serious one, and if a "spy plane" flight was actually undertaken it was an affront to France and a foreign-policy blunder of shocking proportions.

The U.S. Government should face the fact that France is a nuclear power, and drop our hostile and suspicious attitude.

We are treating our friends and allies, especially France, as if they were irresponsible children.

If we have actually sent a "spy plane" over France's uranium plant, then we have added insult to injury. Up to now we have reserved this type of operation for Castro's Cuba, the Soviet Union, and other hostile territory.

President Johnson should immediately explain to the American people, and to the French, the full facts on the alleged incident.

He should also take steps to improve U.S. nuclear policy toward France.

Instead of blocking French weapons development, the United States should be helping. The United States and France should be partners.

As the House Republican fact-finding mission on NATO recently recommended, we must find a way to bring together the vast scientific and technological resources of the entire Atlantic community, including France.

Present policies deprive the United States of the talent and achievements of many brilliant scientists in France, just as they deprive France of U.S. talent and achievement.

The alleged incident makes especially urgent and timely the Republican mis-

sion's recommendation. The United States should take full advantage of any discretionary provisions of our Atomic Energy Act, and if need be amend it so that the nuclear capabilities of France and the United States may be fully coordinated.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS OF SERVICE IN VIETNAM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will authorize educational assistance on the same basis as that provided for World War II and Korean war veterans to any veteran who served for 10 or more days in Vietnam.

American servicemen who have fought in this area, are now fighting, or will fight there, face the same hazards as did their brothers-in-arms who served in World War II and Korea. Indeed, in many instances, their lot is more difficult and demanding.

The President recently designated Vietnam and certain waters adjacent thereto as combat areas for the purpose of income tax relief for persons serving therein. My bill establishes the same geographical boundaries and the same time limitations as the President's Executive order for entitlement.

This legislation will provide 1½ days of education for each day of military service performed between January 1, 1964, and the date Vietnam is no longer designated as a combat area to any veteran who served at least 10 days in Vietnam during this period.

The men and women of the U.S. armed services are making great sacrifices in behalf of freedom and they are entitled to share in the same benefits accorded the veterans of World War II and Korea.

I respectfully urge the support and early consideration of this bill by my colleagues.

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PORK BARREL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has shortchanged the Midwest in the award of job-creating research and development contracts.

This is a matter of serious concern in our region because economic growth often goes hand-in-hand with research and development activities.

The administration now is asking us to vote huge sums to create employment

opportunities in depressed areas. At the same time, through concentration of research and development funds in a few favored locations, it is actually retarding economic growth in much of the rest of the country, particularly the Midwest.

This situation is succinctly described in an editorial titled "The Research and Development Pork Barrel" in the July 2, 1965, issue of Science, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

As aptly stated in this editorial, "some regions of this country not receiving large research and development contracts seem on the road to becoming new Appalachias."

The editorial points out that one-half of the 50 States received 96.8 percent of all Federal research and development funds in 1963.

The significance of this is underscored by the fact that almost \$21 billion—3.2 percent of the gross national product—will be spent this year for research and development in the United States, of which two-thirds will come from the Federal Government.

In the past the administration has excused the maldistribution of research and development funds on the ground that the contracts went where the scientific and technical expertise in such fields as nuclear energy, space exploration, and electronics were concentrated, particularly the Boston area, Texas, and California.

But this reasoning, plausible as it may sound, cannot explain the administration's choice of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. MIT, deservedly famous for its work in other research fields, has no special expertise in the field of transportation. In fact, most research in railroad transportation has been done in the Midwest although there also has been important development work done by railroads and car manufacturers in the Pittsburgh area, Philadelphia, and West Virginia. The Association of American Railroads research center on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago is world renowned. AAR's vice president in charge of research, William M. Kessler, informs me that visitors from almost every country in the world travel to the center "to see what research we are doing." A few miles away, in La Grange, Ill., is General Motors' Electromotive Division which pioneered development of the diesel engine. Also in the Chicago area is Northwestern University's Transportation Center, which has done valuable research work in railroad economics. Important research in various phases of railroad transportation has been carried on at such Midwestern institutions as the University of Illinois, in my own congressional district; Purdue University in Indiana, Ohio State University, the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, and in the research facilities of such companies as Pullman Standard, American Steel Foundry, and American Car & Foundry.

With all this railroad research expertise available in the Midwest it does seem

strange to see MIT on the inside track to the millions of dollars in research and development contracts that are sure to flow from the administration's ground transportation bill. True, the bill designates no institution and no contracts have been awarded. The legislation is still pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, the preliminary studies on which the administration proposal was based were carried on at MIT with the financial support of the Department of Commerce. William W. Seifer, MIT assistant dean of engineering and director of its Project Transport, testified before our committee that he has had about 40 faculty members and 25 graduate students working in this research field since September 1964. It does not require much imagination to foresee that MIT is likely to emerge with the lion's share, if not all, of the \$10 million in research and development funds to be authorized for the first year alone.

I bring these facts to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the Midwest, in the hope that we can do something before it is too late to secure for our area its fair share of research and development funds. We are justly proud of our great educational institutions. The States where the Big Ten universities are located produce 40 percent of all scientists and engineers with advanced degrees. But most of them, after getting their master's degrees or doctorates, must look elsewhere for research jobs because the jobs go along with the big Government contracts.

Following is the science editorial which I referred to earlier:

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PORK BARREL

Distribution of research and development funds is becoming a major political issue. One reason is that present distribution is very uneven. In 1963 one-half of the 50 States received 96.8 percent of all Federal research and development funds while the other 25 divided the remaining 3.2 percent. The 50 Senators from the have-not States may be expected to attempt to improve their States' share. This tendency will be reinforced by a growing general awareness of the role of science and technology in our changing civilization.

The extent of the beneficial effects of Federal funds is not clear, though in some instances the economic stimulus has seemed disproportionately large. In other instances benefits were nominal. However, many of the States whose economies have grown rapidly are recipients of large sums of Federal research and development funds. In contrast, some regions of this country not receiving large research and development contracts seem on the road to becoming new Appalachias.

In a recent speech at a Midwest Governors' conference, Charles Kimball, president of the Midwest Research Institute, outlined problems of one such area. His institute had made a study of a 6-State region, including Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. During the decade 1950-60 the number of jobs in the area had increased only 2.3 percent as against 14.5 percent for the Nation. The average family income is now much below the national figure. At the same time more than a million people moved to other parts of the country. Although total population increased slightly, the increase was much less than the national average.

Contributing to discontent over uneven distribution of research and development funds is growing frustration over a Middle West "brain drain." For instance, in Iowa the two major universities estimate that from 55 to 75 percent of the graduates leave the State for their first jobs. The States in which the Big Ten universities are located produce about 40 percent of all scientists and engineers with advanced degrees, but this region receives only a small fraction of Federal research and development funds. To apply their training many of the scientists must migrate; their migration represents an economic loss to a region which yearly spends huge sums on higher education.

Some of the frustration felt in the Midwest was expressed recently by President Harrington of the University of Wisconsin, who said:

"Failure to provide for geographical spread of Federal defense and space contracts has brought our Nation face to face with a most serious kind of overconcentration:

"Overconcentration of our working scientists and engineers by region;

"Overconcentration of our industrial and defense strengths by region.

"If these tendencies continue in the award of Federal research, development, and production contracts, we are on the road to manpower chaos, economic chaos, social chaos, defense chaos."

The feelings expressed by President Harrington are not unrelated to pressures now evident with respect to the proposed new 200-Bev. accelerator. Major midwestern universities have agreed to support whatever midwestern site appears to be most in the running after initial screenings. If the region exerts its maximum potential pressure, Washington will find it difficult to place the facility elsewhere. Whatever the outcome, politics is destined to be a crucial factor, and an important precedent will be established. The influence of political and geographical considerations on the allocation of research funds is certain to increase.

PHILIP H. ABELSON.

TRIBUTE FOR THE LATE HONORABLE T. A. THOMPSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in a tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

It was my privilege to serve on the Subcommittee for Fish and Wildlife of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which Mr. THOMPSON so ably chaired.

The shock of his death affected us all. His love of the out of doors, his great interest in migratory waterfowl, contributed much to the accomplishment of his subcommittee.

To his family, to his many associates and friends in the Seventh District of Louisiana, I offer my sincerest sympathy.

THE SUBVERSION OF PACEM IN TERRIS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to read a report of the Veritas Committee on Pacem in Terris. Headed by such illustrious Americans as Robert Morris and Phyllis Schlafly, this committee has shown in a scholarly manner the effort at subverting the meaning of Pope John XXIII's encyclical Pacem in Terris. I commend this article to those who are interested in a penetrating analysis of this subject:

THE SUBVERSION OF PACEM IN TERRIS

The Communists know there are just two important obstacles to their goal of world conquest:¹

1. The spiritual strength of the Catholic Church; and
2. The military strength of the United States of America.

In 1958, having already made enormous geographic gains, the Communists mapped their strategy to paralyze or neutralize these two major obstacles.² The principal purpose of Khrushchev's visit to the United States and the United Nations in 1959 was to persuade the United States to unilaterally dismantle its military strength. Great quantities of Communist literature and numerous Communist fronts worked strenuously toward this goal. By 1963 the Communists were openly baiting Catholics and advertising that "religious beliefs (of Catholics) should not be regarded as an obstacle to their joining the (Communist) party."³

Soon after, the Communist commissars of psychological warfare came up with a diabolical plan. They decided upon the use of a single weapon to paralyze both the Catholic and the military obstacles to their conquest of the world. It was a scheme that staggered the imagination by its very boldness. The Communists planned to misuse and distort, in effect, to steal Pope John XXIII's great encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," from Catholics and use it as an instrument to promote—

¹ The primary objective of communism is world conquest. This remains the goal of Soviet Communists as well as Chinese Reds, of "fat" Communists as well as hungry ones. Neither the death of Stalin, nor the industrialization of the U.S.S.R., nor the negotiations and agreements with the West, has brought about the abandonment or even the postponement of this paramount objective. This has recently been reconfirmed by a scholarly and authoritative study by the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University the renowned Jesuit institution in Washington, D.C. The conclusion of this objective and comprehensive analysis of more than 500 Communist documents was published in 1964 by the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education Against Communism under the title "Peaceful Coexistence: A Communist Blueprint for Victory."

² Information on the Communist line is taken from Communist publications: Political Affairs, the Worker, New World Review, World Marxist Review, International Affairs, and New Times.

³ World Marxist Review, March 1963, p. 49. "The Beginnings of a Catholic Left," the Worker, Jan. 6, 1963, p. 5. "The Myth of Catholic Communism," the Red Line, Oct. 31, 1963. "Comrades Wooing Catholics for Socialism" by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, May 2, 1963.

1. A split in the Catholic Church in America by using the Marxist class-war concept to turn Catholics against Catholics;

2. The unilateral dismantling of American military strength; and

3. The withdrawal of the United States from its commitments to defend the free world from communism, beginning specifically with U.S. withdrawal from southeast Asia.

Every knowledgeable Catholic knows that "Pacem in Terris" did not say, and that Pope John did not intend anything remotely like this. The daring Communist strategy was based on—

1. The time-tested Communist weapon of semantic sabotage;

2. American ignorance of Communist tactics and objectives; and

3. American readiness to accept anything clothed in religious words without looking beneath the surface.

Lenin, the master Communist, believed that words are weapons, more powerful than bullets. To train agents in the science of word warfare, the Communists founded the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, and other psychological warfare schools in Prague and Peiping. Graduates of these schools are highly skilled in semantic sabotage—the Red technique of using words with one meaning for the West and a different meaning for the Communists.

The most potent explosive in the arsenal of these Communist word warriors is the word "peace." Recognizing peace as an ideal for which all men yearn, the Communists use "peace" to lure unsuspecting people into their web as the spider lures the fly. An official U.S. Government report called the Communist "peace" offensive "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy."⁴ Communists deliberately use the word "peace" knowing it means one thing to the free world, while to the Communists it means Communist conquest—the "peace" of Katyn Forest, the "peace" of Vorkuta, the "peace" of Budapest.

In spite of America's great achievements in transportation and communications, the average American citizen remains exceedingly ignorant about Communism. Courses on this subject in colleges and high schools are rare exceptions. The American Bar Association reported "The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives."⁵

Furthermore, most Americans do not understand the Communist dialectic, the Marxist-Leninist instrument which enables the Communists to progress toward their goal by a series of retreats and advances like the hammering of a nail. Use of the dialectic enables the Communists to use religion in order to establish atheism. Petr S. Derlabian, an officer of the Soviet NKVD from 1944 to 1954 who later defected to the West, gave sworn testimony showing how the Communists use religion—instead of fighting it—to achieve total control over the minds of men.⁶ Castro deliberately used rosaries, missals and requests for chaplains to aid in his conquest of Cuba.⁷ Americans are susceptible to this kind of propaganda because (unlike some Western nations with

an anticlerical tradition) they have a predisposition to accept ideas and causes wrapped in religious words.

COMMUNIST ATTACK

When "Pacem in Terris" was released by Pope John, it was greeted by immediate and loud acclaim in the Communist press all over the world.⁸ This was not due to the content of the encyclical, which was seldom quoted, but primarily to the title of the encyclical. The Communists recognized in the word "peace" a handle they could seize to twist the encyclical into the context of their worldwide "peace" offensive against the West. Leading U.S. Communist Gus Hall issued this directive: "We must utilize this encyclical to the utmost in the struggle for peace."⁹

Communist propaganda about "Pacem in Terris" deliberately attempted to turn Catholics against Catholics, and to isolate Pope John XXIII from his predecessors and successors, on the age-old tactic of divide and conquer. The Communist press purported to "prove" that a "Pacem in Terris" espouses views completely different from every other encyclical in history.¹⁰ Communist writers promoted this divisive tactic by saying the effect of "Pacem in Terris" was "within Catholic ranks * * * to sharpen the struggle."¹¹

After the Vatican issued clarifying statements repelling the Communists from their arrogant frontal assault on "Pacem in Terris," the Reds realized they had taken a counter-productive approach. In a typical dialectical maneuver, they took one step back and two steps forward in a well-planned propaganda campaign to come in an unguarded side door in America.

It obviously would take money, ingenuity, and massive propaganda to transform "Pacem in Terris" into a Communist military weapon to destroy America's national defense. The catalyst selected for this task was the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a wealthy organization that had been an influential factor in persuading the U.S. Supreme Court to banish prayer from the public schools, thus ending an American custom dating from the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.¹² The center was selected to play the same role to influence U.S. military policy that the notorious Institute of Pacific Relations had played in the 1940's in persuading the U.S. State Department to assist the Communists to take over China.¹³

The chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is William O. Douglas, thrice-married Supreme Court Justice who advocates recognition of Red China and nonrecognition of God in our public life and public schools. The President is Robert M. Hutchins who, when asked by an official State legislative investigating committee how much he knew about communism, replied under oath: "I am not in-

structed on the subject."¹⁴ In 1964 Hutchins advocated the election of Norman Thomas as President of the United States.¹⁵

An objective reading of the published writings of the staff and consultants for the Center for Democratic Institutions led one distinguished reporter to the conclusion that the center is advocating: "Destruction of the first-strike nuclear capability of the United States; unilateral U.S. disarmament; and a better-Red-than-dead U.S. foreign policy," and abolition of U.S. internal defenses against communism including the FBI and congressional investigating committees.¹⁶

A POLITICAL MEETING

The coup by which the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions planned to steal the encyclical from Catholics was called a convocation on "Pacem in Terris" held February 18-20, 1965, at the Hilton Hotel in New York City.

For a year in advance, planning sessions took place and "position papers" were written to prepare for this convocation.¹⁷ These preliminaries determined that the encyclical would not be presented with any theological foundations.¹⁸ They clearly reveal the distortions in the name of the encyclical and the quotations out of context—exactly what Pope Paul VI warned against in "Ecclesiam Suam": "the perversion of discussion, so that the latter is not made use of to seek and express objective truth but only to serve predetermined utilitarian ends."

When the convocation itself took place, it was a duplication of the ideas expressed in the "position papers."¹⁹ Robert Hutchins candidly admitted: "This is a political meeting." Representatives from 20 nations, including Communists, attempting to talk about "Pacem in Terris" after censoring God out of it.²⁰ Delegates ignored the admonition Pope Paul VI sent to the convocation: "Such solutions, of course, if based on the admirable doctrine of that Papal document, will exclude every ostensible remedy which ignores the existence and rights of the Creator."

Informed Catholic observers at the convocation reported that its message could be fairly summed up as urging the unilateral dismantling of American military strength and the abandonment of southeast Asia.²¹ These informed Catholics recognized the basic contradictions of the convocation, and reported that quite a few of the famous speakers either misrepresented Pope John XXIII or used him to spread strange theories.²² For example, Linus Pauling called on the 2,000 conferees "to obey the exhortation of Pope John" to get out of Vietnam.²³

Communist jubilation about the convocation was revealed in many articles in the Worker, leading off with a front page story which stated: "The conference reflected

¹⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 8, p. 10023.

¹⁵ Chicago Daily News, June 22, 1964.

¹⁶ "Fund for the Republic in Focus" by Alice Widener, U.S.A., Feb. 8, 1963, p. 4.

¹⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 9, pp. 11557-11565.

¹⁸ "The Organized Subversion of Pope John's 'Pacem in Terris,'" by Laurene K. Conner, Wanderer reprint, Feb. 18, 1965.

¹⁹ Printed copies of speeches made at the convocation distributed by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

²⁰ "Pope John Without God" by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., Our Sunday Visitor, May 16, 1965, p. 2.

²¹ "Convocation on 'Pacem in Terris,'" Mindszenty Report, Apr. 15, 1965.

²² "A Post Mortem on the 'Pacem in Terris' Meeting" by Laurene K. Conner, Wanderer reprint, Mar. 4, 1965.

²³ "2,000 at Parley Unite on Coexistence Theme," the Worker, Feb. 28, 1965.

⁴ U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities, "The Communist Peace Offensive: A Campaign to Disarm and Defeat the United States," Apr. 1, 1951.

⁵ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 1, 1962.

⁶ U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "Communist Controls on Religious Activity," Testimony of Petr S. Derlabian, May 5, 1959.

⁷ "Cuban Communism and the United States," by Rev. John J. Kelly, O.S.A., Mindszenty report, May 1965.

⁸ "Gus Hall Greets Pope's Message as Aid to World Peace," "A Voice for Peace," "Pope Urges Basis for Coexistence," and "What Pope Said About Nuclear War," the Worker, Apr. 21, 1963. "Why Comrades Twist Pope's Peace Plea," by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, Apr. 25, 1963. "Red Designs on Catholics" by Louis F. Budenz, the Tablet, Sept. 26, 1963.

⁹ "Catholics and Communists: Elements of a Dialogue," a Political Affairs pamphlet, June 1964, p. 11, Political Affairs Publishers, 23 West 26th St., New York, N.Y., 10010.

¹⁰ "The Pope's Encyclical," Political Affairs, June 1963, pp. 34-35.

¹¹ "Catholics and Communists: Elements of a Dialogue," op. cit., p. 9.

¹² "Verdict First, Case Later," by Alice Widener, U.S.A., Sept. 21, 1962.

¹³ "How The Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China," 1941-49, by Dr. Anthony Kubek, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1963.

about as high a level of authoritative influence on U.S. foreign affairs as could be expected under nongovernment offices." The conference demonstrated that "Pacem in Terris" has drawn Catholics more actively into the movement for peace. Also in the audience among the invited was Gus Hall, chief spokesman of the Communist Party.²⁴ Again, we must remember, when the Communists speak of the movement for peace, they mean a Communist-imposed "peace."

One group of American Catholics who were not taken in by the Communist misuse of "Pacem in Terris" is composed of Catholic trade union leaders such as George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, and officers of the International Longshoremen's Association. The Communist Worker moaned: "Conspicuously absent (from the convocation) was the trade union leadership."²⁵ Because of their firsthand experience with the Communists in the 1930's, labor leaders are seldom deceived by Communist propaganda and tactics.

The convocation succeeded in its objective: to escalate the convocation on "Pacem in Terris" into a military weapon to strike at the heart of U.S. national defense. The gathering of 2,000 people in New York was only the beginning. Elaborate plans have been made by the center to make—not the encyclical—but the convocation a continuing influence. The entire proceedings have been video-taped and are now being shown to the public on 90 educational television channels.²⁶ The papers and speeches are being published and distributed widely in both Catholic and non-Catholic channels. The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is making an organized, well-financed, and widespread effort to promote the message—not of the encyclical—but of appeasement and unilateral disarmament.

Unfortunately, some Catholic publications and organizations have been used by the center as conduits for convocation propaganda. If these well-meaning Catholics would examine the facts, they would discover that the center has simply wrapped the mantle of Pope John around an ideological package based on a repudiation of the core of his encyclical. The Communists are already using clergy of all faiths to pressure the United States to surrender the Catholics of South Vietnam; if they succeed, the Philippines will inevitably fall under Communist domination, and another Catholic nation will be lost.

CONVOCATION INFLUENCE

Has the convocation influenced American policy? Since the Communists began to use "Pacem in Terris" as a military weapon, here is what has happened to U.S. military strength.

1. No superbombs: The United States is not building the superbombs which are the decisive weapons of the future. The Soviets have built and tested 100-megaton bombs, 1,000 percent more powerful than the best U.S. bombs. On August 15, 1963, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff officially told the U.S. Senate that "the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the high-yield technology (the super-megaton weapons), in weapons-effect knowledge derived from high-yield nuclear devices, and in the yield/weight ratios of high-yield devices"; and that the Moscow test ban treaty would freeze the United States in second-place position. The Joint Chiefs thus served notice that the Soviet Union has supremacy in the weapons capable of destroying the United States and the free world.

2. Retreat from bases: Several years ago the United States had important military

bases close to Soviet borders, and the Soviet Union had none close to the United States. Today the balance of world power is dramatically altered. The United States has abandoned its missile and bomber bases in Turkey, Italy, north Africa, and other points close to the Soviet Union; and the Soviets have a base in Cuba, 90 miles off the American coast. Cuba today is heavily fortified with the latest missiles and the second largest army in the Western Hemisphere.

3. Drastic cutback in bombers: The United States is cutting back its strategic bomber force from more than 2,000 bombers to only 678,²⁷ and has not built a single new bomber in the last 4 years. The design of our latest bomber, the B-58, is 10 years old. During World War II, the United States conducted single bombing raids using 2,000 bombers. The man most responsible for the safety and liberty of every man, woman, and child in the Western World for the last 7 years, Gen. Thomas Power, Chief of the U.S. Strategic Bomber and Missile Command, states in his new book, "Design for Survival," that it is the U.S. bombers with their nuclear weapons which have kept the Communists out of Europe and the Middle East.

4. Weapons scrapped:²⁸ The United States has abandoned and declassified many important new weapons systems after spending millions for their development, such as (a) the Skybolt missile (which gives a plane the capability of hitting enemy targets without flying over enemy soil), (b) the Pluto missile (low altitude nuclear warhead guided missile capable of going around the world), (c) the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, and (d) mobile Minuteman long-range missiles mounted on moving trains and surface ships so our deterrent force could not be wiped out by a surprise attack.

5. Research stopped: The United States has stopped research on many weapons of the future, such as the atomic-powered airplane. It takes 5 years or more to bring a new weapon from the drawing board to the production line. This means that the United States will fall farther behind the Soviet Union every year because the Soviets are racing ahead in superbombs, antimissile missile, atomic airplanes, and chemical warfare weapons.²⁹ We are doing nothing to develop the neutron bomb, requested by Catholic Senator THOMAS DOBBS and many other patriots, or offensive and defensive chemical warfare weapons, or adequate civil defense. Another neglected new weapon is the spaceship equipped with superbombs which would maintain a position over enemy targets just as the Early Bird satellite maintains its position over the mid-Atlantic.

All this unilateral disarmament is not directly attributable to misuse of "Pacem in Terris." But the misuse of "Pacem in Terris" is a major factor in creating the climate which calls for the unilateral dismantling of U.S. strength, and persuades the American people to accept status as a second-rate power, no longer able to defend the free world.³⁰

The great St. Thomas Aquinas stated: "And as the care of the common weal is committed to those who are in authority, it is their business to watch over the common weal of the city, kingdom, or province subject to them. And just as it is lawful for them to have recourse to the sword in defending that common weal against internal disturbances, when they punish evildoers,

according to the words of the Apostle (Rom. viii 4): 'He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil'; so too it is their business to have recourse to the sword of war in defending the common weal against external enemies."³¹

THE TASK AHEAD

Most Catholics are cognizant of the evil of Communism. What they do not realize is the imminent danger of Communism³² and that this threat arises chiefly because of our failure to understand and refute the diabolical Communist propaganda. There is urgent need for affirmative action to—

1. Expose the misuse of "Pacem in Terris" and refute the Communist propaganda that calls for the unilateral dismantling of U.S. military strength, and the surrender of Vietnam and other free-world outposts to the Communists; and

2. Encourage every Catholic diocese, parish, and family to study how to combat the diabolical propaganda of atheistic Communism which threatens the destruction of the free world.

The Communists have an educational plan to subvert the free world; 109,000-word-warriors have graduated from the Castro College of Communist Subversion in Cuba³³ and are organizing Red revolutions throughout Latin America. Thousands more graduate each year from the Soviet, Prague, and Chinese word-warfare schools.

Catholics must start an educational program on the techniques of communism. Jesus promised that "the truth shall make you free." Cuba fell because the Catholics, who comprised more than 90 percent of the population, were not told the truth about the diabolical propaganda on behalf of Fidel and Raul Castro and Che Guevara. Because of the diabolical propaganda against anti-Communists in southeast Asia, Laos was lost (despite the heroic labors of Catholic Dr. Thomas Dooley), and Catholic President Diem of Vietnam was murdered. John F. Kennedy, the first Catholic President of the United States, was murdered by a Communist who was recruited into the conspiracy by the diabolical propaganda. The fate of the Catholic Church and of the free world depends on exposing and refuting the diabolical propaganda of communism before it is too late.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 12, the House joined with the Senate in passing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Soviet Union and the Eastern

²⁴ Summa Theologica, vol. 2, p. 1359.

²⁵ See the masterful and unrefuted exposition of the military danger to the United States and the free world from Soviet strategy: "The New Myths and Old Realities of Nuclear War" by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, USN (Ret.) in *Orbis*, summer 1964, vol. VIII, No. 2, published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. Also see various Washington Reports of the American Security Council, 123 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill.

²⁶ Christian Economics, May 4, 1965, p. 2.

²⁷ U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 12, 1965, p. 53.

²⁸ U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 1, 1965, p. 39.

²⁹ See Soviet Army magazine Red Star, January 1965 and speech by Soviet Marshal Sokolovsky, Feb. 17, 1965.

³⁰ "Pacem in Terris Convocation" by Arnold Johnson, Political Affairs, May 1965, pp. 47-54.

²⁴ Idem.

²⁵ Idem.

²⁶ Chicago Daily News, Mar. 9, 1965.

European countries should be urged to permit the free exercise of religion. I supported this resolution although I felt it to be rather weakly worded. The record is so full of the persecution of religious groups and individuals by the Soviet Union that our action should have been much sooner in coming and more forceful. It is unfortunate that we are so apathetic to the fate of our brothers behind the Iron Curtain. I sometimes wonder if our religious denominations in this Nation recognize our responsibility to those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom of religion.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on May 10, 11, and 12 and issued a report on "Antireligious Activities in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe." The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has four excellent reports on discrimination and religious persecution by Communist regimes. All of these reports indicate that churches in the Soviet Union have been systematically annihilated with the exception of the Russian Orthodox Church which reached a truce with the Soviet Government during World War II. Showcase churches are allowed in Moscow which visitors are urged to see. These publications give a detailed account of antireligious activities in the Soviet Union. These volumes are entitled "Church and State Under Communism" and I certainly recommend them to anyone who wants to learn more about the fate of our fellow man under the yoke of communism.

Volume III deals with Yugoslavia and is particularly interesting because it is fashionable these days to allege that Tito has a different brand of communism in that country. Quite the opposite; religious persecution has been as brutal in Yugoslavia as in the U.S.S.R. In his foreword, Senator Dobb outlines the pattern of oppression and brutality which has been directed at religious activities behind the Iron Curtain.

He notes that the various churches in Yugoslavia "are governed by commissions for religious affairs, headed up by members of the Communist Party who have received special ideological training for combating religion." He observes that—

Those clergymen, both Orthodox and Catholic, who resisted or denounced the encroachments of the state, were imprisoned or executed.

The foreword indicates that within a year after communism took over in Yugoslavia, the Catholic Church, which had a total of 2,700 Croat priests, lost 400 priests by execution, 200 who fled abroad and several hundred imprisoned.

Three Roman Catholic cardinals have felt the reprisal which communism directs at religious groups who operate independently of state dictation. Cardinal Mindszenty is still in the safe sanctuary of the American Embassy in Budapest where he has been since the Hungarian uprising in 1956, a fugitive in his own land because he will not bow to the will of the Communist masters. The late Cardinal Stepinac felt the oppression of the Yugoslav dictator, Tito, as did Cardinal Wyszynski in Communist Poland.

It is a necessary tenet of any religious faith, particularly the Christian, to believe that the heart can be moved and human nature can change. This can and should be hoped for, prayed for by those of us who wish freedom to flourish again in Eastern Europe and for possibly a first time in Russia. By the same token, there is no virtue to color blindness or refusal to take into true account what is happening behind the Iron Curtain. Many so-called liberal theologians seem to see some Christian witness in seeking accommodation with a regime built on terror and suppression. I disagree with them most vehemently and will not agree to sell any of my brothers into slavery and depravity.

A great philosopher once stated that the beginning of wisdom is in calling things by their right name. Communism is a totalitarian doctrine built on terror and control of all matters, public, social, religious, private. The Congress has served a great purpose in exposing this shallow doctrine and documenting their bloody record of persecution of religious activities behind the Iron Curtain. It is now for the public, particularly the clergy, to acquaint themselves with the details of this godless crusade by the men of the Kremlin and their satellites so they will know them by their right name.

The concurrent resolution which passed last week is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations declares that everyone has the right to freedom of thought and religion and the right to manifest his religion or belief in public or in private through teaching, practice, worship, and observance; and

Whereas articles 124 and 125 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, and the existing constitutions of other Eastern European countries, guarantee their citizens freedom of conscience and religious worship; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other countries of Eastern Europe are persecuting, in varying degrees of intensity, elements of their Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens and infringing upon their freedom of religion through confiscatory taxation and closing of religious institutions, deliberate suppression of religious education, interference with religious and related cultural practices, denial of regular contacts between religious bodies in their countries with similar bodies in other parts of the world, and through persistent discrimination against persons professing and practicing their religions by state, party, Communist youth, police, labor, and public organizations; and

Whereas there is also abundant evidence that Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are being singled out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses and oppressed in the free exercise of their faith through the closing of synagogues and cemeteries, curtailment of religious observances, discrimination in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposition of restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and the arrest of rabbis and lay religious leaders; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries have a clear opportunity

to match the words of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific and appropriate actions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries be condemned, and that such governments be urged to cease such persecution and to permit full and free exercise of religion and related cultural pursuits by all persons within their countries.

Sec. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the attention of the United Nations should be drawn to this resolution and that the United Nations should continue in its efforts on behalf of freedom of religion.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a Member of Congress, as an Illinoisan, and as an American, and join my colleagues and the world in paying tribute to Adlai Ewing Stevenson—lawyer, politician, statesman. A man the President described as "America's most eloquent spirit, its finest voice"; a man praised by the Governor of Illinois as "a public servant of the highest order"; a man termed "irreplaceable—one of our great contemporary men" by Senator Minority Leader DIRKSEN. And so the tributes continue, recalling one after another the many memorable qualities of this unusual man, his sparkling wit, his basic human decency, his dedicated leadership, his strong sense of duty.

Adlai Stevenson was a distinguished Princeton alumnus. The Princeton University class of 1954, of which I was a member, was privileged to have Mr. Stevenson as our senior banquet speaker, more than 11 years ago. I have to this day kept copies of that speech—one of the most stirring, one of the most idealistic, and, yet, one of the most realistic speeches it has ever been my privilege to hear. Over the years, I have found myself rereading his remarks, calling it to the attention of others, and quoting portions of it in public addresses. Without question this speech did much to increase my interest in public service and to lead me to a career in government. That evening in 1954 he gave a glimpse of the man as he said:

If those * * * Americans who have the advantage of education, perspective, and self-discipline do not participate to the fullest extent of their ability, America will stumble, and if America stumbles, the world falls.

He gave advice which, I am convinced, was not merely the product of a brilliant mind, but the practical expression of a personal philosophy:

Face the problems of your time you must, deal with them you must. But do not allow the alarms and excursions and partisanship of our political scene to distract you, do not

let even the awful problems of the atomic age claim all your attention. Dare, rather, to live your lives fully, boldly; dare to study and to learn, to cultivate the mind and the spirit.

He cast a bright light on politics as a profession and did much to change the impression of the politician from a sinister figure in the smoke-filled room to a man of dedication and eloquence in public life. He put in proper focus the significance of the political process under our system of government, saying:

The power, for good or evil, of this American political organization, is virtually beyond measurement. The decisions which it makes, the uses to which it devotes its immense resources, the leadership which it provides on moral as well as material questions, all appear likely to determine the fate of the modern world.

All this is to say that your power is virtually beyond measurement. For it is to you, to your enlightened attention, that American Government must look for the sources of its power. You dare not, if I may say so, withhold your attention.

Such words are stirring to a young man, and the thoughts behind them did, in fact, move Governor Stevenson. Even as he counseled to look ahead, he, too, was looking ahead, it would now seem, when he said 11 years ago:

There is in the molling masses of Asia a tremendous power, potentially the greatest power on earth, and today our enemies conspire to gain the mastery of this power. They have at their disposal, as we all know, a powerful weapon, for communism is a perversion of the dream of justice. And while we see its leading attributes as the perversion, the illiterate, the toiling masses still have their eyes fixed on the dream.

We too have a powerful weapon, truth, and we gain our strength from our thoughtful citizenry, which seeks and holds the truth with both its heart and its mind. The question is, however, whether we have come to decisive responsibility too early, before we were ready, before we had matured sufficiently. No man can say with certainty. Personally, I am optimistic and confident, but this question will not be answered tomorrow; it will be answered in your lifetime, and it will be answered in large part by you.

He presented an insight into the hearts of those who make the decision to seek public office when he said:

It becomes increasingly hard to attract good men to government, and no wonder. Thoughtful men do not enjoy living in an atmosphere of constant guerrilla warfare and suspicion.

I would suggest to you, then, that it is the duty of an educated man in America today to work actively to put good men into public office, and to defend them there against abuse and the ugly inclination we as human beings have to believe the worse. I would suggest that it is not enough merely to vote but that we, all of us, have the further obligation to think, and to maintain steadfastly the rights of all men to think freely.

Adlai Stevenson did not win his Nation's highest office, although he sought it twice. He did not live to complete the fight for freedom which he helped wage in the far corners of the earth. He did not finally have that opportunity to "sit in the afternoon sun and watch the people dance." And yet out of these disappointments, he emerged a winner, and we all share in his successes and his contributions.

Adlai Stevenson will be remembered for the career he chose, for the things that he did, for the wisdom which he imparted, for the humor which characterized his speeches, for the optimism which he carried with him constantly, for the deep faith he held in the cause of freedom. He was a man who made his fellow citizens of Illinois, America, and the world proud to claim him as one of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the address given by Adlai E. Stevenson to the senior class banquet at Princeton University on March 22, 1954:

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, 1922, TO THE PRINCETON CLASS OF 1954, MARCH 22, 1954, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE SENIOR CLASS BANQUET

I have a number of preliminary things I should like to say. In the first place, I am informed that this senior class banquet is being held at the expense of your accumulated reserves. This is a very perilous thing that you are doing by inviting me here because certainly within a few hours the Republicans will ask for equivalent time.

I was delighted to witness, a moment ago, your emphatic approval of my program for Princeton some 32 years ago—unlimited cuts, noncompulsory chapel, and student firing of the dean. I have always considered almost from infancy that it was wise in politics to have—shall we say—a popular program. The trouble is that when I went into politics, it appears that I changed my views.

I wonder, President Dodds, if you would like to be excused now. Leave me alone with these young gentlemen. It is really a very inhibiting circumstance to find myself sitting at the wrong side of the president of Princeton, my old and esteemed friend. I have heard him speak many times. I have always found what I have heard both enlightening and profitable. I am afraid there will be no reciprocity tonight. I've been at a loss as to what to say to you, and having just read over what I have prepared rather hastily, I have concluded that I have resolved my uncertainty by saying nothing. This will take me approximately 40 minutes.

Someone asked me today when I was walking about the campus why I was here, in view of the fact that I had declined or been unable to come on numerous previous occasions when the university or groups were good enough to invite me. I explained that I had come this time only because I had wanted to come and that I need not have an excuse to come. I think it was perhaps an unwise and intemperate thing to do, and had I continued in my earlier resolve, would be better off. There are too many people hereabouts who know me too well. I was thinking on the way over here about the unwisdom of speaking sometimes and the wisdom of restraining oneself. You will perhaps recall—I am sure President Dodds does—the wonderful remark of Disraeli when a callow, young member of the House of Commons came to him—the leader of his party—and said, "Now, Mr. Prime Minister, I've just come to the House; do you think it would be well if I participated actively in debate?" And the Prime Minister looked at him appraisingly for a moment and said, "No, I think it would be better if you did not. I think it would be better if the House wondered why you didn't speak rather than why you did."

I daresay it will be under those circumstances that I shall leave here this evening. In all events, I am deeply grateful for your invitation, and for the opportunity which you have afforded me not only to come back to this place I love so well but to impose on your time and your patience. There is

another one, which you will remember, Harold. President Coolidge said, "It is sometimes better to keep still and be thought a fool than it is to speak and remove all doubt."

I feel as though I were opening the hunting season on college seniors. From now until mid-June, college seniors are fair game for all of us uplifters, viewers with alarm, chautauqua-style orators, even for occasional unemployed politicians. From now until mid-June college seniors are to be repeatedly reminded how fortunate they are and what they should do with their hard-won educational disciplines; they are to be warned repeatedly that the old order is changing, that the sky is overcast, visibility low; and they are to be urged and goaded and implored to accept the challenge to remake the future.

Thirty-two years ago—and I might say quite a number of pounds and a good many inches around the waist ago—when I graduated I believe I listened to these same challenges flung down by orators whose names I have completely forgotten. Now it is my turn to be forgotten. In doing my homework this morning on this evening's oration, I not only let my mind run back to the state of the world 32 years ago when I graduated from Princeton but I also glanced at the Nassau Herald of 1922 in the hope that I could find something about myself that would impress you. Well, I must say, in the long corridor of retrospect, I don't look as important as I thought I was. I discovered that when my senior class voted to bestow the sobriquet of biggest politician upon one of its members I received only eight votes—but when it voted on "thinks he is biggest politician" I won second place, and that was due to a conspiracy among my roommates. For the title of "most likely to succeed," I received the impressive total of two votes—I don't know yet who the other fellow was.

Thirty-two years ago my classmates and I graduated into a world that was quite different from the one you enter in 1954. Before settling down to the business of trying to earn a living, I did some more traveling. It was a happier, more hopeful world than the one I saw on a recent journey around the globe. A terrible war to make the world safe for democracy had just ended victoriously. A noble concept, the League of Nations, had emerged from the chaotic aftermath of that elemental struggle. It was the twilight of kings, the dawn of worldwide democracy. Optimism was boundless and people proclaimed that we were on the threshold of the new era of universal and perpetual peace and prosperity.

It didn't turn out that way. It wasn't a threshold after all. A bitter young man, an author, soon wrote, "I was always embarrassed by the words 'sacred,' 'glorious,' and 'sacrifice' and the expression 'in vain.' We heard them, sometimes standing in the rain almost out of earshot, so that only the shouted words came through, and had read them, and proclamations that were slapped up by billposters over other proclamations, and I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago, if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it."

But I don't need to tell you, a generation that was born and nurtured in the depths of depression and came to consciousness in war and to maturity in the confusion of world revolution—I don't need to tell you that your elders have made something of a mess of things. Things didn't turn out as we had thought they would in 1922, and somehow the hope and the easy confidence we felt dissolved as more and more the articulate and vocal among us doubted their beliefs and believed their doubts.

Nor do I need to enumerate for you in sepulchral tones the problems that you face. You know them only too well. Perhaps you can solve them. I would not presume to

tell you how to do it. This university has given you the tools with which to try. Moreover, even if I would guide you, I could not. What a man knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 is, for the most part, incommunicable. The laws, the aphorisms, the generalizations, the universal truths, the parables and the old saws—all of the observations about life which can be communicated handily in ready, verbal packages—are as well known to a man at 20 who has been attentive as to a man at 50. He has been told them all, he has read them all, and he has probably repeated them all before he graduates from college; but he has not lived them all.

What he knows at 50 that he did not know at 20 boils down to something like this: The knowledge he has acquired with age is not the knowledge of formulas, or forms of words, but of people, places, actions—a knowledge not gained by words but by touch, sight, sound, victories, failures, sleeplessness, devotion, love—the human experiences and emotions of this earth and of oneself and other men; and perhaps, too, a little faith, and a little reverence for things you cannot see.

Nonetheless, I would speak to you not of the past, when my generation held its hopes so high—a time when even I received two votes as the most likely to succeed—but rather I would speak to you of the future, of your future. And if I cannot advise you on how to solve the momentous problems of your future, perhaps I can venture to suggest some duties and, if you please, some rules of conduct that, it seems to me, devolve upon the educated man because that is what you are about to be. I would speak to you briefly, then, about the educated man and his government, and about the educated man and his university.

The political organization that goes by the name of the United States of America consists of no fewer than 155,000 governing units, school boards, conservation districts, municipalities, States, the Nation, etc. It is operated by some 1 million elected officials, ranging from mosquito district trustee to President, and by some 6 million full-time employees. Our government is so large and so complicated that few understand it well and others barely understand it at all. Yet we must try to understand it and to make it function better.

For the power, for good or evil, of this American political organization is virtually beyond measurement. The decisions which it makes, the uses to which it devotes its immense resources, the leadership which it provides on moral as well as material questions, all appear likely to determine the fate of the modern world.

All this is to say that your power is virtually beyond measurement. For it is to you, to your enlightened attention, that American government must look for the sources of its power. You dare not, if I may say so, withhold your attention. For if you do, if those young Americans who have the advantage of education, perspective, and self-discipline do not participate to the fullest extent of their ability, America will stumble, and if America stumbles the world falls.

You know that our record as citizens in recent years has been something less than perfect. Too often our citizens have ignored their duty to their government. Too often they have not even bothered to vote. But this is not all. Participating in government in a democracy does not mean merely casting a ballot on election day. It means much more than that. It means an attitude, a moral view, and a willingness to assume a day-to-day responsibility for the good conduct of your government. How many times have you heard the good citizen demand for example that the gambling laws be enforced without fear or favor—except, of course, for

the slot machines in his own country club? How many good citizens do you know who constantly deplore waste, inefficiency, and corruption in government, and who also go out and ring doorbells for candidates they believe in? Not very many. Far more say politics is dirty—and that is about their only protest about the quality of government, and far more use the word politician as a term of approbrium, disrespect and dishonor—and this in the land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. How many respectable citizens do you know who protest loudly about lawlessness and venality but don't hesitate to fix a traffic ticket? And then there are the unscrupulous for whom anything goes if it is within the letter of the law, or at least not too far outside; the numerous kind for whom legality and morality are synonyms. The fix has become endemic in our political life.

I would remind you of an axiom of political science: People get the kind of government they deserve. Your public servants serve you right. Our American government may be defined perhaps, as the government that really cares about the people. Just so, our government demands, it depends upon, the care and the devotion of the people.

Now it is sadly true that there are corrupt officials that don't get caught, if not as many perhaps as the cynical suspect. It is also true that there are at every level of our Government able, patient, patriotic, devoted public servants—yes, and Army officers too—but all too often their reward is ingratitude, contumely, and lately even investigation. In years gone by we required only of our career servants, upon whom the successful operation of this huge mechanism of government depends, that they serve at a financial sacrifice and that they serve with little glory or public recognition. Increasingly, it appears, we also require them to run the risk of being branded as "subversive," "undesirable," as "security risks." It becomes increasingly hard to attract good men to government, and no wonder. Thoughtful men do not enjoy living in an atmosphere of constant guerilla warfare and suspicion.

You who have spent 4 years on this campus know better than most people that your greatest satisfactions, your greatest rewards, resulted from the free interplay of ideas. You know that your most penetrating insights resulted from the exchange and the interchange and clash of ideas. And I would remind you that just as a great university cannot operate in any but an atmosphere of intellectual freedom, neither can a great government. It is the function of the democratic form of government to nurture freedom. No less does the democratic form of government require freedom as the condition in which it can function at all.

I would suggest to you, then, that it is the duty of an educated man in America today to work actively to put good men into public office—and to defend them there against abuse and the ugly inclination we as human beings have to believe the worst. I would suggest that it is not enough merely to vote but that we, all of us, have the further obligation to think, and to maintain steadfastly the rights of all men to think freely.

It is always true that when the citizens of a democracy become apathetic, a power vacuum is created, and corrupt men, or incompetents or worse rush in to fill it. But today our situation is even more dangerous than that. In ordinary times the corrupt or the incompetent can be suffered for a while and then ejected. But these are no ordinary times. The world's fate now hangs upon how well or how ill we in America conduct our affairs. And if a bad man is elected trustee of a sanitary district, or if an able man in Washington is left to shift for himself in the face of unjustified attack, then our Government is diminished by that much—and even more

because others will lose heart from his example. So you as educated, privileged people have a broad responsibility to protect and improve what you have inherited and what you would die to preserve—the concept of government by consent of the governed as the only tolerable way of life.

We in our country have, indeed, placed all of our faith, we have placed all of our hope, upon the education, the intelligence and the understanding of our people. We have said that ours is a Government conducted by its citizens and from this it follows that the Government will be better conducted if its citizens are educated. It's as simple as that. We believe that the people will find their way to the right solutions, given sufficient information. We believe with Lincoln, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people?" (although I must confess to having entertained certain private fleeting doubts upon occasion). We have bet all our chips, if you please, on the intellectual improvement of our people. This is a magnificent gamble—but it is a gamble, for it raises the question whether we have reached the awesome pinnacle of world power we now occupy too soon, before we have sufficiently elevated our national mind to lead the world wisely. Only the educated man entertains doubts, and doubt is the beginning of wisdom; but doubt is not wisdom's fulfillment, and in a time of crisis the man who doubts may fall prey to the strong dumb brute—to the man on horseback.

There is in the molling masses of Asia a tremendous power, potentially the greatest power on earth, and today our enemies conspire to gain the mastery of this power. They have at their disposal, as we all know, a powerful weapon, for communism is a perversion of the dream of justice. And while we see its leading attribute as the perversion, the illiterate, the toiling masses still have their eyes fixed on the dream.

We too have a powerful weapon, truth, and we gain our strength from our thoughtful citizenry, which seeks and holds the truth with both its heart and its mind. The question is, however, whether we have come to decisive responsibility too early, before we were ready, before we had matured sufficiently. No man can say with certainty. Personally I am optimistic and confident, but this question will not be answered tomorrow; it will be answered in your lifetime, and it will be answered in large part by you, the privileged American.

If I have made your tasks and your responsibilities sound formidable, which indeed they are, may I also remind you that this is what makes the prospect of your careers so exciting. There is a wonderful passage in Emerson—and happily I couldn't lay my hands on it—I'll spare you from it. I hope sometime you will read that essay. It says the time to live is not when everything is serene, but when all is tumult—when the old admits being compared with the new. This is the time of early morning, when it is fresh and exciting. I think this is your generation, I cannot be sure. Change is the order of life and difficulties its meat. You live in a time of historic change and of infinite difficulty. But do not let the difficulties distract you. Face the problems of your time you must, deal with them you must. But do not allow the alarms and excursions and partisanship of our political scene to distract you, do not let even the awful problems of the atomic age claim all your attention. Dare, rather, to live your lives fully, boldly; dare to study and to learn, to cultivate the mind and the spirit, even though it isn't fashionable in your community. For though our people become prosperous as never before and though our foreign policy triumphs, these things are but instruments of the proper purpose, the higher purpose, of western man—the cultivation of the mind and of the spirit.

It would be presumptuous, and out of character for me to lecture you about your spirit. That I must leave to the wiser, and to better men. But perhaps you'll forgive me if I draw on my own haphazard, desultory experience—I have not always been an unemployed politician, you know—to say a word about intelligence and experience as attributes of the good judgment you will need—the good sense, if you please.

Don't be afraid to learn; to read, to study, to work, to try to know, because at the very best you can know very little. And don't, above all things—and I am sure President Dodds will agree with me—be afraid to think for yourself. Nothing has been, in my judgment, more disheartening about the contemporary scene the last several years in America than the growth of the popularity of unreason—of anti-intellectualism. One thinks of those chanting, screaming crowds that walked over precipices in Germany—and not so long ago. The conformists—unreason and anti-intellectualism—abominate thought. Thinking implies disagreement and disagreement implies nonconformity and nonconformity implies heresy and heresy implies disloyalty. So obviously thinking must be stopped. This is the routine. But I say to you that bawling is not a substitute for thinking and that reason is not subversion but the salvation of freedom. And don't be afraid of unpopular positions, of driving upstream. All progress has resulted from people who took unpopular positions. All change is the result of a change in the contemporary state of mind. Do you remember—and here again I shall tap a resourceless memory—some words of Maternalink, who was writing about the Spanish Inquisition and said that in those times to the conservative they should not kill so many and to the radical they should not kill any. Don't be afraid of being out of tune with your environment, and above all pray God that you are not afraid to live, to live hard and fast. To my way of thinking it is not the years in your life but the life in your years that count in the long run. You'll have more fun, you'll do more and you'll get more, you'll give more satisfaction the more you know, the more you have worked and the more you have lived. For yours is a great adventure at a stirring time in the annals of men.

You have a better chance than many people to give a lot and, therefore, to take a lot of life. If we can't look to people like you for this leadership, for good judgment, for wise directions for ourselves and for the convictions of our society, then where can we look? For here at Princeton, which for more than two centuries has transmitted from one generation to the next the riches of Western civilization, you have gotten some grasp of the basic principles on which our culture is founded—the concept of the supremacy of the individual, the worth of a human being, and the necessity for a climate of freedom in which these values may find means of expression.

And before you depart from this campus that you and I have known and loved, stay a moment, my young friends, and think a bit, inquire—these halls, this campus, our university, what do they mean? "University" is a proud, a noble and ancient word. Around it cluster all of the values and the traditions which civilized people have for centuries prized most highly. The idea which underlies this university—any university—is greater than any of its physical manifestations; its classrooms, its laboratories, its clubs, its athletic plant, even the particular groups of faculty and students who make up its human element as of any given time. What is this idea? It is that the highest condition of man in this mysterious universe is the freedom of the spirit. And it is only truth that can set the spirit free.

The function of a university is, then, the search for truth and its communication to succeeding generations. Only as that function is performed steadfastly, conscientiously, and without interference, does the university realize its underlying purpose. Only so does the university keep faith with the great humanist tradition of which it is a part. Only so does it merit the honorable name that it bears.

When you depart, think occasionally upon your university's inherent ideas and purposes, as its outward trappings recede. Don't forget that Princeton is a university, as well as your university; and that it has obligations to the whole of mankind, not just to you—obligations which it can neither ignore nor shirk, and which cannot, consistently with its honorable name and its place in the community of scholarship, be sacrificed to passing passions and prejudices. As members of the alumni family I trust you will be alert to its needs; they are imperative, and you can meet them if you will as many of your predecessors are today, but keep, I beg you, always in the forefront of your mind the realization that the single greatest need of any university, as of any seeker after the truth, is not just the money, not expensive libraries and laboratories, but this freedom, this thing that seems so inchoate to you now, freedom to do its work, to pursue its inquiries, to conduct its discussion, to extend the limits of learning.

The right to the serene pursuit of truth did not descend like manna from heaven; it was won by hard fighting, and the fight goes on and on to the end of time—even as the struggle between good and evil. See to it then, that no one, for whatever reason or in the service of whatever interest, diverts this university from its classic objective. As its graduates, as individuals who have made in it an investment of the golden, irreplaceable years of your lives, you cannot, I suggest, do less. And carry away with you some of the wise serenity of the timeless courage, the unhurried objectivity which is the atmosphere of Princeton and which represents the collective imprint of its founders, students and teachers who have gone before you.

The university in America is the archive of the Western mind, it is the keeper of Western culture, and the foundation of Western culture is freedom. Princeton, or any other university, great or small, has the obligation of transmitting from one generation to the next that heritage. The faculty and administrators of a university can do that only if they are free. I think we believe with Gladstone that it is liberty alone that fits men for liberty.

I came here last night in darkness, after not having been here for some 4 or 5 years. I came with an old friend and an old classmate. We drove a little through the campus, after dusk. It was soft, the air fresh, the beginning of spring. I thought of some words that I read here long ago, written by an English poet, Alfred Noyes, who stayed on the Princeton campus for a few years. They went something like this if I am not mistaken:

"Now lamp-lit gardens in the blue dusk shine
Through dog-wood red and white,
And round the gray quadrangles, line by line,
The windows fill with light,
Where Princeton calls to Magdalen, tower to tower,
Twin lanterns of the law,
And those cream-white magnolia boughs
embow
The halls of old Nassau."

Sentimental? Yes. Nostalgic, childish? Perhaps. Yet lovely, beautiful, true. Your days are short here; this is the last of your springs. And now in the serenity and quiet of this lovely place, touch the depths of

truth, feel the hem. You will go away with old, good friends. Don't forget when you leave why you came.

THE WONDERS OF THE "WUNDEES"

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there remain a few of us in the Congress who foresee nightmarish consequences to some of the far-out proposals of this administration, such as the subsidized rent program. We can only presume James J. Kilpatrick was faithfully chronicling just such a nightmare in his recent column for the Washington Evening Star. For the benefit of our Freudian friends, we submit it for the RECORD:

THE WONDERS OF THE "WUNDEES"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Winston and Sally Belle Smith were married in the spring of 1966, a few weeks after he had been booted out of his third Job Corps encampment and she had been sent home from the girls' school in Florida. They had grown up together, more or less, in the same public housing project; they had dropped out of school together. They had the same ambition, which was to stay well fed without really working, so it was natural to find them at last man and wife.

Winston worked part time in a service station and Sally Belle worked part time in a barbeque and grill, but these were merely avocations. Their real job, which occupied them increasingly as the years went on, was simply to stay poor within the P. and R. It was a lot of work, what with all the forms and things.

The "P. & R." of course, were the procedures and regulations established by the Administrator. These had first been established in the summer of 1965, 9 months or so before the young couple were married, but by 1966 they had become a way of life. Rent supplements, it will be recalled, were only the beginning. "The amount of the annual payment with respect to any dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount by which the fair market rental of such unit exceeds one-fourth of the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him." That was the way the law first read, in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Winston and Sally Belle qualified at once for a rent supplemental. They were among the 300,000 who came in the one-oh-one-oh-dee's, soon shortened to the Wundees, a diminutive taken from the act's definition under the so-called Stephens amendment of those eligible for help on their rent. This made the supplemental available to any family whose income was within established levels for public housing, provided that such a family, under section 101(1)(D) were then occupying "substandard housing." Winston and Sally Belle were living in an ordinary walk up flat, not too good, not too bad, but after Sally Belle broke out the windows with a beer bottle, they were officially substandard; so they went down and signed up.

By the summer of 1968, when the time came for the first recertification of income under the P. & R. the Smiths were a little uneasy. They had been earning \$3,200 between them when they moved into the new apartment in the co-op, where the fair mar-

ket rental was \$125 a month or \$1,500 a year. The taxpayers had been kicking in \$700 a year as the difference between one-fourth of their income and the fair rent, but lately the Smiths accidentally had been earning a little more and they were afraid the P. & R. man would catch up with the situation.

As it turned out, they didn't need to worry, for that same summer—the summer of 1968—Congress added another section at the President's request. This brought Winston and Sally Belle into the wonderful world of the one-oh-one-one-ee's, or Wunnys as they were called, in which rent supplementals were extended to any persons "socially or culturally disadvantaged." The Wunnys were permitted to qualify if they earned as much as 50 percent above the maximum permitted for occupants of public housing, and with all that Job Corps background, there was no question of Winston's making good. He had only to keep falling.

It wasn't easy, for money somehow kept coming Winston's way, but Sally Belle helped by leaving the bar-b-q and devoting her full time to the P. & R. The amendments of 1970 spread the principle of supplementals to clothing, transportation, and food. That year Winston took in \$6,000—he couldn't seem to help it—and while this naturally left him safely poor under the P. & R., it complicated the bookkeeping. The trigger points were 25 percent on rent, 20 percent on food, 15 percent on transportation, and 8.3 percent on clothes, and Sally Belle never could learn to multiply by 8.3 percent. She had determination, though, and after a while, what with further amendments of the law, they were getting \$1,000 toward rent, and \$800 toward food, and \$500 toward payments on the two cars, and the P. & R. had been revised to cover a coat of imitation mink. What with Sally Belle's unemployment compensation, it all added up.

Winston retired in 1980, at the age of 34, his active working life behind him. Thereafter the Smiths earned no income, by which they qualified for 100 percent supplementals including a swimming pool not to exceed 20 by 40 feet. Here the poor fellow drowned, 4 years later on a cold afternoon in April when the clocks were striking 13. The coffin supplemental, under the P. & R. covered the full expense.

THERE IS NO PLACE IN THE GREAT SOCIETY FOR VETERANS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no place in the Great Society for our veterans.

I am asking today that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee conduct an investigation, and halt the practice of admitting and treating Job Corps trainees, a segment of the poverty program, at Veterans' Administration hospitals, in preference to veterans. The action of the Administration in giving preference to members of the Job Corps at Veterans' Administration hospitals over veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts is incredible.

There are approximately 15,000 veterans awaiting admission to VA hospitals and while these veterans are forced to wait for much needed and deserved

hospitalization, Job Corps men are obtaining hospitalization at VA hospitals. Never before to my knowledge has a group been hospitalized categorically without regard to the origin of their disabilities, or the responsibility for treatment of such condition, and to give them preference over veterans who have served this Nation with honor and distinction is reprehensible.

Every day I receive mail from qualified veterans in dire need of hospitalization, who simply cannot get into these facilities, yet these Job Corps men, most of whom never served in the Nation's Armed Forces, are being admitted.

Every admission of a Job Corps man takes a bed away from a veteran. This compounds the error recently made by the Administration in closing certain VA hospitals in the Nation. An investigation into this order is needed, and corrective action should be taken immediately by the Congress to halt this unconscionable practice.

I am today calling upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to rescind this order.

THE LATE HONORABLE T. A. THOMPSON

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this time has been requested and granted in order that the colleagues of ASHTON THOMPSON may have the opportunity of paying him a final tribute here today.

As Members will recall, our colleague was the victim of a traffic accident in North Carolina some 2 weeks ago. Today we come together to pay our final tribute and our final respect to his memory.

I shall be pleased to yield to any Member of this body who desires to pay tribute.

At this particular time let me preface the recognition of those Members desiring recognition by recalling the colleague who lived among us. He was a dynamic man. He was a man who enjoyed the dramatic and reveled in living the life he lived in this body.

I believe that on occasions of this nature there are some symbols and some things more far-reaching, more expansive, more significant than the final tribute we pay a departed colleague. We respect his memory at a moment when we recall the memory and the respect we owe all colleagues who have left this body.

In these aisles have walked the great of history. In the Speaker's chair have sat men who have written American history, whose voices are now stilled but whose memory remains alive.

This Nation is a nation founded under God.

This Nation is a nation believing in the concept we now read over the Speaker's chair—"In God we trust." Each time we pay tribute to the memory of a departed colleague, we restate that concept and reexpress our belief. We declare to the world that we reject a godless ideology and draw again close to us the ideology of eternity and of immortality. If we did not, we would not ap-

pear here today to speak in memory of those who have departed. Hollow would it be to recall the greatness and the contributions of those who have left us if we did not believe in the immortal soul and in life eternal.

So we rise here today to speak again of our most recently departed colleague. In speaking of him and renewing that bond between this earth and that which is before us, we speak also to those others who have left and who dedicated their lives.

May I recount and recall at this moment the words which I believe suit ASHTON THOMPSON more than anything else, the words in that great fraternal order which so aptly say: "The faults of our brothers we write upon the sands; their virtues on tablets of love and memory."

So be it with ASHTON THOMPSON.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we express our grief today for the tragic loss of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana.

Before he came to the House of Representatives in 1952 he had had extensive experience in the accounting and budget field of the government of the State of Louisiana. He served with distinction in the Air Force during World War II, and later was an able and dedicated leader of veterans organizations.

While serving as Louisiana's budget officer and as financial adviser to the State legislature, he drafted legislation for Louisiana's employees' retirement system and then ably served as chairman of the system's board of trustees for 8 years.

He brought his experience in government and his insight into men and issues with him to the Congress. Only 3 short years ago he summed up for his brothers in this Chamber his feelings and beliefs after a decade of distinguished service in the House.

He said at that time:

I have received every kind of consideration and help from the membership of this body. I want to thank my colleagues in the House for their friendship and cooperation in the accomplishment of so much for the people of my district and State. When I was elected to Congress in 1952, I resolved then that I would to the best of my ability represent the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana in such manner that they would not regret the confidence they had placed in me by electing me as their Representative.

Today we thank him for his friendship, for his courtesy, for his unflinching kindness and consideration. We testify that he fulfilled the resolution that he took to his constituents that they would never regret electing him their Representative.

That they will regret his passing we know full well. In this House his colleagues have lost a friend and valued counselor. We mourn his loss and extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Thompson and her loved ones. They have much to be proud of in his record of achievement for his State, his district, and his country.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the day after his passing away, I expressed on the floor of the House my great shock and loss over the death of our colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana; I outlined my personal friendship for him and extended my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and children, to his dear mother and the other members of his family.

Today I express the hope that T. A. may have a special place in the house of many mansions. In doing so I draw again on an article I called to the attention of my colleagues once before.

Coming back to Washington from Louisiana on a plane a number of years ago I clipped from a newspaper a passage of great beauty and comfort from the "Wisdom of Solomon," a part of the apocryphal books.

I think you will read many books and go a long way in life before you ever find anything more inspiring, for sheer beauty of phrase and majesty of thought. I have kept this passage in my purse ever since, and I now read from it:

The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God
And no torments will ever touch them.
In the eyes of the foolish they seem to have died
And their departure was thought to be an affliction,
And their going from us to be their destruction;
But they are at peace.
For though in the sight of men they were punished, their hope was full of immortality.
Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good.
Because God tested them and found them worthy of himself.

I humbly pray that T. A. is at peace and that having been disciplined a little, he will receive great good, "because God tested him and found him worthy of himself."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it was one of the saddest days of my life when I learned with deep shock and regret of the tragic death of our friend and colleague, T. A. THOMPSON.

T. A. THOMPSON was one of my very closest friends. He could not have been closer had he been my own brother.

Ours was a friendship forged throughout many years of hardship and triumph, heartache and exhilaration, failure and success. In a man's lifetime he can deem himself fortunate if he has even one friend as close and steadfast as T. A. THOMPSON was to me. It is thus with the profoundest sense of personal loss which

I speak today, for when one loses a friend he loses part of his life.

T. A. THOMPSON was a Congressman's Congressman. He performed his duties with a dedicated devotion and diligence which I have seldom seen matched here in Congress. He was a man deeply in love with his job, a man with a great sense of responsibility to his district. He was not so concerned with headlines as he was with results. He was the type of man who carefully considered all sides of an issue, quietly laid a solid foundation for legislation through careful research, and then bulldoggedly pressed his colleagues for favorable consideration. He had an unusually large measure of success, and, more important, his achievements have been solid and lasting because of the firm foundations he built so carefully.

His career in service to his people has been a long and distinguished one. His entire adult life has been spent in government work. During the depression years he worked for the State of Louisiana as a fiscal expert. After serving in World War II he returned to his State and again performed yeoman service in revamping and modernizing the accounting system of the State and leading the drive for an adequate retirement plan for State employees. In 1953 he was elected to Congress. We are all familiar with the phenomenal work he has done in his all too brief career here on Capitol Hill. He was an outstanding champion of wildlife conservation and has probably done more than any other single Congressman to see that this precious national heritage is preserved. As a senior member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, he was in an unparalleled position to effect these goals.

The entire country owes a debt to T. A. THOMPSON for his devoted service, but the greatest loss is inevitably felt in the Seventh District of Louisiana which he represented so devotedly and well. As you know, the problems which flow daily into a congressional office are many and varied. None of us worked harder to see that all the people of his district received the representation they deserved.

No problem was too big, no person too small to receive the single-minded attention of T. A. THOMPSON. He did not close his ear to any segment of his district. He was the champion of all, and all benefited.

But this is just the measure of T. A. THOMPSON as a public servant. The measure of T. A. THOMPSON as a man is far more important in the final assessment of his life. The humanity of T. A. THOMPSON was even more imposing than his impressive physical stature. He was always there with a helping hand, always the first to offer encouragement, always careful with the feelings of others. I have seen him time and time again give unstintingly of his time to help a colleague with a personal problem, to patiently explain the minute intricacies of an involved bill, to help teach fledgling Congressmen the mysteries of

this august body, or just to be present for moral support in times of stress or personal hardship. It is these acts of personal kindness which when added up made him a big man—a man who was a model for so many of us.

In addition to the ever-widening circle of friends he made in this House, he likewise gained in stature in his home district, where his fellow citizens saw fit to elect him seven consecutive times as their Representative.

Several months ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a huge testimonial dinner held by the friends and supporters of our former colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, an unprecedented event for his district. On that occasion the outpouring of praise and commendation formulated a ringing endorsement of this man's desire to help his constituency on every possible occasion. No other official had ever been honored in such a gigantic fashion.

It is a difficult task for me to properly and completely describe and portray to my distinguished colleagues here today the confidence, love, and affection that I shared with T. ASHTON THOMPSON. To me he was like a brother. I grew to admire and respect this man, and to value his sentiment and his inspiring dedication to the job of being an outstanding Representative for his people.

I could cite instance after instance of his dedication to the people of his district, I could illustrate his service to the country in World War II as a member of the Air Corps, I could speak at great length on the contributions he made to the establishment of good government in the great State of Louisiana. However, I feel all these things somehow become dim in our minds as we who knew him remember the spirit, the personality, and the lovable person that was T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I know that I shall always miss this bold, noble, and wonderful man; and I join with my colleagues here today in humbly expressing my deep sorrow of his untimely passing.

Mr. Speaker, our dear colleague and friend, T. A. THOMPSON, taken from us with tragic suddenness, was above all a man of fine character and a loyal and true friend. He was a dedicated public servant—dedicated to the advancement of the people of his district, his State, and Nation. He was one of Louisiana's ablest advocates, who worked tirelessly for the people and interests which he represented. He was admired by Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, and he will be missed by all of them whose friendship he earned and kept from the beginning of his long tenure here.

Upon his return to Louisiana after World War II service, he concentrated his efforts on refining the fiscal processes of Louisiana's government, and the legacy he leaves us includes a complete accounting system for all the State agencies which he designed and installed, along with legislation for the Louisiana State employees retirement system, and subsequently he was elected twice to 4-year terms as chairman of the board of trustees of that system.

In these "Halls," Mr. Speaker, he has served the House ably and productively since January 1953, as a member of both the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Public Works Committee. One of his principal fields of interest and accomplishment was the proper conservation and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife. For his good work in this field, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in May 1964, gave T. A. THOMPSON a great tribute.

T. A. THOMPSON was an exemplary Congressman. He understood his duty to represent his constituency to the best of his ability. And he understood the challenges and responsibilities that a changing nation can place on its leaders.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. THOMPSON did not hesitate to speak out when he saw a wrong. The cause of good government has lost a valuable voice.

Mr. Speaker, my life has been made richer for having known T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I am sure that I can speak for the entire Louisiana delegation in addition to everyone who has had the good fortune to know T. A. THOMPSON, when I say that it was a privilege to know such a fine man as T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

T. A. THOMPSON was a friendly man. He kept busy. He was always helping people. He worked unceasingly for the people of his Seventh District. He helped many students attend college, though this was not his responsibility as a Federal Representative, because he would often help a deserving student get a spare job which made college possible. He aided the small businessman. He untangled the problems of veterans. He worked for people in all walks of life. The people of his district knew that they had an advocate and a friend in Washington with their T. A. THOMPSON.

T. A. THOMPSON worked to bring a better life to his constituents. He worked on the Public Works Committee to improve the port and water facilities of his district. He worked to bring new industries to his district.

Mr. Speaker, when you take a look at Congressman THOMPSON's district, you will find that his district is one of the most progressive, most unusual, and one of the most colorful districts in the whole land. He was so proud of his district. He used to talk about it in very descriptive terms. He would describe an oil field derrick that came up from the ground in a swamp, with moss covered trees as something that made a beautiful picture; and there were thousands and thousands of acres of cotton in full bloom, like a white cloud close to the ground; the golden rice fields laden with the fruit of their seed ending in full production which he could portray with color and fantasy in many words. As my distinguished colleague Ed WILLIS from the adjoining district has said, his country was known as the Cajun Country, a very colorful country. He pointed with pride to the fact that he was Congressman THOMPSON's neighbor on the east and on the south. I, likewise, was Congressman THOMPSON's neighbor to the east. In that great and

wonderous land ASHTON THOMPSON was so proud of, with all the zest and zeal of a person in full life, he would describe his district as a place where people worked hard, played hard and enjoyed life, that they created the finest kind of life itself. He eloquently spoke of his people, whom he loved so well and knew so well and of whose life he was a part, with great pride, saying that they made a success out of life itself. He was certainly not only a representative of his people but he was a part of his people, and a very forceful and a very amazing part of his people, because as they lived, so he lived, no matter whether he was in the midst of the district where he lived or whether he was 1,200 miles away here in this august Chamber, or whether he was in some other part of the world. No matter where, he never seemed to get away from his home town of Ville Platte or his home district which, as he referred to it on many occasions, was the Cajun District.

Many people who heard him on occasions would say that he never could seem to get away from the Ville Platte or the Cajun country. Whereas many people in his shoes might have thought that they were making him provincial, I believe he took that as a great compliment. I think that so typified him that with the opportunity which he had to be a Congressman and be their representative and be able to work for them and be able to share their problems, their successes, and their everyday life, even though he was away many miles in distance, was an opportunity he never forgot. He never could, in spirit, get too far from the land that he loved, and I think he demonstrated on all occasions that to have the high honor of representing them in this office was the top pinnacle of his life.

So, Mr. Speaker, he served his district with honor and distinction. I think he went a lot further afield than was his duty or that which was required of him, in order to give his people the proper representation that they deserved. In so doing I think he demonstrated that he was perhaps one of the most generous men that has ever served in this body. He was not only generous from the standpoint of his life, his ability, and in what he gave to his people back home, but in the little things in the everyday life here in this Chamber. There was never an opportunity that he did not try when someone asked him—and sometimes without their requesting it—to do something to help someone regardless of whether they were a fellow Member or whether they were a person in the average walk of life or even a person who may have come here to visit who might not have been necessarily from his district.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with the record that he made in so completely serving his people, that they perhaps are realizing each day the greatness and the depth of their loss.

Mr. Speaker, ASHTON THOMPSON was a rather humble man and did a lot of things, perhaps, that many of us never had an opportunity to observe. On the other hand, many of his distinguished ac-

complishments are monuments which will live on and will be monuments always.

I do not think that any place in this land of ours has, as the result of the efforts of anyone, any more projects than Congressman T. A. THOMPSON could point to and say, "I not only helped to get this, but I labored long and hard, and whether others joined me or not, I did my best to secure all the help or whatever was necessary in order to get the job done."

And as he used to artfully say, there is room as far as credit is concerned for everyone that will help my district or my State or my Nation, and let us get the job done first and then worry about the credit, as to who shall share in it.

Then when you consider that perhaps no other Congressman has ever accomplished the feat, up to the present time than T. A. THOMPSON. Since the very inception of the House of Representatives, discharge petitions are few and far between and many have tried but very few were ever successful; Congressman T. A. THOMPSON not only was successful on one discharge petition of which he was the author but maybe he set an all-time congressional record in that he was successful on two discharge petitions. There again that was a great feat and an unusual feat. Perhaps no other Congressman in our lifetime may ever come to equal that record.

But there again that was typical of T. A. THOMPSON. He not only thought he should represent the people necessarily who could vote for him, but he went far, far beyond that. I have seen him go to all kinds of trouble and take a tremendous amount of time putting what seemed to be an endless amount of energy getting the people of his district, young boys and girls, and bringing them here to the Nation's Capital to take part in something that he was so proud of when he could bring them here to Washington. He would say that as far as the Mardi Gras is concerned, where you have the queens and the kings and where you have all the pageantry—that is a way of life where I come from; it is wonderful to have the opportunity to bring them to the Nation's Capital and show everyone just exactly how that pageantry takes place—not as something that was promoted at the moment in his district but something that was there before he was born and perhaps will be there for generations to come.

But the very fact that he went to all this great effort to bring these beautiful young ladies from his district, of whom he was so proud, to show off the agricultural products of his district—as the queen of rice or the queen of the oil festival or the queen of the cotton festival or the queen of the sweetpotato festival—of all the agricultural products in his district—that got top billing with him was what he called a beautiful queen of the Cajun country. So in his life, the life he lived every day, and lived with great feeling that perhaps he was one of the most fortunate people in the world, as T. A. THOMPSON would tell me, that I serve in a democracy, that I serve in the Nation's Capital, that I serve in Washington, D.C., that I serve and am

one of 435 Members of the Congress—he did not look upon that, as if it was a chore in doing his daily work here. He did not look upon it as a chore to go back home and be reelected. He looked at it as the greatest opportunity and the greatest privilege and certainly his privilege for him to be able to do that.

He was a man from a large family. Besides his mother he had many aunts and uncles, many brothers and sisters, nieces and nephews and endless numbers of cousins. But at no time did he ever fail to look forward to an opportunity to serve any and all of his relatives in the position that he had reached and which in the eyes of his family was the most exalted position so far as they were concerned in all the world. Never at any time did he ever fail to look at it as doing something that was an honor and a privilege to do to help one of his relatives. He looked upon it as one of the most wonderful and joyful opportunities in the world to be able to help any relative or anyone else for that matter. I do not believe he ever stopped thinking that other people besides those who were blood relations of his, were likewise his relatives. I think he felt the same way about every constituent and every family in his entire district. I think he lived that way and proved it by his everyday actions. He proved he felt all the people were his people and that he was just related to one great big family that happened to live in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana.

I have seen him when people would bitterly attack him in his district. I have seen him when people would come up to him personally in his district and do that. Frankly, I was always amazed at the way he could produce that smile after such an attack. He would say to me that he had told that person, "Well there is only one problem as I see it. If you had just been in my shoes you would understand it. But since you have not had that opportunity, maybe that is the reason you feel the way you do and if I had the opportunity of being in your shoes, I would feel like you do."

I have seen him on such occasions when such people would go far beyond merely making a protest and yet T.A. would tell me after we left a gathering where that might have happened and he would say, "Well, here is the thing about it. You have to know this, JIMMY. I have to look at all these people, I guess, just like a minister or a priest looks on his congregation or the people of his church."

He would say, "You know these people do not mean to be bitter toward me. But I have to understand them and I have to be the person to tell them that their way may be a little wrong and plead with them to go the proper way and not to become people who are against progress and not to be people who are against their neighbor or against any particular individual, but to be the kind of persons who want to live and let live."

He would tell me, "JIMMY, every day when I am in my district I try to teach Christianity and brotherly love because no matter what some of these people may have done to me, I cannot feel that way

toward them because they are my people."

When I think of that, of the way he lived and his philosophy of living and the way he felt about all people, I believe that perhaps he left an inspiration, a spirit, a feeling, a life of accomplishment which will not end but will be handed down to generations to come. Certainly he will greatly influence all of those who knew him, for good.

So far as his district is concerned, and in areas many long distances from his district, that spirit, that feeling, that generosity will live on and on.

He has certainly earned the respect and the admiration of the people of his district, and likewise of the Members of this body, with whom he served, from whom he seemed to get such a wonderful and remarkable feeling of comradeship and brotherly love on both sides of the aisle.

This was always with the understanding that no matter what position any Congressman ever took in the well of this House, no matter how much he may have disagreed with what that particular Congressman was saying, whether over this microphone or that microphone, he would always say, when I had the opportunity to hear his comment, "Well, the man believes in what he is doing, to the best of his ability, he is doing the job of representing his people. After all, that is what I am here for."

And he would say, "JIMMY, that is what you are here for." He would add, "No matter what position anyone takes in this House, I have respect for him and I have admiration for him, and when any man or woman who is a Member of this House continues to be reelected, I believe it is natural all of us should have respect for them and should have admiration for them."

That perhaps typified T. A. THOMPSON. As a person, he was not always trying to get something for himself. I believe he got a great deal for himself, but I believe the secret of what he got for himself lay in the fact that he was always willing to give a lot more and to go a lot further toward the other person's direction than he expected to have anyone come in his direction.

His life typified the saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive. I believe he always put that emphasis on giving. Perhaps no man ever tried to give more than did our distinguished and beloved colleague, T. A. THOMPSON.

Since T. A. THOMPSON was so appreciative of the fine work done by his office staff, it would be most appropriate to include the words of his administrative assistant, Mrs. Frances A. Forgy:

Personally, and in behalf of our entire staff, I wish to thank Congressman MORRISON for the opportunity to add a few words of tribute in honor of the man for whom it was our real privilege to work. Each year, all of us on the staff came to appreciate Congressman THOMPSON more and more and to realize what a truly unique and genuine individual he was.

Louisiana has lost a strong and invaluable member of her congressional delegation. The Seventh District has lost an enlightened and dedicated Representative. But more than this, the world has lost a man in whose veins the milk of human kindness flowed

freely. It is a grievous and irreparable loss which we can ill afford.

The tributes which could justly be accorded Congressman THOMPSON in regard to his generosity and personal traits are unlimited. The enumeration of his most creditable deeds and accomplishments during his tenure of public service would be too lengthy a task. Perhaps we could best indicate all of them at once by saying simply that in a world populated in vast majority by ordinary people with ordinary interests, Congressman THOMPSON stood out as an extraordinary person with an extraordinary interest in his fellow man. His aim in life was to serve his family, his friends, his district, his State, and his country—and he served them all with rare, unselfish dedication.

We have lost not only our Congressman for whom we had an abiding respect and admiration, but we have lost a close personal friend whose absence we keenly feel and whose memory we shall always cherish.

To the members of his family who have surely suffered the most cruel and devastating loss of all, we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

There were many editorials and stories written about his passing. A few of them follow.

The following editorial appeared in the Monday, July 5, edition of the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

REPRESENTATIVE T. A. THOMPSON

The death of 49-year-old U.S. Representative T. A. THOMPSON, of Ville Platte, especially under such tragic circumstances, is sincerely regretted. Representing the Seventh Congressional District for 13 years, he made his presence felt in the House, through energy, initiative, and other qualities. Early in his congressional career, he survived handsomely in his home area an onslaught by dictatorial, State machine forces. As a member of the Public Works and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees (chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee), he found many opportunities to serve his district and the State in matters coming under committee jurisdiction.

Recently he was credited with administrative adoption of a more enlightened management policy respecting wildlife hunting limitations. He was counted on in a struggle now pending to reject or modify an ill-advised new rice-control program embodying in effect a consumers' tax.

En route home for the Fourth of July holidays, near Gastonia, N.C., he became the first prominent victim among their associated highway casualties—his family, likewise, seemingly having a narrow escape. Though circumstances have not been completely defined, it is clear he was an innocent victim. It is somewhat ironic that he, one of the fathers of the gigantic interstate highway program, himself met his death on one of its newer segments, in a freakish pavement-shoulder episode. Our sympathy is extended his family and friends.

The following editorial appeared in the New Orleans States-Item on Saturday, July 3:

REPRESENTATIVE T. A. THOMPSON

Eulogy, sincerely delivered by colleagues, serves to gage the stature of deceased public servants.

By this criterion Louisiana's Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, of Ville Platte, killed in a North Carolina highway accident Thursday, measures up well.

One of this State's youngest delegates to the National Legislature, he served on the House Public Works and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees and was chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee.

Of his tragic death, other members of the Louisiana delegation had these remarks:

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT: "He was one of the most aggressive Members of Congress."

Representative HALE BOGGS: "His death has removed from the national scene one of Louisiana's ablest advocates."

Representative JAMES H. MORRISON: "He earned the respect and admiration of all his colleagues."

Representative JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.: "Louisiana and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant."

Along with their Congressmen, all Louisianians will mourn the tragedy that deprived this State of a capable and dedicated solon.

The following editorial appeared in the Charlotte Observer, Sunday, July 4, 1965:

HIGH COST

The death of T. ASHTON THOMPSON in an accident on Interstate 85 was tragic enough for his family and many friends.

It was made worse by the fact that he was a valued Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. This tall, warm man from Louisiana's cajun country was warmly regarded by President Johnson and his own colleagues.

Representative BASIL WHITENER described him as a man of strong loyalties, a quiet but positive individual.

He had a dozen years seniority and was a member of two committees, Public Works, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was the chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee and of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee.

Representative THOMPSON was only 49, so he brought considerable experience to bear on his work without the liability of crusty obstructionism.

He was, in short, a contributor; and the Nation never can and never will be able to afford this kind of loss.

In Joseph Young, Star staff writer's column known as "The Federal Spotlight," the following article appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

GREAT LOSS

Federal and postal employee leaders are saddened over the death of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Democrat, of Louisiana, who was killed last week in a highway accident. THOMPSON was a strong friend of Federal and postal workers. It was he who initiated the successful discharge petitions on two different occasions to pry Government pay-raise legislation out of the House Rules Committee when that group refused to act.

The Seventh Congressional District in so many countless ways is far better and finer because of T. A. THOMPSON.

The people of the State of Louisiana can look back to so many benefits that they would not have had, if it were not for the efforts of T. A. THOMPSON. He did so much, and so willingly, and asked for so little in return that he perhaps stands out as one of the greatest Congressmen that ever served from any district in Louisiana. There is no amount of money that could be paid to one or hundreds of people that could ever accomplish what T. A. THOMPSON accomplished for the Seventh District. By all standards of measurement, no Congressman in modern times ever tried to do more than T. A. THOMPSON.

So we ponder and think how one man could do all this in such a short space of time and then be forced to leave us in

the prime of his life. I guess the only answer is that with his departure his spirit will live on for so long, for so many of us. Thus all of us share in this personal tragedy. All of us that were close to him have lost a part of our lives. I can only bid a fond and sad farewell to a great friend.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I shall take only a minute, although it would really require many minutes and many hours to do justice to T. A. THOMPSON.

Let me say that his was a life it is difficult to believe does not exist with us any longer. Everything about him was constructive and forceful. He worked harder than almost any other Member of this body. His service here was admirably suited to his nature and his disposition.

He served on the Public Works Committee, and he was a constructive man. He should have been on that committee. He admirably helped his people and his district and his State, as everybody knows.

He was, as my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], said so ably only a moment ago, persistent and aggressive in behalf of all his people and of his State and of his country. He was effective and articulate. He was compassionate and understanding. He sought friends and he made friends.

I first knew him when he was engaged in a political campaign, on a course opposite to my own. We became friends immediately, and we were friends throughout his career here. We are gathered here in this Chamber to pay tribute to a beloved Member of this House who was a dear friend to so many of us. Now he is gone from our midst, but he has left behind in the minds and hearts of his colleagues the glow of genuine friendship and warmth—that outgoing, engaging personality, that spirit of generosity which was T. A.

I am reminded on this solemn occasion of an immortal verse by the poet John Donne, in which he wrote in part:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

The sudden, untimely passing of my dear friend and colleague has diminished me. To so many of us in this House, T. A. THOMPSON was more than "any man"—he had endeared himself to us, sometimes without our being aware of the depth of our bond with him. Only with his passing has the full impact of this loss settled upon us.

The people of the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, and of our entire State, have lost a tireless and devoted public servant. So has this House. So many of us who knew him have lost a true and loyal friend, a man of genuine character who was always willing to lend a helping hand to those in need.

On this note of a generous helping hand, T. A. was particularly kind to many young people who needed financial assistance in order to complete their college education. T. A. was never too busy to

help young people, to try to provide them with part-time jobs on the Hill, and to give them fatherly advice and counsel on their problems. I know that many young men on the Hill since T. A. joined us in January 1953, are grateful for his kindness and his generosity. T. A. was foresighted enough, was wise enough, to know that the education of our Nation's young citizens is the very foundation upon which the United States will grow and flourish, or perish, in the years ahead. His kindness and generosity to the young is a powerful example of our colleague's Christian spirit.

In his service with us, T. A. was an able, hard working member of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and of the Public Works Committee. His principal field of interest, through his work on both these committees, was the proper conservation and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, and in this capacity, he was working, right up to the time of his death, on an extensive program to assure the preservation of those animal species which are now threatened with extinction.

Among his achievements for his district and our State on the Public Works Committee was his obtaining approval for the deepening of Calcasieu Channel, so that the port of Lake Charles could handle the largest oceangoing vessels. Today the port of Lake Charles is growing and thriving, and its progress is due in no small measure to the good works of T. A. THOMPSON. This is one of the many beneficial projects which our colleague brought to the Seventh District of Louisiana.

For the individual constituents of his district, no request to T. A. was too big or too complex for him to tackle with all his energy—and this our colleague did with dedication and patience. He was indefatigable in his efforts for his people, and I know they are most grateful to him. It can truly be said that T. A. was a man who left this world better off for having been here. He gave of himself gladly in the service of others, and no man can do more in the eyes of God.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Seventh District of Louisiana, and the State of Louisiana are indebted to T. A. THOMPSON for his long and productive service and his good works. For me and my fellow colleagues who knew him and loved him, we are indebted to him for enriching our lives, for raising our faith and our belief in our fellowman and in our country.

To have known T. A. and to have shared his friendship was to love him. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion to salute him for fighting the good fight and keeping the faith; in so doing, he strengthened our character and that of this House.

To Mrs. Thompson and the members of T. A.'s family, we express our sorrow at their loss and the loss to us all. We know that T. A. is looking down on all of his friends here, and urging us, in his friendly and generous way, to carry on. This we shall do for him, and for the likes

of him who have gone before. We can do no less for this House which we all so dearly love. We ask God's blessing on those T.A. left behind—his wife and his mother, and all the members of his dear family. May they receive God's grace in this hour of trial.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a great institution in many ways. It is great in its legislative achievements and its investigative achievements, but it is also compassionate in respect to the care it takes of its Members to the very end.

Congressman THOMPSON, as all of us know, met death in a very tragic accident. Hardly had the word flashed over the press and radio before, acting under the admirable direction of our dean, Congressman HÉBERT, the House itself went into action. Ken Harding, working with Mr. HÉBERT and other Members, did an admirable job of providing solace and comfort to Mrs. Thompson and to the children and to the other members of our late friend's distinguished family.

I could not let this occasion pass without paying tribute to Congressman HÉBERT and to Ken Harding and also to our colleague from North Carolina, BASIL WHITENER, who happened to be in the immediate vicinity at the time of this accident and, who, with his wife, immediately went to help and to console Mrs. Thompson and the other members of the family on the scene.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the wonderful things about serving in this institution is that it lends its protection and help even unto the end. All of us who knew T. A. THOMPSON shall miss him, but it is indeed fortunate when a man is able to serve his State and serve his country and at the same time establish for himself and his family countless friends wherein his memory will live for generations yet to come.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, there is not much that I can add to what the other members of the Louisiana delegation have said before me nor too much to what I said the day after the loss of our colleague, Representative T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana. But I would like to reiterate some of the things I have said previously as well as some of those said by my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District, indeed his native Louisiana, and the Nation still mourn the untimely and tragic death of my friend and colleague T. ASHTON THOMPSON. We are all filled with a deep sense of personal loss.

Life was not always kind to T. A., but he was truly an honorable, self-sacrificing man of strong conviction and unequalled compassion for his constituents, for fellow Louisianians and for fellow Americans. Because of this deep feeling for people, his time, his talents, and his energies were in great demand and were heavily taxed.

T.A. accepted the duties incumbent upon his office with a driving determination and discharged them with ease and a sincerity that was genuine. He dis-

played fortitude and integrity in all endeavors.

He was a man who loved life; and enjoyed its daily challenge. He was a warm personality; a friendly, personable and patient man. He was truly enlightened about governmental matters at every level of Government and this knowledge emerged from a burning desire to serve his fellowman.

In his absence from this chamber so full of activity, he would want us to carry on the task of seeking solutions to the problems of our people. He would want the birthright of this Nation protected from those who seek to destroy us; and he would want the foundation of our Republic strengthened, and, moral adherence to a supreme being.

These ideals are the legacy left by T. ASHTON THOMPSON to you, to me, and to the future generations. On this occasion his spirit and his memory is perpetuated in this great chamber and I predict that it shall not have been in vain. T.A. was a great Louisianian and a great American. We shall all miss him.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I recall very well the sense of personal loss which I felt when I learned of the death of T. A. THOMPSON. It was a loss to everyone who knew him. It was a shocking loss to the Congress and to the Nation. I knew him well and I enjoyed his friendship. His was a delightful personality. He was an able man and an able and outstanding Congressman. His principal work was in the area of conservation, which was of particular importance and value to his own State, and my State of Florida, had a similar interest in that same work in the field of conservation. It was equally valuable to many other States. It was work in which he was expert, and his contributions were valuable indeed.

The people he represented, Mr. Speaker, lived better and happier lives because he was here.

I join my colleagues in expressing my deep and earnest sympathy to all the members of his family.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve for 11 years on the House Committee on Public Works with my colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. He rendered great service on that committee, to his State and to his Nation. He was diligent, he was conscientious, he was thorough, and he was a tower of strength on the committee. He made many fine contributions in the way of improving legislation that was processed through our committee.

It was with a deep sense of shock that I heard over the radio that he had met a tragic death in an automobile accident. I join with those who have already spoken in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his children.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with T. A. THOMPSON since I first joined this distinguished body, now approximately 7 years. T. A. was a strong advocate of his various philosophies, as well as of the legislation that he tried to promote. But he was a strong advocate not without reason. He was always willing to listen to the other man's side. He contributed a great deal to the deliberations of the committee on which we served.

T. A. and I used to ride the same airplane quite frequently. I caught it at Houston and he would board it at New Orleans. We had many delightful flights together. The crew on those planes that we used to fly quite a bit felt that they had not had a good weekend if they did not have T. A. aboard. Whenever he happened to miss the plane I was on, they always inquired about him. They missed him. I am sure that same feeling existed among all who had the pleasure of coming in contact with T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, he was a devoted family man. My wife and I and my youngsters along with other Members of this body, had the privilege of being with him and his lovely wife and 2 children on a recent family trip to the World's Fair in New York. We were all impressed with his devotion to his wife and his children.

So it was indeed with a great feeling of shock, when I was on a 4th of July weekend with my family, that I heard that this fine man had been cut down in the prime of his life, when he seemed to be enjoying life so much and contributing so much, not only to his immediate family and his own constituency but to the country as a whole.

It is indeed with a feeling of loss because of this great tragedy that I say to his lovely wife and his children that their sorrow is being shared, not only by the Members of this body but all who had the privilege to know T. A. THOMPSON.

He was a big man in stature, he was a big man in heart, he was a big man in understanding, and in my opinion he will go down in the history of his community and his country as one who stood out, out of the ordinary, out of the commonplace.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it behooves all of us to realize that we too should strive to do better, for we never know when the good Lord is going to decide that we have finished our course on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and his children and to the other members of his family, as well as to those who have had the privilege to know him and mourn him in silence.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our fallen friend, ASHTON THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to serve on either of the two committees

with him, but I became acquainted with ASHTON THOMPSON shortly after my arrival in the House of Representatives.

It was a pleasure to know him and to count him as a friend. He was always friendly, cordial, cooperative, and helpful in every way.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember his smiling countenance, the good feeling that you had in talking with him, whether it was about the business of the House or whether it was just in passing personal conversation.

His death came, of course, as a great shock to me personally. It came as a great shock to all of us in North Carolina. I feel that it is even more grievous to us, if that is at all possible, because his tragic end came on a highway in our beloved State.

I shall always remember the day I arrived in my hometown, some 120 miles away from this tragedy. I was met at the airport by my wife, who told me that she heard the report of the accident on the radio in the car on the way to the airport. I will never forget how shocked and stunned I was and how dismayed and shocked and grieved the people of my State were upon hearing the word that a Member of Congress—although they knew him little, if at all—had been stricken down in such a manner in our State.

So, Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people of my State in conveying our condolences and sympathies to his fine family, to the members of the Louisiana delegation and to the Members of this entire House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and a deep sense of loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague and friend, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

News of his untimely passing and the shocking circumstances surrounding his death reached me as I was leaving Washington for Hawaii to speak at a July 4th celebration. I was then reminded of his frequently expressed wish to spend a nice leisurely visit in Hawaii. I deeply regret that his wish was not fulfilled.

We know, of course, that T. A. THOMPSON was a highly respected State finance officer of Louisiana before answering his country's call in World War II as an Air Force officer. Following his period of service, he returned to Louisiana and continued to render distinguished service as a State fiscal officer. On November 4, 1952, he was elected to the 83d Congress, and was reelected to serve in each of the succeeding Congresses. To all his duties he brought an analytical mind that was tempered with a very human approach.

On May 27, 1965, it was my privilege to appear and testify before T. A. THOMPSON's Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation with respect to a bill then under consideration. It was a pleasure to watch the hearings progress under his able chairmanship. I was deeply impressed with his fairness, in-

clusiveness, and familiarity with the subject matter at hand.

Truly, T. ASHTON THOMPSON was a dedicated legislator. The Congress and the Nation have suffered a great loss. His home State of Louisiana will sorely miss one of her greatest citizens. We who knew him will forever cherish his warm friendship and understanding which he so willingly shared.

To Mrs. Thompson and members of his family, as dean of the Hawaii delegation and as a friend in grief, I offer my heartfelt sympathy. May the good Lord bless them and give them courage to face the morrow without T. A.'s physical presence, with hope for the future.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with other friends and colleagues in taking note of the passing of the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON. The words of tribute which they have offered indicate the high esteem in which he was held in the House of Representatives. Their words of tribute to his life of service can be echoed by countless other voices without overstating the real value of our fallen colleague to his State and Nation.

ASHTON THOMPSON was my friend and congressional neighbor. When we moved to the new Rayburn Office Building the early part of this year, it was my good fortune to have been assigned to an office suite a few doors away from his offices. Because of the proximity of our working quarters, I had an opportunity to become even better acquainted with him than had been possible during the previous terms of our service here together. This association resulted in the acquisition of personal knowledge on my part of the sincere dedication of T. A. THOMPSON to the important role which he held in national life.

It is not possible for me to express the sense of shock which I experienced on the occasion of the sudden and accidental death of our colleague on July 1, 1965. As I came into the outskirts of my home city, Gastonia, N.C., on that summer afternoon, I was notified by the radio dispatcher from the Gaston County Sheriff's Department that T. A. THOMPSON had been stricken down within the corporate limits of my home city. It was suggested that I should proceed to the Gaston Memorial Hospital to be present with Mrs. Thompson, the children, and their maid. On arrival at the hospital, I found that many of my fellow citizens had already made their services available and were undertaking to comfort the family as they suffered from the impact of shock of the sudden death of our colleague.

I was proud of the response of hospital officials, law enforcement officers, clergymen, physicians and others who had come to the assistance of this grief-stricken family. Experiences of this kind cause one to realize how wonderful the people of the community really are. I was proud of my home city and her people. I am sure that people of most American communities have the same concern and solicitude for others in a time of suffering and travail.

The shock of this unfortunate incident was more keenly felt by members of the Thompson family than by any other per-

sons. But, Mr. Speaker, I can say to you that there was a deep sense of shock experienced by the thousands of residents of my community when the news of the tragic accident reached them. This was manifested in a very tangible way by telephone calls tendering assistance and in innumerable other ways in which our people sought to be of service to the family of our departed colleague.

T. A. THOMPSON is now gone from this earthly scene. We are deprived of further association with him in the Congress of the United States. But, we are not deprived of the leadership which he gave to so many worthwhile causes in his community, State and Nation. His good works will be of lasting and eternal value to all of us. His contributions in so many ways to improving the lot of mankind will not be lost to us or to succeeding generations.

The loss which the members of his family have sustained is immeasurable. We can only hope that in their grief they will understand that many of us have a deep understanding and sympathy for them. His wonderful mother, his wife and children and his several brothers and sisters are especially in our minds as we reflect upon this great tragedy which has come to their family and to the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in this expression of appreciation for the life and works of T. A. THOMPSON and in conveying to members of his family our sentiments of sincere sympathy.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, during my 10½ years in Congress I have found myself facing difficult problems. This moment brings me face to face with total inadequacy. Trying to find the proper words to express my feelings at the loss of such a dear friend and colleague as T. A. THOMPSON is impossible. I owe my very life to him. While visiting Central America in 1955 I was stricken with food poisoning and T.A. actually carried me out of the jungles of Guatemala on his back, boarded an airplane with me and brought me to New Orleans to a hospital cutting short his trip by a week. From that day forward I knew what a great individual ASHTON THOMPSON was. He was a fine and conscientious legislator, a great friend to every one with whom he came in contact, but above all, he was a real gentleman at all times.

Just a few days before his untimely death he and Mrs. Thompson spent a few hours on my boat with other friends and every one remarked about what a good time they had visiting with the Thompsons. This was typical of T.A. and his penetrating personality.

Life is so uncertain and death is so certain yet it is difficult indeed to understand how the life of such a promising individual could be taken from us. In our efforts to understand this terrible tragedy and loss I know we will take comfort in the fact that all of us are better off because T.A. came our way. I want to join the leadership in Congress, the Louisiana delegation, and all of my colleagues and friends both Democratic and Republican in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thompson, the children, his loving mother, brothers and

sisters during this sad time in bereavement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the tragic, accidental death of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, shocked all of us and I know we all feel a deep sense of personal loss.

ASHTON THOMPSON, Mr. Speaker, was a great man and a great Congressman with a brilliant future. His recent death has removed from the scene a dedicated public servant, the type of public servant that we should all strive to emulate.

ASHTON THOMPSON has been a power for good in each Congress in which he has served since he was first elected to the 83d Congress on November 4, 1952. In the law-making process, he was a strong man, while being sensitive and reasonable in debate. He was a man of high principles and never, in my years of association with him, did he ever consider compromising those principles.

I worked side by side for many years with Congressman THOMPSON on the Committee on Public Works and all of us on the committee are deeply aware of his manifold contributions to the deliberations and actions of the committee. I know, too, of his fine record as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and of his service as chairman of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, ASHTON THOMPSON was a solid pillar of the Public Works Committee. At the time of his death, he was the fourth ranking member of the committee, and he sat on four important subcommittees. Last January he became chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a driving force within the committee. He was hardworking and thorough, had a tremendous knowledge of the subject under consideration, and was always willing and able to declare himself in committee councils. He was a skillful advocate and a splendid parliamentarian and never, to my knowledge, did he fail to take part in basic decisions of the committee.

He was extremely active in our work on the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

He was chiefly responsible for many of the great development programs in the lower Mississippi Valley, was a foremost advocate of the Interstate Highway Act of 1956, and a leader and authority in the field of water pollution and wildlife conservation.

At the age of 49, when tragedy befell him, ASHTON THOMPSON had a sparkling future in this House. He had proved his ability, dedication, and courage and he had won the respect and friendship of all of us. He possessed the caliber that would have enhanced any area of the public service.

He could be tough and unrelenting in pursuit of a goal which he believed to be right and just for his fellow citizens. Indeed, there was granite in his nature. But at the same time there was an exquisite tenderness in his soul.

Mr. Speaker, in the death of ASHTON THOMPSON this legislative body suffered

an irreparable loss. And each of us has lost a good and true friend.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a warm, open-hearted friend who was an able and effective representative of his people.

T. A. THOMPSON was a man who had deep roots in the soil of his beloved Louisiana, and who won the hearts of all who served with him and came to know him.

He was a man of great force and influence on the Committee on Public Works, where he served with honor and effectiveness for many years.

It was a privilege and a genuine pleasure to know this big, quiet American, who contributed so much to the strength and progress of his country during his congressional service.

My wife joins me in this expression of our sympathy to the wife and family of our beloved colleague.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of our late departed colleague, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. On the day of the fatal accident, I was on my way by automobile to my home in Southside, Va., when the distressing news came over the radio at about 5 p.m. I am unable to find words in which to express fully the shock and the distress which came over me.

I had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Congressman THOMPSON in April 1953, when I was inducted as a new Member of the Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. He was then in the first few months of his service. We formed a friendship which increased and became more binding as the years passed. During the 89th Congress, we occupied offices in the Rayburn Building which were adjoining.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of fine character. He exuded good fellowship and it always lifted one's spirits to be in his presence. I had the privilege of conferring with him on several occasions the week before he passed away, and I found him, as always, cooperative and desirous of being of help to his fellow Members in this body.

The family, no doubt, has lost a dear and devoted husband and father. We, as Members of the Congress, have lost a warmhearted colleague and the country has lost a faithful servant, whose heart and mind were attuned to the highest public good.

I shall ever cherish the memory of our association, and I take this means of extending to his constituents and to his family and his many friends my deep sympathy in the loss which they have sustained.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we, the Members of the House of Representatives, have sustained a great loss in the tragic passing of T. ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana.

He was a man among men.

His was the true Christian philosophy—he loved his fellow man above all else.

I knew "TOMMY" THOMPSON well. It was my privilege to sit beside him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for many years. Ours was

generally a common cause. He gave without stint to help his fellow legislators, yet he never demanded anything in return.

He was a good man—a man who loved his family, devoted to his fine wife and children.

Verily, T. ASHTON THOMPSON met the rigid standards set by the poet in his definition of a man: "He could walk with kings, yet keep the common touch."

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my last respects to our beloved colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, who lost his life in a highway mishap, a most untimely and tragic event, at a time in his life when he had reached the peak of his mature knowledge, talents, and experience. I join with his host of friends and admirers in expressing sadness at his passing, and extending my deepest sympathy to his wife and children and other members of his family.

I will never forget the friendly glance and gracious greeting of the fine and able gentleman from Louisiana, who sat in the row immediately behind me in the Committee on Public Works, nor will I cease to admire the excellent grasp and wisdom which he manifested in regard to the complicated subject matter handled by that committee, and his dedicated efforts to get the job done. I am proud to have known T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and hereby wholeheartedly extend this parting salute.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in tribute to the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON. Before Congressman THOMPSON's untimely death, I had the privilege of working with him on the Watershed Development Subcommittee which he had chaired. Through my association with him as a member of the full Committee on Public Works, I had come to know Mr. THOMPSON as a warm individual who took to heart the welfare of our great Nation. I had the greatest admiration for T. ASHTON THOMPSON—one of the most able, conscientious and dedicated Members of this body.

I want to extend my sympathy to the people of the State of Louisiana who have lost their able Representative, and most of all, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Thompson family in the loss of their loved one. We all share in their sorrow.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, words are wholly inadequate to express my grief and shock when I learned of the tragic death of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON. His passing is a distinct loss, not only to his family and friends, but to the Seventh District, the State of Louisiana, and to the entire Nation. I numbered T. ASHTON among my good friends and my feeling of personal loss is indeed great.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of integrity and character. He was an honest, conscientious, and dedicated legislator. He loved his country and was continually alert to every opportunity to uphold and defend those principles which have made this a great country.

It was my privilege to serve with him and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Committee and I was often impressed by his keen desire to serve the best interests of the people of the entire Nation as well as the people of Louisiana whom he loved so well.

As president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, it was an unusual privilege to have ASHTON THOMPSON serve as vice president. His contributions to the work of the association were invaluable and will continue to bear fruits for years to come.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the members of his family.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing sorrow and a real sense of loss at the tragic accident which took the life of Representative T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana. To his family I extend my sincere sympathy. In the midst of their great sadness, they can take pride in his lifelong service to his State and to his country. To the people of Louisiana his absence from Congress will be keenly felt for he was an honest and aggressive Representative of his district. The tragedy which took this man in the prime of his legislative career can only dismay. But the work of T. A. THOMPSON will live and ever bring credit to his memory, his family, and his State.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for a brief spell Congressmen ASHTON THOMPSON was my dear neighbor on the fourth floor of the Rayburn Building, and I had looked forward to a long neighborly association with one whose great charm and ability cloaked with modesty had placed him high in the esteem and affection of his colleagues. That he was fated to be the first called to his Maker of the tenants of the new building opened for occupancy only a few months ago no one could have foreseen. He was relatively young and in robust health. When I passed the door of his offices draped with black I could but wonder at the uncertainties of life, and so wondering I gave expression to my meditations and my grief in a silent prayer for the repose of the soul of one who on earth radiated gentleness and sweetness, the optimism of the human reach upward. He was an able and dedicated Member of the Congress. He served with us and among us well and faithfully. A wartime flier, he never lost his interest in and concern for the welfare of the Nation's veterans and always his name will be remembered by the members of the AMVETS as the author of the first budget and accounting system of that fine organization. To the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from Louisiana and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our colleague and friend, T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

T. A. THOMPSON was a great American. Much more could be said but these three words summarize his life and his achievements. I knew T. A. THOMPSON as a dedicated man, an able colleague, a leader who served the people of his district and State with great sincerity and effectiveness. He combined the qualities of a true legislator and he felt the

compassion and needs of the people he served. He gave his all to his country and to the people of his district and State and Nation. His passing has left a vacancy in our midst that will be difficult to fill.

I extend to Mrs. Thompson and the members of his family an expression of deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tremendous degree of sadness that I join with my colleagues in the House to speak a word of tribute on behalf of our very dear friend, the late Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON of the 7th Congressional District of Louisiana.

It was my privilege to meet Congressman THOMPSON for the first time during his service in the 83rd Congress. Through the years, I have had an opportunity to observe the diligent manner in which he represented the residents of his congressional district.

As a freshman Member of the House, I had the good fortune to be assigned to the Public Works Committee of the House, on which Congressman THOMPSON was a senior member. During this period of time, I had the honor of serving under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as well as serving with him on the Subcommittee on Flood Control, of which he was the ranking member to the chairman.

This association taught me the value of Congressman THOMPSON's service to his district, his State and to our Nation. His experience over the years cannot be replaced.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because we have all lost a respected and dedicated friend, I particularly extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, T. ASHTON THOMPSON truly was a man dedicated to providing anything which promised to contribute to the better life for our American people. What marked his personality especially for me was his concern for the welfare of our country in our debates on the proposals for monumental public works; but more than anything else, he evaluated every one of them in terms of how they would benefit the individual citizen.

I served with him on the Public Works Committee for some years, and never did he do anything but helpful, kind things for all of us and the Louisiana people who looked to him for counsels and helps in Washington.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON came to the House after a long and notable apprenticeship in his State in its government and had acquired wide knowledge, especially in the highway and conservation fields. Coupled with his skills was an ability to envision the high plateaus and horizons ahead for our country and our people. Endowed with great gifts, he was far up the ladder of accomplishment as a legislator. The tragedy of his death is that it cut short a brilliant career of even higher service and value.

We all know of his important contributions as a member of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and

Grounds. He commanded respect and admiration in the Congress, and I know there is a universal sense of loss among us by his going.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON needs no monument, because they are spread around the United States in great highways, public buildings, flood control, and other water use projects, and better harbors.

My sincere sympathy goes out to his family and the Louisiana people. I hope that the memory of what enormous good he accomplished during his shortened life will help assuage their grief.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and a deep sense of loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a departed colleague and friend, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, I had come to count T. A. among my close friends; we came to Congress together, and we served together on the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, he as chairman and I as ranking minority member. I can only say that this dedicated legislator will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress.

I join in offering my sympathies to his wife and children during this terrible ordeal through which they are now passing.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the Congress in expressing my deep sense of shock and a personal loss by the tragic death of T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

His accidental death was a tragedy for his family, his State of Louisiana, and the Congress. It was a shocking end to a career which continued to advance in skill and effectiveness, which held promise for him of national leadership. His passing is a genuine loss to me and other members of the House Public Works Committee, where his experience and counsel were truly valuable.

Upon his coming to the House in 1953, it was evident that Mr. THOMPSON had those personal gifts and qualities which contribute to leadership and development of legislative talents. He was regarded unanimously by his colleagues as a comer who was destined to attain congressional leadership and national eminence.

T. A. THOMPSON brought wide experience and needed skills to the House and especially to the Public Works Committee. As auditor for the Louisiana State Highway Commission for 7 years, his counsel was invaluable to us when we were considering the proposals for the Interstate Highway System. Mr. THOMPSON was a nationally recognized authority on governmental budget systems and a trustee of the National Finance Committee on Government Accounting.

He was a dedicated overseer of the public purse and spending. The American taxpayers owed him more than they were aware. Mr. THOMPSON was devoted also to the cause of natural resources conservation. Because public works does much to alter our national landscape and natural sites, his advice on how to preserve natural animal and plant areas, beauty spots and recreational areas had deep effect in the country at large.

Louisiana people and Americans everywhere have been deprived of the services of a good and faithful public servant. Coupled with great ability and dedication was a reluctance to have his accomplishments publicized.

After the shock of his tragic passing abates, his family and friends can take comfort in remembering that his shortened life was one of splendid service which benefited multitudes of Americans.

Mr. WAGGONER. God bless you, ASHTON.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON. It is with a heavy heart that I do so, for he was more than a colleague; a fellow Member representing our State of Louisiana. He was my friend.

He sought me out when I first came to this body. I felt that he understood the uncertainty and the frustration a new Member feels when first he comes here. He offered me his assistance and I took it. He helped me over some of the rough spots and I was grateful. He offered me his friendship and I welcomed it.

By his life and his labor he enriched the world. He was a servant of his people, and there is no higher standard any Member can set for himself.

I enjoyed his friendship. I am stronger for it and I shall cherish the moments we shared together throughout the remaining days of my life.

God rest you, ASHTON.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned with profound shock and deep regret about the untimely death of our colleague, Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, shortly after I had arrived in Louisiana for consultations with my personal doctor.

The loss of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, at the youthful age of 49 again brings to our attention the uncertainty of life and the fact that our time on earth is controlled by the great Supreme Architect of the Universe and not by our wishes or by the electorate back home.

My friendship for and association with T. A. doubtless predate those of any other of his colleagues because we campaigned together on a State basis before he decided to come to the U.S. Congress.

Our colleague was a dedicated public official who always supported his principles. The problems and welfare of his constituents of the Seventh Congressional District were always foremost in his mind. The tragic death of this skilled legislator and public servant is a great loss to all who were privileged to know him, to the Congress, to the country, and especially to his constituency.

I join with my colleagues in paying homage to the memory of our colleague and in extending my profound sympathies to the members of his family.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned of the untimely passing of my good friend and colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I considered him to be a real personal friend and a warm friendship grew as a result of our close association for many years on the House Committee on Public Works and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a fine American

and a dedicated legislator. I shall miss his friendship, and my deepest sympathy goes to his family.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a real sense of loss that I rise to say a few words in memory of our beloved colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, who was tragically torn from among us a short time ago.

We served together as members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during these past 13 years.

You all know that committee service gives the best opportunity to take the measure of a man in this great body.

T. A. THOMPSON was a man. He was a man of conviction, understanding and sincerity. He was a man of diligence and ability. He was a man devoted to the public service of his district, his State, and, above all, his Nation. He was a social man—that is to say, a warm and friendly man, without sham or pretense and always a joy to be with.

In the absence of HERBERT BONNER, our committee chairman, who was necessarily absent on official leave, the Speaker asked me to serve as a member of the congressional delegation attending the services for Mr. THOMPSON in his hometown of Ville Platte, La., on Saturday July 3, 1965.

It was a sad occasion.

But it was also heartwarming to see the love and devotion which he inspired in his thousands of friends in his district. I was honored to join with the Louisiana delegation, other Members of Congress and the many, many others who came to pay their last respects to a dear friend, colleague and distinguished public servant whose life of past fulfillment and greater promise, was lost through a cruel trick of fate.

I consider myself fortunate to have known and felt the wise and friendly presence of our beloved colleague, T. A. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. THOMPSON was an able, active, and deeply interested member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during all his years in the Congress. He has served as subcommittee chairman on several important special matters over the years. At the time of his death, he was chairman of our standing Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

During the relatively brief term of his chairmanship of the subcommittee, it produced an outstanding record of important legislation considered and enacted.

In his memory as a beloved person, friend and colleague, and as a hard working, effective member of the committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries adopted a resolution to be spread upon our permanent record and to send to his beloved wife who has suffered the most irreparable loss of all.

At the direction of our committee, Mr. Speaker I would like to insert the committee resolution in the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives hereby express their profound sor-

row and grief upon the tragic and untimely death of our beloved colleague and committee associate, the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and order the clerk of the committee to spread upon our permanent records this heartfelt resolution to his memory.

Mr. THOMPSON was first elected to Congress in 1952 where he faithfully and ably served his district, his native State of Louisiana and his Nation in all the ensuing years of his life.

In appreciation of the vital importance, to his State and to the Nation, of ocean transportation, commercial and sport fishing, and wildlife conservation, he requested election to our committee, where he served with distinction and devotion to duty as member and as subcommittee chairman in the consideration of many and varied important and difficult assignments. His service in recent years as chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation was outstanding.

The passing of T. ASHTON THOMPSON is a serious and grievous loss to our committee. He will be mourned for many years and the product of his efforts will be undying.

T. A. THOMPSON was a warm and friendly man. His genuine sincerity, coupled with deep-seated honest convictions, endeared him to all who knew him whatever may have been their station or walk of life, or political conviction.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON represented the highest embodiment of the true public servant. He served in this great body of the House of Representatives for nearly 13 years before his Master called him to a still higher service. But this does not tell the story. His public career began with the government of his beloved State of Louisiana, to whose purposes he devoted himself with increasing distinction until he was chosen to come to Congress. He gave nearly 4 years of his life to the Armed Forces of the United States, having served in the U.S. Air Force in World War II. Afterwards he continued to work diligently in behalf of our veterans, civil defense, and many other public causes, above and beyond the call of the responsibilities of his job as representative of his congressional district.

We are fortunate to have been privileged to serve with ASHTON THOMPSON. Our lives are richer thereby.

The committee wishes to extend their sincerest condolence to his beloved wife, Leatrice and their two fine children, Christine and Ted.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, as further testimony to the mark which T. ASHTON THOMPSON made during his congressional career, I also ask leave to insert in the RECORD a number of communications addressed to the chairman of the committee, expressing grief and condolence at his untimely loss. The communications are as follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1965.

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: Conservationists throughout the Nation were shocked to hear of the untimely death of Congressman T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana in that unfortunate roadside mishap.

Many of us had an opportunity to become acquainted with Mr. THOMPSON during the years that he was a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. As we listened to him during committee hearings and when we discussed various projects with him from time to time, the conservationists became more deeply impressed with his per-

sonal interest in the welfare of this country's fish and wildlife resources. During the all-too-brief time that Mr. THOMPSON was the chairman of the Wildlife and Fisheries Subcommittee, we had an opportunity to see this interest further manifested in his strong leadership to authorize and expand essential programs for restoring and protecting fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. THOMPSON's leadership will be missed in the years ahead. Mrs. Thompson, the members of his family, and his colleagues on the committee and in the Congress should take comfort in realizing that the results of his labors will benefit generations to come.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1965.
The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine
and Fisheries, Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that the Congress will soon set aside a day to commemorate the memory of the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Member of the House from Louisiana's Seventh District. Because of his long interest in wildlife conservation affairs, we would very much appreciate having the following statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if and when such tributes are in order.

The National Wildlife Federation joins Members of the Congress and conservationists throughout the Nation in this commemoration of the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON. Representative THOMPSON's tragic death brought to a most untimely end a long period of service to the people of Louisiana, as well as sportsmen and conservationists throughout our Nation. Since his election to the Congress in 1952, Mr. Thompson's interest in wildlife conservation and especially the management of this continent's waterfowl resource was demonstrated by word and deed on many occasions. He ably represented the people of Louisiana and his loss is felt with a deep sense of sadness and regret by members of our organization.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director.

SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.
Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries
Committee, House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: The Sport Fishing Institute is deeply grieved by the loss of one of your valued committee members, Congressman T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. His more recent tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation is evidence of the respect held for him by his committee members. His record on this committee, dealing with fish and wildlife conservation measures, is well known. Various acts involved furtherance of fishery research, which the Sport Fishing Institute believes is an important key to providing improved future fishing opportunity.

Beginning in 1954, Congressman THOMPSON played important roles in the passage of the North Pacific Fisheries Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (as amended in 1958), and the Marine Game Fish Research Act of 1959. Always interested in the more outstanding problems affecting fish and wildlife resources, he urged congressional action authorizing continuing studies of the effects of pesticides. The 1960 act, providing for authorization of the State university cooperative fishery units, was strongly sponsored by Congressman THOMPSON.

Beginning in 1964, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Congressman THOMPSON was instrumental in stimulating additional research and development of fisheries by the individual States. The Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act provided significant grants-in-aid to the States for marine and inland fishery resources study. Many other actions by this conservation-minded Member of the Congress helped stimulate programs and actions needed to conserve our aquatic renewable natural resources.

We think it would be an altogether fitting legislative memorial if the Congress would promptly consider Mr. THOMPSON's bill, H.R. 9424—"To provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction * * *" with appropriate hearings designed to secure its early enactment, possibly with some minor clarifications.

Most sincerely,

PHILIP A. DOUGLAS,
Executive Secretary.

CHAS. E. JACKSON & ASSOCIATES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.
The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries
Committee, House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It was with deep sorrow that I learned of the untimely death of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana. I wish to comment particularly on his service as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. He conducted his committee meetings in an absolutely fair and impartial manner and developed the best possible information for the record. As you know, I have long represented many phases of the fishing industry, and I am confident I express the industry's view when I say the leadership demonstrated by Representative THOMPSON is deeply appreciated.

We grieve with you and members of the committee over Representative THOMPSON's tragic passing.

Sincerely,

CHAS. E. JACKSON.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, WILDLIFE
AND FISHERIES COMMISSION,
New Orleans, July 15, 1965.
Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine
and Fisheries, House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONNER: We are advised that early next week the House of Representatives will pay tribute to the late Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, who was killed during the 4th of July holidays.

I am attaching resolution, signed by the members of the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission and trust that you will incorporate it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the House of Representatives proceedings in connection with the tribute to our late Congressman.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. HAIR, Jr.,
Director.

RESOLUTION BY THE MEMBERS OF THE LOUISIANA WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION

Whereas the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, Member of Congress, representing the Seventh Louisiana Congressional District since 1952, was killed in a freakish automobile accident over the Fourth of July holidays while en route with his family to his home in Ville Platte; and

Whereas during the 13 years which he served as a Member of the House of Representatives, he demonstrated vital interest in

both State and National wildlife and fisheries resources, and worked tirelessly to bring about a grassroots realization of the interdependence of conservation and utilization of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources; and

Whereas as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he worked untiringly to bring about full understanding of the economic and recreational value of fish and wildlife resources and the need to foster national legislation to conserve those forms of vanishing wildlife, as well as to increase present populations of game birds to meet ever-increasing pressure from sportsmen seeking more and more outdoor recreation in the form of hunting; and

Whereas he was deeply respected by conservationists and sportsmen, not only in Louisiana but throughout the country, for his devotion to the fundamental principles of sound conservation and wise use of all wildlife and fisheries; and

Whereas in Louisiana he was known throughout the State as a man who enjoyed hunting and fishing, and was determined to do everything in his power to perpetuate the resources necessary for those sports; and

Whereas his untimely death represents a great loss to the State of Louisiana and to the Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, representing conservationists and sportsmen of the State of Louisiana, does hereby gratefully and respectfully commend the many accomplishments of the late Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and respectfully requests that this resolution be incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States to become a permanent record of the United States of America.

JOHN EDWIN KYLE, Jr.,
Chairman.

H. B. FAIRCHILD,
Vice Chairman.

J. D. HAIR, Jr.,
Director.

A. J. BUQUET,
Member.

JOHN PAUL CRAIN,
Member.

HOBSON NORRIS,
Member.

JIMMIE THOMPSON,
Member.

H. CLAY WRIGHT,
Member.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the House well knows, the beloved chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT BONNER, is necessarily on official leave at this time.

I have recently received a letter from HERB, expressing his shock and grief on the untimely passing of our colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. He asked that I bring to the attention of the House his expressions of respect and condolence.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD at this point Chairman BONNER's letter of July 9, 1965:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1965.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: I don't know of anything that has shocked me so much as T. A. THOMPSON's tragic, senseless, and untimely death last weekend, as he was driving home to Louisiana with his family.

I well remember when he first came to Congress in 1953 and requested membership

on our committee. Though still a young man, he already had behind him a distinguished record of public service in Louisiana, as well as a fine military record earned in 3½ years with the Air Force in World War II. With this substantial background he naturally matured quickly into the spirit and the ways of our great Congress.

When I became chairman of the committee in 1955, it was my pleasure to name this able Representative to important committee posts, including the chairmanship of our Special Subcommittee on Freight Forwarders, charged with the handling of a most difficult investigatory assignment. He committed himself well. During his 13 years of devoted service to our committee he grew in stature and in breadth of understanding of the varied subjects under our jurisdiction.

Outstanding during his service with the committee was the interest and attention which he devoted to vital matters dealing with our fisheries and wildlife conservation. During the period of his chairmanship of our Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee he exhibited the highest standards of leadership and the subcommittee can boast an enviable record of achievement.

He will be sorely missed.

I regret that I will be unable to be present in person to join with you and his many, many friends and admirers to pay tribute to his memory on the floor of the House. May I ask that you be good enough to bring my expressions of respect and condolence to the attention of the House?

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER, *Chairman.*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in expressing my deepest sympathy to the family of T. ASHTON THOMPSON, our colleague from Louisiana, who was taken from this earth so suddenly and so tragically.

T. A. and I came to this Congress together in January of 1953 and we served side by side on the Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries these past 13 years.

He was an able legislator and argued his point well on all occasions. I have seen and heard him fight for the things he believed in both in committee and on the House floor.

May God grant him eternal rest and give his family the courage to carry on without him.

Mr. FASCELL. The sight of our country's flag flying at half mast over the Capitol on Friday, July 2, signified the end of the life of a good man and a great Member of Congress. It was evidence of the cruel truth that the Congress of the United States had lost one of its most respected Members, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. This untimely tragedy was an irreparable loss to his many friends in the Congress, the State of Louisiana, and the entire Nation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife, Representative THOMPSON's concrete legislative service was of tremendous national value. Despite his heavy burden of public service, T. A. THOMPSON was an engaging human being, whose good nature marked him as one of this Chamber's most well-liked individuals. His life demonstrated all the chivalric virtues of public service: a fighting spirit, a devotion to service, a high sense of honor,

and a steadfastness of purpose. He possessed a sharp insight into the political process and recognized the genuine scope of his institutional power and personal ability. The words of Edward Everett Hale recall to me the dedication he exhibited:

I am only one, but still I am one.

I cannot do everything, but still I can do something;

And because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse to do the something that I can do.

T. A. THOMPSON was respected and loved by everyone on the Hill who knew him—and most everyone did. Even in the most burdensome of times, he always had a kind word for a colleague, staff member, or elevator boy. He was always available and ready to listen and discuss. To him, everyone was a person in his own right.

Philip Lader, summer intern in my office, for example, recently represented me at a meeting over which Representative THOMPSON presided, and the Congressman took the time to introduce this young man to all those present and brief him thoroughly on the issues being discussed. He then proceeded to ask the student to assume my chair, if he wished, and interrogate the witnesses. For this young man, as well as for me, the memory of T. A. THOMPSON will serve as a testament of the highest personal qualities of American public service.

It was a privilege to know T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and I valued his friendship. I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family, as I join them in prayer for a fine man whom we all loved so dearly.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, during my three terms in Congress, I have had the privilege of serving with the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana. I was particularly saddened by the news of T. A. THOMPSON's untimely death a few days ago, for Mr. THOMPSON was a dedicated public servant who always upheld the high ideals of this body.

He represented the people of Louisiana's seventh district faithfully and well. Yet he was not bound by narrow, parochial interests, but acted in the best interests of this great Nation.

His loving family has my deepest sympathy, and I want them to know that all of us here will miss T. A.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, courage, good will, and true ability are qualities which are rarely found together in the person of one man.

Our late colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana, was one of these rare men. He was a man of clear and strong conviction. He had almost boundless energy which he devoted to his State, to the House of Representatives, and to his Nation. His contributions in the field of finance are too numerous to mention, but we all know that they had a profound impact on Louisiana and on various organizations with which he was associated.

But the esteem in which he was held by those of us who were his colleagues here in the House was not solely because of these attributes. His warmth of personality and genuine concern for

the welfare of others than himself marked him as a wonderful man whose friendship we sought and enjoyed.

I appreciate this opportunity to express my sincerest sympathy to his family and to the State of Louisiana for this great loss of a husband, father, and statesman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of great shock that I learned of the tragic passing of my dear friend and very esteemed colleague, Congressman T. ASHTON THOMPSON, an outstanding Member of this House.

I was deeply impressed, as I believe our entire membership was, by the genial, friendly, amiable personal qualities of this proud son of Louisiana.

He was approachable, cordial and warm-hearted and had a very lofty concept of his public responsibilities and duties as a Member of the House. He was well trained, well informed, capable and efficient in the performance of his work.

Strong in his convictions, humane in his reactions and sympathetic in his response, he stood steadfastly by the principles and ideals in which he believed, and his outstanding service in the House was marked by adherence to those principles and ideals and his loyal, unfaltering attachment to the many causes of free government in which he believed.

He brought to his work a keen mind and a deep understanding of the great principles of government. He was particularly devoted to his district and his people and his great State and country, and he gave of himself unselfishly to the cause of humanity, freedom, and human betterment.

He was highly esteemed by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and he had the respect, admiration, and affection of our membership.

Like everyone else who knew him, I had highest regard for him, and I looked upon him as a valued friend, an able, devoted colleague and an accomplished, faithful representative of the people and a great American. His fine record of achievement in this body will long be remembered.

I am greatly saddened by his sudden and unexpected passing and the shocking tragedy of the circumstances of his demise.

My heart goes out to his bereaved family and all his dear ones to whom he was so deeply devoted, and I extend my most heartfelt sympathy to each and everyone of them for the great sorrow that has come into their lives.

I also express my deep sympathy to his very many friends and constituents whom he had served with such great ability, vitality, and warmth.

I hope that the good Lord will bless them with the spirit of reconciliation to abide by His divine will and will strengthen them to bear the irreparable loss that they have suffered with true spiritual resignation.

A great and distinguished public servant and a dear, esteemed friend has been called to his Heavenly reward.

May he find peace and rest in his eternal home.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely passing of our beloved colleague, T. A. THOMPSON, came as a great shock to me, my family, and to the people of South Carolina. It is ironic that the tragic accident which took his life occurred on one of the most magnificent and beautiful interstate highways in the Nation. A highway system that, as a member of the Public Works Committee, he helped create. It was my honor to serve on the Public Works Committee with ASHTON THOMPSON that I was privileged to observe firsthand his dedication and devotion to the development and the preservation of the great natural resources of our country. He was an ideal member to serve with on the committee. His word was his bond. He was considerate of the opinions of others and always willing to meet other Members more than halfway in developing legislation in the best interests of the Nation.

ASHTON THOMPSON was a man of great humility. He did not seek headlines or credit but was interested in accomplishments and achievements for his people and his country. The United States today is a more powerful Nation—more united, enjoying more economic opportunity, and a great civilization—because of his outstanding service in the Congress. He was a great leader, a great American, and one of the greatest Louisianians in the history of that great State. He typified and exemplified the traditions, the heritage, and the culture of the Old South. He was a southern gentleman to the core.

Serving with ASHTON THOMPSON will always be to me a pleasant reminiscence. He will be greatly missed. Mrs. Dorn and my family join in extending always to Mrs. Thompson and his lovely children our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

ASHTON THOMPSON'S service here and his devotion to his people and the development of our land exemplifies the admonition of Daniel Webster on the walls of the House:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, T. A. THOMPSON in his day rendered his Nation superb service and will be remembered.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of my good friend ASHTON THOMPSON was a shock and a source of great sorrow to me personally. We served on the Merchant Marine Committee together, and he was the very able chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation. He always impressed me with his capable manner and his warmth and friendliness.

ASHTON THOMPSON was liked by all who knew him; he was popular among his fellow Members of Congress, and he was a dedicated and able legislator. The Congress has suffered a great loss. We shall miss him sorely, but we shall cherish the memory of our distinguished colleague for years to come. To his bereaved family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join with my colleagues and the people of the State of Louisiana in expressing my grief over the sudden and shocking death of our close friend, Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON.

Throughout our Nation's history, the State of Louisiana has traditionally sent numerous dedicated and competent men to the Congress of the United States. Representative THOMPSON was indeed a shining example of this tradition.

Having engaged in State government service at a very early age, Representative THOMPSON served in various capacities in his home State until his election to the 83d Congress in 1953. As a Member of Congress, Mr. THOMPSON continually displayed the qualities of a statesman. A humble man, he never forgot the people or the purpose for which they sent him to Congress. His efforts were not only confined to the people of his district, but to any measure that would benefit the vast majority of the American public.

The respect which we have all held for this man stemmed not only from his proven competence in the Congress, but also from his personal character. His devotion to his family and church and his intrinsic belief in God's goodness served as an example to all.

The State of Louisiana and indeed the entire Nation has lost an outstanding public servant whose dedication to his principles and his people will long be remembered.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Thompson and the entire family my prayers and deepest sympathies on this sorrowful occasion.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a highway tragedy during the Fourth of July weekend took the life of one of the outstanding Members of Congress. The gentleman from Louisiana, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, was taken from us by a strange, incredible, and senseless highway accident in the State of North Carolina.

I knew ASHTON well as a Member of this body, but I knew him best as a distinguished member of the Committee on Public Works, a committee on which he served with distinction and the highest integrity. He was vitally concerned with the area of public works and economic development and had already made a substantial name for himself in the area. The gentleman from Louisiana was the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, a member of the Subcommittee on Roads, a member of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development. But ASHTON had really begun to distinguish himself as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He only served for half a year in that position, but during that short time he had quickly grasped the concepts behind the Federal public buildings program and was exercising a firm understanding of the intricate processes. He had presided over a hearing before that subcommittee only a few days before his most untimely and most tragic demise.

ASHTON served his State and Nation well. He entered public service in his

State in 1934 at the age of 18, and he soon became involved in the highway programs of the State as an employee of the Louisiana State Highway Commission. He was a financial adviser to the Louisiana Legislature and was the pioneer of a new method of accounting for the State agencies. ASHTON came to the Congress in 1953 and served for a dozen years with distinction. It is a loss to this body and to the Nation that he was not permitted to served for many more years.

Mr. Speaker, there was a great irony in the death of ASHTON. As I have said, he began his public service in the area of highway activities. He served on the Committee on Public Works when the largest public works program in history—the Interstate and Defense Highway System—was acted upon in 1956 by that committee. His tragic death came on the Interstate and Defense Highway System. It came on Interstate 85 near Gastonia, N.C. The proponent of the Nation's highway programs died upon the highway system he helped to perfect. But his actions and the actions of his committee have made it possible for fewer to meet such a tragic end on our Nation's highways. For this, he is indeed to be commended.

ASHTON was outgoing, helpful, devoted, and an all-around good legislator. He knew his responsibilities and duties to the people of his State and Nation, and he exercised them well.

For both myself and my family, I want to extend our sorrowful regrets and sadness to his wife and children. I know this sorrow is felt by all Members of the Congress. Our Nation has lost a good Congressman and a public-spirited citizen.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, although it was not my good fortune to become personally well-acquainted with Mr. THOMPSON, I was privileged to serve with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I valued his important contributions to that committee's work.

During Mr. THOMPSON'S tenure on the committee, the Congress granted a wide variety of research authority concerning conservation activities. A measure of special interest to many of us from the States bordering the Great Lakes was the Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956.

Mr. THOMPSON became chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation with the organization of that committee in the 88th Congress. In 1964, under his leadership, the committee was instrumental in stimulating action by the individual States involving the development of fisheries.

Our Nation's conservation programs are much stronger because of efforts put forth by Representative THOMPSON. His dedication has provided us with a solid foundation from which to direct our future conservation policies.

All of us join in the feeling of shock and sadness because of the tragic death of ASHTON THOMPSON, and we on the Merchant Marine Committee will greatly miss him. But I also want to express the very special sense of respect and gratitude and loss which we of the Great

Lakes area feel, because of his leadership role in support of fisheries research measures desperately needed in our area.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late T. ASHTON THOMPSON—statesman, legislator, and good friend. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for me to improve on the tributes which have already been paid. I cannot improve upon what has been said. I rise simply to pay tribute to the memory of a departed friend who always had a kind word to say, who was always most cooperative and thoughtful, a friend who made his mark in the Nation's service.

The record of his attainments will speak for itself and it will speak eloquently. I simply want to speak of him as a friend and pay tribute to his memory and extend sympathy to Mrs. Thompson and other loved ones left behind.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock and deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my good friend, our colleague T. ASHTON THOMPSON. T.A.'s first team was in the 83d Congress as was mine. Our paths crossed frequently. I never knew him to say an unkind word or to make an untrue statement. He was a fine Member of this body, a fine gentleman, and a real credit to his district, his State, and his country.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Thompson, the Thompson children, and to T.A.'s constituents who, I am sure, share his loss with all of us.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is no longer to benefit from the presence of the Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON of Louisiana, who has been taken from us by the cruelest act of fate.

We who worked with him and knew him as a colleague and a friend are equally bereft as his constituents, for whom he gave the utmost of his time and his energy. All who knew him even slightly were stunned at the awful news of his demise in the realization that the people of Louisiana, the Congress, and the Nation itself had lost a fine and gallant leader, capable of noble ideas and high accomplishments.

T. ASHTON THOMPSON entered the public service in the year 1934, as traveling auditor for the Louisiana Highway Commission. From then until the day of his death he worked for no other employer save the government of the State of Louisiana and the Government of the United States, both of which he loved with all his heart and was willing to serve with everything at his command.

Although T. ASHTON THOMPSON was for many years associated with the finances of the State of Louisiana, this was by no means his only area of competence or interest. On the contrary, they ranged far and wide. As an Air Force officer in World War II he became exceedingly knowledgeable in the fields of aeronautics and military strategy. As a longtime State official, he developed a keen awareness of the value of public works programs, and as a citizen of a State bordering on the sea he was all his life familiar with nautical affairs.

In line with these interests T. ASHTON THOMPSON was appointed to the House Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in both of which bodies he performed with a great enthusiasm matched only by his skill.

Although myself a member of the political party opposed to that of T. ASHTON THOMPSON, I found in him a splendid man and a splendid politician, for he was one of those to whom the word, "compromise," was more than just a word. He was truly concerned for effective, workable legislation, and partisanship was simply not a major part of his nature.

The House of Representatives will miss this man of great ability, almost to the same extent as will his friends and family.

Indeed, he was a tribute to his district, his State, and the Congress, itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned of the untimely passing of my good friend and colleague, T. ASHTON THOMPSON. I considered him to be a real personal friend, and a warm friendship grew as a result of our close association for many years on the House Committee on Public Works and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was a fine American and a dedicated legislator. I shall miss his friendship, and my deepest sympathy goes to his family.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, ASHTON THOMPSON's tragic death was a deep shock to me. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Public Works Committee and on the Subcommittee on Roads for the past 2½ years. He was a hard-working, considerate legislator whose contributions to the work of the committee and the Congress will long be remembered. His death has cut short a fine career holding much promise for the future. Mrs. Cleveland and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and children.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a sense of profound sadness overcomes us when we realize that T. A. THOMPSON no longer will be with us in this Chamber.

For some of us who served with the able gentleman from Louisiana on the House Committee on Public Works, our sense of personal loss is compounded by our realization of the great loss which the Nation itself sustains.

Not given to flamboyance or bombastic bursts of oratory, T. A. THOMPSON labored quietly and effectively in the less glamorous but often infinitely more productive realm of meaningful congressional activity involved with the mundane but highly necessary work of the congressional committees.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving with T. A. THOMPSON on the Public Works Committee enjoyed a rare opportunity to know a true legislative craftsman at his work. Without fanfare or self-congratulation, the gentleman from Louisiana made many long lasting contributions to the welfare of our Nation. The people of his congressional district have great reason for pride in the service he performed not

only for Louisiana, but for the United States as a whole.

With the clear vision given to those who think earnestly of the future, T. A. THOMPSON many years ago saw the critical need for development and conservation of the Nation's water resources. He was a tireless and efficacious champion of pure, clear water to serve the water needs of this country.

His handiwork is ever apparent to those of us who observed his deep interest in the numerous pieces of landmark legislation which have provided dams and reservoirs throughout the Nation. With a resolute purpose, he worked incessantly for years to improve and strengthen the Nation's fight against pollution of the streams and against other impediments to usage of this most primary resource, such as the water hyacinths which had infested the water surfaces in much of the Southland.

Only this year, his hand was ever evident in the perfecting of workable language for the Water Quality Act of 1965 which will greatly strengthen our efforts to abate pollution.

Coming to the Congress after years of practical experience in the administration of highway programs in his native Louisiana, T. A. THOMPSON played a prominent part in the enactment of the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 and the subsequent Federal aid highway programs which have saved many thousands of lives and speeded the Nation's commerce across broad ribbons of concrete. How ironic that his own life should have been sacrificed in a highway fatality.

Always considerate of his fellow man, T. A. THOMPSON was much beloved and appreciated by those who knew him best. We who served with him here day in and day out knew him as a man of infinite patience and reason, blessed with tolerance and understanding.

His shadow will linger long. His good works will continue to bless future generations of Americans. His example will remain with us who knew him.

Words are poor consolation indeed to his bereaved survivors. To them our hearts go out, even in the knowledge that what we say can scarcely solace or comfort them in so grievous a personal loss. Yet we know that there is for them the assurance of faith and the comfort of the knowledge that others would share their grief. There is also the legacy of the good deeds that he performed, the good life that he lived, and the services which endure to bless his fellow man.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, tragedy is always shocking and, when its hand moves in to take away the life of a friend and colleague so recently a cheerful and lively member of our group, it is indeed painful and oppressive. I can recall with vivid recollection the quiet, instantly friendly young man from Louisiana who came to the Congress with me as a freshman in 1953 and remember well our early efforts to learn firsthand the duties of one charged with the responsibility to represent a constituency, a State and a Na-

tion in this great deliberative body. He was immediately popular with all of us because of his genial attitude and, as our responsibilities here mounted, this admiration and respect multiplied manifold for the fine qualities he possessed. It was a great pleasure to have enjoyed his friendship and it has been an honor indeed to serve with him in the House of Representatives. I join his many friends in this House in an expression of anguish over his sudden and untimely passing and extend to Mrs. Thompson, his family, and his loved ones my genuine sympathy.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, was a grievous loss to this House and to the Congress.

T. A. and I served together on the Public Works Committee. We were usually of the same mind. His devotion to his work was an inspiration to all who knew him. No district has elected a man with more pride in his district and more concern for his people, his constituents. My friend Congressman THOMPSON loved people. He was compassionate and of good humor. He was a wonderful father and a good husband. Truly few men could better epitomize an American citizen and a Congressman in the finest tradition of our great Nation.

Congressman THOMPSON was more than a distinguished and conscientious legislator. He was a Christian who attempted to carry his philosophy actively into every minute of his public and private life. His work was not only diligent and constructive, but always sincerely concerned with the well-being of his fellow men. T. A. was both amiable and devoted; steadfast and sympathetic. He had quickly developed invaluable expertness in State finances, public works, economic development, merchant marine, and fisheries. His experience and counsel is as great a loss as his personal ability as mediator and conciliator. His energy and devotion to a cause once illuminated by thorough investigation was ceaseless.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thompson and her loved ones. We all share her grief, if only in some lesser fashion.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of the Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives express our deepest appreciation for the kindness and generosity of the remarks made concerning our late colleague, ASHTON THOMPSON. It is quite fitting that he be remembered in the words that have been uttered here today.

I also want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, in joining my colleague from New Orleans, Congressman Boggs, on behalf of the Louisiana delegation, how much we appreciate the efficient manner in which Ken Harding handled the funeral arrangements. This was a great source of consolation to the family and to the members of the delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a tribute that has been sent to me from the Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable John J. McKeithen.

EULOGY SPOKEN BY THE HONORABLE JOHN J. McKEITHEN, GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA, UPON THE UNTIMELY DEATH OF THE HONORABLE T. A. THOMPSON

It is given to few men the opportunity to voice a people's aspirations, their hopes and desires. T. A. THOMPSON was one of the chosen few, and he accepted the duty with honor and humility. Charged by destiny with the leadership of his people as a Member of the Congress of the United States, he acquitted himself admirably in that ancient institution, rising to meet his responsibilities with a deep reverence and respect for the commonwealth we all serve, and bringing honor to the name of his people.

Representative T. A. THOMPSON passed this way briefly, and we are all the wealthier in the spirit for his sojourn here. That he passed so suddenly and so tragically is the Nation's loss. We feel the heavy weight of sorrow and loneliness his widow and his children know at this sad moment, for he too is our loss. We were bound to him as surely as if by blood or by vows.

We are richer today for having had him serve us. We are better men and women for having known him. Today, though his voice is stilled, though his presence has fled, this land continues a better place in which to live because he labored to increase its abundance, to quieten its hostilities, to perfect its justice.

T. A. THOMPSON'S life was his own greatest tribute. No man can utter better than this: He was called to the service of his people; he harkened to their voice; he served them well. Pray his soul rests now in the bosom of the Father of us all.

Again let me say to the Members of this body and to all those who participated in the ceremony that this was in keeping with what ASHTON lived and believed in.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to pay tribute to the life and character of T. A. THOMPSON, and to include therein any extraneous matter they may desire.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2984) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to

the bill (H.R. 2985) entitled "An act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 7984) entitled "An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 510) entitled "An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GERALD L. K. SMITH FIGHTS ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I am deeply disturbed by the drive to use a constitutional amendment as a means of diluting the principle of one man, one vote in our State legislatures. As I have watched this campaign develop, I have been shocked to learn the identity of some of the individuals and groups whose support for such a constitutional amendment is the most strident.

Last Thursday's mail brought the latest in a series of extremist broadsides against the Supreme Court and its decisions in favor of political equality. It consisted of a paragraph from the Cross and the Flag, published by Gerald L. K. Smith. Mr. Smith, who is fond of styling activities with which he disagrees as "Jew conspiracies," was characterized nearly 20 years ago by a group of Members of this House as "America's most raucous purveyor of anti-Semitism and of racial and religious bigotry." What

was true 20 years ago is still true today. Mr. Smith reportedly received more than \$300,000 in donations last year. He must qualify as the most durable, if not the most successful, extremist in the country.

On page 25 of the July issue of the *Cross and the Flag* is this comment:

11. The Supreme Court edict concerning the reapportionment of the State legislatures of the several States is another dictatorial decision made by our treasonable Supreme Court. This edict destroys geographic representation in the State legislatures and insists that the State senates be elected by population the same as the State representatives. This ruling makes the State senate a fifth wheel and destroys its importance. Most of the States in establishing their legislatures imitated the Congress of the United States insisting that the lower house represent the population while the upper house represent the geography. As things now stand, the great metropolitan centers are about to take over the State governments completely in the States where they are located whether it be New York, Illinois, California, or any one of the several States where big cities constitute the dominant population. The Citizens Congressional Committee has done a lot of work on this problem. It is to be hoped that a movement has been started which will save State sovereignty from this tyrannical edict handed down by the most obnoxious, heady, arrogant, impudent, lawless set of men called judges ever to appear on the public scene in the United States of America. God save America from Earl Warren's (Finkelstein) Supreme Court. I use the word Finkelstein advisedly because Rabbi Finkelstein is the chief intellect of American Jewry, and he has virtually dominated the philosophical thinking of the man who now virtually bosses the Supreme Court of the United States. This abortive personality (Earl Warren) is a tumorous growth on American liberty for which we can thank Dwight David Eisenhower who appointed him to this high position.

As one might have expected, this is not the first *Cross and the Flag* harangue against the principle of equality at the ballot box, so basic to a democratic form of Government. In the September 1964 issue of the *Cross and the Flag*, Mr. Smith's comment on the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions was to proclaim that the Court had driven "a dagger into the back of our constitutional republic" and to warn that "the whole legislative process in the 50 States has been completely altered and virtually wrecked by the pro-Communist membership of the Supreme Court of the United States led by the diabolical traitor to tradition Chief Justice Earl Warren." He went on to urge "a revised campaign to impeach this diabolical Court" and immediate action to amend the Constitution "in such a way as to throw this treasonable decision into discard."

In his efforts to match words with action, Smith has enlisted in his campaign "to throw this treasonable decision into discard" one Charles Winegarner, his nephew by marriage and the author of the comments on reapportionment in the most recent edition of the *Cross and the Flag*. Mr. Winegarner is listed in an editor's note as "executive secretary of the Citizens Congressional Committee, an auxiliary of the Christian Nationalist Crusade." Last April, Smith described

his long-time associate, Winegarner, as one of the "brilliant, loyal, time-tested patriots" who operate the "Citizens Congressional Committee."

The current focus of this particular subsidiary is opposition to any liberalization of the immigration laws, but in earlier years it has also concentrated its fire on the Supreme Court—calling for the impeachment not only of the Chief Justice, but the other members as well.

Smith and Winegarner, however, attach such importance to the passage of a constitutional amendment overturning the one man, one vote decision that they have created a separate front group for the sole purpose of promoting this amendment. Earlier this year, many of us received a letter purporting to come from a group labeled "National Committee—Reapportionment Crisis." Under the headlines urging us to "Save State Government" and to "Save the U.S. Senate," the letter utilized relatively calm language to proclaim sentiments which can only be characterized as extremist. It began with a flat assertion—completely at variance with fact, as any reading of the Supreme Court's decision in *Reynolds* against *Sims* should show—that the same logic used by the Court in that decision could also destroy the U.S. Senate. It went on to charge that this abortive edict already threatened State Governments with chaos.

The letter, which asked for an appointment to discuss the issue, was signed by a Charles Winegarner, listed on the letterhead as "executive secretary."

The return address of the committee was given as Post Office Box 27895 in Los Angeles, the same return address used by the Citizens' Congressional Committee and the return address of Gerald L. K. Smith's *The Cross and the Flag*. I gather that it is quite a large box.

Mr. Speaker, why are bigots like Smith and Winegarner so deeply involved in this campaign to overturn the principle of one man, one vote in our State governments? What is the purpose of their hysterical attacks on the Supreme Court? What is their interest in an amendment to override the Court's decisions on legislative apportionment?

I, for one, suspect that the interest is a simple one: They obviously dislike, mistrust, and oppose the entire democratic process. They seize every opportunity to use the weapons of smear and fear in attacks on our system in an attempt to prove that the system cannot work. They want nothing less than repeal of the 20th century or as much of it as they can get their hands on.

The fact that these extremists want a constitutional amendment to overturn the principle of "one man, one vote" should put us on guard. For myself, Mr. Speaker, finding Smith and Winegarner on the opposite side of an issue is reassuring. At the same time, it reinforces my conviction that this fight to reapportion our State legislatures on a population basis is a vital one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for the information he has just brought to the attention of the House. The activities of Gerald L. K. Smith, the Nation's most vicious racial and religious bigot, in opposition to the principle of one man, one vote are deeply disturbing.

Smith is a notorious enemy of our democratic form of government. The intensity and virulence of his attacks on one man, one vote are clear evidence that this principle will materially strengthen the democratic system which he is dedicated to destroy.

One man, one vote is initiating a new era in the American experiment with freedom. Those forces which have benefited from malapportionment will continue their protests. That is their constitutional right and I do not question it. But I and the people I represent also have a constitutional right to vote and have our vote counted equally with other votes.

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman O'HARA, has ably led a rapidly growing number of our colleagues who support one man, one vote and oppose the Dirksen amendment. His remarks today have only made more the necessity of defeating the Dirksen amendment more urgent.

PRESSURING THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the White House applied what might be described as subtle pressure. It is a part of the American system to advocate causes and urge others to support your programs. On the other hand, it is a subversion of free government to blackjack, arm twist, and play partisan politics with the public welfare. Time and time again during this session we have witnessed a growing tendency for the White House to force its will on a docile Congress by rude threats and arm-twisting tactics. There is no quicker means of perverting the public welfare than through this tactic and it is time that Members of this body, both Democrat and Republican, stand up and call a halt.

The Federal Government spends over \$100 billion a year on a variety of programs. The basic reason for these expenditures is to improve the welfare of our citizenry. We can always argue that some programs are wasteful and some unneeded but their basic purpose nonetheless is to serve the needs of the people, whether real or imagined. This administration is more and more looking upon these programs as a means to pressure Congress. "Vote for this program and we will approve your post office or public works project," we hear. Sometimes there is an approach which is closer

to blackmail. A New York Democrat told us last year of a visit by Post Office Department officials which he thought to be in regard to new post offices on Long Island. Instead they asked him if he was going to support the farm legislation which was coming up the next week. They made their message unmistakably clear. He was different from most Members of this body; he rose up and protested in indignation.

On the front page of yesterday's New York Times, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor made no bones about the tactics they plan to use in getting through one of their pet programs. He said:

It will boil down to how much arm twisting we can do.

This administration is trying to do the same thing to secure passage of their bill which would remove 14(b) from the Taft-Hartley Act. I have talked to a number of Democratic Congressmen who are highly incensed at the highhanded manner which has been used to get them to vote for this controversial proposal. They have been told that there will be no farm program until it is passed. Carl DeBloom, writing in the Columbus Dispatch, on Sunday, July 18—the same day as the Connor statement—told the story in pretty plain language and it should shock many Americans who properly feel that taxpayers' money should be used for the welfare of the people and not for building political power.

Every week we get a reminder of the abuse of power which comes from the one-sided political complexion here in Washington. With more than 2 to 1 majorities in both Houses of Congress, the administration can play politics with the welfare of the farmers or any other group. Representatives of the people should not be pressured with public funds and the best way to stop it is to vote for or against proposals on the basis of the best interest of the public and not in response to what the White House might tell you to do. This Congress is already becoming known as a rubberstamp Congress and we cannot possibly hold the confidence of the people if we continue to cover up the Bobby Baker incidents, submit to executive pressure and put politics first and the public welfare second. A great Democratic Senator from Missouri, Jim Reed, once observed this highhanded pressure during the Court-packing days of the thirties and castigated those "congressional cats who for a little White House cream will sell the interests of their constituents down the river."

Read the Carl DeBloom article which I insert following these remarks and judge for yourself what is happening to the representatives of the people, the last real repository of freedom and self-government. This whole matter crosses party lines. While the power of the Government is undoubtedly tilted a bit to help Democrats at the expense of Republicans, there are numerous occasions where independent-minded Democrats meet the same pressure tactic. I need only point out the different treatment accorded the senior and junior Senators

from my own State of Ohio. Patronage is not cleared through the one who steers the more independent course.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, July 18, 1965]

FARM BLOC TOLD TO BACK BILL—RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW REPEAL IS PUSHED

(By Carl DeBloom)

WASHINGTON.—The Johnson administration has taken the wraps off in its hitherto undercover drive to assure passage of legislation which would nullify so-called right-to-work State laws.

The administration, through Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, bluntly told farm area Members of the House, "You don't have the votes to pass your farm bill this year unless you buy them by your own support of repeal of 14(b)."

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is the big goal of the AFL-CIO and the rest of big labor at this session of Congress. Section 14(b) empowers the States to adopt laws outlawing union shops.

Through most of this session of Congress, lobbyists for the White House, AFL-CIO, and liberal farm organizations have been trying to put together a farm-labor coalition which would provide sufficient support for both bills to get them through Congress.

There has been evidence that this move had in the main succeeded, but the new coalition began to fall apart last week in a dispute over whether the farm bill or the labor bill would be called up first in the House.

It was apparent that neither side trusted the other to make good on its promises of support unless its own bill came up first.

It was that situation which the Vice President sought to resolve by his appearance at an unannounced breakfast of southern rural Congressmen at the Congressional Hotel Friday morning.

While the breakfast meeting was held behind closed doors, some lawmakers who were there said that HUMPHREY did not engage in subtlety in laying on the line the administration's demand for support of the section 14(b) repealer.

The Vice President reportedly explained that the labor bill may have enough support to pass both the House and the Senate without "trading" for farm area support, and that at the least, it has close to enough votes for passage.

On the other hand, HUMPHREY was reported to have said, the farm bill stands not a ghost of a chance of passage unless it can get substantial backing from urban and suburban Congressmen who do not really favor it, but who would vote for it to guarantee passage of the 14(b) repealer by a substantial margin.

While HUMPHREY did not come right out and say so, it was implicit in his remarks that the farm bill's rural area supporters should abandon their fight to get their own bill voted on first in the House.

He said in effect that unless the urban area backers of the 14(b) repeal bill had guaranteed delivery of farm area votes for it, they weren't likely to vote for the farm bill.

That seemed to mean, without question, that the labor bill must be voted on first—or the farm bill won't get pro-labor support in advance.

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following explanation of the Teaching Professions Act of 1965 and a letter from the President:

JULY 17, 1965.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As I announced in my remarks before the National Education Association on July 2, I am proposing legislation to bring the best of our Nation's talent to its schools. This legislation—the Teaching Professions Act of 1965—will:

Create a National Teacher Corps to serve in city slums and areas of rural poverty;

Establish a program of fellowships to prepare students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary education and to help experienced teachers enhance their qualifications;

Aid institutions of higher education to provide better programs for educating teachers.

The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission—those best suited to the momentous tasks this Nation faces in improving education.

The National Teacher Corps can help improve the quality of teaching where quality is most needed and most often in short supply—in city slums and in areas of rural poverty. It will enroll experienced teachers, and, to work with them, students who intend to make teaching a career. They will teach in local schools at the request of local communities and will serve on the same terms as local teachers. They will be local, not Federal, employees.

The fellowships are essential if teaching is to attract a higher proportion of our ablest young people, and if the best teaching is to prevail in the classroom. Students preparing for teaching in these days should have superior graduate training. Teaching is a difficult job at best; the more preparation for it, the better.

The desire of classroom teachers to replenish their skills and knowledge is not only to be applauded but aided. As revolutionary changes take place in all subjects and at all levels of learning, there is a limit to the sacrifice we can ask of our teachers in their efforts to renew their knowledge.

Finally, I propose a program of grants to help institutions of higher education offer first-rate programs to would-be teachers as well as to experienced teachers. This measure, coupled with the fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps, completes a program which is entitled to be called the Teaching Professions Act of 1965.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a national teacher corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN BRADEMAs for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINK for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

This bill will deepen the meaning and substance of the already impressive work of the 88th and 89th Congresses in the field of education. I have concluded that it is of sufficient urgency to justify action by this session of the Congress. The problems which face us in education do not grow smaller as time goes by; neither should our determination to attack and solve those problems. I

commend to you the Teaching Professions Act of 1965, and hope that you will give it speedy consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

The newly proposed Teaching Professions Act of 1965 would carry out the President's proposals, first announced in his July 2 speech before the National Education Association's convention in New York City, to establish a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel and to create a National Teacher Corps.

The legislation would authorize the Commissioner of Education to support fellowship programs carried out by institutions of higher education for recent baccalaureate recipients, for persons in other careers desiring to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons in elementary and secondary education desiring to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary and secondary education.

Fellowships would be awarded for up to 2 years of graduate study in approved high-quality graduate programs which give major emphasis to substantive courses and are designed for persons pursuing careers in elementary and secondary education.

In addition to stipends for fellowship holders, a cost-of-education allowance of \$2,500 would be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such fellowship holder is studying for each academic year of study.

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to pay to institutions of higher education part of the cost of developing or strengthening high quality graduate and undergraduate programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of such programs.

The bill would establish in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps in which experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree but who have had no teaching experience would enroll for periods of up to 2 years. Members of the Teacher Corps would, pursuant to arrangements with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with institutions of higher education designated by the State educational agency, be furnished to local educational agencies in areas having high concentrations of low-income families to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874 (title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

Before undertaking their teaching duties, all members of the Teacher Corps would be provided training under arrangements which the Commissioner of Education would enter into, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies. The Commissioner would likewise provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, in-service teacher training programs for teacher-interns, who would teach on less than a full-time basis in order to have time for training courses under supervision of an institution of higher education. Such courses would, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Teacher-interns joining the Teacher Corps would be assigned in teaching teams which would also include experienced teachers, and the teaching program for teacher-interns would be under the supervision of experi-

enced teachers. Insofar as practicable, such experienced teachers would be teachers who are enrolled in the Teacher Corps.

Arrangements for furnishing Teacher Corps members to local educational agencies must provide that such agency will compensate Teacher Corps members at the rate of pay for a teacher who has similar training and experience and similar teaching duties.

Stipends (including subsistence allowances) would be paid to members of the Teacher Corps by the Commissioner of Education during periods of training when Teacher Corps members are not on assignment with a local educational agency. The Federal Government would pay travel expenses and readjustment allowances before and after Teacher Corps members undertake their duties in the areas where they will be teaching. In addition, the Federal Government could make payments necessary to protect retirement rights, medical insurance, and other employee benefits for an experienced teacher who expects to return to the school, or educational agency or institution where he was employed before joining the Corps.

Members of the Teacher Corps would be utilized by local educational agencies to provide educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate, in the manner described in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The legislation guarantees that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision and control of local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

While the bill authorizes the furnishing of teachers and teaching teams in the Corps to all local educational agencies with programs for low-income children which State educational agencies approve under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, if the demand for the services of such teachers should exceed the number available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner of Education would be directed to allocate them among the States (to the extent practicable) in proportion to the number of low-income children in each State who are counted for State-by-State distribution of basic grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The appropriations authorization for both programs is limited to \$30 million in this fiscal year (1965-66).

An Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation would be established in the Office of Education to review both the fellowship and Teacher Corps programs, as well as other programs bearing on the improvement of teacher preparation programs in the Nation.

REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the important pending debates that will come before this body on the matter of the repeal of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and the farm legislation, I think it is important that my colleagues should have brought to their attention an article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Washington Post of July 15.

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1965]
FARM, LABOR GROUPS JOCKEY TO SEE WHOSE BILL IS FIRST

(By Julius Duscha)

"If I get some help on the farm bill," said Democratic Representative JOHN R. HANSEN, who is from the rural southwestern part of Iowa, "I'm willing to listen on 14(b)."

"If 14(b) doesn't pass," said another Democratic Representative, JOSEPH E. KARTH, of industrial St. Paul, "I'll take another look at the farm bill."

HANSEN of Iowa, a manufacturer of farm equipment, and KARTH, a former union representative, are two of the many Congressmen caught up in some of the most intensive lobbying of Capitol Hill this year.

Lobbyists for the Agriculture Department and liberal farm organizations like the National Farmers Union have joined with representatives of the AFL-CIO and other labor groups to try to form a farm-labor bloc to pass two of the most controversial bills before Congress.

The bills are farm measures extending cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs, and labor legislation repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the section that permits States to outlaw the union shop.

As one Johnson administration lobbyist said, "When you get to a farm bill, there's trading all over the place."

This year, Capitol Hill sources pointed out, most of the trading involves the labor legislation.

The labor bill was approved by the House Education and Labor Committee last month, but the House Rules Committee has not yet set a date for a hearing to decide on how many hours the measure should be debated on the House floor.

The farm legislation is expected to be approved by the House Agriculture Committee today.

Tentative plans made by the House leadership call for consideration of the labor bill on the House floor during the week beginning July 26, with the farm legislation to follow some time in August.

But there is considerable debate among influential farm, labor, and administration lobbyists over whether the farm or labor legislation should come up first. Neither side seems to trust the other.

City Congressmen whose arms need to be twisted harder each year to get them to vote on farm legislation maintain that they want to see a labor bill come first for a change.

Representatives from predominantly rural areas are just as adamant in declaring that the farm bill must have priority.

The farm legislation is in particular trouble this year not only because of the cost of the programs but also because of the increasing urban complexion of the House and charges that the legislation involves a "bread tax."

About half of the 71 new Democrats elected to the House last year are from districts where farming is still important while the other half are from city and suburban districts.

An administration lobbyist who is familiar with the thinking of the new Congressmen from the cities and suburbs said that many of them do not know whether they owe their election to President Johnson's coat-tails, the unpopularity of Barry Goldwater or to their own campaign.

So, the lobbyist added, these Representatives are not automatically predisposed to following the President on an issue as unpopular among urban voters as the farm program.

In addition, the new Democratic Representatives from the cities and suburbs do not have close ties built upon past favors owed the rural-dominated hierarchy of the House.

The city and suburban Congressmen are also being bombarded with letters opposing the farm bill. Most of the letters appear to have been inspired by large milling and baking companies that formed the Wheat Users Committee in June to fight the wheat program.

Members of Congress report that many of the letters are from employees of the companies. The two unions that represent bakery employees and the Teamsters Union were among the organizers of the Wheat Users Committee.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Price, Democratic national vice chairman and my long-time personal friend, paid a beautiful tribute to Adlai Stevenson, saying:

With the death of Adlai Stevenson the world has lost one of the truly great spirits of this century, and I have lost a warm and beloved friend.

I am sure I speak for the Democratic women of America when I recall the grace and dignity with which he wore his many robes in a lifetime of public service. As a great Governor of a great State, as a gallant standard bearer for his party, and as emissary to the United Nations in a time that tested the will of the strongest men and nations, he never failed to meet his own description of Eleanor Roosevelt—"she would rather light a candle than curse the darkness."

The light he shed and the warmth of his glow should be a beacon and a comfort to those of us who share his dream of a world of freemen at peace with each other. He enriched everything he touched and he touched the world.

If his life is to be given a meaning beyond its end, we must, all of us, construct a memorial of the bricks he so lovingly laid and build on the foundation of justice and brotherhood that was his life.

His vision of man's destiny in a world without fear is his legacy. Senator EUGENE McCARTHY once said of him—" * * * this man has made us all proud to be Democrats." To which I would add—"this man has made us all proud to be Americans."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, the most terrible war ever fought in the history of mankind came to an end. Despite the fact that this war was prosecuted by the United States to assure the continued existence as a free, democratic state of our Nation and of all nations, the

sad fact is that today, two decades later, 100 million people in nine European nations are not free.

In Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, these 100 million people live under Moscow-imposed Communist totalitarian regimes, robbed of the right of self-determination.

During this same 20-year period, numerous peoples of Africa and Asia have achieved nationhood, with full freedom of self-determination, and are now represented in the world council, the United Nations. Yet, the millions of formerly free people in the nine captive nations, many of whom still recall living in freedom, live under more oppressive regimes than did many of the African and Asian peoples now enjoying statehood.

It is especially significant that we pause to note the plight of those living under communism in the captive nations at this time, designated by President Johnson as Captive Nations Week. Communist regimes are today seeking by infiltration, subversion, and so-called wars of liberation to force their oppressive system upon still other nations. Yet they shrilly denounce the United States for alleged interference into the affairs of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

While their denunciations din in our ears, it is well to remember that the captive European nations remain under alien rule, and despite some slight improvements of late, are still denied the enjoyment of fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, it seems altogether fitting that, during Captive Nations Week, the United States rededicate itself to standing firm against any further inroads by communism on the people of the free world, and offer to the enslaved peoples of those captive nations renewed assurance that we are working unceasingly for a world based on freedom, justice, and peace for all people everywhere.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week we solemnly observe Captive Nations Week, an annual occasion authorized by Congress in July 1959. This is a time for sober reflection and a rededication to purpose. It is a time when we must renew our pledge to keep alive the ideals of freedom, democracy, and independence which still exist among those valiant people cut off from freedom by the totalitarian Iron Curtain.

Throughout their history, the countries of eastern Europe have suffered under the domination of foreign despots. For centuries, many of them have been partitioned time and time again by foreign authoritarian powers without regard to the feelings and wishes of the

people. Following the First World War, these nations finally gained the long-denied right of independent statehood and sovereignty. Yet, only a short time later, they were dealt a cruel blow by having their freedom and independence usurped by the cancerous growth of world communism. The Soviet Union, by the force of arms as well as by conspiracy and subversion, imposed its will on these proud peoples.

Although these nations have been subjugated physically, we cannot but look with respect at their stoic determination to once again regain their freedom. Again and again they have rebelled against tyranny. The world has witnessed the courage and faith which these peoples have shown in the face of Soviet totalitarianism. Although their rebellions—in Poznan, in Budapest, in East Berlin and elsewhere—have been brutally crushed by superior force, they continue to demonstrate their persevering belief in freedom and national unity. Regardless of how hard Moscow has tried to dominate these peoples and to make them helpless pawns in their design, the free spirit of these nations could not be subdued permanently with armed force.

We have viewed with great alarm the steady growth of communism not only in Eastern Europe but in Africa, Asia, and Latin America as well. Mainland China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba have fallen while other nations are increasingly threatened.

Mr. Speaker, not only during this special week but throughout the entire year we must keep the fire of freedom burning in the minds and spirits of the peoples of the captive nations of the world. We must let them know that they have our full moral support, that we shall resist further Communist aggression and at the same time help them to achieve their most cherished goals: freedom and independence.

I feel, however, that force must be given to this moral support and that definite action be taken to make known—clearly and fully—our desire to promote the return of the peoples of Eastern Europe and all other captive nations, to the state whereby they can freely determine their own social, political, and economic institutions. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution—House Resolution 484—which calls upon Congress to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I know how long and hard my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], had worked to make this committee a reality. It is with great pleasure that I join him and others in this great effort.

Among other tasks, this committee would study means by which the United States can assist the captive nations by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedom.

I believe that by this action, the peoples of the captive nations, as well as those of the free world, will fully comprehend our determination to aid all peoples living under fear and oppression.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—
PART CXXXII

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the effort to revitalize Paterson, N.J., and the lesson that effort contains for New York. It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, 1965.

The article follows:

HOW BUSINESSMEN REVITALIZED PATERSON—A
LESSON FOR NEW YORK CITY?

(By Barrett McGurn)

Paterson is the kind of place where a bar is likely to cover one-quarter of its front with the blunt, brash legend "68° cool inside."

New Jersey's third largest city, it has known family-run "cockroach" textile manufacturing shops, labor, and race riots, two-family frame houses occupied by nine families, boarding houses creeping into the best residential districts and—recently—a 6-percent decline in retail sales.

The latter helped trigger a businessman's revolt which promises to save this community as the hub of northern New Jersey commerce, a rebellion which illustrates what New York City's own businessman Committee of 14—now in formation—may be able to accomplish for a far larger New York City in crisis.

The Paterson fall-off in shop sales occurred between 1958 and 1964. Vast shopping centers had sprung up along the highways on the outskirts. People could park out there. Paint-peeled, skidding Paterson began to slip more rapidly. The English castle which Catholina Lambert had built in 1891 atop Garret Mountain as a monument to his own Paterson silk fortune looked no longer upon a city of bustling hope. Itself now a museum, it seemed as if it were doomed to ponder a town of what once had been.

A DEMOCRATIC BROOM

Then the turn came. One-party (Republican) control of city hall was upset. A Democratic new broom, wielded by young Francis Xavier Graves, Jr., a businessman, began sweeping clean, but everything, at first, was on a scattered project-by-project basis. The State's largest high school went up. Several high rises for the old were planned and, gradually, constructed. A \$13 million series of residential towers were built with the help of two-thirds Federal financing. Victor Gruen and associates were hired for \$35,000 to redesign the blighted 1-square-mile heart area of Paterson.

It was good, up to a point. But the downtown 77 acres were merely part of the Gruen-studied area. Would it get first priority as the money-generating heart of the city? Some young downtown businessmen were by no means sure of that. They raised an extra \$20,000 for the Gruen peoples, and told them to use it just for study of the 77 acres. Whatever came out of it would be a free gift to the city as an amplification of the overall plan, they said.

That did it. The ingenious businessman-conceived tall soon wagged the dog. The city and the Federal Government agreed to take the 77 acres first as a \$35 million three-quarter Federal urban renewal project in the core of downtown Paterson.

The businessmen called themselves PLAN (Paterson Looks Ahead Now). The mayor chose to join rather than fight them. He appointed eight of the PLAN group as his special citizens committee to get the \$35 million project going. For the past year the eight have been hard put to it, running their own private store, manufacturing and banking businesses, while doing the city's work at the same time. They have had dramatic results.

One job was to convince the Federal Government to give an initial \$18 million without a matching \$6 million from Paterson. The city's bonding power was nil. Ingenious book juggling convinced Federal examiners that other do-good projects which Paterson has been managing over the years could be considered a \$6 million counterpart.

WHICH TO ADMIT

Next it was necessary to get the owners of 15 percent of the 77-acre area to agree to demolition. By plot-switching, that was accomplished.

After that there was the problem of determining which companies and factories to admit to the refurbished central area and to an adjacent industrial park at Bunker Hill. The PLANers figured they would be over their heads handling that. They asked the Ford Foundation for a grant for the hiring of professional city planners, and the foundation gave up with the equivalent. It put the Paterson businessmen on to ACTION, an urban renewal study group, which has just received a Ford Foundation \$500,000 allotment for the handling of just such crises. ACTION went to work in Paterson this week and the first of the new wave of businesses will begin getting land assignments August 1.

"Probably the most dramatic moment in the story was when Mayor Graves agreed to let ACTION move in to assign the redevelopment plots," Charles Jacobs, one of the PLANers, says.

"That was the test," he said. "The mayor showed that he was breaking with the old ways, that the project would not be turned over to politicians, that it would be kept in the hands of experts."

Mr. Jacobs, a young dry goods store operator, former Columbia Graduate School of Journalism student, is vice president of the businessmen's Committee of Eight.

With ACTION now getting to work assigning plots at the Bunker Hill industrial park and elsewhere, the Paterson reform is entering the stage of accomplishment. But even now the gradually mounting efforts of businessmen and a reform mayor have begun to show effects. On July 1 the new transcontinental highway 80 will open the section linking Paterson with the George Washington Bridge. It was thanks in large part to an older Paterson business group, known as Forward Paterson, that the 90-percent Federal-financed highway has curved within 5 blocks of the heart of Paterson. Eighty-seven percent of the thoroughfare's traffic along this section is expected to start or stop in this city.

WANTED: A HIGHWAY

Essentially the Gruen 77-acre plan is to refurbish the sick downtown area, providing garages for parking and, possibly, eventually shutting some streets off as pedestrian malls. What was needed as a topper, the businessmen felt, was a 50-mile-an-hour, 2½-mile peripheral highway linking four main arteries which parallel one another in the Paterson area. It would be an extension of New Jersey Route 20 and would run through all or part of 60 small riverbank factories. Estimated cost was \$35 million. Earnest talk with the factory operators shifted the planned road slightly this way and that and finally produced an agreement. The first leg will be constructed 6 months from now. The State and Federal Governments are each paying half.

Paterson was a place where nobody invested any more. It was hard to realize that Alexander Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury in 1791 had picked out this area of Passaic River waterfalls as the site for one of America's first alphabet do-good operations (the SUM, Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures). Textiles and silk had come and gone. There was a question about how long the present small plants and the 20-percent Negro and Puerto Rican population would be able to carry on. Police and fire costs were up. Assessed valuations were down. Even now joblessness is still 5.4 percent.

But the tide seems turned. Charles Jacobs has followed his own good civic example and, wearing his private hat, has invested in an escalator in his dry goods store, first of its kind in Paterson. Martin Sukenick, 48, treasurer of PLAN, and a member of the eight-man citizens group, has helped put an 8,500-foot extension on the bank of which he is vice president. Others are doing the same all around town. And new laws will catch the laggards. Paterson has proved that a crisis city which wishes to do so can help itself.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART
CXXXIII

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the proposed civilian police review board and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis." It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 24, 1965.

The article follows:

POVERTY OFFICIAL'S REQUEST: PUT MINORITIES
ON POLICE REVIEW BOARD

The head of Mayor Wagner's council against poverty favors a civilian board which would include at least one Negro and one Puerto Rican to hear allegations of police brutality in the city.

Dr. Arthur Courtney Logan, former chairman of HAR-YOU-ACT, said yesterday on the "Page One" show telecast by WABC-TV that any review board "independent of the control of the police department is basically sound." He did not endorse specifically the plan advanced by Representative JOHN LINDSAY last week nor any other of several different proposals.

He told reporters later, however, that something must be done to improve the picture of the police in the minds of most of the Negro and Puerto Rican population. A review board completely divorced from politics or any direct connection with city agencies would go far toward accomplishment of this end, he said.

He agreed that such a body would have to be appointed by the mayor but suggested that any possible "taint" would be removed by the naming of such men as A. Phillip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Logan said also that there is "not enough representation of the poor" on the Council Against Poverty as constituted in the mayor's executive order issued today. He said that he has urged more membership from the "target population" and was confident that the number will increase as time goes on.

He said that he was "firmly convinced" of the city administration's desire that all elements concerned should have a say in the antipoverty program.

Dr. Logan was reminded of widespread criticism of the fact that some 40 percent of all money available for the war against poverty is going for salaries.

He defended this on the ground that most of it is to be paid to "block workers" recruited from among the poor people for whose benefit the program was devised. He pointed out that most of these workers are nonprofessionals. Their own economic status is improved because they are working regularly. At the same time, they are exactly the ones to arouse their neighbors from apathy and convince them that their lot is not hopeless after all.

THE HONORABLE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LOVE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay special tribute to the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert who, as Secretary of the Air Force for the past 4½ years, has helped lead our country many steps forward in this age of space.

I know of no man more diligent in his work. He has served longer as Secretary of the Air Force than any other man in history. Since 1961, he has pushed forward a strategic and tactical revolution in our offensive area. There has been a great improvement in missile accuracy as well as a hardening of missiles. Bombers have become more effective due to better disbursement and more flexibility. Our airlift capacity has increased 200 percent since 1961. All this has been accomplished under his leadership.

Secretary Zuckert is best known as a manager. He set up the Designated Systems Management Group in the Air Force which has for its prime objective to spot problems before they develop. Through his management, there has been a great reduction in Air Force expenditures and a greater degree of teamwork with the other services.

For this dedication and leadership, I would like to extend my personal thanks to this outstanding public servant.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the New York Times of July 18, 1965 entitled, "Better Day for the Migrant," which calls attention to a matter in which I am

deeply interested; that is, the welfare of the migratory American farm laborer.

The article follows:

BETTER DAY FOR THE MIGRANT

More than a half-year has passed since Congress cut off the mass inflow of foreign labor willing to work at starvation wages to harvest American crops. Despite continued expressions of anguish from many large farmowners, the transition to total reliance on domestic workers has been encouraging. Only 1,500 foreign workers are now engaged in offsetting local labor shortages on American farms, compared with more than 54,000 at the same time last year.

A sterner test may come in September and October; but thus far the evidence is strong that the Nation's food needs can be well met without reopening the flood gates for low-cost labor from Mexico, the West Indies and other areas. Secretary of Labor Wirtz deserves credit for his refusal, under incessant political pressure, to yield to the warnings of disaster with which California growers bombarded him. He stood courageously on the principle that enough domestic labor would be found if wages and living conditions for fieldworkers were brought up to a level of decency.

The interesting fact is not only that he has been proved right on this score but also that fruit and vegetable prices have not skyrocketed as a result of the bettered labor standards. A Labor Department survey over the past 9 weeks indicates that most farm products have been selling in the wholesale market at prices below those of 1964. The spread between what the housewife pays and what it costs to pick most fruits and vegetables is so great that even a doubling of farm wages would have only a slight direct impact on market-basket prices.

The need now is to extend to migratory American farm laborers some of the protections that are basic for virtually all other American workers. Mr. Wirtz has told a Senate subcommittee of his strong personal support for the inclusion of farmworkers under both the Federal minimum wage and the statutory guarantees of freedom to bargain collectively. But he emphasized that there was no official administration position in favor of either of these highly salutary objectives. There ought to be.

A nation dedicated to abolishing poverty cannot continue to neglect the most elementary rights of the most deprived group in its work force.

Mr. Speaker, those who for 15 years have exploited the bracero program under which millions of migratory workers were imported from abroad, still have not given up their fight, although Congress has ruled decisively that the practice must terminate. Corporate agricultural interests cite section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to justify their designs. It is true that this section presents the appearance of a loophole in the legislation, although the intent of Congress is clear. To end this equivocation, I have introduced H.R. 8313, which states:

Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the importation of any alien as a nonimmigrant * * * for the purpose of employing the alien in the production of agricultural commodities and products.

I urge the support of my amendment. Unless my amendment is passed, I fear the agricultural interests which seek to exploit foreign labor will not be stilled. Until such exploitation is ended, once and for all, it will be difficult to get on

with plans to improve the wages and working conditions of American migratory farmworkers, which is the real objective of Congress.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the entire world, no less than the United States, has lost a great champion in the death of Adlai E. Stevenson.

Adlai Stevenson was the finest embodiment of the American sense of responsibility toward all peoples. He never faltered in the quest for peace. His warm, humanitarian spirit was ever seeking answers to the problems of disease, poverty, illiteracy, and hunger. His long and distinguished career was devoted in the first instance to the citizens of the United States, but Adlai Stevenson never forgot for a moment that Americans are part of a world community. In his service as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, he won the unparalleled confidence of friend, neutral and foe. Adlai Stevenson, by the force of circumstances, was deprived of giving his fullest capacities to this Nation, but of how many can it truly be said, as it can be of him, that the world is better for his having lived among us?

Adlai Stevenson had qualities of character that the finest eulogist is inadequate to describe. He had intellect and judgment, eloquence and style, kindness and grace. In death he will be missed by us all. I convey my deep sympathy to his family, while noting that he is sincerely mourned everywhere.

TEXANA: ED CLARK DONATES SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY VALUABLE COLLECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Edward Clark, Austin, Tex., Ambassador Designate to Australia, is an eminent lawyer and scholar and civic leader. In addition, he is a great book collector, particularly on subjects pertaining to the Southwest.

Recently, Mr. Clark donated his valuable Texana collection of some 2,400 volumes to Southwestern University in Georgetown, Tex., his original alma mater for whom he has done so much over the years. Southwestern University is one of the great Methodist universities in our State.

Recently, a story about this collection of Texana appeared in the Austin American as follows:

[From the Austin American, July 15, 1965]
TEXANA: ED CLARK GIVING SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY VALUABLE COLLECTION

Edward Clark, the newly appointed U.S. Ambassador to Australia, will give his valuable collection of Texana, more than 2,400 volumes, to Southwestern University in Georgetown.

Clark announced the permanent home of the collection Wednesday through Dr. H. Bailey Carroll, University of Texas history professor and the outstanding authority on books about Texas. Dr. Carroll has advised Clark in the finding and purchase of the volumes.

The Clark collection is one of the two greatest such collections in private hands. The other belongs to Cooper K. Ragan of Houston.

It was about a dozen years ago while Clark's daughter Lella was studying Texas history at UT that Clark became seriously interested in collecting Texana.

Southwestern was chosen by Clark because of his strong emotional ties with the university, extending back to the days when he was an undergraduate there.

The collection will be housed in a room in the new library addition under construction.

Weighing heavily in Clark's decision is Southwestern's strong Texas history studies program.

"The history department at the university in Georgetown is an excellent department, and we are certain both students and faculty will make creative use of these books," said Dr. Carroll.

The Clark home is absolutely full of books, with some volumes resting on the stairways, and a special section of the law offices of Clark, Thomas, Harris, Dennis & Winters in the Capital National Bank Building is devoted to Texas books.

"There isn't a stray in the collection," Dr. Carroll said. "It is absolutely pure—contains nothing but Texana, and each volume was carefully selected."

While no careful appraisal has been made of the value of the books, Dr. Carroll estimates—and he emphasizes that this is a conservative estimate—that the collection is worth more than \$50,000.

The Clark Texana collection may weigh a bit heavier in biography than in other fields. It includes a virtually complete gathering of the biographies of the President of the Republic of Texas and Governors.

It also includes the good biographies of other outstanding Texans.

The Ambassador has also been interested in acquiring materials about early peace officers and badmen.

"There is a nice amount of county history," pointed out Dr. Carroll, who added that east Texas, Clark's home country, is more heavily represented. While the serious collection of books by Clark is a recent hobby, his interest in history runs back to his boyhood in San Augustine.

Among the rarest and most expensive items are a group of immigrant guides put out in the various European languages during the peak of the great era of immigration to Texas—during the days of the Swante Palms.

Not only does Clark follow the New York book auctions and the rare book catalogs to pick up missing pieces of Texana, he reads the books.

"He's as interested in reading a book at home as he is in reading a brief at the office," Dr. Carroll said.

Since the Australian appointment came up, Clark has become interested in Australian history and especially in Australia's "Out back"—the Australian frontier, which re-

minds Clark of his own Texas and American West frontier.

The giving of the collection to Southwestern doesn't end Clark's interest in Texana. He has promised Southwestern that he will continue to add to the collection the rest of his life.

"Book collecting is like a drug," Dr. Carroll summed up. "There's no cure."

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many of us believe that the United Nations has a constructive role to play in Vietnam.

But before it can play such a role there, or anywhere, it must be put back on its feet. The present deadlock over assessments for past peacekeeping operations which has paralyzed the United Nations must be resolved. This in turn will require that Congress act as soon as possible to amend the concurrent resolution adopted last August which requires the U.S. representative at the United Nations to seek a showdown.

In an article in the current issue of *Commonweal* magazine, I attempt to set forth why Congress should modify its position on the application of article 19 and seek to create a United Nations presence in Vietnam. The text of the article follows:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Despite the natural tendency to back the Government's policy in times of foreign difficulty, many Americans are troubled about our role in Vietnam. True, few want to pull out and leave the 16 million South Vietnamese to Communist rule by force and terror. Rather, it is the manner in which the United States has engaged itself in Vietnam that produces the uneasiness.

The United States has acted unilaterally. It is a western, and largely white nation, virtually going it alone in southeast Asia in a war which is not manifestly, or wholly, a war against foreign aggression. The United States has placed itself in a position much too reminiscent of the French in their ill-considered effort to recolonize Indo-China after World War II.

Communist China is not directly involved in the conflict, and North Vietnam does its best to disguise and deny its involvement. On the other hand, the growing U.S. participation in what many Asians and others regard as primarily a Vietnamese civil war tends to excite fears of American imperialism and to corroborate China's claim to be the champion of national liberation in Asia.

American leaders have continually pledged devotion to the United Nations as mankind's best hope of preserving peace. Yet we have signally failed to prove this devotion in southeast Asia.

In bypassing the United Nations, we are not only depriving ourselves of an opportunity to strengthen the moral, political, and military basis of our effort to preserve freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese. We are also exhibiting disrespect for the United Nations and are violating the letter as well as the spirit of its charter, thereby undermining the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations.

The primary purpose of the United Nations, as set forth in article I of the charter, is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the preservation and removal of threats to the peace * * *." By ignoring the United Nations in our Vietnam policy, we frustrate this purpose.

More specifically, article 37 of the charter provides that the parties to any dispute which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security "shall refer it to the Security Council" if they fail to settle it by negotiation or other peaceful means. And if a veto blocks action by the Security Council, the General Assembly is empowered to take charge and make recommendations under the "uniting for peace" resolution.

The United Nations has acted honorably and effectively to help restore peace in other international conflicts, notably in Korea, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus.

There are obvious difficulties and limitations for the United Nations in any conflict involving great powers. But great powers are no more exempt from the charter than small nations. In the Korean invasion, the United Nations acted against North Korea, the agent of the Soviet Union. In the Middle East, the world organization embarked on peace-restoring efforts over the opposition of two permanent members of the Security Council, the United Kingdom and France.

But prior to President Johnson's speech at San Francisco on June 25, spokesmen for the administration consistently deprecated all suggestions that the United Nations should play a major peace-restoring role in southeast Asia. They advanced three main arguments against a United Nations presence.

First, it was said that the U.N. could not play a useful role unless North Vietnam and Communist China agreed. This they obviously were not doing. North Vietnam's denial of the Security Council's competence to consider the Tonkin Gulf incidents last summer, and Peiping radio's condemnation of U.N. meddling were cited as evidence that the two Communist nations would not agree to a U.N. presence.

But the point is that their agreement is unnecessary. The idea that the criminal must assent to being restrained and hauled before the bar is as absurd in international peacekeeping as it would be in domestic law-enforcement. The United Nations did not seek the agreement of the North Korean aggressors before it acted in 1950. The existence or lack of North Vietnamese and Chinese acceptance of a U.N. role affects the manner in which the U.N. can operate, but it surely does not prevent it from operating.

It is equally irrelevant that neither North Vietnam nor Communist China is a member of the U.N. Article 2 of the Charter provides that "The Organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

A second argument against bringing the Vietnamese conflict before the United Nations is that to do so might force the Soviet Union into a vigorous defense of North Vietnam and China. Not only might this prevent a possibly useful Soviet role as a behind-the-scenes negotiator in southeast Asia; worse, it might harden up the entire post-Stalin softer Soviet line.

In truth, the Soviet Union has been subjected to very conflicting pressures over Southeast Asia. On the one hand, it has no desire to become involved in the risk of a mutually disastrous nuclear exchange with the United States over South Vietnam. On the other hand, it must publicly take an anti-U.S. position or court further erosion of its leadership position in the Communist

world. Most likely, invoking the United Nations in Vietnam would have little effect on the Soviet Union's position. She would continue to fulminate publicly against the United States. But it is by no means clear that she would vote or act against a U.S. position which was genuinely restricted to preventing the subjugation of South Vietnam by force.

A third argument is that if the Vietnam issue were brought before the U.N., U.S. policy would come in for sweeping and damaging criticism. Too many nations, it is said, regard the Vietnam conflict not as aggression but as a conflict among two segments of the Vietnamese people.

The existence of such sentiments among the countries of the free world is, in fact, an argument for taking the Vietnam conflict before the United Nations. The United States should not and need not fear debate or the exposure of the facts. By ignoring the U.N. and avoiding debate, we allow suspicions and doubts about our policies and motives to grow. By going before the U.N., we can make our point that what is at stake is the independence of small nations.

The General Assembly should respond to such an appeal. As Dag Hammarskjöld observed, it is not primarily the great powers who have need of the United Nations' capacity to protect national security. They can take care of themselves. It is the small and weak that benefit most. And these nations, I think, if squarely presented with the question, will be unwilling to see the United Nations stand by idly while a small Asian nation is undermined and engulfed.

If the United Nations takes jurisdiction over the threat to world peace which exists in southeast Asia, as the letter of the charter provides, the United States will be better off no matter what the result. We will be better off because we will have shown that our words of devotion to the U.N. are meaningful.

In short, if the United States will adopt in the U.N. a substantive position which stresses that our opposition is to violent change of Government in South Vietnam (not to peaceable change brought about by U.N.-supervised free elections there), and if we present our case plainly and well, we stand to gain from U.N. debate much more than we stand to lose.

For the past year and more, a number of voices in Congress and in the country have been urging that the United Nations be brought into the Vietnam conflict. Senators CHURCH, of Idaho, MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, have spoken up in the Senate. I have taken a similar position in the House. Thoughtful students of international affairs such as Benjamin Cohen, former counselor of the State Department and member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. have sounded the call for a U.N. presence in Vietnam. Last month the Democratic Party of Wisconsin in its annual convention at Green Bay unanimously adopted a plank urging that "the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development."

Happily, President Johnson appears to have rejected the keep-the-U.N.-out school of thought in his speech commemorating the 20th anniversary of the United Nations on June 25 at San Francisco:

"I put to this world assembly the facts of aggression, the right of a people to be free from attack, the interest of every member in safety against molestation, the duty of this organization to reduce the dangers to peace, and the unhesitating readiness of the United States to find a peaceful solution.

"I call upon this gathering of the nations of the world to use their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the tables those who seem determined to make war. We

will support your efforts, as we will support effective action by any agent or agency of these United Nations."

Those are fine words and a great step forward. But the speech was significant also for what the President did not say.

Two other things must be said, sooner or later: how the paralysis of the United Nations over the financial question can be resolved so that the U.N. can again act for world peace when it is called upon, and how the Vietnamese conflict is to be brought before the world organization.

The real barrier to United Nations action in southeast Asia at this time is the financial question which has turned the General Assembly into a mere debating society, incapable of action and one step ahead of bankruptcy.

The Soviet Union has refused to pay its assessments for the United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. France has refused to pay anything for the Congo operation, although it supported the Middle East force, even making voluntary contributions.

The Soviet contention is that the assessments are illegal since both operations were authorized by the General Assembly and, in their view, this power is reserved to the Security Council under the charter. The French argue that the General Assembly resolutions on financing are merely recommendatory.

An opinion of the International Court of Justice, which held that the assessments for the two peace-keeping operations were "expenses of the organization" and therefore obligatory, has failed to shake the French and Soviet positions.

By the opening of the 19th General Assembly last December, both France and the Soviet Union owed more than 2 years' assessments and, under article 19, were subject to the loss of their votes in the General Assembly.

The United States was ready to invoke article 19. Congress, with administration encouragement, had passed a concurrent resolution in August 1964, calling on the permanent U.S. delegate to the U.N. to "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19."

Russia threatened to withdraw if deprived of its vote, and there was a good chance that France would do likewise, thus raising the specter of the United Nations going the way of the League of Nations.

The result, during the 19th General Assembly, was paralysis. A clear majority of nations was determined to avoid at all costs a vote that threatened to result in a disastrous showdown. They were afraid either to apply article 19 or not to apply it, afraid of ousting Russia or of grievously offending the United States. So the world organization, set up to be an effective instrument to preserve the peace, dragged along in tragedy.

To make an unavoidable decision between two contenders for a seat on the Security Council, the president of the Assembly held "consultations" in his office. "We go into the back room and vote and then say we have not voted," one delegate remarked. But this discreditable device would not work for the long agenda of items from a troubled world before the Assembly.

A special peace-keeping committee set up to solve the problem before the convening of the 20th General Assembly in September has done no better than the Assembly itself in breaking the impasse. A June 15 deadline for some resolution came and went.

By now it should be clear that the United Nations cannot gain by a confrontation that will result either in our defeat or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization.

The United States should take the initiative in revitalizing the United Nations, based

on the reality that as of today the major sovereign states simply will not be compelled to pay for peace-keeping operations which they consider harmful to their best interests. The United States should support the proposition that future peace-keeping operations be financed by voluntary contributions. In fact, only the Congo and Middle East operations have been financed by the involuntary assessments that are at the center of the current controversy. More than a dozen U.N. peace-keeping operations, including those in Korea and Cyprus, have been financed by other means. As for the past, the United States, while remaining zealous to invoke article 19 against countries in arrears on their regular U.N. dues, should not press article 19 on the Middle East and Congo special assessments.

If the 20th General Assembly is to be saved from the debilitating fate of its predecessor, the United States must act in the few weeks remaining before the Assembly convenes and Congress adjourns. Congress has to clear the way by passing a new resolution modifying Congress' injunction of last August to seek the application of article 19. A new resolution, such as I introduced in April, should provide merely that the United States continue efforts to obtain the payment of arrears by negotiation, with the hope that some scheme of voluntary contributions will prove acceptable once the attempt to require payment is abandoned.

With the United Nations revived, the way will be open for the Vietnam conflict to be brought before it. President Johnson has already declared our willingness to support any U.N. action. There remains the question of who will initiate the consideration of such action.

I would hope that one of the small powers which have the most to gain from the strengthening of U.N. security operations—an Ireland, Austria, Israel, or Costa Rica—would take the lead. If not, I believe the United States itself must raise the matter before the U.N. A U.N. peacekeeping operation authorized by the General Assembly can be supported by the voluntary contributions of willing members, according to the Korean precedent.

The precise form of the U.N. operation will depend upon the circumstances at the time and the response of the North Vietnamese and their Chinese backers. Action by the United Nations calling for a cease-fire and negotiations, either at a reconvened Geneva conference or in a new setting, is a first step. The United States must assert its willingness to abide by a properly supervised cease-fire. If the Communists refuse such a cease-fire, a U.N. peacekeeping force should be stationed both on South Vietnam's borders to prevent further infiltration of men and arms from the North, and within South Vietnam itself. Undoubtedly, the United States would have to supply the lion's share of the troops and money for the operation, as in Korea. But we would still benefit, since our costs would be less than if we continue to act virtually unilaterally, and since the force would be operating under the moral umbrella of the United Nations.

As pacification of South Vietnam progressed, the United Nations would be in a far better position than the United States to assist in the development of the country without any stigma of colonialism and to supervise an eventual plebiscite in which the people of South Vietnam could freely choose their own form of government. For our part, we would have to announce our readiness to abide by that result even if it might mean the submergence of South Vietnam into North Vietnam.

Bringing the United Nations into Vietnam is not a cure-all or an easy solution. As the mainstay of a U.N. operation, the United States will continue to be confronted with hard tasks in Vietnam. But invoking the

U.N. would strengthen our military, moral, and political posture in southeast Asia and help build the peacekeeping precedents of the U.N.

There is much to be done after San Francisco. But the foundation is laid.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON BY RICHARD N. GOODWIN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, these past few days many of us have voiced with heavy hearts our respect and our affection for Adlai E. Stevenson.

A moving tribute to Governor Stevenson and analysis of his role in American life, written by Richard N. Goodwin, Special Assistant to President Johnson, appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1965. Mr. Goodwin is himself a splendid example of the generation of young Americans who were inspired by Governor Stevenson to go into public service.

The text of Mr. Goodwin's article follows:

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."

—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self-doubt? It is for every man except the very danger-

ous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck; poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitions and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent, and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him because they did not know him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters; which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met nor running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him nor had I read the carefully crafted

texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and "vaulting ambition" but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of post-war America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near-tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialog of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Ill., in that hopeful dawn year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most far-sighted policies molder and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More

than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You did not need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them and he would deride this writing with soft self-deprecation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike; and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and vallant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

"Let four captains

Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
For he was likely, had he been put on,
To have prov'd most royally. . . ."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TEACHER BILL MESSAGE OF JULY 17, 1965, GIVES BOOST TO TEACHER FELLOWSHIP AND TEACHER CORPS BILLS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased indeed to have been present at the White House last Saturday, July 17, 1965, to hear President Johnson make his eloquent statement urging Congress to enact into law during this session legislation to improve the quality of the elementary and secondary school teachers of our country.

It was of course gratifying to hear the President speak of the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] and my own efforts in drafting and sponsoring legislation to authorize both a teacher fellowship program and a national teacher corps.

Mr. PERKINS has introduced both a teacher fellowship bill (H.R. 7309) and a teacher corps bill (H.R. 9833), and I have introduced a teacher fellowship bill (H.R. 9627). Our General Education Subcommittee has for the last several days been conducting hearings on both these proposals. We have been most encouraged by the strong support which has been evidenced for these measures from many groups and from outstanding educators.

President Johnson's proposed Teaching Professions Act of 1965 contains three major provisions, two of which, the teacher fellowship and teacher corps programs, are directly based on the bills we have been considering in our subcommittee and which, in the Senate, are now under consideration by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee as proposed titles to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The principal sponsor of the teacher fellowship bill in the other body is the distinguished Senior Senator from Oregon, Senator WAYNE MORSE, while the chief advocates of the national teacher corps bill are the distinguished junior Senators from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, and Wisconsin, Senator NELSON. Indeed, Senator NELSON testified last week on these measures before our General Education Subcommittee.

In order to enable the General Education Subcommittee to continue its consideration of the teacher fellowship and teacher corps proposals on which we have been working, Congressman PERKINS has today introduced the administration version of these measures.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that our subcommittee will be able to blend the best in the President's proposals with the best

in ours to develop a bill that will help produce the best possible schoolteachers for America's children.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of President Johnson's White House statement of July 17, 1965. Let me do so with the observation that the President's sense of urgency about the congressional action on this legislation during this session of Congress was demonstrated by his interpolating, with great emphasis, the words, "now—now," toward the end of his prepared remarks so that, as delivered, they read:

I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning now—now, even though it is well along in its present session.

The statement by President Johnson, July 17, 1965, follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Like many of my fellow Americans, I believe that this land's most noble enterprise is the work of education; that, in our Nation's classrooms, our future is being built. And I believe that the chief architects of that future are the teachers of America.

Today I have completed work upon a legislative proposal which is a testament to those beliefs: the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is now on its way to the Congress.

Today in the United States there are 1,800,000 teachers in elementary and secondary schools. By this fall we will need 193,000 new teachers merely to accommodate growing enrollments and to replace teachers who retire and leave the profession. We will need nearly 2 million new teachers in the next 10 years.

Yet our needs cannot be expressed in numbers. Tomorrow's teachers must not merely be plentiful enough; they must be good enough. They must possess not only the old virtues of energy and dedication, but new knowledge and new skill. And if we are to have the best available teachers, we must attract to teaching the best available students.

Today almost 5 percent of our teachers—85,000—lack adequate certification. Almost 10 percent have less than a bachelor's degree; only 25 percent have a master's degree.

Our Nation, whose needs are so immense and whose wealth is so great, can do better. We must do better. And this act offers a way to begin.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 will establish, first, a National Teacher Corps. Members of the Corps—experienced teachers and students who plan to make teaching a career—would go together to the city slums and to rural areas of poverty to offer what these troubled regions need most: light and learning; help—and hope.

Second, the act will create a program of fellowships to prepare superior students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary schools and to help teachers renew their knowledge and skills. The Federal Government already assists men and women making their careers in college teaching. Now is the time to do the same for those who serve at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Finally, this act will provide direct assistance to institutions of higher learning so that they may develop better programs for teacher education.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a National Teacher Corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE, and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN

BRADEMAS for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINX for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning even though it is well along in its present session. The problems confronting us in education do not diminish with the passage of time; neither should our zeal for solving those problems. This act may be just a beginning; but now is the time to begin.

Henry Adams said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." This act, I believe, will have an eternal influence on this Nation.

A FORMIDABLE FORCE FOR WORLD PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, each year, in accordance with Public Law 90 of the 86th Congress, Captive Nations Week is observed. This is the week each year during which we in this Nation seek to give appropriate recognition to those formerly free nations which now bear the heavy yoke of Soviet imperialism. We also recognize, as Professor Dobriansky has pointed out:

Over two dozen captive nations with a population close to a billion people represent a powerful deterrent against overt Soviet Russian and Red Chinese aggression and thus a formidable force for world peace with freedom and justice.

For 25 years the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have not only been denied the basic rights of self-determination, but have been subjugated under the tyranny of the Soviet Government.

The House of Representatives took note of this on June 21 when it adopted without a single dissenting vote House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was sponsored by 70 Members and which was similar to legislation which I have introduced. This resolution was a powerful statement in behalf of freedom of the people of the Baltic States, and was the product of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. These hearings were a part of the series of hearings held by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee over a period of several years, and attests to the deep interest of the Congress in the plight of these subjugated people. This resolution stated that:

All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States.

The resolution noted that it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for

self-determination and national independence, and that there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people.

Finally, the resolution urged the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of these captive nations in order to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of their basic rights to the Baltic peoples.

It was pointed out during the House debate on the resolution that under the Soviet Constitution the captive people dominated by the U.S.S.R. should have their heritage and rights protected, and that the Soviet Constitution contains a provision that people can leave the U.S.S.R. in case they wish to depart from that governmental structure. This provision has never been used even though it exists. If, finally, during this year, and as a result of the adoption of this resolution by the Congress, the peoples of the captive nations exercise this right to leave the U.S.S.R., the Constitution of the Soviet Union would meet its supreme test. Perhaps this year will see the forces set in motion which will liberate these peoples, if so, it will be a year to be celebrated in the annals of mankind.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BINGHAM, for Monday, July 19, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

Messrs. ROOSEVELT and PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of attendance at the Stevenson funeral.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the rest of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. RONCALIO (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) for Monday, July 19 through July 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and include certain material.

Mr. MILLER, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, July 22.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 20 minutes, on July 20.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARSTEIN (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 15 minutes, on July 20.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana), for 30 minutes, on July 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. ROBINSON.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LONG, of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. JONES of Missouri.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. McCORMACK.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 225. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; and

H.R. 5242. An act to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2080. An act to provide for the coinage of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 16, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4526. An act to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1970;

H.R. 5041. An act to provide for safety regulation of common carriers by pipelines under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1343. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for consideration a draft of proposed legislation to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

1344. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim survey of Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 19, 1963 and June 19, 1963 (H. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1345. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a violation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1346. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from and within the United States and between overseas areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1347. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government, as of the end of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1348. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of proposed disposition of nickel now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act approved September 15, 1964; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1350. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank under our short-term export credit insurance pro-

gram for the month of June 1965, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1352. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1353. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to strengthen regulatory practices and study certain trading activities relating to commodity future markets, Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1354. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary interest costs incurred by advancing funds to U.S. air carriers for transporting mail of foreign countries, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1355. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of disposal of good serviceable furniture due to inadequate management action, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1356. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of activities as of June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 1309 of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1357. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report of the court's opinion and findings in the case of *Bernhard F. Elmers v. The United States*, congressional No. 1-61, pursuant to House Resolution 112, 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1358. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the valor of American youth, pursuant to the act of August 3, 1950, Stat. 397-398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of grants made during calendar year 1964 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 85-934 (72 Stat. 1793; 42 U.S.C. 1891); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1360. A letter from the chairman, New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission, transmitting a report of the activities of the commission; pursuant to Public Law 86-683; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7813. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 482. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1153, a bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit em-

ployer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; without amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 483. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6845, a bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9910. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase to 60,000 miles the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9911. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 9912. A bill to establish a U.S. Capitol page system for needy and deserving students of a college, university, or other institution of higher education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 9913. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9914. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 9915. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9916. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9918. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 9919. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9920. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9921. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in order to provide a minimum payment for certain State administrative expenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9922. A bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 9923. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9924. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9928. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9929. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Res. 481. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Res. 484. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 485. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our

relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

341. By Mr. PEPPER: Senate Memorial No. 917 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States urging the preservation of the dual banking system and defeat of any measure requiring a State bank to become a member of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

342. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1182 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the President of the United States of America, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

343. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1188 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting a continuation of national policy employing private enterprise to provide goods and services for the space and defense programs which was promulgated by the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower and continued under the administration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

344. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to preserving the dual banking system of States and Federal banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

345. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to fulfilling the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

346. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the Congress to conduct an investigation of the leadership and the activities of certain civil rights groups; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 9930. A bill for the relief of Irwin Hensler, Danuta and Edward Hensler and their minor children Olgiard, and Beata Hensler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9931. A bill for the relief of Jose Cruz Orozoco-Arana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9932. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Bonduki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fabiana Hodullich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9934. A bill for the relief of Caterina Iovino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fasulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9936. A bill for the relief of Luis Palomares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9937. A bill for the relief of Nuno Medeiros Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bozenna Czarnecka and her minor daughter, Eva Czarnecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Livoti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marisa Sordelli LoMugno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Vilma Henson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Elisa Fat-torusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DERLIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill for the relief of Erman Donald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Landry Parish Police Jury, Opelousas, La., conveying deep sympathy in the loss of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON and requesting that the records show that a resolution was adopted as an expression of respect to his memory; to the Committee on House Administration.

247. Also, petition of Washington State Grange, Seattle, Wash., to enact legislation relative to a vacancy in the office of the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

248. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to oil depletion allowances for Federal income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

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

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

O Thou before whom the prayers of Thy children go up as incense from contrite souls, speak to our burdened and longing hearts as we lift our lives to Thy searching gaze.

We would test our thoughts, and deeds, and words, not against the faulty background of our fellows but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the crystal Christ.

In these hard bestead and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm, and above all cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. Sober us with a sense of personal responsibility as to what we contribute to our own age and with the realization that Thy call to every one of us is to make available for the world's good his own life, clean, strong, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

In the light of this challenge we pray for ourselves that we may not fail our own generation and Thee, that the paganism that afflicts the world may be redeemed into decency, justice, and