benefits for Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and members of the National Guard, who are injured in connection with inactive duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10460. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, with respect to the system of courts-martial for the National Guard not in Federal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10461. A bill to provide travel and transportation expenses for members of the Reserve Forces authorized medical or surgical care, hospitalization or rehospitalization at Federal expense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10462. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide an incentive plan for participation in the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10463. A bill to provide that National Guard officers appointed, designated, or detailed as U.S. property and fiscal officers shall not be counted against the authorized active duty strength of the Army or Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10464. A bill to provide medicare for dependents of reservists who die in a training status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10465. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to provide Federal support for defense forces established under section 109(c) of title 32; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10466. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the investigation by a military department of certain aircraft accidents and for the use of reports resulting from those investigations in actions for damages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10467. A bill to provide for leave of absence for members of the National Guard who are officers or employees of the United States when called or ordered to Federal or State military service in aid of civil authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10468. A bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10469. A bill to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10470. A bill to provide for the furnishing of a uniform and the presentation of a flag of the United States for deceased members of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10471. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, with respect to the remission or cancellation of indebtedness of enlisted members of the Armed Forces and the National Guard to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10472. A bill to provide for the extension of certain rights and protections contained in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 10473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 10474. A bill to amend section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 822a, to provide the General Accounting Office with authority to audit the exchange stabilization fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10475. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 10476. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10477. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 10478. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 10479. A bill to indemnify dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 10480. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission To Study Railway Post Office Service and Its Relationship to the National Transportation System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 526. A resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 118; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 10481. A bill for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10482. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora J. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10483. A bill for the relief of Kyung Sook Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10484. A bill for the relief of Stefan Bryttan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10485. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Giallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10486. A bill for the relief of Francesco Martorana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10487. A bill for the relief of Vito Barresi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10488. A bill for the relief of Manuel Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Masssachusetts:

H.R. 10489. A bill for the relief of Jose Dos Santos Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10490. A bill for the relief of Salvatore and Antonina Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10491. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Batista Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 10492. A bill for the relief of Syed Hashim Reza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10493. A bill for the relief of Anna Gambino; 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:

257. By the SPEAKER: Petition of State recreation commission, Sacramento, Calif., relative to rental charges for agencies of local government for use of certain areas of the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

258. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to incorporating the U.S. Trust Territory into the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

259. Also, petition of the city council, Boston, Mass., relative to reaffirming American principles of fair and open trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 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:

Almighty God, Thou art the true home of our souls, whence we sprang, to whom we belong, and in whose love and fellowship we may daily renew our strength.

At the beginning of another week, comfort us, we beseech Thee, with a vivid awareness of the spiritual verities by which we are surrounded and undergirded, that we may be stripped of pride and made humble and penitent.

In a world full of the clamor of the violent, the boasting of the arrogant, and the agony of tortured peoples, make us valiant for thy truth in a day when the hearts of many turn to water. As undefeated souls may we sustain the shocks of these days of social earthquake, master their handicaps, turn their threats into challenges, and at last make even the wrath of men to serve Thee.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 13, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

H.R. 206. An act to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training;

H.R. 208. An act to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training;

H.R. 2176. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6097. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9075. An act to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10139. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, relating to the telephone and telegraph services furnished Members of the House of Representatives;

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, to authorize the apportionment of such amount, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

On request by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar under rule VIII was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow. The request has been cleared with both Democratic and Republican Members.

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

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 13, 1965,

Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported favorably, with an amendment, on August 13, 1965, the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, and submitted a report (No. 600) thereon, which was printed, together with minority and supplemental views.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the memorial of Flora Terry, of Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against the establishment of Russian consular establishments in American cities, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Doctor Oscar Valdes Cruz (Rept. No. 603);

H.R. 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffet (Rept. No. 604);

H.R. 3750. An act for the relief of certain individuals (Rept. No. 605);

H.R. 4719. An act for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley (Rept. No. 606); and

H.R. 5497. An act to amend paragraphs b and c of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 607).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1701. A bill to provide relief for Dr. Jose M. Quintero (Rept. No. 608);

S. 1802. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Raul C. Soler y Rodriguez, and his wife, Dr. Gladis B. Pumariega de Soler (Rept. No. 609); and

S. 1945. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esther Yolanda Lauzardo (Rept. No. 610).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to authorize funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement (Rept. No. 602).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4465. An act to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 612).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1154. A bill to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries (Rept. No. 601).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1587. A bill to amend the Tucker Act to increase from $10,000 to $50,000 the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation (Rept. No. 614);

H.R. 1763. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (Rept. No. 615);

H.R. 3990. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors (Rept. No. 616);

H.R. 3992. An act to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts (Rept. No. 617); and

H.R. 3997. An act to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means (Rept. No. 618).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 6964. An act to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States (Rept. No. 613).

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. 2127. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones (Rept. No. 619).

Mr. TALMADGE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 2127, at its next printing.

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

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS AND WIDOWS AND MINOR CHILDREN OF A FORMER PRESIDENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—(S. REPT. NO. 611)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original bill (S. 2420) to provide continuing authority for the protection of former Presidents and their wives or widows, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a committee was submitted:

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

Executive C, 89th Congress, 1st session, agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada concerning the establishment of an International Arbitral Tribunal to dispose of U.S. claims relating to Gut Dam, signed at Ottawa, March 25, 1965 (Executive Report No. 5).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2409. A bill to prevent loss of veteran pension benefits as a result of increases provided under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 in monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 2410. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell

Institute; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2411. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2412. A bill to terminate use restrictions on certain real property previously conveyed to the city of Kodiak, Alaska, by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2413. A bill for the relief of Magdalene Tsoukalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2414. A bill to provide retirement benefits for firefighters employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2415. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to provide a new schedule of salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2416. A bill for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2417. A bill to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions and territories, and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 2418. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2419. A bill to make assistance to localities under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 contingent upon the publication of the names of the owners of rental properties in such localities which are used for residential purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2420. A bill to provide continuing authority for the protection of former Presidents and their wives or widows, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2421. A bill to make retrocession to the State of Washington of jurisdiction over lands comprising the Fort Canby-Cape Disappointment Area near the mouth of the Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

PROPOSAL NOT TO TABULATE INCREASE IN INCOME DERIVED FROM SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR A VETERAN'S PENSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am introducing, today, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, section 503, relating to non-service-connected disability pension payments to veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. This amendment provides that any increase in income derived from social security increases under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 will not be tabulated in determining eligibility for a veteran's pension. This modification is necessary to avoid actually penalizing some of the very people living on low, fixed incomes that the 7-percent social security increase was intended to aid. Let me cite a case that was recently brought to my attention that will illustrate the need of which I speak.

A certain veteran will receive an increase of $81 per year from January 1, 1965, under the new social security amendments. Since he is already under the benefits of the social security program he has been officially advised that he must accept the increase. This added sum will, unfortunately, bring his total annual income to a figure above the $1,800 maximum allowed under the veterans' pension program. He will, therefore, lose the $516 per year he now receives as a pension, thus actually reducing his annual income by $435. So, one of the typical persons we intended to help with this much-needed increase in social security will be hurt instead. This case is only one of many like it in every State in the Nation.

This amendment will be thoroughly consistent with the existing provisions of the law related to determining pension eligibility. For example, effective last year Public Law 88–664 exempted 10 percent of retirement income from counting against the maximum allowable. Similarly, donations or payments from welfare or relief organizations do not count in computing pension benefits. Proceeds from fire insurance policies are treated the same way, as are profits realized from the sale of a house or personal property other than in the course of business. There are other specific exclusions. It seems to me that none of these exclusions, and they are all highly justified, is more logical than the one I now propose.

Veterans pensions are pitifully low at best. The meager increase of 7 percent in the new social security amendments will not go far to help the disabled or elderly person living on a small, fixed income. Surely these two programs should not be allowed to work against each other to the detriment of those who need them and are qualified to receive them. The bill I offer will correct the unfortunate situation that exists and be of great benefit to a group of American veterans who need and deserve our support.

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

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

The bill (S. 2409) to prevent loss of veteran pension benefits as a result of increases provided under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 in monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

JURISDICTION OVER HASKELL INDIAN INSTITUTE SHOULD BE CONCURRENTLY FEDERAL AND STATE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which would correct an error of long standing presently affecting proper law enforcement in and around Haskell Indian Institute of Lawrence, Kans. The bill would retrocede legislative jurisdiction over Haskell Indian Institute to the State of Kansas. Through a clerical oversight some years ago, exclusive jurisdiction was given to the Federal Government instead of noting that jurisdiction would be concurrently Federal and State.

It is apparent that exclusive Federal jurisdiction over an institution such as Haskell, which is contiguous with the city of Lawrence, Kans., can create problems involving law enforcement, fire protection and other services normally engaged in between the city and the Institute. The bill I introduce today has the approval of the Department of Justice and has been forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget where no opposition is expected. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is aware of this legislation and has expressed their belief that jurisdiction must be retroceded to Kansas to offset any problems which might occur through the joint use of city and Institute property for such programs as high school athletics and other sporting events.

Because the city of Lawrence would like to enter into a contract with Haskell for their track and football facilities at the beginning of the school year next month, it is of the utmost urgency that this bill be acted upon during this session of Congress. A similar bill will be introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ROBERT ELLSWORTH.

Mr. President, I ask that this legislation be referred to the appropriate committee for immediate action.

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

The bill (S. 2410) to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute, introduced by Mr.

PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED STUDY AND APPRAISAL OF THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the establishment of a Commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government.

Most briefly stated, the purpose of this measure is to create once again a Commission with duties and responsibilities similar to those of the highly successful and widely heralded Hoover Commissions of past years.

This measure would create a bipartisan Commission on Governmental Operations. The proposed Commission would be authorized to make studies and investigations of the present organization and methods of operation of all agencies of the Federal Government and to submit recommendations to Congress for appropriate action designed to abolish services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of the Government or which may be found to be in competition with private enterprise.

It is almost universally acknowledged that there is a need for a comprehensive study of duplicated and overlapping activities, organizations, methods, administration, functions, and policies. This study would proceed with the view of improving Government efficiency and effecting economies wherever possible.

Mr. President, the best way to aid the States, counties, and cities is to reduce Federal expenditures. When this is done some tax revenues will be left at the local levels. In order to do this every possible means must be taken to reduce the cost of the Federal Government. We have learned that it is not easy to reduce Federal expenditures. The only safe way to do it is through better government; that is, by reorganizing, merging, eliminating, consolidating, and standardizing those unnecessary and wasteful practices which exist in the executive branch of the Government.

Those who have a knowledge of government or who may be students of the former Hoover Commission understand that many of its recommendations have not been fully implemented and these recommendations should be reevaluated in the light of present conditions.

A study in reorganization of the executive branch of the Government would be consistent with and complement hearings now being held by a joint committee of the Congress on the organization of the Congress of the United States. This committee is now making a full and complete study of the operation and organization of the Congress and will submit recommendations designed to strengthen and streamline congressional procedures and operations with a view toward improving the relationship of Congress with the other branches of our National Government.

Thus, the time is particularly appropriate, it seems to me, for the institution of such a commission as provided in the proposed bill.

Since the last reorganization and streamlining of the executive branch of Government, many agencies, bureaus, and administrations have been created. With the proliferation of bureaus and the attendant multiplication of expenditures, the lines of authority and responsibility have become entangled. This Congress, in particular, with the passage of many new pieces of legislation, has significantly expanded the structure and the functions of the Federal Government. Medicare, new health legislation, the expansion of the poverty program, Federal aid to education, water pollution control, new housing legislation and the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing at the Cabinet level, an Equal Opportunities Commission, and many others yet to be acted upon, are examples of this new wave of Federal executive action.

Mr. President, with some of these measures I have found myself in agreement. Others I have opposed. But whatever may have been my position, they are now the law of the land, and the success of each of these measures depends not upon their passage but upon their implementation. Indeed, so much praise has been voiced concerning the ability of both the President and the Congress to pass these measures that there is and has been developing an attitude that the passage of a bill is an end in itself. It is rather the beginning.

The President recognizes the existence of this situation and, in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, he stated:

> For government to serve these goals it must be modern in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency. I am busy currently reviewing the structure of the executive branch of this Government. I hope to reshape it and reorganize it to meet more effectively the tasks of the 20th century.

The measure introduced today is identical with that presented to the House of Representatives by the very able and distinguished Congressman from the Fourth District of New York [Mr. WYDLER], who has exercised great initiative in the earlier introduction of this measure in the other body.

Mr. President, last Thursday the bill authorizing the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa, was signed into law. Many who honor the memory and the work of Herbert Hoover urge the continuing efforts of his life in feeding the poor, in guiding the young, and in answering the call to participation in public affairs. With the passage of the legislation proposed we may continue one of his greatest works, in fairly, honestly, and independently improving the tools of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill herein introduced be printed in full following these remarks and that said measure remain at the desk of the clerk for a period of 7 days for those Members of the Senate who should wish to join in cosponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will remain at the desk for 7 days, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

The bill (S. 2411) for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2411

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;

(5) defining responsibilities of officials;

(6) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise; and

(7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies if it can be shown to be more efficient as a result.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of ten members as follows:

(1) Two appointed by the President of the United States from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Members of the Commission appointed from private life

shall represent equally the majority and minority parties. With respect to members of the Commission appointed from the House of Representatives and the Senate there shall be a Representative and a Senator from the majority party and one each from the minority party.

(c) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The President may appoint the last two former Presidents of the United States as co-Chairmen. If no such appointment is made, the Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such studies.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government except the judiciary and the Congress of the United States to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit an interim report to the Congress ninety days after the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act and an interim report ten days after the end of each succeeding ninety-day period on its activities and recommendations for such ninety-day period. The Commission shall make its final report of findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

TERMINATION OF USE RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN KODIAK, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to terminate use restrictions on certain real property previously conveyed to the city of Kodiak, Alaska, by the United States.

In 1950 an act, 64 Stat. 470, was passed by the Congress to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the then Territory of Alaska to local school officials. One such property was located in the city of Kodiak, a small tract of 2.2 acres described as U.S. Survey No. 1594. Under the authority of the act, the Kodiak property was transferred by the United States to local school officials there.

Mr. President, it is important that I point out that the deed under which the Kodiak property was conveyed contained a restriction that the land not be used for other than "school or other public purposes."

A short time ago the city of Kodiak commenced planning with the Alaska State Housing Authority and the Federal Urban Renewal Administration for a downtown urban renewal project designated R–19. The Urban Renewal Administration recently made funds available for the purchase of property for the renewal project. Included in the project plans is the purchase of the school property I mentioned earlier. It is here the renewal project has run into a roadblock.

Because of the restriction in the deed prohibiting use of the property for other than "school or other public purposes" the city of Kodiak is unable to convey the property for urban renewal. The bill I introduce today would remove the restriction and allow Kodiak to go ahead with this Federal urban renewal project.

Mr. President, I have assurances from the city of Kodiak and the Alaska State Housing Authority that development of this property will not be pursued until the Kodiak School Board has developed a suitable school site at another location. Relocation of the school is expected to take place some time in the summer of 1967. However, it is important that the urban property acquisition be accomplished as soon as possible for orderly execution of project R–19.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I am hopeful that this bill, which is similar to one enacted in the last Congress in connection with a Fairbanks urban renewal project, will be quickly and favorably acted upon. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2412) to terminate use restrictions on certain real property conveyed to the city of Kodiak, Alaska, by the United States, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2412

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the restriction contained in the Act entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the Territory of Alaska to local school officials", approved August 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 470), limiting the use of any real property conveyed under such Act to school or other public purposes, is hereby terminated with respect to that real property conveyed under such Act to the local school officials of Kodiak, Alaska, which property is more particularly described in United States Survey Number 1594.

REQUIREMENT OF OPERATORS OF OCEAN CRUISES TO FILE EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions and territories and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the

Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement of purpose and need for the bill.

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

The bill (S. 2417) to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United States, its possessions, and territories, and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to require cruise operators to file evidence of financial responsibility and other information.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the first session of the 89th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HARLLEE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired), Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR BILL TO REQUIRE CERTAIN OPERATORS OF OCEAN CRUISES TO FILE EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

The bill would require chartered vessel operators offering and conducting passenger ocean cruises from the United States to file evidence of financial security which would indemnify passengers for nonperformance of an ocean cruise. Certain identifying information would also have to be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission. The security intended by this bill would be in the nature of a performance bond written by an American bonding company. However, the Federal Maritime Commission would be authorized to establish the form of the bond and to accept other security that would accomplish the intended protection.

The bill is intended to prevent financial loss and hardship to persons, who, after payment of cruise passage money, are stranded by the abandonment or cancellation of a cruise. Other matters concerning cruise operations such as safety and accommodations are not covered by this proposed legislation. Some of the circumstances and background information concerning the protection of cruise passengers was presented by the Federal Maritime Commission to a House subcommittee studying the problems of international travel in relation to the balance-of-payments deficit. That information is contained in the report of hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Tourism of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2d session, 83–104 (1964).

The Commission is authorized to act as a repository for the information required by the bill and to satisfy itself that the financial security has been accomplished. The Commission would not, however, be authorized to act on claims arising out of the nonperformance of a cruise. Some investigation would be necessary to assure the Commission that the terms of the act were being carried out.

The class subject to the bill consists, in the main, of the type that operate a cruise without sufficient financial means and responsibility which protect the public from the consequences of being stranded. The bill exempts operators who have a proprietary interest in a vessel employed in such cruise operation, because such an interest would indicate a sufficient degree of financial responsibility.

RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, I am introducing today a bill which would permit the Secretary of the Army to make retrocession of jurisdiction over the Fort Canby-Cape Disappointment area to the State of Washington.

The State of Washington would like to acquire some of the land in the Fort Canby-Cape Disappointment area for State park purposes. The State parks and recreation commission has not been able to lease or buy any of the property until the Army's exclusive jurisdiction over the area has been rescinded.

In 1852 this area, on the north side of the mouth of the Columbia River, was reserved from the public domain for military purposes. In 1890 and 1891 the Legislature of the State of Washington passed statutes ceding exclusive jurisdiction in the area to the Federal Government.

In 1954, this Fort Canby reservation was transferred from military to civil works accounts of the Department of Army. The Corps of Engineers advises me that it is their policy not to ask for jurisdiction, and therefore they have no objections to this bill.

This bill deals with retrocession of jurisdiction only, and in no way conveys or grants any property rights from the Army to the State.

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

The bill (S. 2421) to make retrocession to the State of Washington of jurisdiction over lands comprising the Fort Canby-Cape Disappointment area near the mouth of the Columbia, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TREATMENT OF TIPS UNDER RAILROAD RETIREMENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 388

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose as an addition to H.R. 3157, which deals with the Railroad Retirement Act.

In many respects we have in the Congress attempted to retain a close parallelism between the Railroad Retirement Act benefits and those available in other industries through social security. The Social Security Act amendments which have now become law include a provision whereby workers who receive tips may for the first time report them and qualify through them for social security benefits. The largest single group affected will be waiters and waitresses.

There are also waiters in railroad dining cars, and other tip employees such as pullman porters. In order to give equivalent treatment to them, my amendment would apply the same provisions to the Railroad Retirement Act as those which are now law under social security. This does not involve any additional tax upon employers, since the treatment in the case of tip workers is that accorded the self-employed. I might add that this comparable change has the support of at least one of the major labor unions thus affected, and so far as I know there is no objection from other groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 388) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 389

Mr. DOMINICK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 390

Mr. DOMINICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 8283, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 391

Mr. FANNIN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8283, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 392

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8283, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 393 THROUGH 401

Mr. PROUTY submitted nine amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8283, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the next printing of S. 2263, to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the names of Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PROUTY, and

Mr. DOMINICK be added as additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

All members of the Committee on the District of Columbia endorse the bill that I earlier introduced calling for five additional judges, two of whom would be assigned to traffic court. The bill really now should be treated as a combined Morse-Bible bill, because I was an enthusiast for the bill introduced by the chairman of my committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], when he introduced it, which provided for only three judges. But further study leads all of us on the committee to believe that the suggestion that I made in my bill for five judges instead of three, two of them to serve as traffic court judges, ought to be adopted by the Senate. I believe that the report on the bill will be filed before the day is over, and therefore I would like to have the names of the additional cosponsors printed when the print is made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 960, to amend the War Claims Act, at its next printing.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 2305, to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, the next time the bill is printed.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

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

Authority of July 28, 1965:

S. 2339. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the Highway Trust Fund for purposes of urban mass transporation: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of August 2, 1965:

S. Res. 138. Resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate requiring germaneness of amendments: Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

POPULATION HEARINGS SCHEDULED TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17 AND 18, IN ROOM 3110, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, STARTING AT 10 A.M.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this week the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will hear experts in the fields of health, medicine, and economics discuss the population dilemma and how it relates to these areas.

The subcommittee will hold public hearings Tuesday, August 17, and Wednesday, August 18, starting at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Witnesses appearing before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures tomorrow are Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN from Oregon's Fourth Congressional District and Dr. Andre Hellegers, Baltimore, associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology at the Johns Hopkins University Hospital. Dr. Hellegers is one of more than 50 nationally prominent Catholic laymen and clergymen endorsing tax-supported birth control programs including all medically accepted forms of family planning in a statement presented to the American Bar Association convention in Miami, Fla., on August 9. The statement was presented on behalf of the signatures by the Reverend Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., director of the Institute of Law, Human Rights, and Social Values, Georgetown University Law Center.

Wednesday, August 18, the subcommittee will hear testimony from the Honorable Marriner Eccles, of Salt Lake City, Utah, former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and internationally known financier; Dr. Ernest Lyman Stebbins, Baltimore, Md., dean of the School of Hygiene and Public Health of the Johns Hopkins University; and Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich., director, Center for Population Planning, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

The testimony of these witnesses will help to examine further the many ways in which the population explosion relates to health, economics, and general well-being, and the subcommittee looks forward to hearing their contributions to the population dialog.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS OF AMERICA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in recognition of National Drum Corps Week, August 15 through August 22, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to all those who have contributed their talents and services to this phase of our American way of life. Music, harmony and precision are great assets in the training and development of the youth of our country and an important extracurricular activity to be enjoyed by performers and spectators alike. Congratulations to the drum and bugle corps of America, and best wishes for continued success as a constant part in our onward march for a greater America.

LOST OPPORTUNITIES IN WHEAT

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, over the years the United States has been a great exporter of wheat. It is one of our biggest dollar earners in meeting our balance of payments with the rest of the world.

Consumption in the United States over the past 30 years has remained constant at approximately 500 million bushels a year. This means that with the wheat yields of 10 years ago we would still have to export nearly half of our wheat production even with greatly reduced acreage under present farm programs. This is only half of the story. Due to the efficiency, ingenuity, and hard work of our farmers, coupled with new technological advances and improved farm machinery, wheat production per acre in the last 15 years has practically doubled.

Unlike our neighbor to the north—Canada—United States wheat farmers cannot participate in the biggest dollar market for wheat in the world—that of Russia, her satellites, and China. It is understandable that our wheat farmers would be barred from selling wheat to China. The biggest single impediment now to selling wheat to Russia is the requirement that 50 percent of the wheat shipped to Russia or Russian bloc countries be carried in American vessels. This means that the cost of wheat to these wheat deficit countries is 20 to 30 cents a bushel higher than if the price were the same in both countries.

Canada and every other surplus wheat-producing nation in the world now have sold practically all of their surplus wheat and their farmers are placed in the position of needing to increase their acreage to meet their export commitments.

Here in the United States we have a completely opposite situation. Because we are locked out of the big markets of the world, our farmers have had to resort to stiff production controls and even then we are having a difficult problem holding down surpluses.

Mr. President, the Bismarck Tribune published at Bismarck, N. Dak., under date of August 13 contained a most enlightening editorial on the farm production situation entitled "U.S. Farmers versus Soviet." Unlike this editorial, the farmers and farm programs of this Nation are being condemned and vilified in widely read and most erroneous press stories. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. FARMERS VERSUS SOVIET

Around North Dakota this week farmers were busy with harvest, reaping what promised to be one of the richest in history. With more people than ever to feed, fewer farmers than ever were feeding them better than ever.

Across the world, in Russia, quite the opposite was true. Despite the brags of Soviet planners, Russia's farms will be hard put to meet Russian needs of food and fiber.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture publication, Farm Index, draws some comparisons.

In Russia, it takes over a third of the Soviet work force to grow food; in the United States it takes only one-twelfth.

We get our abundance off 308 million acres of sown cropland. Russia struggles in shortages with 540 million sown acres.

Where we raise 4,092 million bushels of corn, Russia produces only 91 million bushels.

Where we had 106.7 million head of cattle in 1963, the Soviets had only 85.4 million.

Only in wheat and potatoes, among major crops, does the Soviet Union outproduce the United States.

There are, of course, good reasons for American agriculture's productive superiority. We use four times as much fertilizer as they do, have four times as many tractors and twice as many combines. More than

that, of course, our farmers have the know-how and management ability needed to produce, because without it they couldn't survive. This is their incentive.

Russian farmers have no such incentive. We have some 3,573,000 farms in this country. There are only 48,000 in Russia, some 38,000 state-supervised collectives averaging 33,000 acres per farm and another 9,000 state-owned farms averaging 147,000 acres and 411 families each.

Here has to be the real reason why American farmers year-in, year-out win the agricultural olympics hands down over their Russian rivals.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the New York Times of August 13 contains an editorial entitled "Lost Opportunities in Wheat," which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. This editorial from one of our greatest publications tells a story that every American citizen should take time to read.

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

LOST OPPORTUNITIES IN WHEAT

The United States is the odd man out in the huge wheat purchases being made by the Soviet Union. Canada and Argentina have received windfalls largely because U.S. wheat is too costly as a result of the Government's discriminatory requirement that 50 percent of wheat exports to Soviet bloc countries must be shipped in American vessels.

The U.S. exclusion is unfortunate on many counts. Sales from the Nation's surplus would have meant greater prosperity in farming districts. They would also have increased the trade surplus in the Nation's balance of payments. Beyond these economic gains, the sales would have given tangible expression to the Johnson administration's desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

Even so, the big Russian purchases are important to the West. For Canada they mean higher incomes in agriculture, the one area of her economy that has not been enjoying boom conditions, and a cut in the big deficit in the Canadian balance of payments. As far as Argentina is concerned, the inflow of scarce dollars will have an even more significant impact on her inflation-racked, capital-short economy.

The United States itself will reap benefits indirectly. If the Russians pay for a good portion of their purchases by selling gold in London, the Treasury will not have to supply as much gold from its own dwindling stock to meet the demands of private and official sellers of dollars. Thus the Russians will be helping to calm the nervousness that has threatened to curb international trade and investment.

The West also is bolstered by the continued demand for grains from the country that had once been the granary of Europe. The Soviet Union has made great advances in industrialization and technology, but it has utterly failed to match the revolution that has taken place in American agriculture. And because Russia has to depend on outside sources of food supply, its leaders must recognize the desirability of strengthening their relations with those who can meet their needs.

It is ironic that the United States, which is the champion of liberalized trade and which has wheat to sell, cannot participate in this trade with Russia because of the high cost of American shipping. Yet the very unions that have done most to make the American merchant marine uneconomic are the chief insisters on quota preference guarantees. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has accurately testified that, if the shipping restrictions were eliminated, the almost certain result would be a protest strike by dock and maritime unions.

A large part of the merchant fleet is already strike-bound for reasons that are a compound of economics and interunion warfare. Political strikes are just one more of the factors that contribute to the demise of American shipping they also undermine our prosperity and our foreign policy.

SOCIAL EARTHQUAKES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the prayer of the Chaplain concluded a few moments ago, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, referred to "social earthquakes." Those, alas, are precisely what have been visited on the great city of Los Angeles and on other communities in the State from which I come during the past 5 frightening days. The news this morning apparently reflects a diminution, possibly a cessation, in the wanton killings, the pillage, and the arson which yesterday provoked one newspaper reporter to compare a portion of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles with Hitler's Berlin in the last hours of that infamous reign.

Last Friday night at my home in Washington I said:

I earnestly implore all citizens involved in this frightening and bloody breach of the peace in Los Angeles to become law abiding and rational. Respect for law and order is the very keystone of our society, and no disrespect for duly constituted authority can be tolerated.

Mr. President, respect for law is the only sound basis on which a free American society may be grounded.

We are a nation of 194 million people—black people, white people, people of all shades and races and colors—endeavoring to create a better life for ourselves, endeavoring to lead humanity toward a peace with justice; yet today law and order have been violated in a horrible way.

Law and order must be enforced by government on any and all levels. Law and order must be enforced with courage, with vigor, and with speed. Law and order also must be maintained.

But beyond that, what are the causes which may have produced these terrible and tragic effects? That, too, is a critical and immediate problem for American society, for all of us, in every part of this land, which must be solved.

Education programs enacted by the Congress, war on poverty programs, housing programs, aid programs, are for naught unless finally free from any venal political concern, organized Government in this country is able to raise the standards of those whose deprivation may have contributed to the holocaust which we face in the State from which I come.

I regret that holocaust with all my heart; and, speaking in the Senate, I hope and pray that all the people of the United States will follow the law and respect order, for otherwise American society is in danger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Anarchy Must End," published in the Los Angeles Times of Saturday, August 14, 1965; an article entitled "Eyewitness Account—Mob Shouts Cry for Blood: Get Whitey," written by Robert Richardson, and published in the Los Angeles Times of Saturday, August 14, 1965; and an article entitled, "Feelings Behind Rioting Analyzed," written by Harry Nelson, Times medical editor, and also published in the Los Angeles Times of Saturday, August 14, 1965, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Aug. 14, 1965]

ANARCHY MUST END

Race rioting has brought anarchy to a crowded area of south Los Angeles. Terrorism is spreading.

Whatever its root causes, the chaos which has gripped the city for 3 days and 3 nights must be halted forthwith.

If the National Guardsmen belatedly sent to the relief of Chief Parker's outnumbered police, sheriff's deputies and California highway patrolmen are not enough, additional hundreds must be provided at once.

Now that kid-glove measures have failed, the sternest possible steps must be taken to quell the madness before mob violence becomes mass murder. During this all-out effort, citizens are requested to stay out of the riot area. If they live in the vicinity, they are strongly urged to remain in their homes.

Only after sanity is restored can there be any meaningful talk about long-range cures of the basic problems involved.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Aug. 14, 1965]

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT: MOB SHOUTS CRY FOR BLOOD: "GET WHITEY"

(By Robert Richardson)

(NOTE.—Robert Richardson, 24, a Negro, is an advertising salesman for the Times. He witnessed the rioting in south Los Angeles for nearly 8 hours Thursday night.)

It was the most terrifying thing I've ever seen in my life.

I went along with the mobs, just watching, listening.

It's a wonder anyone with white skin got out of there alive.

I saw people with guns. The cry went up several times—"Let's go to Lynwood" (an all-white neighborhood) whenever there weren't enough whites around.

RACIAL WORD SPREADS

Every time a car with whites in it entered the area the word spread like lightning down the street:

"Here comes Whitey—get him."

The older people would stand in the background egging on the teenagers and the people in their early twenties. Then the young men and women would rush in and pull white people from cars and beat them and try to set fire to their cars.

One white couple, in their sixties, happened to be driving along Imperial before the blockades were put up. They were beaten and kicked until their faces, hands, and clothing were bloody. I thought they were going to be killed. How they survived I don't know. Those not hitting and kicking the couple were standing there shouting "Kill! Kill!"

Finally they turned them loose and an ambulance was called and they were taken away.

Two white men driving down Avalon Boulevard ducked when rocks bombarded their car. When they ducked the car hit a car with Negroes.

They were beaten so badly one man's eye was hanging out of the socket. Some Negro ministers made their way through the crowd

and carried both men into an apartment building and called an ambulance.

The crowd called the ministers hyprocrites. They cussed them and spit on them. Some Negro officers tried to disperse the crowd, but they were jeered at, sworn at, called traitors and stoned.

NEGRO OFFICERS PERILED

The Negro officers were given a worse time than the white officers.

Light-skinned Negroes such as myself were targets of rocks and bottles until someone standing nearby would shout, "He's blood," or "He's a brother—lay off."

As some areas were blockaded during the night, the mobs would move outside, looking for more cars with whites. When there were no whites they started throwing rocks and bottles at Negro cars. Then near midnight they began looting stores owned by whites.

Everybody got in the looting—children, grownups, and old men and women, breaking windows and going into stores.

Then everybody started drinking, even little kids 8 or 9 years old. That's when the cry started, "Let's go where Whitey lives." That's when I began to see guns.

I believe the mobs would have moved into white neighborhoods, but it was getting late and many of them had to go to work Friday morning.

But some said, "Wait till tonight and Saturday. We'll really roll over the weekend. We'll really get Whitey then."

They knew they had the upper hand. They seemed to sense that the police nor anyone else could stop them.

I heard them say, "Just wait till one of the blood gets shot—then heads will really roll. Then Whitey will get his."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Aug. 14, 1965]

FEELINGS BEHIND RIOTING ANALYZED—TWO PSYCHIATRISTS SEE ANGER, ANXIETY, AND SELF-HATRED AS EMOTIONAL KEYS TO OUTBURST

(By Harry Nelson)

Anger mixed with mistrust of white men plus strong feelings of rejection, self-hatred, and anxiety about the future are the key psychological ingredients in Los Angeles' race riots, two psychiatrists said Friday.

The riots very likely will be repeated in other parts of the city—Pasadena especially—unless communities open up more socially acceptable ways of releasing the anger and anxiety, predicted Dr. Edward J. Stainbrook, head of psychiatry at the USC School of Medicine.

But until emotions have cooled, the best course of action is force—firm but not brutal—and a show of numbers, the psychiatrist said.

RATIONAL METHODS

"At this stage it can't be solved with rational methods, although rational methods are what should have been applied before the riot and will have to be when it is over," he said.

A Negro psychiatrist, Dr. Alvin F. Poussaint, analyzed some of the causes of the anger and resentment which overflowed into violence because, he said, there was no other outlet sufficient to handle the strong feelings.

Until a month ago Dr. Poussaint was chief resident at UCLA's Neuropsychiatric Institute. He is now southern field director for the Medical Committee on Human Rights in Jackson, Miss., and was interviewed by telephone.

REVIEW BOARD NEEDED

Police brutality—whether actual or imagined—is a key reason for the anger, he said. The psychiatrist felt there is a need for a review board made up of ordinary citizens in the Negro neighborhood, not Negro professionals, to discuss grievances with the police department.

The reason for having nonprofessionals on the board ties in with another reason for their anger, he said.

"They equate the middle-class Negro, the professional, with the whites. They see them sometimes as not caring for what happens to the common Negro. They see them moving out of the Watts area to richer parts of the city and seldom returning.

"They see the Negro doctors move out. What is needed on the board are some ordinary Joes who have good leadership ability—the sort of a man who would make a good Army platoon leader," he said.

"Proposition 14, the repeal of the Rumford Housing Act in last November's election, also had an enormous psychological effect on Negroes in ghetto areas. It made them feel trapped, as if there is no way of getting out of their low-income housing areas."

Another source of their anger has been identification with the injustices to Negroes in the South.

GETTING EVEN

"By lashing out at the white police officer they feel they are getting even with white people in general," Dr. Poussaint continued.

"There is also self-hatred mixed up in this riot because those people have been told so often that they are no good that they don't think much of themselves and resent the fact that they don't."

"Put an anonymous person in a sprawling city where he scans the future and sees little more than hopelessness and you're going to have trouble," Dr. Stainbrook said.

"That's why we have a John Birch Society—because there is anxiety for the future. People feel they can't depend on the world around them, as they see it, to help them realize their future."

One big problem in analyzing the reasons for the riots, according to Dr. Stainbrook, is the difficulty in differentiating between the Negroes' own feelings about discrimination and the actual situation.

This makes it difficult for the Negro to look at his own behavior and analyze how he is contributing to the problem and then take steps to correct them, Dr. Stainbrook said.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 563.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the items on the calendar, beginning with order No. 563.

HUBBELL TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE, ARIZ.

The bill (H.R. 3320) to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historical Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 580), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The purpose of H.R. 3320, a companion measure to S. 1337, introduced by Senators HAYDEN and FANNIN of Arizona, is to authorize the acquisition of the Hubbell Trading Post, Ariz., including its valuable collection of Indian art and ethnological materials, and to provide for its administration by the Secretary of the Interior as a national historic site. A companion bill, H.R. 4901, was introduced by Congressman SENNER and considered by the committee at the same time as H.R. 3320.

NEED

The Hubbell Trading Post is in northeastern Arizona on the Navajo Indian Reservation. It has been classified by the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments as being of exceptional value to commemorate and illustrate an important phase in the history of the United States.

Federal control of trade with the Indian dates back to the earliest days of the Republic (act of July 22, 1790, 1 Stat. 137). It was recognized from the beginning that the trader would be of great importance, for good or ill, in determining the relations between the Nation and its Indian neighbors and wards. In such isolated spots as northeastern Arizona was where John Lorenzo Hubbell, familiarly known as Don Lorenzo, founded his trading post; the institution was inescapably a strong influence. In his case, this influence was particularly strong, for he was recognized by the Navajos as well as the Hopis, among whom he had lived earlier, as being earnestly interested in their welfare.

Don Lorenzo started his trading business at Rio Pueblo, Colo., now Ganado, in 1878 or earlier. His was the first trading post operated away from direct military protection. He himself continued the business until 1930 when he died. Thereafter the post was kept intact by his son who operated the business until his death not many years ago. The present trading post structure—a "long, low stone building, neither beautiful nor impressive" but representative of a past era and located in an area in which Indian, Spanish, and American influences were and are inextricably intertwined—was constructed about the turn of the century, replacing a smaller structure which was built when the business was founded. It and its furniture and furnishings have been kept intact. This means that the Nation now has an opportunity to acquire what is, in effect, an on-site museum of an era that, with the coming of roads and "civilization," has disappeared nearly everywhere. As the situation is summarized in the volume of the "National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings" on military and Indian affairs, 1830–98:

"The significance of the Hubbell Trading Post lies * * * in its preservation today of the trading post of yesterday. There have been few changes since the present post and house were built about 1900 to replace an earlier, smaller structure. The long stone trading post, with its wareroom, storeroom, office, and blanket room, looks much as it did in Don Lorenzo's time, and much as other Navajo posts looked. The original massive counters still dominate the storeroom. Office furniture is that of half a century ago. Ancient firearms, Indian craftwork, paintings, and rugs adorn the rug room. The rambling adobe hacienda in which Hubbell lived and entertained retains all of its old charm and atmosphere. The walls of the long living room and the bedrooms are covered with artwork, photographs, and Indian artifacts. Shelves laden with books line the walls. Navajo rugs lie everywhere. The old home conveys more vividly than words the manner in which the Hubbells and other early traders lived. The barn and utility buildings, mostly of stone, round out the complete picture of the old-time trading post. At the Hubbell Trading Post, the visitor at once understands and appreciates the pattern of the Navajo trade, the type of man who conducted it, and the kind of life he led."

For these reasons, it is the opinion of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

that the Hubbell Trading Post will be a valuable addition to the National Park System, particularly if arrangements can be worked out to have it operated along lines close to those that were in effect when it was an active post.

H.R. 3320 calls for the acquisition, at not more than fair market value, of 160 acres of land plus the buildings, nine in all, that are on it. The 160 acres, it is believed, will be sufficient to protect the setting of the trading post against unsightly intrusions. If this is more land than is needed for the purposes of the bill, the Navajo Indian Tribe will be given an opportunity to purchase the excess at the price for which it was acquired and the proceeds of the sale will be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury. It may also be that it will be possible for the tribe and the National Park Service to work out an exchange in which certain land within the area to be acquired will be traded for a small tract on its fringe which is in tribal ownership and which, it is believed, will be of value to the national historic site.

COST

The estimated cost of acquiring the Hubbell Trading Post and the land and buildings related to it is $169,000. The collection of art, ethnological objects, and miscellaneous other movables has been valued by experts in the field at about $143,500. Development costs will, it is believed, be about $635,000. Section 3 of the bill, as amended, contains language appropriate to limit the amount authorized to be appropriated accordingly. Annual operating costs, at present price and wage levels, will be about $70,000.

The land and water conservation fund will be available for appropriations for land acquisition in connection with the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site and the site will be subject to the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act providing for the charging of admission fees.

ALIBATES FLINT QUARRIES AND TEXAS PANHANDLE PUEBLO CULTURE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 881) to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $5,000 for the acquisition of land and such other sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000 for the acquisition of land and not to exceed $260,000 for the development of the area.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ALIBATES MONUMENT BILL IS WORTHY AND NEEDED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today's passage of the Alibates Flint Quarries bill insures that a great archeological find will be preserved forever.

The Alibates mines were first found and used by ancient man on an extensive scale well over 12,000 years ago. This was 6,000 years before the wheel was invented, 7,000 before the great pyramids of Egypt were built, and 500 years before the last ice age peaked in North America covering the St. Lawrence valley and the Great Lakes under a thick covering of ice. The brightly colored flint from these mines was shaped by ancient man to make arrowheads and spear points. Arrowheads made from Alibates flint have been found associated with the fossilized skeletons of the mammoths and the now extinct giant bison.

The flint from the Alibates mines has been found throughout the Midwest and Far West, from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. At the mines themselves are artifacts of red Minnesota pipestone, California shell, Yellowstone obsidian, and Arizona pottery—all brought in by the Indian merchants of the past to trade for badly wanted flint. The Alibates mines are truly a great graphic display of the ways of life and trade of those who lived on this continent before the white man came.

The national monument created by this bill will be situated along the Canadian River, 35 miles north of Amarillo, Tex. Most of this land is already part of the soon to be opened Sanford Reservoir National Recreation Area. This bill insures that access roads, parking spaces, and a visitor's center can be constructed so that the thousands of people who will soon start visiting the recreation area will also have the opportunity to see these great reminders of what human life was like on this continent before the time of Columbus.

I have been working for the passage of this bill for over 2 years now. In fact, I introduced the first bill for the purpose of making the Alibates Flint Quarries into a national monument on April 25, 1963, in the 88th Congress. At first, the Department of the Interior opposed passage of that bill but the Department reversed its position this winter following congressional authorization establishing the Sanford Reservoir National Recreation Area.

In the interest of facilitating passage, I approve of the committee's decision to report out H.R. 881 rather than my own bill S. 721. It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I note the passage of the bill by the Senate and the House, awaiting only the President's signature in order to be made law.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in my opinion, the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarry as a national monument is of paramount importance, not only to the State of Texas, but to our Nation.

The preservation of the Alibates Flint Quarry as a priceless treasury to archeologists, anthropologists, paleontologists, and geologists is indeed worthy of our consideration. Not only is its preservation of vital importance to the populace, but it represents a historical landmark in ancient man's struggle for survival.

For millions of years this flint lay veiled in obscurity, waiting for man to mold its future course. Then, during some millennium this 3-square-mile deposit of flint was discovered, and man found in it his future instruments for work and war. It was through diligent efforts and hard work that ancient man acquired the knowledge and the skills for making flint into tools and weapons.

As we can well imagine, this was a unique accomplishment for primitive man, who had no prior knowledge of metal or iron. Of course, man was not only concerned with the functional aspects of the flint, but he was also attracted by its esthetic beauty.

Present evidence indicates that this source of flint was used as long ago as 12,000 to 15,000 years by a culture of the oldest known man in North America, who found the flint most beneficial in hunting the ice age mammoth and the giant bison. It is known that some cultures traveled as far away as 150 miles, in order to gather the flint to make spear points and other implements needed for survival.

These ancient men established a complex industry based on the trading of this flint with other cultures—from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico and the Yellowstone to the Pacific Ocean. So the use and influence of the Alibates flint was varied and widespread.

Certainly there can be little doubt that this source produced the finest and most beautiful quality of flint available. The Alibates flint was used the most frequent and by a larger area of the continent than any other, and perhaps ancient man's fight for survival would have been deterred without its existence and importance.

The interest in the Alibates Flint Quarries is not confined merely to the quarries and flint, but also incorporates that mass of evidence deposited by ancient man and his cultures. Artifacts of great significance are still awaiting discovery, where once a great industrial complex was conceived.

In the 1930's, a 66-room pueblo ruin in the quarry areas was excavated and 16,000 known artifacts were revealed. Now, a 100-room pueblo ruin has been located within the area and is awaiting excavation.

The use of the Alibates flint flourished until the age of modern man and the introduction of metal, as still another phenomenon. Yet, before metal was improvised, thousands of tons of this flint was quarried by primitive man with his ancient tools—a formidable task still for modern man with his complex machinery.

I believe the Alibates Flint Quarry could become one of our most important monuments. Located within what is known as the "breaks" of the High Plains, it would provide for all a clear view of intriguing geological strata, complete with numerous fossil remains. The quarry itself spans the entire period of prehistorical America.

The preservation of the Alibates Flint Quarry as a historical site will stand as a monument to those people and cultures who so long ago flourished upon the earth. With the completion of the new Sanford Reservoir, many people will be visiting the area, which was once under private ownership. It is imperative that we act now to preserve those

surroundings where once prehistoric North American man lived and worked.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 581), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 881 is to set aside certain land in Texas, most of which is already owned by the United States, as the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument.

NEED

For 12,000 years or more the Alibates Flint Quarries were worked by Indians living in the panhandle area of Texas. From these quarries came the multicolored flint arrowheads and tools which were both used by the inhabitants of the locality and traded by them for goods supplied from far-distant sources. Flints from these quarries have been found as far north as Minnesota and Wisconsin, as far west as the Pacific coast, and as far south as the Gulf of Mexico. Professional archeologists regard the quarries as one of the outstanding remains of the prehistoric cultures of North America.

Toward the end of the period when the quarries were being worked the panhandle area was occupied by sedentary tribes which built large pueblo-type structures for their homes. Some of these structures housed as many as 60 to 100 families. They were constructed of limestone slabs and adobe and are regarded by archeologists as a blend of the types of structures used by the Indians of the Great Plains and by those of the arid Southwest.

The two areas in question—that of the quarries and that of the pueblos—are about 35 miles from Amarillo. They were rediscovered in the 1920's but have been only partially excavated. Such excavating work as has been done indicates that the quarries extend in a narrow band through an area about a mile long and a tenth of a mile wide. The pueblo area is believed to have occupied about 60 to 80 acres. Taken together and with surrounding protective land, the area involved in H.R. 881, then, may total as much as 230 acres.

Most of this land is already in the ownership of the United States. It was acquired by the Government in connection with its Sanford Reservoir, a feature of the Canadian River reclamation project (act of Dec. 29, 1950, 64 Stat. 1124) and the recreation area authorized in connection therewith (act of Aug. 31, 1946, 78 Stat. 744). Whether any more land needs to be acquired can be determined only after further field studies are completed. At most, however, it is believed that about 90 acres will be needed. A limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated for future land acquisition has been written into the bill accordingly and the precise boundaries of the monument will be reported to the committee after they have been settled.

While it would be possible to administer the area proposed to be included in the national monument as a part of the authorized recreation area mentioned above without special recognition of its archeological value, setting it aside as a national monument will give it the superior recognition that it deserves without detracting from the education and enjoyment that it will give those who visit the recreation area and without adding to the costs which would, in any event, be incurred in connection with the latter.

COST

The cost of land and interests in land to be acquired hereafter for the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument is, as has been stated, not more than $5,000. The capital costs to be incurred for road parking areas, a visitor center, and the like have been estimated by the Interior Department to be $260,000.

The committee directs that the Park Service make every effort to secure a donation of the 90 acres of land authorized for acquisition. If this is not possible then a scenic easement should be acquired rather than fee title.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1044) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, certain lands in the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, in exchange for certain other lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION EXERCISED BY THE UNITED STATES OVER LANDS WITHIN CAMP McCOY MILITARY RESERVATION, WIS.

The bill (H.R. 546) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Camp McCoy Military Reservation, Wis., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 588), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over such portions of Camp McCoy Military Reservation as are required at the present time and in the future. The immediate problem relates to traffic control over certain major highways which traverse the reservation.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

Camp McCoy, located in Monroe County, Wis., was originally established in 1908 on 14,000 acres of land, expanded during World War II, and now comprises approximately 60,000 acres of land owned in fee by the United States. This is a class I installation, and, although designated "inactive," it constitutes the major component training site for Reserve units from those States within the 5th Army area. The United States is vested with exclusive jurisdiction over a substantial portion of these lands by virtue of various acts of cession and the general statutes of the State of Wisconsin.

The camp is traversed by the three major public highways referred to in this bill, as introduced, Highways Nos. 16 and 21 having been in existence for many years, and I-90 being in the process of construction.

POLICE AUTHORITY

The retrocession of Federal jurisdiction over property within our camps, posts, and stations is made desirable, and even necessary, for a number of reasons which vary from place to place. For the most part, however, the particular difficulty which makes it necessary to place equal jurisdiction in the Federal Government and in the State is the matter of traffic control. Where the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction, military police, if deputized, do have authority to arrest civilian traffic violators but must bring the violators before a U.S. Commissioner. In many instances, the U.S. Commissioner is at a great distance, which entails the expenditure of both time and money from the military authorities. Where there is concurrent jurisdiction, military police can take appropriate action with respect to military personnel and the State can take similar action with respect to both civilian and military personnel.

Even where traffic control is not involved, exclusive jurisdiction in the United States can cause difficulties with respect to the attendance at public schools of children living within the area; divorce proceedings are sometimes impossible to initiate; and criminal prosecution, while possible, is rendered particularly difficult. In short, wholly unnecessary jurisdictional difficulties are encountered where exclusive jurisdiction rests in the United States.

MRS. A. E. HOUSLEY

The bill (S. 683) for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley was considered, ordered to be engrosed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. A. E. Housley, of Annapolis, Maryland, the sum of $467.69 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States arising out of the failure of the Post Office Department to pay Mr. A. E. Housley at the overtime rate for services in excess of eight hours in a day during the period October 15, 1962, through March 27, 1963. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney an account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 590), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mrs. A. E. Housley, of Annapolis, Md., the sum of $467.69 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States arising out of the failure of the Post Office Department to pay Mr. A. E. Housley at the overtime rate for services in excess of 8 hours in a day during the period October 15, 1962, through March 27, 1963.

CHILDREN OF MRS. ELIZABETH DOMBROWSKI

The bill (H.R. 1291) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary

of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each child of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, widow of Victor E. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to each such child under section 542 of title 38 of the United States Code for the period from July 1, 1960, to the date which each such child actually began receiving a pension under such section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 591), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the six children of the veteran, Victor E. Dombrowski, the amount of death pension which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies would have been payable to each such child from July 1, 1960, through March 27, 1962, had timely application therefor been filed.

LEWIS H. NELSON III

The bill (H.R. 4024) for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 592) explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Comptroller General to settle the claim of Lewis H. Nelson III, of Rome, N.Y., for compensation for services he rendered the Department of the Air Force at Griffiss Air Force Base after termination of his appointment on the basis of erroneous information that his appointment had been extended. The bill would authorize a payment of $255.33 in final settlement of the claim.

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

The bill (H.R. 4025) for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 595), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSES

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay three employees of the Federal Aviation Agency amounts found to be due them for personal property destroyed in a fire in Government quarters furnished in connection with their employment. The amounts authorized by the bill are as follows:

Terence J. O'Donnell	$435.83
Thomas P. Wilcox	3,138.20
Clifford M. Springberg	1,144.52

JOHN HENRY TAYLOR

The bill (H.R. 5819) for the relief of John Henry Taylor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 593), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve John Henry Taylor, of Columbus, Ga., of liability to pay the United States the sum of $923.51, representing salary overpayments received by him from the Post Office Department in the periods of January 1, 1953, through November 30, 1957, and January 11, 1958, through September 15, 1962, due to administrative error in the certification of service for longevity credit and without fault on his part. The bill would authorize the refund of any amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

LT. SAMUEL R. RONDBERG, U.S. ARMY RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 766) for the relief of Lt. Samuel R. Rondberg, U.S. Army Reserve, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$231.30" and insert "$240.30"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 766

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Samuel R. Rondberg, United States Army Reserve, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $240.30, representing the amount of overpayments of subsistence allowance received by the said Lieutenant Samuel R. Rondberg for the period from September 27, 1957, through June 10, 1958, while he was in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps serving at Washington University in the State of Missouri, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Samuel R. Rondberg, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 596), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to relieve Lt. Samuel R. Rondberg, U.S. Army Reserve, of all liability for repayment to the United States the sum of $240.30, representing the amount of overpayments of subsistence allowance received by the claimant for the period from September 27, 1957, through June 10, 1958, while serving in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Washington University in the State of Missouri, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

MRS. CLARA W. DOLLAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1873) for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 11, after "GS-3", to insert "longevity"; in the same line, after "GS-4", to insert "longevity"; and on page 2, line 12, after the word "Act," to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Clara W. Dollar, of Atlanta, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $629.35, representing overpayments of compensation she received as an employee of the Federal National Mortgage Association for the period from March 25, 1956, through October 28, 1961, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing her salary rate when she was promoted from grade GS-3, longevity step 3, to grade GS-4, longevity step 2, in violation of the limitations prescribed in section 802 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mrs. Clara W. Dollar, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from

the report (No. 597), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to relieve the claimant of liability to refund the sum of $629.35, representing overpayments of compensation she received as an employee of the Federal National Mortgage Association and to provide for the payment to the claimant of the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of such overpayments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that further proceedings under the call of the calendar be discontinued at this time, so that we may determine whether there is objection to the remaining two bills.

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, H.R. 4905, Calendar No. 526, is a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.

I have been endeavoring since the middle of last week to contact the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to discover whether or not he is opposed to the passage of that bill. I understand the Senate staff has been doing the same thing.

This measure is very important to our State. The area of the State where this land would be conveyed would be used as the site for a junior college, for which the State has put up $2 million for construction funds.

It is important that the bill be passed at the earliest possible time. I wonder if any progress has been made toward clearing this matter with the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We hope to have information about the bill shortly. In any event, it will be scheduled.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event there is objection by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, will the measure be scheduled for action without delay? It seems clear to me that this matter should come up at the earliest possible moment. The junior college is to be located on a part of the Eglin Field reserve which is not being used and is not intended for use. Already approximately 700 members of the families of the Armed Forces and civilian employees have registered in the junior college, and the little communities near the area have already made substantial contributions with respect to supplying and conditioning some 8 or 10 local buildings for the operation of the junior college this year.

I believe the Senate will pass the bill regardless of what the distinguished Senator from Oregon may think about it because its merits are so great.

I understand that the bill has been cleared by the leadership on the minority side so as to permit us to consider and pass it at the earliest possible time, because the $2 million already made available by the State agency which has jurisdiction must be committed by September 1.

More junior colleges are now in a formative condition in our State than we can supply with building funds at the same time. Because of the urgent need of a junior college in Okaloosa and Walton Counties to serve the local people, and also 15,000 to 18,000 personnel at Eglin Air Force Base, including uniformed and civilian employees, the bill is so important that it should have early clearance for passage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have approved the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that is the case, and I understand the majority leader desires to assist us in having it passed. I am not criticizing anyone but I wish to have the Senate proceed at an early date either to pass this bill as an unobjected-to matter or to submit it to the conscience of the Senate for consideration.

At this time we would be bound by whatever expression the Senate might make. The measure has already been passed by the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that the leadership on this side of the aisle is sympathetic to the problems of the Senator. We wish to assist in every way we can.

The majority leader is not present at this time. However, the majority leader does plan to schedule the bill soon. He hopes that the measure can be passed within the week.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

This bill has already passed the House unanimously as an unobjected-to measure. I believe that it should receive the same treatment at this end of the Capitol.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that we can do that also.

DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the passage of H.R. 89, which establishes the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, will be of great benefit to many millions of people seeking outdoor recreation. The creation of this area will bring boating, swimming, and picnicking within easy reach of the crowded metropolitan areas of New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. By our action today we are planning for the future. We are setting aside one of the most beautiful sections of the northeast to be retained in all its natural beauty.

The complex of the Delaware Water Gap and the new Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will preserve the heritage of our country. Natural features that have defied the onslaught of time will now be spared the further invasion of man's urbanization. This is a fine example of the way in which an area can cope with the problems of rapidly increasing population. This project will not only accommodate the people presently living within this area, but the scope of the recreational area is such that it will be able to adapt to the increases as they occur.

Moreover, this will be a complete recreational area. Plans call for good scenic roads throughout the area as well as competent access roads. Hiking trails will wind through the forest areas and move along streams, ponds, and waterfalls. The reservoir will provide facilities for boating and swimming. And all this within easy reach of over 30 million people.

Those who concentrated their efforts to make this project possible are to be commended for their farsightedness. We have provided for the future and I am sure that the people of the future will thank us for our efforts. I will be looking forward to the completion of this project so that our citizens will be able to enjoy the outstanding facilities that will be provided.

WILL ROGERS-WILEY POST MEMORIAL AIRPORT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 30 years ago yesterday the world lost a great humorist and a great aviator.

They were killed when their single-engine plane crashed shortly after taking off from a river 15 miles south of Barrow, Alaska.

Word of the tragedy was slow to reach the outside world. An Eskimo ran to Point Barrow to advise authorities of the crash. An Army Signal Corps staff sergeant sped to the scene in a launch, and then reported in a cryptic radio message the deaths of Will Rogers and Wiley Post.

The plane went down in a shallow river running through desolate country. Barrow, the northernmost point on the North American Continent, consisted of an Army signal station, a Government school for Eskimo and Indian children, and a Presbyterian mission.

Barrow has grown since then. A sign of the times will be the dedication of the Will Rogers-Wiley Post Memorial Airport at Barrow tomorrow.

But if the times have changed in the last 30 years, the contributions Rogers and Post made to the world have not been diminished by the years.

Mr. Post overcame physical and financial handicaps to help lead the world into the age of air travel. His around-the-world flights were magnificent accomplishments and his trip from New York to Berlin in 1933 was described as the greatest and most accurate flight up to the time of his death.

Will Rogers, of course, made his contribution in another field, no less necessary to the well-being of mankind.

Will Rogers was revered throughout the world because he spoke for every man in ways that made points without creating rancor. He was the friend of the famous and of the unknown.

The epitaph he wrote for himself is often quoted. It says:

I joked about every prominent man of my time but I never met a man I didn't like.

Perhaps more indicative of the Rogers philosophy is the statement:

A comedian can only last till he either takes himself serious or his audience takes him serious.

The world could stand some Will Rogers' advice today.

If the feats of Wiley Post opened the door to a new age, Will Rogers' words were meant for all ages.

It is fitting that the tragic accident which took their lives will be commemorated by an airport named for the two men.

SAFE CAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has won national acclaim for his diligent efforts to stimulate public discussion and action to reduce the frightful death toll on our Nation's highways.

A new nonprofit organization is making what I consider a useful and interesting contribution to this campaign. The Safe Car Educational Institute, using the slogan, "You can't be safe in an unsafe car," is working to convince the public, particularly young people, of the need for continuous preventive maintenance in safe driving.

A guiding spirit behind the formation of the institute is Purolator Products, Inc., of my hometown of Rahway, N.J. Purolator originated the Safe Car Educational Institute and is its chief supporter. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from Petroleum Marketer for June 1965, which explains the work of the Safe Car Educational Institute.

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

NEW ORGANIZATION FORMED TO TEACH YOUTH THAT CAR SAFETY STARTS WITH CAR CARE

YOU CAN'T BE SAFE IN AN UNSAFE CAR

(By James B. Lightburn, president, Safe Car Educational Institute

The Safe Car Educational Institute is a nonprofit, completely independent and noncommercial organization supported by the Nation's automotive equipment manufacturers and oil companies.

It has been created to aid both educators and industry in the task of educating the Nation's drivers that proper safe care is vital in order to reduce the heavy toll of death and destruction on the Nation's highways.

To accomplish this the Safe Car Educational Institute is launching a nationwide program to provide educational material to schools, clubs, organizations, and industry on the maintenance and operation of motor vehicles.

The initial program of the institute is to provide the millions of high school students now taking driver education courses with a supplementary educational program on car care designed to establish dramatically and forcefully this single, important, and irrefutable fact:

HELP YOUR COMMUNITY

The SCEI has produced, in cooperation with Training Films, Inc., a series of 7 color slide films aimed at, and designed for the 2 million high school students currently taking driver education courses.

These films cover in detail the following subjects:

"Seeing for Safety"; "Tire Care for Safety;" "Good Brakes for Safety;" "Filtration for Safety"; "Tuneup for Safety"; "Electric Power for Safety"; and "Cooling for Safety."

These films have been created specifically to enhance the present 30 hours of classroom driver instruction recommended by the National Educational Association and are not intended to replace or supplant any existing car care program.

In a survey of some 17,000 schools, officials of 98 percent of the schools said "Yes" they would welcome the films and the program as prepared by the SCEI.

The seven films can be purchased for $50 from Safe Car Educational Institute, Butler, N.J., 07405. They will be ready for distribution in July. No product is identified by brand but you can identify your company as the donor on the package containing the films. It is estimated the films will not be obsolete for at least 5 years.

RACIAL RIOTING IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the entire Nation is shocked and horrified by the racial rioting in the city of Los Angeles. In the wake of this holocaust, in which more than 30 lives have been lost and which still rages in some parts of the Los Angeles area, various and sundry so-called explanations and excuses have been offered by experts in the fields of law enforcement, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, urban affairs, and economics.

Regardless of how learned the expert or how scholarly the presentation, I, for one, cannot comprehend how poverty, slum conditions, unemployment, cultural or economic need, or alleged discrimination—as deplorable as they are—can be justification for lawlessness and rioting. I, for one, Mr. President, have yet to be given an acceptable excuse for taking the law into one's own hands. In our country under the American system of government, there is no such excuse.

However, I believe the Washington Evening Star in an editorial last Saturday came close to the heart of the matter. The Star in my opinion put its finger on a dangerous trend in America at the present time which we have seen manifested in Los Angeles, Springfield, Mass., Chicago, Ill., New York City, Selma, Ala., Americus, Ga., and indeed throughout all parts of the United States.

The Star, calling attention to a growing contempt for law and the rights of law-abiding people, asked this very pertinent question:

What is the effect on respect for law when prominent members of the clergy announce they will not obey a law if they disagree with it? What is the effect when the Supreme Court, as well as lower Federal courts, overturn convictions for law violations on the flimsiest of bases, or, as in one instance, for one stated reason?

Does this sort of thing encourage the hoodlum type to think that respect for law is for the birds? We think so.

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

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

LOS ANGELES RIOTS

The most baffling aspect of the savage rioting and looting which has swept Los Angeles is the utter senselessness of the thing.

It started Wednesday evening when a white policeman tried to arrest a Negro motorist on suspicion of drunken driving. And it really took off from there.

At least 16 people are dead, including a deputy sheriff and a fireman caught by a falling wall. Property losses will run high into the millions. The Negro rioters would set fire to buildings, and then stone and shoot at firemen responding to the calls. Also stoned were ambulances trying to aid the injured. Police cars were special targets, many being wrecked or burned. Finally, when the police conceded they could not control the mobs, National Guardsmen were called in last night and for the moment at least an uneasy peace prevailed.

To try to put this thing into some kind of perspective, Los Angeles has a Negro population of about 250,000, or roughly 12 percent of the total. The largest number of rioters at any one time is not believed to have exceeded 7,000. Thus, the hoodlums have constituted a relatively small minority. And there is probably much truth in the comment of a housewife who said: "It's the rowdy teenagers all gassed up on airplane glue and gin who provoke the trouble." The news photos indicate this is true. So does a report to the New York Times which stated that the Watts area of Los Angeles, where the trouble started, is not at all typical of the Negro city ghetto. There are some pockets of extreme blight. But, according to the dispatch, most of the Negroes "live in neighborhoods that would represent a dream of suburban bliss to Harlem Negroes."

So one must look behind the conventional excuses offered when something of this sort happens. What are the real reasons which touched off what a Los Angeles Negro official called an "inexcusable outbreak?"

One certainly is a hatred of all police, white or black, but especially white. Another is total contempt for law and the rights of law-abiding people. This latter is not peculiar to Los Angeles. It crops out in many places, although generally in less severe form.

In short, the rule of law, to which so much lipservice is paid, seems to be breaking down in Los Angeles and throughout the land. This is something which might properly concern the President's new Commission on Crime. What are the real reasons? Slums? Discrimination? Underprivileged? These doubtless are part of the story. We suggest, however, that the Commission examine other possibilities. What is the effect on respect for law when prominent members of the clergy announce they will not obey a law if they disagree with it? What is the effect when the Supreme Court, as well as lower Federal courts, overturn convictions for law violations on the flimsiest of bases, or, as in one instance, for no stated reason? Does this sort of thing encourage the hoodlum type to think that respect for law is for the birds? We think so.

At any rate, it has become clear in Los Angeles that the rioters will give way to nothing except superior force. And in that event the superior force must be applied—followed, one may hope, by severe punishment of those who may be found guilty of criminal activity.

SALES OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week we learned that an eight-man Soviet Trade Mission had concluded negotiations with Canada for the sale of 5 million tons of wheat and wheat flour. We knew, in addition, that last week Argentina had sold 1.2 million tons of wheat to Russia. And the week before that Canada sold an additional 700,000 tons of wheat to Russia for a total of over

260 million bushels of wheat for delivery over an 11-month period through July of 1966. In the latest round alone, it is estimated that Canada sold $450 million worth of wheat in these sales.

This is more wheat than was grown in North Dakota last year—and nearly as much as was grown in the spring wheat States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota.

Why did Russia avoid the United States in satisfying their domestic wheat needs?

In the last several months the Soviet Union has purchased substantial quantities of wheat from Canada, Australia, France, and other countries. The USDA Foreign Agricultural Service estimates that since July 1, 1965, Russia has bought a total of 6.3 million metric tons of wheat, and, when previous sales by Argentina and Australia to be shipped after July 1 are included, the Soviet purchases reach the amazing total of 9 million metric tons.

Not one single grain of wheat, however, has moved from the U.S. cash grain trade to the Russians or their East European neighbors during this same period. Why not.

Since July 1, 1964, the East European countries have purchased a total of 5¼ million tons of wheat from the world. But the U.S. share was a paltry 90,000 tons, or less than 2 percent of the total.

In the marketing year which closed July 1, 1965, Russia and Eastern Europe had bought from Canada, Argentina, Australia, France, and other countries a total of 7.56 million metric tons, or over 290 million bushels of wheat, or 1.3 percent of the total.

Why has not our share of the world market been greater?

Why have we not shared in a market potentially worth millions of dollars in support of our agricultural price structure and in foreign exchange?

In the fall of 1963, our Government declared wheat sales to the Soviet bloc to be in the national interest. We expected to sell to them grain in the neighborhood of 150 million bushels, but only through very aggressive salesmanship were we able to export even half of that amount to Russia and other East European nations, an amount far short of our expectations. In fact, the Soviet Union that year bought 10.05 million tons of wheat from the world, and we were able to market only 17 percent of that total.

Why again was our share so insignificant?

The answer is simply stated, but not easily understood.

An administrative ruling, first made in 1963, requires that 50 percent of any wheat or grains sold to the Soviet bloc countries—even though for cash on normal commercial terms—must be shipped in American-flag vessels.

This means that, since shipping charges of U.S.-flag vessels are considerably above world shipping rates, American wheat is priced out of foreign agricultural markets in the Soviet bloc nations.

Senator McGOVERN has pointed out time and again that shipping rates today are about $18 per long ton on American ships and $9.25 on foreign-flag ships. This is 48 cents per bushel on American ships, and 25 cents per bushel under foreign flags, or a difference of about 23 cents. Since we have required that one-half of our grain be shipped in U.S. bottoms, our agricultural traders are forced to assume a handicap of about 11½ cents per bushel in a highly competitive world market in which fractions of a cent per bushel are determinative.

It is estimated that a bare 1-cent-a-bushel increase added to the Eastern European purchases last year would have cost them an additional $1.5 million, while an 11-cent differential would have meant $16.5 million more.

This, then, is the basic reason why the Soviets and their satellites no longer even visit the United States to discuss commercial grain transactions. They do not visit the United States even though our country has a 900 million bushel wheat stock on hand, millions of idle productive acres, and economically depressed wheat producers. An extra 11 cents per bushel made the difference.

The avowed purpose of this administrative interpretation is to advance the health and vitality of U.S. merchant shipping. It does not achieve that goal. Indeed, it has just the opposite effect. The regulation involved here has proved to be illogical and irrational. It is not merely an arrow that fell short of the target, but a boomerang returning to plague the thrower.

According to Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy, when this regulation was first established it was not intended to interfere with our 1963 sales of wheat to Russia. But, he said, it has not worked out at all the way it was intended. In a statement to the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on March 16, he said the evidence was very clear that, except for this requirement, the sales to Russia in 1963–64 would have been approximately twice as large as they were. Mr. Murphy went on to say, and I quote:

> Thus, the actual effect of this requirement now is—not to provide additional business for the U.S. merchant marine—but to prevent U.S. longshoremen, U.S. exporters, and U.S. farmers from having employment and earnings that would otherwise accrue. The adverse effect of this one requirement on the U.S. balance of payments might well be in the range of $100 million a year.

The total effect is all very simple. No sales of wheat—no seafarers employed—no longshoremen employed in handling grain—no merchant marine vessels moving—no wheat being transported to ports—and millions of bushels of wheat going into Government storage. In effect, those who unrealistically advocate retention of the 50 percent requirement are realistically advocating retaining 50 percent of nothing. They continue their demands for 50 percent of nothing, even though tremendous cash markets are going by default to our wheat and grain-producing neighbors.

Mr. President, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, questioned Secretary of Commerce John Connor closely on the possibility of lifting the requirement of 50 percent domestic bottoms on cash sales in agricultural commodities, pointing out that this was not required for other cash exports in the nonstrategic field. We were assured that a committee was studying the requirement, and that we might expect action by the committee.

But just a little over 2 weeks ago, Secretary Connor again appeared before our committee, and I asked him when we might expect a report on these matters. He told the Subcommittee on International Finance that he had no estimate on when the Maritime Advisory Committee might be able to suggest a final resolution of this problem, even though not one American benefits by the regulation, and even though we are not able to sell our wheat for cash.

The Secretary told our subcommittee to expect dire consequences if the Government lifted the "bottoms" requirement, pointing out to us that this action could cause all the maritime unions as well as the longshoremen to join in the present strike, and thereby seriously cripple our foreign commerce and domestic economy. He told us, in effect, that although he agreed with the arguments for lifting the restriction, certain labor unions had tied his hands.

He said:

> Well, Senator MONDALE. I cannot disagree with your statements or your conclusions. I think the present situation is a highly unsatisfactory one. This whole question of cargo preference on private transactions is one of the many problems now under consideration through the Maritime Advisory Committee and internally within the Government through the medium of an intergovernmental task force chaired by Alan Boyd, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
>
> It is true as you say that under the present policy there seem to be no advantages to anyone; the farmers and the grain dealers are not getting any business, and neither are the mariners, the seafaring people, and members of the maritime unions benefiting, because no wheat is moving from the United States.
>
> And there seems to be no security reason why we shouldn't sell wheat to Russia. And, in fact, in some of the recent committee reports, such as the Presidential Miller Committee and the CED report, there were recommendations and relatively strong recommendations that our trade with some of the Eastern European Communist countries in commodities of this kind could very well be increased to the benefit of all concerned.

Not all of my friends in the labor movement will understand my position on this. I am a strong supporter of the principles of unionism. I am sympathetic with the goals of the workingman, and the role that strong and vigorous unions have in helping him attain those goals.

But I cannot be sympathetic with a position that is not in the public interest, is not in the interest of the workingman, whether seafarer, longshoreman, or transportation worker. In addition, this position does harm to the American farmer, who can ill afford it.

For this is what we are losing. First, even though we have declared expanded trade with the Soviet bloc to be "in the national interest," we have defeated that

national policy and lost valuable opportunities to meet and deal with the Soviets on a peaceful, commercial basis. There can be no question of humiliating, punishing, or denying the Reds here, because they can and will buy grain elsewhere if we do not sell it to them.

Second, it is painfully clear that we have lost substantial opportunities to make cash grain sales for dollars, and in so doing, strengthen our economy and improve our balance of payments. Lastly, we have ignored the economic plight of thousands and thousands of American wheat and grain producers. We could have reduced Government-held surpluses, reduced Government storage costs, and could have increased income to our American wheat farmers.

My farmers and farm cooperatives in Minnesota cannot understand this. Nor can I. The 1965 estimated production of all kinds of wheat in Minnesota will be approximately 19.8 million bushels. My farmers cannot understand why they are denied the opportunity to sell this wheat in foreign markets on a competitive basis.

Minnesota will produce in 1965 an estimated 21 million bushels of barley, 2.2 million bushels of rye, and 150,234,000 bushels of oats. While not all of this will go into foreign markets, I think we should at least have the opportunity to compete in those markets.

This is not the time to recount the plight of the farmer. It is enough to say that his return on his investment of capital and labor is sadly below what it should be. Many of us have labored long hours on the Senate Agriculture Committee and elsewhere to be of help. We have tried to increase the farmers' income and reduce Government costs. We have sought to bring supply into balance with demand so that the normal forces of the market could be used to help our farm economy. We are fighting for every dime we can get for our farmers.

Cash grain sales in the international market are the classic response to these needs and the most effective method to secure these objectives.

To be denied several millions of dollars in grain sales, under the circumstances of this case, is not only injury but insult as well.

The President is undertaking an unprecedented effort to seek a better balance in our world trade. It must be done. Those of us who serve on the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee have been holding hearings for months seeking new ways to help. Our Government has asked business to reduce overseas investments in certain areas, foregoing or reducing profits. We have necessarily placed restrictions on the outflow of American capital, once again denying desired profits. We have made many other efforts to save a few dollars here and a few there.

Everyone agrees that export cash sales are the most desired source of improvement in our balance of payments. Why then do we deny ourselves the benefit of multimillion-dollar cash sales of U.S. grain? I cannot see the justification.

And, in exchange for the loss of a multi-million-dollar grain business, what benefits can we see?

Absolutely none. I have yet to learn of a single group or individual in the United States which benefits from present policy. In fact, the only people to benefit are our neighbors in Canada, Argentina, Australia, France, Mexico, and other grain-exporting nations.

As it is, we are only encourging the expansion of productive capacity in other countries. Canada and Australia between them, furnished 62 percent of all the wheat moving to the Communist world from 1961 through 1964. The Soviet bloc market unquestionably helped to stimulate increased wheat production in those two countries. Canada's land acreage in wheat last year was 30 percent above the 1955–59 level, and Australia's was 60 percent above that average.

Compared with the 62 percent furnished by Canada and Australia, the United States furnished a mere 19 percent of the 4-year 1961–64 total exports of 1.4 billion bushels.

I think we can do better.

Two weeks ago, Mr. President, I made my first major speech on the floor of the Senate. In that speech I asked that the American farmer be given the opportunity to do far more than he has been able to do in fighting the world hunger explosion. But what good will it do to ask that he produce substantial quantities of foodstuffs for Public Law 480 purposes, and deny him the opportunity to sell his products for cash?

One month ago, I spoke to a Norway Day gathering in Minneapolis, and told them of the fantastic agricultural story in the United States. We, in the United States, produce far more than we can consume, we have surplus stocks and millions of idle acres, we are participating in the largest program of foreign food assistance in the history of mankind, and American agriculture provides the largest single source of dollar earnings in world trade.

It is difficult—no, impossible—to explain to our people why we prevent cash sales of farm commodities and thereby consume more of our production, reduce our surplus stocks and idle acres, and increase our foreign exchange balances.

The time to act is now.

Trade experts have estimated that the Soviet Union will purchase an additional 2 to 3 million tons more wheat in this marketing year. It may yet be possible for us to share in these sales and in sales to Eastern Europe.

In short, Mr. President, our present policy is a bundle of incredible contradictions. We have declared sales to Russia and Eastern Europe in line with national policy, but have made those sales impossible.

We face a severe balance-of-payments problem, and we have adopted an unprecedented program of voluntary restraints on businessmen and bankers, but we are denying ourselves a market which could provide up to $100 million a year.

We have a continuing farm crisis, we are paying millions to store grain, but we close off a cash market which would reduce surpluses and the cost of programs for the farmer.

There must be better ways to support our merchant marine than by this contradictory, self-defeating policy.

In closing, Mr. President, it is arguable that this requirement is not only unwise but may even be illegal. The Cargo Preference Act, established by Public Law 664 in 1954, provides that Government-aided sales and Government-owned commodities should move by American shipping in international trade. It is questionable whether or not the 50-percent requirement, designed for one purpose, may be written into export licenses for cash sales required under an entirely different law, the Export Control Act of 1949.

However, even though it be quite legal, it cannot stand on policy grounds. I ask that it be rescinded.

I ask unanimous consent that material dealing with this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1965.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is to confirm information given your Mr. Destler regarding sales of wheat to the Soviet Union and exports by source to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe in 1963–64 and 1964–65.

Our very preliminary estimate is that Eastern Europe may import about 5.5 million tons of wheat in 1965–66 compared to 5.25 million in 1964–65. If previous trade patterns are followed, some of the wheat sold to the Soviet Union may go to Eastern Europe.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. ESKILDSEN,
Associate Administrator.

Sales of wheat and flour to U.S.S.R. which are expected to be exported to U.S.S.R. and satellite countries, July 1965 to June 1966

[Million metric tons, wheat equivalent]

Sales since July 1, 1965:	
Canada	6.3
Argentina	1.2
France	.3
Subtotal	7.8
Estimated quantities from previous sales by Argentina and Australia to be shipped after July 1	1.2
Total	9.0

Wheat exports to U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, 1963–64 and 1964–65 [1]

[Million metric tons, wheat equivalent]

Source	U.S.S.R.		Eastern Europe	
	1963–64	1964–65	1963–64	1964–65
Argentina	0.01	0.19	0.07	0.06
Australia	1.54	.81	.04	
Canada	5.69	.90	.74	1.95
France	.15	.35	.48	1.07
West Germany	.40		.21	.05
Sweden			.08	.02
United States	1.72	.01	1.44	.09
U.S.S.R.			.92	1.60
Others	.54	.05	.20	.41
Total	10.05	2.31	4.18	5.25

[1] Source: International Wheat Council.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Aug. 12, 1965]

RUSS BUY MORE CANADIAN WHEAT

(By Dick Youngblood)

Announcement Wednesday of two major wheat sales to Russia by Canada and Argentina sparked renewed protest from the U.S. grain trade against what it considers short-sighted Government policies on trade with the Communist bloc.

Nevertheless, most trade sources admitted that these policies likely will not be changed in time—if at all—to allow the United States to cash in on the apparently subpar wheat crop in Russia.

The Russians jumped into the world wheat market with a bang yesterday, taking 187 million bushels of wheat or flour-equivalent from Canada, and more than 40 million bushels from Argentina.

These transactions, seen as an indication of impending failure in Russia's spring wheat crop, came a week after the Russians had purchased 27 million bushels of wheat from Canada, bringing the total for the two cash sales to $450 million.

Earlier, the Russians had also picked up 40 million bushels from Argentina.

To Richard Goodman, who represents Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in Washington, D.C., they represented sales lost to the U.S. wheat industry "because of ridiculous Government trade policies."

These policies, demanded by the maritime unions and granted by the Kennedy administration at the time of the 1963–64 American wheat sales to Russia, require that 50 percent of all commodities sold to the Communists must be moved on American ships.

And because shipping costs on American vessels are more than twice the costs on foreign ships, Goodman said, Russia has gone elsewhere for its grain.

The American farmer has been cut out of the growing Russian market, he said, and the maritime industry has been left with "50 percent of nothing."

Goodman estimated that, except for the 50-percent requirement, the United States might have captured half to two-thirds of the sales picked up by Canada and Argentina.

Others, however, expressed doubt that the U.S. share would have been anywhere near that large, no matter what its trade policies were.

"The Canadians, after all, would still be stiff competition under any circumstances," said Burton Joseph, Minneapolis grain trader who played a key role in the negotiations that led to the Russian wheat sale 2 years ago.

But he admitted that, without the 50-percent requirement, the United States might well have garnered a significant share of the recent sales.

Pressure for a change in policy has been building for months, both in and out of government, and picked up a full head of steam with the announcement of the Canadian and Argentine sales yesterday.

But among both the Minneapolis grain trade and officials in the Department of Agriculture, there is little optimism that this will be seen very soon, for two reasons:

The maritime unions have been unswerving in opposition to a change in the 50-percent requirement, and there is doubt that the administration is willing to knock heads with labor while a big share of its legislative program is still to be acted upon.

And with "American blood being spilled in Vietnam," as one Minneapolis grain trader put it, it might be politically dangerous to push for liberalized trade with the Communists.

But to Goodman and others in the grain trade, this presents the ideal opportunity for the United States to drive the wedge still further between Russia and Red China.

"If we were willing to give the Russians a fair shake in their search for food," he said, "we might see a softening in their attitude on Vietnam."

It was an argument that some thought the President might listen to—although even they admitted it was a longshot.

Nevertheless, news of the Canadian and Argentine sales to Russia pushed wheat futures on the Chicago board of trade to their highest levels of the season.

As brokers saw the situation, the Russian sales have "booked" all available supplies in both countries, leaving the United States the only major exporter for other large-quantity buyers.

Most sources in the Twin Cities grain trade disagreed, however, saying that the brokers have reckoned without the bumper wheat crop now in the offing in Canada.

"The Canadians still have wheat to sell," said Joseph, "and they have the port capacity to handle it. They will certainly continue to service their established customers."

This, most observers agreed, would prevent the United States from picking up any large block of sales as a result of the Russian transactions yesterday.

But another factor, which also made itself felt on the wheat futures market yesterday, is the recently reported prospect of weather-reduced crop yields and quality in Western Europe, particularly France and West Germany.

The inability of these countries fully to supply other Common Market nations, as well as other traditional customers, would have far greater impact on U.S. wheat exports than the Canadian sales, trade sources said.

And even here, many agreed, the Canadians would still have the capacity to be an important competitor.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1965]

LOST OPPORTUNITIES IN WHEAT

The United States is the odd man out in the huge wheat purchases being made by the Soviet Union. Canada and Argentina have received windfalls largely because U.S. wheat is too costly as a result of the Government's discriminatory requirement that 50 percent of wheat exports to Soviet-bloc countries must be shipped in American vessels.

The U.S. exclusion is unfortunate on many counts. Sales from the Nation's surplus would have meant greater prosperity in farming districts. They would also have increased the trade surplus in the Nation's balance of payments. Beyond these economic gains, the sales would have given tangible expression to the Johnson administration's desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

Even so, the big Russian purchases are important to the West. For Canada they mean higher incomes in agriculture, the one area of her economy that has not been enjoying boom conditions, and a cut in the big deficit in the Canadian balance of payments. As far as Argentina is concerned, the inflow of scarce dollars will have an even more significant impact on her inflation-racked, capital-short economy.

The United States itself will reap benefits indirectly. If the Russians pay for a good portion of their purchases by selling gold in London, the Treasury will not have to supply as much gold from its own dwindling stock to meet the demands of private and official sellers of dollars. Thus the Russians will be helping to calm the nervousness that has threatened to curb international trade and investment.

The West also is bolstered by the continued demand for grains from the country that had once been the granary of Europe. The Soviet Union has made great advances in industrialization and technology, but it has utterly failed to match the revolution that has taken place in American agriculture. And because Russia has to depend on outside sources of food supply, its leaders must recognize the desirability of strengthening their relations with those who can meet their needs.

It is ironic that the United States, which is the champion of liberalized trade and which has wheat to sell, cannot participate in this trade with Russia because of the high cost of American shipping. Yet the very unions that have done most to make the American merchant marine uneconomic are the chief insisters on quota preference guarantees. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has accurately testified that, if the shipping restrictions were eliminated, the almost certain result would be a protest strike by dock and maritime unions.

A large part of the merchant fleet is already strikebound for reasons that are a compound of economics and interunion warfare. Political strikes are just one more of the factors that contribute to the demise of American shipping; they also undermine our prosperity and our foreign policy.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1965]

SOVIET PURCHASES CANADIAN WHEAT FOR $450 MILLION—SALE OF 187 MILLION BUSHELS RAISES TOTAL IN 2 WEEKS TO 214 MILLION BUSHELS—GAIN SEEN FOR OTTAWA—HUGE TRANSACTION EXPECTED TO EASE PAYMENTS WOES—ARGENTINA GETS ORDER

(By John M. Lee)

TORONTO, August 11.—The Soviet Union has made its second giant purchase of Canadian wheat and flour in less than 2 years.

The Canadian Wheat Board, a Government sales agency, announced today the sale of 187 million bushels for cash. Combined with a 27-million-bushel Soviet purchase last week, the total of 214 million bushels was valued at $450 million by Canadian officials.

In September 1963, the Soviet Union made a record single purchase of 239 million bushels of Canadian wheat and flour valued at about $500 million. There have been a number of subsequent small purchases.

Argentina announced the sale of 1.1 million tons of wheat to the Soviet Union. In Moscow, it was indicated the Soviet spring wheat harvest would be well below last year's crop. The wheat purchases may prompt a resumption of Russian gold sales in the West, according to officials in Washington.

Today's big sale is expected to stimulate an already-booming Canadian economy and brighten this country's clouded payments picture.

Political observers saw an advantage for Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson's Liberal Government among traditionally conservative prairie farmers.

SOVIET COMMENT

There was also speculation whether the Soviet Union would have to sell gold to finance the wheat purchase, as it was reported to have done following the 1963 deal.

The announcement was made at a packed press conference at the Wheat Board's offices in Winnipeg. Trade Minister Mitchell Sharp, Agriculture Minister Harry Hays and W. C. McNamara, Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, attended.

"The West will be going full blast," Mr. Hays predicted.

Mr. Sharp called for cooperation from producers, elevator companies, railways, grain handlers, longshoremen, port authorities, and shipping companies to move the massive order.

N. G. Osipov, a Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, also attended the conference. He said that trade was a two-way street and that Russian sales to Canada must be increased.

"We help you to settle your trade imbalance with our big purchases," Mr. Osipov

said, "but in doing so we create a certain imbalance of our own." Mr. Osipov is heading a trade mission now visiting Canada.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimates that Canada bought $2.8 million worth of goods, mostly furs, from Russia last year, and sold $315.9 million, mostly wheat.

Today's mammoth sale coincided with a prediction of a bumper wheat crop for Canada of 12 million bushels, compared with the record of 703 million bushels harvested by prairie farmers in 1963–64.

The National Grain Co., Ltd., of Winnipeg, predicted an average yield of 29.1 bushels an acre, compared with a long-term average of about 17 bushels.

The estimates were 529.4 million bushels for Saskatchewan, 190 million for Alberta and 92.6 million for Manitoba.

Other grain companies have been informally estimating a crop of about 700 million bushels for the crop year that began August 1.

The contract on today's sale calls for delivery to start this month and to be completed by the end of next July. Shipment will be entirely through St. Lawrence River and Atlantic ports.

No part of the new contract will be shipped through Vancouver, which has been tied up for weeks by a grain-handlers strike. However, Mr. Sharp said the tieup was not responsible for the routing of the new shipment.

He said Vancouver already had large shipping commitments, including a major part of last week's 27-million-bushel sale and could be considered "sold out" for the new-crop year.

TERMS OF SALE

The new sale is for 4.6 million tons of wheat and an additional 400,000 tons in the form of flour, for a total equivalent of 187 million bushels.

Last week's 27-million-bushel sale was for 700,000 tons of wheat and 20,000 tons of flour.

Combined with smaller quantities bought earlier this year for delivery after August 1, total Soviet purchases for delivery in the current crop year amount to about 222 million bushels.

The Soviet Union has become Canada's major wheat customer, far surpassing purchases by Britain, Communist China and Japan. Most Soviet-bloc countries are also customers for Canadian wheat. Sales of wheat are second only to newsprint in Canadian export earnings.

Mr. Sharp said the wheat board, in view of the large order, "has taken every care to insure that it will be able to supply our traditional markets with their normal requirements."

EXPORT TARGET SET

Minister Sharp said the sale meant an assured market for every bushel of wheat that could be moved through Canadian ports during the next 12 months.

He set an export target of 600 million bushels for the current crop year, which would, if realized, exceed the 1963–64 record of 595 million bushels shipped.

Exports of wheat only for the 1964–65 crop year, ended July 31, were 366.7 million bushels. Wheat flour has not yet been calculated, the wheat board said. The total is estimated at about 390 million bushels, just shy of a 400-million-bushel goal. Five years ago, 300 million bushels in exports was considered good.

The carryover of wheat on hand at July 31 was estimated at 500 million bushels. Domestic consumption is about 150 million bushels annually.

The sale to Russia gives a lift to Canadian trade figures. In the absence of large shipments to Russia, which increased export figures last year, Canada's trade balance through April showed a $30 million deficit against a $95.5 million surplus a year ago.

Lagging trade had led to predictions of a $1 billion deficit in trade in goods and services this year.

Canadian grain, milling and transportation securities reacted favorably to news of the sale. On the Toronto Stock Exchange, Maple Leaf Mills was up 1, to 16, the Canadian Pacific Railway was up ⅝, to 64⅛, and Massey-Ferguson, the farm-implement producer, was up 1⅜, to 30½.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 11, 1965]

SOVIET HARVEST SEEN DROPPING

Moscow, August 11.—The Soviet Union's spring-wheat harvest will be well below 40 million metric tons, a drop from the 1964 yield of 47.9 million, according to indications.

Winter wheat, now mostly harvested, looks promising but there are signs that the spring-wheat yield may sink as low as 30 million tons.

The average spring-wheat crop for 1958–62 was 42.7 million tons.

The harvest is not expected to be as disastrous as the one in 1963. In September of that year, the Soviet Union made a single record purchase of 239 million bushels of Canadian wheat and flour.

HOUSTON POST BACKS SENATE ACTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently this legislative body rejected a proposal which would have permitted States to apportion representation in one chamber of a State legislature on factors other than on population.

The Houston Post on August 8, 1965, printed an editorial supporting the Senate's rejection of the reapportionment amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

DISTRICTING AMENDMENT BLOCKED

The country should be grateful to those Members of the U.S. Senate who joined in blocking, first in the Judiciary Committee and then on the floor, the proposed Dirksen amendment to the Federal Constitution.

The amendment, if submitted by Congress and ratified by the required number of State legislatures, would have legalized what the Supreme Court, in an historic ruling last year, said is unconstitutional. It would have permitted States by referendum vote to apportion representation in one chamber of a State legislature on factors other than population.

In its decision, the Court said that all State lawmakers must represent people rather than acres of land or something else and that representation must be substantially equal. This means that legislative districting must be on the basis of population alone.

In a country that is now predominantly urban, this means an end to the control that rural areas long have exercised over State governments and with it an end to the control maintained by vested interests that benefit from this violation of democratic principles.

The sponsor of the amendment, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois, says that he will try again at this session of Congress to get his proposed amendment submitted, and he probably will. Those long entrenched in power do not give up easily, and the Senator is particularly vulnerable to their pressure.

By its ruling, the Supreme Court said, in effect, that the country must return to the principle of democratic, representative government at the State level. To be representative, government must be responsive to the needs and wishes of a majority of the people, and this is unlikely, if not impossible, if State legislative districting is based on factors other than population.

It became necessary for the Federal courts to act only because the States themselves would not adjust to the changes that have taken place in the country during recent decades, one of them being the shift from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban society.

It is worth noting that some of those who screamed the loudest about the Supreme Court's ruling and who were the most ardent supporters of the Dirksen amendment are those who shout the loudest about States rights and denounce most vigorously expansion of the Federal Government.

The fact is that much of this expansion of the Federal Government has come about because State governments are unwilling or unable to meet the needs of their people satisfactorily. State political leaders have resisted all efforts to modernize State governments and to make them responsive to the will of the people. Through inaction, they have made it necessary for the Federal Government to act in an increasing number of areas.

The net result of the Supreme Court's decision should be better and more effective State government, which in turn should tend to discourage the accretion of Federal power.

The Dirksen amendment represented an attempt to preserve State power arrangements that are not in the best interest of the people or the Nation. One can only hope that it also represents the last, dying gasp of those who really do not believe in the basic principles upon which the American system of Government is supposed to be built and who, while giving them lip service, attempt to block and frustrate their application in practice.

POVERTY PROGRAM PONDERED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, some time ago, Vermont's former U.S. Senator Ralph E. Flanders, a friend to many of us, brought to my attention the work of one William D. Pardridge, with the suggestion that his views be given wide attention through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Like many Americans, Mr. Pardridge is concerned by this Nation's economy. But he is not like those who regard the economy much as they do the weather—as something everybody talks about but something nobody can do anything to change.

To the contrary, Mr. Pardridge is a man who believes in action. And so, he has left his graduate studies at the University of Chicago to launch on an ambitious project to write 50 articles examining what he calls economic inequities—inequities which seriously impair our national well-being. Eventually, after each of the articles has appeared in a leading newspaper in one of the 50 States, Mr. Pardridge plans to publish them in book form for the attention of professors, national advisers, and other economists who have the greatest influence on the Nation's economic direction. Hopefully, the inequities will be removed or, at least, efforts to eliminate them will be initiated.

As a part of his series, Mr. Pardridge focused on the war on poverty in an article carried on July 25, 1965, in the Pittsburgh Press. One need not agree

with every word to share the author's hope that he will stimulate the public's thinking. From careful thought, better solutions to our economic problems may emerge and, for this reason, I believe the provocative points raised are well worth the attention of all of us.

In his letter to me, our former colleague from Vermont wrote:

I have known Mr. Pardridge both professionally and personally for some 16 years, and I can vouch without reservation for his intellectual integrity and great dedication to the pursuit of economics * * *. I want men like you to know him and be known by him. Helping Bill Pardridge will be helping my own principles of intellectual manners and morals.

Mr. President, with this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Pill for Poverty Is Jobs," together with the editor's explanatory note, be printed, by request, at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editor's note and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 25, 1965]

ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE: THE PILL FOR POVERTY IS JOBS

(By William D. Pardridge)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William D. Pardridge, whose hobby is economics, is a former national magazine editor and a Chicago University graduate student. He left Chicago a month ago to prepare a series of articles on what he calls the "Economic Inequities" in America today. Following is one he wrote for the Pittsburgh Press. It is an amusing and interesting critique in which he contradicts the basic philosophy underlying the Government's "poverty program" and pokes fun at the economic theory on which it depends.)

The poverty program is poverty stricken.

It also is upside down.

Almost all professional economists today were brainwashed in their formative years by the teaching of the glamorous Lord Keynes.

This con artist said that employment is caused by investment. From this simple pronouncement in 1936, which was born under an intellectual flatrock, a cult spread out of England and across Western economic thought.

The cart is clearly before the horse. Employment is not caused by investment; investment is induced by employment.

A man with money will invest in a new shoe factory only if he thinks he can sell shoes. And he knows he can sell shoes only to people who already have jobs.

IT'S SIMPLE

This is not complicated, but textbook-trained economists make it so.

To John Maynard Keynes, the idol of the dilettantes, everything is based on money. The real world, however, says that everything is based on goods. Money is simply a way of exchanging goods. It has no economic value in itself.

Long before money came along, people were trading goods. Money simply makes trading easier.

Even in the New York Stock Exchange, the moniest place in the world, the lingo is that brokers are trading stocks.

LOOKING AT POVERTY

Well, so it is with the poverty program.

Instead of money, everything is unemployment. Everything is poverty. The question is: Are you broke? Or how broke are you?

More energy is spent defining poverty for a family of four, or for a worker with two dependents, or for single women between the ages of 24 and 27, or for widows with one dependent—seriously—than is spent on constructive economic analysis.

Our census takers and our electronic computers (an evil team) can tell us right off just who needs help.

Everybody is analyzing poverty, which our intelligentsia suspect is caused by some unknown, highly complicated, and difficult theoretical condition known around town as being out of work.

Everybody is analyzing unemployment.

Nobody is analyzing employment.

THE ONLY WAY

No crystal ball is needed; just read your newspaper and you will see that all the reports coming out of Washington and the universities relate to who needs a job: or how much uneconomic Government money is needed to "do away" with poverty.

This is all for the birds.

There is only one way to decrease unemployment—without the Nation going broke, that is. The one and only way is to increase employment.

Now everybody knows this. But they don't.

The very concept of unemployment should be discarded as insidiously wasteful, and especially negative in attitude. Economists must analyze the elements of employment so that weak elements may be strengthened, and strong elements left alone.

IT DIFFERS

America is not like a quart of homogenized milk. The weak elements of employment in Pittsburgh may be completely unlike the weak elements in Denver.

Michigan may be strong in those elements in which Iowa is weak, and weak where Iowa is strong or plain average.

We should determine what are the elements of employment—not who is poor and how poor is he, anyway.

We don't need computers to tell us who is poor. And we don't need machines to tell us that poverty is going to be erased away by Government dole. Because it isn't.

In one fine American city substantial poverty program money is being used to increase relief checks. That money which actually is a claim on real economic wealth—goods and plant facilities—that money is being taken away from the taxpayers' pockets.

THE POCKETS

Now these taxpayers' pockets are the source of the life of the retail stores that keep the factories going, that create and maintain employment.

Forget unemployment. It's a dirty word. Concentrate on employment.

Demand for goods, then, is an element of employment. In fact, it's the most important element there is.

What very little statistical analysis of this element has been done, in the back rooms, proves it every time.

Education is another element of employment. Statistical analysis also supports this element—but only when education is general education, not when it is vocational training or the much touted work-experience programing.

What good is work experience when there is no work?

SLOW CURE

It is the general level of education that is an important element of employment. And this general level varies from place to place in the United States. We can find those weak spots, and move in with public school construction, schoolbook grants, and, especially, substantial teacher-training grants.

This takes time. But our worrisome level of persistent low employment didn't come overnight. And the cure won't do the trick overnight.

MORE SCHOOLING

There is a side effect that could be an amazing boon in both the short and the long run.

Factory work hours have decreased steadily from the 70 or 80 hours a week of a century ago to the present 40-hour workweek. But nobody thinks of raising, quite in tune with fewer work hours due to advanced technology, the mandatory school age limit.

At once, this would reduce the number of people looking for jobs and strengthen considerably one of the basic elements of employment.

It doesn't cost any more money to be busy in a schoolroom than to be idle on the streets. Savings on police and court expenses would buy the books. This is a social orientation program that has been completely ignored.

There are natural school dropouts, of course, just as there are natural work idlers. We'll always have both. But to say that the teenage population of America is not mentally equipped to finish at least high school (and many intellectual snobs say it) is exactly the same as saying that America is a mentally retarded nation.

It may be, at that, from the looks of things.

OTHER FACTORS

Besides purchasing power and education, there are many more elements affecting employment, of course; like the price level, racial mixture, technological development, money stock, and so on. All are orphans of the big grab for huge research grants that scream for quick results.

This is veneer research. It isn't even research. It's an intellectual, white-tie, charity ball. The results are posted in the learned journals instead of in the hiring halls.

In America there is no advanced statistical analysis of the elements of employment. There is a "sophisticated" analysis of whether or not George is more or less poor than Fred.

What difference does it make who is poorer than whom? What these guys need are jobs, not labels.

WOLVERINE STANDS ITS GROUND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, we have all heard of the wolverine, known as one of the fiercest creatures inhabiting the northern latitudes. We have heard of his great strength despite his small size, his courage and we have heard, too, that many men consider him a predator who should be wiped off the face of the earth. Some men do not feel that way; they feel that the wolverine, limited in numbers, fighting a losing battle against human encroachment on his territory, is a marvelous creature that should not be shot at sight, should be left alone in most instances so that he can reproduce his kind and so that there always will be wolverines instead of merely books about a vanished animal.

However all of that may be, we do not hear too much about the wolverine. Even more seldom do we read about it. Now we can, for Howard Rock, editor and publisher of the Tundra Times published at Fairbanks, Alaska, has in the Times for July 26 written a thrilling account of how a wolverine stood his ground against four wolves. Speaking for myself, this is one of the best wildlife stories I have ever read and I ask unanimous consent to make it a part of my remarks now so that

others may have the pleasure of reading Howard Rock's story:

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

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Tundra Times, July 26, 1965]

ARCTIC SURVIVAL: WOLVERINE KILLS CARIBOU, DEFENDS IT AGAINST PACK OF FOUR WOLVES

(By Howard Rock)

Uyatorna walked up a low ridge. He had been hunting caribou about 5 miles from his family's camp at the fishing grounds at Kukpuk River. The camp was some 35 river miles up from the village of Tikiqaq (Point Hope).

As he was about to reach the crest, he noticed a movement that surprised him from the corner of his eye to the left. He looked quickly to see what it was. What he saw made the hair on the nape of his neck stand on end and a shiver trickled down his spine causing goosepimples to appear on his body.

He ducked quickly to make sure he was not seen. He looked around to find a place where he could conceal himself. He saw a rock formation to his right. He backtracked, keeping himself as low as possible by ducking his body.

He took an arrow and carefully placed it on his bow for instant use if he had to. He made a curving turn and approached the rock formation from below making sure to be very quiet. He tiptoed to it. He was pleased that the rock was craggy and it would make a perfect place to hide.

He also felt fortunate the wind was blowing from the east, the direction he was going when he came upon the scene. It was a stiff wind and it had muffled the sounds of his footsteps.

He edged himself to the rock and looked through an aperture. It was a perfect vantage point from which to watch the drama that was about to unfold slightly below him and not 30 yards away. There was even a place for him to sit comfortably without exposing himself.

RISES EARLY

Uyatorna had risen early that morning to go hunting. His wife Amasuk had complained the night before that she was tired of eating ptarmigan and squirrel meat that had been their diet for many days.

"Uyatorna, we have been eating ptarmigan and squirrel meat for a long time now and it would be good to have some caribou meat for a change. We also need the skins for parkas for the coming winter," Amasuk had said.

When the hunter started, he went in the easterly direction across valleys and hills. The wind had already been blowing from the east. He hoped that he might be able to head off some caribou heading east against the wind that the animal always seem to do from which ever direction the wind might blow.

He saw a few of them a long distance to the northeast. They were heading east from the direction of Cape Lisburne to the north. He looked to the west but there was no caribou to be seen in that direction.

Ptarmigan was plentiful along the way and Uyatorna flushed many of them. He didn't bother to try to take any. He didn't want to load himself down while traveling away from his camp. He would get a few on the way back.

FORBIDDING CLOUDS

Uyatorna walked on. The velocity of the east wind increased and the clouds swelled into huge dark masses ahead of him.

"If the wind shifts to the south, it will rain," he thought.

He thought of turning back but a low ridge ahead intrigued him.

"I might see some caribou resting beyond it," he said aloud. "Amasuk was right. It would be good to have some caribou meat for a change."

The hunter was not optimistic about getting a caribou that day. He made up his mind that he would turn back after looking over the country beyond the low rise if he didn't see any animals.

He walked up the incline. The footing was good and hard. It was a rocky surface with a covering of moss. Since it was the middle of August, there were some moss flowers in bloom. The velocity of the wind increased as he neared the crest and he leaned against it.

WOLVES AND THEIR PREY

Uyatorna become alert as the country became visible beyond the ridge. He noticed a movement to his left which stopped him cold. The animal moved but a little but it was enough for him to notice. It was a wolf.

He made a momentary glance in the direction the wolf was looking. He saw three more. In the center of them was a wolverine circling around what appeared to be a dead caribou.

Uyatorna ducked and stealthily backtracked. The animals didn't appear to notice him. He made a half circle away from them and silently tiptoed to the rock formation to the right of him. He drew an arrow and adjusted it to his bow for instant use.

As he set himself on a ledge of the rock, the hunter looked through a crevice. From this perfect vantage point he nervously settled to watch this impending battle—a deadly drama that was about to unfold.

As he watched, a series of chills ran down his spine. The scene seemed deadlier than he realized. It was strangely silent—an ugly scene. The wolves slinked in what seemed to be carefully gaged movements. They were edging closer and closer to the wolverine.

Each of the wolves bared its fangs from time to time without sound. They seemed to be perfectly coordinated to the deadly task they were about to undertake. They kept baring their fangs, heads lowered—their ears pinned down against the back of their skulls. For all the hunter could tell, the wolves were evenly spaced and of equal distance to the perimeter of ground circled by the wolverine.

THE PREY

The wolverine kept circling the caribou carcass in ambling motions characteristic of its pudgy, short-legged body. His head moved from side to side in swift vigilance of the deadly enemies around him. He kept his wicked fangs bared much of the time. He looked pitifully small against the large gray wolves.

As he watched, Uyatorna concluded that the fate of the wolverine was a foregone conclusion. It was just a matter of time. How could a small animal like him ever hope to pit its small body, although powerful to be sure, against the great bulk of the savage wolves?

The hunter was amazed at the show of courage of the small animal. He was not about to cower away leaving the caribou he had claimed for himself. He had apparently killed it himself because of the apparent savagery of the attack. The throat of the caribou had all but been torn away.

THE TIGHTENING CIRCLE

Spellbound and with tingling expectancy, Uyatorna watched the ever-tightening circle of wolves around the hapless and courageous wolverine. It seemed to him that it was a maneuver designed to unnerve the doughty little animal.

The maneuver was deadly, calculated—that showed a latent and lethal ferocity. Uyatorna felt a pang of pity for the wolverine. Should he intervene? He decided against it. The animals were working themselves into a pitch of fury and if he revealed himself, there was a good chance that they would turn on him.

The wolverine no longer circled around the dead caribou. He settled on the side where the dead animal's legs lay sprawled. Each of the wolves were now about 15 feet from the object of their prey. They began to emit low, threatening growls, not all at once but by staggered turns. This forced the wolverine to turn its body in different directions in quick succession.

Still the wolves edged forward shrinking the deadly ring. Suddenly one of them, apparently the leader, snarled wickedly, baring its fangs. The others followed, again in staggered turns. The wolverine sprung around swiftly with hissing growls—fangs bared.

The series of snarls increased. The wolves were apparently trying to confuse their prey that was beginning to spin around to his left and right by turns. He was expecting attack from any quarter any moment.

THE DEADLY SCENE

Uyatorna watched in dreadful fascination. The scene below him was a deadly one where each animal would ask no quarter nor would it expect any. At least one of them would be dead. The hunter no longer doubted in his mind that one of the dead would be the wolverine.

"Amaqut makoa tuqutiqneagii munna qaveoraq." ("These wolves will surely kill the little wolverine") Uyatorna thought.

The snarls of the wolves continued. They began to make feinting moves toward the wolverine. Uyatorna was amazed at the little animal. He seemed to be aware of each feint. He showed great agility and he seemed ready to meet each one. What if the wolves attacked all at once in a mass of collective fury? What chance has he got?

THE ATTACK

Even as he wondered, one of the wolves attacked a split second before the others. The wolverine met it in a surprising and unorthodox manner. The little animal ducked and appeared to go under the wolf. At that instant there was a sickening, grinding snap of bone. In a lightning-fast counter, the wolverine had gone for the left hind leg of the attacker and closed his powerful jaws on the thigh and bone.

The victim yowled with pain and twisted violently in the air and fell down hard on the front quarters of one of the attacking wolves, confusing it. The wounded wolf's leg hung loosely—grotesquely—blood squirting from it in a series of jets.

The little brown and cream haired animal took advantage instantly and snapped its jaws on the small of the back of the momentarily confused animal and twisted its grip wickedly. The vicious attack apparently did a great damage, because the wolf tried to flee all but dragging its hind quarters.

The two remaining wolves made a savage attack on the wolverine, momentarily knocking him off balance. The little animal regained his footing while one wolf gripped him on the neck. The other one went for his flanks.

The powerful little carnivore, apparently worrying about his flanks, made a quick, twisting motion. An instant later his heavily muscled right foreleg whipped and caught the wolf at his flanks on the shoulder with his sharp nails and paw. An exposed flesh suddenly appeared as the skin flapped down from the wound.

The injured wolf backed away limping but the one at his neck held on tenaciously—wickedly. The wolverine was in trouble. He made a series of quick motions and suddenly there was a terrible crunch of bones. The little animal had caught his remaining

attacker by the knee of its right foot and crushed it with his powerful jaws.

The wolf let out a howling scream as it released its hold on the neck of the wolverine. This is what the latter wanted. He turned aggressor in an instant and snapped his powerful jaws on the neck of his enemy partly from under and side.

THE ENRAGED WOLVERINE

Working for a leverage, the enraged wolverine braced himself and made a pulling and twisting motion. The body of the huge wolf whipped partly in the air. Its neck snapped and it fell dead—its head in a gruesome and unnatural position.

THE CARNAGE

The little animal had emerged victorious against what seemed impossible odds. He looked around and then made a circle surveying the carnage and the evidence of it he had created. The terrible death-dealing look remained in his eyes. He bared his fangs from time to time as he emitted half hissing growls. There was froth at the corners of his mouth.

Except for his murderous eyes and wicked fangs, the wolverine looked anything but a lethal killer to Uyatorna. He ambled along clumsily as if he didn't possess any agility and strength. It was all there along with one of the most powerful jaws possessed by any animal.

The wolverine was apparently trying to locate the trail left by the wolf that had left the scene of the fray dragging its hind quarters. He seems to have picked up the scent and proceeded to trail it.

"AYIIYAA," shouted Uyatorna. "Little wolverine, you have done quite enough. I will kill that wolf for you."

As he shouted, the hunter revealed himself above the rock formation. The animal saw him instantly and bristled, baring his fangs. Man was another sort of an enemy and the wolverine instinctively withdrew and ambled away.

Uyatorna walked around the rock and began to pursue the wounded wolf. When he came upon it, he shot an arrow through its heart. He didn't bother to go after the one with a severed artery on its hind leg. It had gone over a low rise and disappeared.

"If he hasn't bled to death by now, he will in a short time," Uyatorna voiced his thought.

The one with the shoulder wound had run away with a bad limp and it was nowhere to be seen.

HEALTHY CARIBOU

Uyatorna went back to the dead caribou and the wolf. He was surprised that it was a yearling bull and a healthy one except for a recent injury to the right eye. It had been badly torn into uselessness. It had probably suffered an unexpected accident and fell behind a herd when the wolves apparently took pursuit.

The wolverine might have been in a lucky position and beaten the wolves to the attack. Uyatorna concluded that it had attacked the caribou from the blind side and this unexpected incident had created the deadly drama which the hunter witnessed in spellbound fascination.

The man skinned the caribou and cut out choice pieces of meat and wrapped them in the skin.

The wolverine had taken a position at a distance just beyond effective arrow range from the man. Uyatorna could have shot the animal if he wished because it had been within perfect range.

He didn't however, because he had come to admire the little animal's invincible courage under what seemed to be the most deadly and impossible odds. The wolverine was licking its wounds and watching Uyatorna as he worked around the carcass.

The hunter cut out a piece of caribou meat and walked part way toward the animal.

"Uvah, qaveoraq, tutumik neqeoraqin." ("Here, little wolverine, eat a piece of caribou meat,") he shouted. He threw the morsel toward the fierce little carnivore. As the hunter returned to the carcass, the animal edged toward the piece of meat and ate it.

THE WINDFALL

As he finished skinning the dead wolf, Uyatorna turned to the wolverine and shouted, "Little wolverine, now you can have all the caribou meat you want."

He skinned the one he had shot through the heart and then followed the bloody trail of the third one. He found it about a quarter of a mile where it had bled to death.

As he skinned it, Uyatorna observed, "These were young grown wolves and they were reckless. The one that got away will never forget the terrible lesson he learned today."

As he started home with the load of caribou meat and skin and three wolf pelts, Uyatorna chuckled:

"Amasuk will never believe me when I tell her how I got all these animals."

MINNESOTA POLL SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's policies in Vietnam have brought forth loud criticism from a vocal minority, a minority which claims that these policies do not have the support of the American people. But I am proud to report that, according to a recent poll by the Minneapolis Tribune, a strong majority of Minnesotans do stand behind the President and the action he has taken in meeting this very difficult problem.

President Johnson has declared that we must support the people of Vietnam and their efforts to determine their own destiny in the face of Communist aggression. Fifty-eight percent of Minnesotans clearly support this policy, compared to only 21 percent who oppose it. An even greater majority, 77 percent, feel that the President's explanation of the reasons for our commitment is a convincing one. And 58 percent of the people of my State recognize the necessity of sending more American troops to Vietnam at this time.

Results of the poll also indicate strong support for the President's efforts to find an alternative to war, his efforts to reach a peaceful settlement through negotiations which our Communist adversaries still refuse to participate in.

Mr. President, I am proud that the people of my State are so clearly in support of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the Minnesota poll of August 8, 1965, be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 8, 1965]

FIFTY-EIGHT PERCENT APPROVE SENDING OF TROOPS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Most Minnesotans (58 percent) support U.S. policy of sending more troops to battle in South Vietnam, a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll indicates.

Thirty-one percent of the men and women questioned in home interviews disapprove of enlarging the Nation's role in Vietnam, as is being done by the Johnson administration.

The rest of the people are undecided or have special opinions to offer.

Approval is based mainly on the feeling that "we have committed ourselves and have got to end the war as soon as possible" or that U.S. involvement in the war needs to be increased to stop communism.

Such endorsements often are expressed reluctantly in the survey. "I don't like the idea, but we have to do it," a Bloomington housewife said.

A farmer from Otter Tail County put it this way: "I guess we got to finish what we started, but we're not wanted over there. It's just like it was in Korea, all these boys killed and no real answer for it."

Frustration over the difficult war in southeast Asia and dismay over losing American lives there are the main factors which cause Minnesotans to disapprove of sending more troops.

What is expressed in the survey is a close approximation of how the general public in the State reacts. That's because the 600 people who were interviewed only 2 weeks ago are an accurate model of the adult population.

They reveal uncertainty about U.S. participation over a decade in the affairs of Vietnam, although a majority of people (58 percent) think our reasons for helping South Vietnam are sound.

The public is more in agreement when it comes to accepting President Johnson's explanation for the United States being in South Vietnam; 77 percent say a paraphrase of Mr. Johnson's remarks contain "good" reasoning.

People were asked early in their interviews:

"Let's consider southeast Asia for a moment. The United States has been helping South Vietnam since 1954. Do you think the reasons for our support are sound or not sound?"

The replies:	Percent
Reasons are sound	58
Reasons are not sound	21
Other answers	3
No opinion	18
Total	100

Interviewers then changed the subject and asked several questions on other topics, a conversational maneuver that was specified on their question forms.

That interlude afforded people a chance not to feel locked into their previous opinions when they were asked:

"President Johnson has said that the United States is in South Vietnam to help the people there secure their independence and to show the world we keep our promises to fight for freedom. Do you think those are good reasons or poor reasons for being in South Vietnam?"

The answers:	Percent
Good reasons	77
Poor reasons	14
Other answers	3
No opinion	6
Total	100

Almost half of the people (47 percent) who said on the earlier question that our participation in Vietnamese affairs was based on unsound principles thought the President's explanation was good.

Here is a comparison of the two sets of responses with the qualified answers and no opinion count not shown:

[In percent]

	U.S. participation		L.B.J.'s reasons	
	Sound	Not sound	Good	Poor
All adults	58	21	77	14
Men	62	24	75	16
Women	54	19	78	12
Adults with grade school training	44	29	71	16
High school	59	19	81	11
College	73	17	75	16
Democratic-Farmer-Laborites	63	19	83	11
Republicans	58	27	74	16
Independents	52	21	70	16

The next question was: "We now have 70,000 men in Vietnam. The U.S. ground forces will be increased to 150,000 troops, many of whom will be taking an active part in the fighting. Do you approve or disapprove of our playing a larger role in the Vietnam struggle?

[In percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	Other and no opinion
All adults	58	31	11
Men	67	25	8
Women	50	36	14
Grade school	54	31	15
High school	57	34	9
College	66	25	9
DFL'ers	67	26	7
Republicans	55	34	11
Independents	49	37	14

Each person who had an opinion was asked why they approved or disapproved. These are their answers, the percentages being expressed in terms of all people interviewed:

	Percent
Approval:	
We committed ourselves and have got to follow through, must end war as soon as possible	40
Must stop communism	16
Must keep promise to South Vietnam	4
Other answers	3
Disapproval:	
They don't want our help and we don't belong; United States can't win anyway	8
Nothing is accomplished, we have done enough there, should pull out or end it now	5
We are losing too many lives	5
Must be another solution, the U.N. should help	5
Other answers	11

As an example, the above table indicates that 40 percent of all the people interviewed approve of sending more troops to Vietnam because we have commitment to follow through. Many persons supplied more than one reason for their approval or disapproval.

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF KALAUPAPA SETTLEMENT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, 100 years ago a tiny settlement was established on the island of Molokai in the Hawaiian Kingdom for the victims of leprosy, now known as Hansen's disease.

Last week a 3-day centennial observance was held at the isolated settlement. Guests from the outside world were invited by the nearly 200 active and inactive patients for a luau—Hawaiian feast—and a display of crafts made there.

It is difficult to imagine now the pathetic condition of those who were sent to the settlement at Kalaupapa in the early years. Into this valley of death and despair came Father Damien, who ministered to the afflicted until he himself succumbed to the disease.

The dramatic story of the Kalaupapa settlement and the heroic sacrifice of Father Damien has been retold on this centennial occasion in an article in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of August 11, 1965. Ably written by Tom Kaser, the article describes the settlement as it was and as it is today.

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

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

KALAUPAPA MARKS A CENTURY OF ISOLATION

(By Tom Kaser)

KALAUPAPA, MOLOKAI.—You can't help but feel a little humble at this place, especially when you consider its geography and its history.

Kalaupapa, located on a peninsula at the foot of cliffs on Molokai's rugged north coast, is one of only three centers for the treatment of Hansen's disease (leprosy) in the United States today.

Hale Mohalu, in Pearl City, and a U.S. Public Health Service hospital in Carville, La., are the only other institutions in the country that exclusively treat communicable or "active" cases of Hansen's disease.

It is possible that leprosy, as it was known before 1874, was diagnosed in the Hawaiian Islands as early as 1823, when a Protestant missionary wrote in his journal that "cases of kokuas or helpers. Also included was a were on the increase.

The first officially recorded case of leprosy in Hawaii was in 1853, and by the late 1850's the disease had spread to almost epidemic proportions.

King Kamehameha V finally declared, in January 1865, that those afflicted with leprosy must be isolated, and the site chosen by the board of health was a peninsula on the north coast of Molokai.

For $1,800, the board bought most of the land on the peninsula, including from 15 to 20 houses and rights to use nearby Waikolu and Wainiha Valleys.

Nine men and three women were on the first boat that arrived at the peninsula, on January 6, 1866. Part of the group consisted of ophthalmic scrofula and elephantiasis" health department superintendent, but neither he nor several of his successors spoke Hawaiian.

The first settlement on Molokai was at Kalawao, 2½ miles across the base of the peninsula from Kalaupapa.

From January to October of 1866, 104 men and 38 women—some of them kokuas—were sent there. Contrary to popular belief today, there is no evidence that the lepers were dumped overboard near the shore, although rough seas at times may have made it necessary for them to be pulled ashore on ropes.

THERE WAS NO LAW DURING FIRST YEARS

The first superintendents at Kalawao encountered difficulties enforcing law and order. Instead of the stronger patients tilling the land and looking after the weaker, it was vice versa. Might made right, there was no law, the able refused to work, and drunkenness, rape, and pilferage were rampant.

Two years before this time, Joseph de Veuster, a Catholic brother in the Congregation of The Sacred Hearts (SS. CC.), arrived in the islands from Belgium to begin missionary work in place of his brother, who was too ill to come.

Brother Damien, as Joseph de Veuster was first known in religious life, was ordained a priest in Honolulu, and in June 1864—2 months after his arrival in the Islands—he went to the big island to begin 10 years of missionary work in Kohala and Hamakua, among other districts.

Meanwhile, in 1871, a Protestant church named Siloama (meaning "Church of the Healing Spring") was built at Kalawao and served by Hawaiian pastors, one of them a patient at the settlement.

The following year, Brother Victorin Bertrant of Honolulu went to Kalawao and stayed long enough to build a small wooden chapel less than a half-mile from Siloama, naming it St. Philomena's.

Later, after Father Damien arrived, he built the main part of the church.

King Lunalilo ascended the throne in 1873 and brought about changes that slightly improved conditions at the leper settlement on Molokai. A member of the Royal Hawaiian Guard, himself a victim of leprosy, was brought to the settlement and made superintendent; better food was sent to Kalawao; and a bonus system (granting pay and privileges) was established for those patients who worked.

But the health situation remained grave; of the 797 lepers who had been brought to Molokai as of the beginning of 1873, 311 had died.

Noting the concern of the Right Reverend Louis Maigret, SS. CC., Catholic bishop of the Islands, that there was no priest at Kalawao, Father Damien volunteered to come to the settlement.

Damien and Bishop Maigret arrived at the village at 11 a.m., May 10, 1873, aboard the SS *Kilauea,* which also contained about 50 lepers and some cattle.

FATHER DAMIEN'S VISIT PROLONGED

The intention was that Father Damien would stay at the settlement for 2 or 3 weeks, then return to the big island. A petition, signed by 200 patients and asking that a permanent priest be sent to Kalawao, was presented to Bishop Maigret and in the ensuing days Father Damien decided to stay.

Over the next 16 years, Damien administered physical and spiritual aid to the lepers in a remarkable number of ways. He helped them build homes, install an adequate water system, and he even spent much of his time building coffins for the lepers. The deaths averaged about one a day.

Doctors were occasionally sent to Kalawao and Kalaupapa, a smaller village on the western edge of the peninsula, but their visits were always brief. In 1884, a doctor returned to Honolulu and reported that "no one but Father Damien renders any help."

Because of the lack of doctors at the settlement, Damien spent much of his time being nurse, doctor, and even surgeon to the lepers. Using only soap, water, bandages, and sedatives, he occasionally found it necessary to amputate limbs.

The atmosphere for these and other ministrations was almost unbearable. In his official report to the president of the board of health in March 1866, he wrote:

"The smell of their filth, mixed with exhalation of their sores, was simply disgusting and unbearable to a newcomer. Many a time, in fulfilling my priestly duties at their domiciles, I have been compelled not only to close my nostrils but to run outside and breathe the fresh air.

"To protect my legs from a peculiar itching, which I usually experience every morning after visiting them (the lepers), I had to beg a friend of mine to send me a pair of heavy boots. As an antidote to counteract the bad smell, I made myself accustomed to the use of tobacco, whereupon the smell of the pipe preserved me somewhat from

carrying in my clothes the obnoxious odor of the lepers."

From time to time Father Damien made trips to Honolulu to consult with his religious superiors and make repeated requests to the board of health for supplies and equipment. But many times these requests took the form of demands, and Damien—whose temper often flared was known as a stubborn and argumentative character.

BITTERNESS MARKED HIS LAST YEARS

His last trip to Honolulu was made on July 10, 1886, when he visited a Dr. Goto to receive temporary treatment for what were plainly symptoms of leprosy. The last years of his life were unfortunately embittered by some of his religious superiors, who—according to historical documents—appear to have been jealous of his popularity.

One historian, Father Reginald Yzendoorn, SS. CC., notes that the correspondence between Damien and his religious superiors in Honolulu in the years 1886 and 1887 "is saturated with acrimony, and one wonders what misconduct may have provoked such evident hostility."

Partly because of his leprosy and partly, perhaps, because of bitterness, Father Damien was forbidden by his religious superiors to come to Honolulu.

But he continued his work on Molokai until March 28, 1889, when he took to bed. On April 15, at the age of 49, he died, leaving behind a layman, Ira Joseph Dutton, and sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis to continue his work.

It is possible that Father Damien had leprosy before he came to Molokai, for he worked with lepers while he was on the big island. The history of his affliction is detailed in a diagnostic report prepared by Dutton in March 1889, and signed by Father Damien before he died. Parts of the report read:

"Served as priest on the Island of Hawaii from 1864 till 1873. Occasionally heard confessions of lepers, ministered to them in their cabins sometimes, but he had not constant or very particular contact with them until he came here, to the leper settlement * * *.

"Is quite sure that when near to lepers, as at confession or in their cabins—before coming to the leper settlement—he felt on such occasion a peculiar sensation in the face; a sort of itching or burning, and he felt the same here, at the settlement, during the first 2 or 3 years; that he also felt it on the legs.

"Is confident that the germs were in his system, certainly within the first 3 years of his residence here; can trace it positively to 1876. Small dry spots appeared at that time, particularly on arms, some on back * * *.

"Finally, in 1877 and 1878, (they) assumed yellowish color and became larger. * * *

"In the autumn of 1881 he began to be badly troubled with severe pains in his feet, specially in the left one, and in 1882 sciatic nerve trouble came on, clearly defined all along the left leg.

"Then the right ear became swollen with tubercular enlargements, making the whole thing an immense affair. * * * The eyebrows began to fall out, the other ear became enlarged, and tubercular swellings took possession of the face, hands, etc. The knuckles and knees are in hard enlarged knobs, becoming suppurating sores. Many sores on hands and wrists, some about the neck; eyes weak and at times very much inflamed. * * *"

Since the latter part of last century, Hansen's disease has receded greatly—thanks especially to sulfone drugs, which were introduced at Kalaupapa in 1946.

Kalaupapa, which before the turn of the century started to become the center of activities on the peninsula, is today a sleepy little hamlet that looks as if it has been forgotten by time.

NOW ONLY ABOUT 60 COMMUNICABLE CASES

As of July, there were only about 60 communicable cases of Hansen's Disease at the settlement. Another 135 "temporary release" patients had recovered from the disease and were living at the settlement by choice—some as employees of the State health department.

The rest of the 251 people living on the peninsula consisted of medical (including one doctor) and administrative employees of the department of health, an airport employee of the department of transportation, two Coast Guardsmen to maintain the Molokai Lighthouse near the tip of the peninsula, a priest, and two wives of health department workers.

Included in the health department staff are six Catholic nuns, who have proved to be more permanent hospital workers than lay personnel.

Andrew Flying Service, based at Honolulu International Airport, is the only airline that maintains a flight schedule to Kalaupapa ($22 round trip), although other operations fly to the settlement on a charter basis. Last year, approximately 1,100 tourists visited the settlement.

Anyone planning to visit Kalaupapa must first obtain a health department permit, but this is a routine procedure that can be handled by any tour agency or Andrew Flying Service.

The purpose of the permits is to make sure all visitors understand the rules of the settlement: do not shake hands or otherwise come into personal contact with anyone, do not enter patients' homes or the wards of the hospital, and use only the three restroom facilities marked for visitors.

Children under 12 are prohibited by law from the settlement, and anyone under 20 is usually refused permission to visit. Because there are no restaurants, stores or overnight accommodations on the peninsula, visitors are advised to bring along a picnic lunch.

FORMER PATIENTS CONDUCT TOURS

Former patients meet each plane and offer personally conducted tours—at $5.50 per person—of the best scenic and historic spots on the peninsula. The tour, which takes approximately 2½ hours, is done between the morning and afternoon flights.

The only place you are likely to see more than two people together is at the village wharf, which is a popular fishing site. Once in May, once in July, and once in September a barge—loaded with heavy staples—lands here.

The superintendent of Kalaupapa is Edward Burlem; he has been at the settlement 12 years. His wife, Georgina, handles all nonpatient mail.

All outgoing patient mail is handled by the Kalaupapa postmaster, who is responsible for a unique duty: fumigating the mail. He must snip off the corners of all out-going mail so the gases can penetrate each piece of mail touched by or sealed with saliva from a patient.

The highlight of any visit to Kalaupapa is Kalawao. All that remains of the original settlement site are the two churches, Siloama and St. Philomena, both of which have been renovated and are open to visitors. Adjacent to St. Philomena is a graveyard containing many of Father Damien's assistants and successors, including Joseph Dutton.

The remains of Father Damien himself were once buried next to the church, but they were exhumed in 1936 and taken to Belgium, where they were entombed in a shrine at Louvain. In 1956 they were exhumed again by Catholic authorities as part of a process to declare him a Catholic saint. But a monument still stands over his original gravesite on Molokai.

The road to Kalawao extends a few hundred feet beyond St. Philomena Church and ends at Kalawao Park, a delightful picnic spot situated on a shady bluff above a cove. When the sea is rough, thunderous waves splash against the rocks and cliffs, creating mountainous water sprays. Offshore are two small islands, Mokapu and Okala.

Few places in Hawaii possess the bucolic reverence of Kalawao; few places recall such pathos.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION—TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH A. L. ERRIGO

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a distinguished Wilmington, Del., lawyer, Joseph A. L. Errigo, testified last March before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Errigo appeared in his capacity as grand venerable of the Grand Lodge of Delaware and national chairman of the Sons of Italy Committee on Immigration. I can also verify from long personal knowledge that he is an outstanding contributor to the civic life of his community and State.

His summation of the reasons why our present immigration laws need to be changed was brief and forceful. It is timely, in my opinion, to outline them again.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the opening statement Mr. Errigo made at the hearing be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. ERRIGO. Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am Joseph A. L. Errigo, grand venerable of the Grand Lodge of Delaware and national chairman of the Sons of Italy Committee on Immigration. I have been a member of the Delaware bar since 1929. I am currently the senior member of Errigo, Biondi, Porter & Rubenstein, a law firm in Wilmington, Del., with offices at 1300 King Street. I deem it an honor and a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee, and I express my gratitude and appreciation for having been given this opportunity to do so.

We have many important problems facing our Nation today. Without detracting from the importance of other problems, I wish to state that one of our most important problems involves immigration, not only because it affects our national internal security, but also because it affects our relations with other nations of the world.

A distinguished Congressman from the great State of New York, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, an expert on immigration law, gave a historical and elucidating statement on the immigration polls of our Nation in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 16, 1964. I incorporate his remarks in this statement by reference thereto, and with particular emphasis I quote the following paragraph:

"The present law perpetuates the principle of national origin, an antiquated immigration system, proven beyond peradventure of a doubt to be unworkable. It was devised way back in 1921, more than 40 years ago, in an atmosphere of fear bordering on hysteria, a direct result of the unsettled domestic and foreign conditions following World War I."

The New York Times has always fought for sound and reasonable immigration laws. A lead editorial in March 1959, typical of many similar expressions, deserves our attention. It could have been written yesterday. It reads in parts as follows:

"The real purpose of a good immigration law should be to permit the entry of those

who are desirable, and especially of those who need this place of refuge. It should not be designed to keep out as many as possible on one pretext or another. The harshness of some of the legislation in the past has been the product of some sort of national panic, some curious xenophobia in reverse, almost an inferiority complex that ill-becomes a great country that has been made great by its immigrants. All of us indeed belong to that classification the moment we begin to look back a bit. The thing that is most hurtful about harsh legislation, however, is that it puts us in a bad light in many parts of the world precisely at a time when we aspire to leadership and need prestige. We cannot accomplish our ends if others think that we are timid, selfish, overbearing, or superior. Our immigration laws reflect in many minds some of these attitudes."

The archbishop of Boston, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, has stated that discriminatory and undemocratic features of the McCarran-Walter law "are to my mind a grave potential threat to our domestic development and our international leadership."

President-elect Eisenhower said in a speech on October 17, 1952:

"A contest for world leadership, in fact for survival, exists between the Communist idea and the American ideal. That contest is being waged in the minds and hearts of human beings. We say and we sincerely believe that we are on the side of freedom, that we are on the side of humanity. We say and we know that the Communists are on the side of slavery, the side of inhumanity, yet the Czech, the Pole, or the Hungarian who takes his life in his hands and crosses the frontier tonight or to the Italian who goes to some American consulate, this ideal that beckoned him can be a mirage because of the McCarran Act."

President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization established on September 4, 1952, made a tremendous and terrific report to the President of the United States on January 1, 1953. I incorporate that report entitled "Whom We Shall Welcome," in this statement by reference thereto. In particular I wish to emphasize the following quote from that report:

"The Commission believes that we cannot be true to the democratic faith of our own Declaration of Independence in the equality of all men and at the same time pass immigration laws which discriminate among people because of national origin, race, color or creed. We cannot continue to bask in the glory of an ancient and honorable tradition of providing haven to the oppressed and belie that tradition by ignoble and ungenerous immigration laws. We cannot develop an effective foreign policy if our immigration laws negate our role of world leadership. We cannot defend civil rights in principle and deny them in our immigration laws and practice. We cannot boast of our magnificent system of law, and enact immigration laws which violate decent principles of legal protection. Nor can we ourselves really believe or persuade others to think that we believe that the United States is a dynamic expanding and prosperous country if our immigration law is based upon a fear of catastrophe rather than a promise and hope for great days ahead."

The stirring and inspiring message of President Johnson on immigration is still fresh in our minds. It follows as a natural sequence similar messages by President Kennedy. In his recent message President Johnson said:

"A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue."

I am here today to plead for the passage of the President's bill on immigration, S. 500, introduced by Senator HART and other Senators who have joined him as cosponsors. For over 40 years the Order Sons of Italy in America has pursued the long-range mission on immigration. We cannot and do not wish to return to an era of unrestricted immigration. Someone has well said, and I quote:

"There is a difference, however, between immigration restrictions and immigration discrimination. There is an ethical basis for the former, but none for the latter."

The Sons of Italy has always been interested in the improvement and modification of our existing immigration and naturalization laws. From time to time we have suggested and encouraged certain changes to meet world conditions. We have always been ready to support any program conducive to the improvement of cultural and economic relations between the United States and other peace-loving countries, so long as they advance the best interests of the United States. We have sponsored a number of private immigration bills. We fought for the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 that brought to these shores over 220,000 refugees outside of the quota systems. We were absolutely thrilled in August 1958 when Congressman FEIGHAN'S bill on immigration made it possible for more than 40,000 Hungarian refugees to establish permanent residence in this country. The inscription on the Statue of Liberty began to acquire a real significance.

In 1958 we welcomed the relief granted by Congress to the Portugese victims of the earthquake in the Azores, and the admission of the Dutch expelled from Indonesia; the Portuguese and Dutch quotas were woefully inadequate, and Congress wanted to help these unfortunate people. Other congressional acts made it possible for thousands of nonquota immigrants to enter our country. In 1962, 283,000 immigrants entered the United States. Of these, 90,000 were quota immigrants and 193,000 were nonquota. In 1963 the same situation developed. Approximately 306,000 immigrants entered our Nation; 103,000 were quota immigrants and 203,000 were nonquota. I cite these figures only to show you that it shouldn't be too difficult for you to abolish a system which is gradually becoming unpopular and inoperative.

As a matter of fact, it should be rather easy to accomplish this much-desired end when it can be done over a period of 5 years.

At several successive biennial conventions including the last convention held in Cleveland, Ohio in August 1963, the Order Sons of Italy in America promoted a seven-point program which continues to be our goal. It is as follows:

1. Amendment of the national origins quota system and in its place submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

2. To adopt the 1960 census in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.

3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.

4. To grant more favorable preferences to relatives of U.S. citizens.

5. To equalize citizenship between native born and naturalized citizens.

6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to administration, exclusion and deportation of aliens.

7. To revise and extend the Refugee Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans Act of 1957.

Our next national convention will take place in Baltimore, Md. in August of this year. It is to be hoped, gentlemen, that at that convention I shall be able to announce that Congress has approved the President's bill relating to immigration. If that is done, we will have taken a great step forward in the right direction. We do not ask for anything that is revolutionary. We do not suggest changes in the law that are unfair and unreasonable. This great Nation of ours had always believed in equal justice under law. As Americans we believe in equal opportunity based upon qualifications.

We ask for justice for all people. We ask that all potential immigrants be granted equal opportunity to prove their qualifications to enter this country. We have established military and naval bases in many countries to protect our American way of life. We are maintaining numerous Peace Corps units throughout the world to help others who are unable to help themselves. We have established and maintained for many years an excellent student exchange program that has helped to create a better understanding among the nations of the earth. We make vast contributions to the U.N., to NATO, to SEATO, and to other international organizations. We do these things and many others because we want to maintain world peace at any cost, making any sacrifice. But all these international activities will be nullified if we persist in continuing an immigration policy that should never have been born.

On the one hand, throughout our international activities we endeavor to prove to the world that we are a good neighbor, but on the other hand throughout our immigration policies we say to millions of people in many nations, "You are not fit to enter this country. We don't want you. Stay where you are."

Gentlemen, our ancestors came to these shores in different boats. The sons of the American refugees and the sons of Italy settled here for the same reasons. We are now in the same boat. We call that boat the ship of state. We cannot continue to rock that boat on wreaths of bigotry and prejudice lest all of us perish. If we are truly interested in peace at home and peace abroad, we will adopt without delay the President's bill on immigration, S. 500. In the words of President Johnson: "I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interests and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged exclusively on his worth as a human being."

Once again, gentlemen, I express my gratitude to you for permitting me to make this presentation on behalf of the Sons of Italy. It gives me the feeling that each one of us in endeavoring to serve our country.

TAX STRUCTURES HERE AND ABROAD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the need for more money to handle Federal programs increases, an article by Miss Sylvia Porter, "Tax Structures Here and Abroad," would seem of some interest.

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

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

TAX STRUCTURES HERE AND ABROAD

(By Sylvia Porter)

Even if Congress votes another Federal income tax reduction in 1966, more than three-quarters of the revenues collected by Federal, State, and local governments still will be coming from incomes and property.

This is the highest percentage by any major nation on the incomes and wealth of its citizens. No other leading country depends as heavily as the United States on this form of taxation. No other industrialized country depends as little as we do on sales taxes, excise taxes, or taxes on consumption.

While Congress already has revised and reduced Federal income tax rates and more surely will be done, our tax structure appears odd next to the systems of European nations, Japan, and Canada.

DIFFERENCES LISTED

The following table, based on U.S. Treasury and United Nations statistics, covers the year 1961, because comparative percentages aren't available for more recent years. Tax laws passed since 1961, though, would alter the percentages in only a minor way. For instance, in this country the 1964–65 Federal income tax cuts have been partially offset by State income tax increases and the new Federal excise tax reductions are being at least partially offset by State and local excise tax increases. In short, the basic comparisons stand as indicated below:

[In percent]

Country	Income and property taxes	Sales, excise, and consumption taxes
United States	78	22
Sweden	66	34
Japan	66	34
England	65	35
West Germany	65	35
Canada	61	39
Italy	52	48
France	50	50

One implication of this table is that there is plenty of leeway here for a shift in emphasis from taxation on incomes and wealth to taxation on sales and consumption. Today, those urging this shift are in the minority; sales taxes are "regressive" because they hit the lowest-income family purchasing the taxed item to the same extent that they hit the highest-income family. Nevertheless, as the search intensifies at all levels of government for ways to finance essential public programs—ranging from health to education, from highway construction to reclamation of our resources—heavier reliance on sales, excise and consumption taxes seems inevitable.

SALES LEVY RESENTED

Another implication is that much as we resent sales taxes and detest their indiscriminate character, our tax levels in this sphere are far below Europe's. This month Sweden's general sales tax jumped to about 10 percent, more than double the rate of 4.2 percent when the general sales tax was originally imposed in 1960. A similar trend toward higher sales taxes is clearly apparent in other Scandinavian countries. France's 50–50 percentage speaks for itself. Some of France's sales taxes on luxury or scarce items range as high as 25 percent.

The aim of Federal income tax cuts in recent years has been to stimulate our economy. "Reform" has been shelved temporarily and, assuming the objective of a 1966 tax cut is also sustaining economic growth, reform again might be postponed.

But when we finally do get to a real overhaul of our system, just simplification of our crazyquilt Federal-State-local structure will demand serious consideration of a more equal relationship between income and sales taxes.

THE NEED FOR THE 1965 ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT: AN EXAMPLE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the recent statement given in this Chamber by my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the principal sponsor of S. 2045, the 1965 Antidumping Act Amendments struck a responsive chord for me. They appear on page 19642 of the RECORD of August 6. Senator HARTKE commented on the continuing concern of many segments of industry and labor about the unfair trade practice of injurious dumping in this country, and set forth the resolution of the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors.

A similar expression of concern was voiced earlier this year by the Chamber of Commerce of Allentown, Pa. In a resolution which was sent by the chamber to all members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, it stressed the specific concern of this organization and its members about the dumping problem, citing as an example the situation with which the cement industry is faced, particularly in the Lehigh Valley area, the birthplace of the portland cement industry in the United States. The observations set forth in the chamber's statement give an insight into how a local area can be affected by dumping and may be typical of experiences which other of my colleagues have had within their constituencies.

In an earnest request to each Member to introduce and lend his efforts on behalf of S. 2045, the resolution added two points of special importance which I should like to quote:

1. Many industries and labor organizations, in addition to the cement industry, have indicated their sponsorship of effective antidumping legislation.

2. The Chamber of Commerce of Allentown is not opposed to fair and desirable foreign trade, but we do believe that American industry should not be subjected to unfair foreign competition. * * *

Mr. President, I urge that these observations be taken to heart, and that we all remain aware of what is at stake in our own backyards when we talk of injurious dumping. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the resolution to which I have made reference be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF ALLENTOWN,
Allentown, Pa., April 7, 1965.

To: All members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation.

Subject: Proposed antidumping legislation.

Certainly this proposed amendment will serve the interests of all American industries and labor threatened by unfair competition from dumped imports. Particular reference to cement, which is locally manufactured, will help point up some of the problems created by dumping.

Pennsylvania, and in particular the Lehigh Valley area, is the birthplace of the portland cement industry in the United States. Sixteen companies, employing thousands of people, operate 20 portland cement producing plants within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. However, even during this decade of unparalleled prosperity, the portland cement industry has been operating at substantially less than its capacity; for 1964, the rate was only 75 percent.

Demand for cement is closely tied to the general level of construction activity. Price is often crucial in determining which supplier will fill the existing demand. For example, the U.S. Tariff Commission has explained that even a slight difference in price may well determine the identity of the seller, as the sale of cement in a given market is generally contingent upon its price not being higher than the price of like competitive cement. Similarly, some years ago, the Federal Trade Commission found that a difference in price of 1 cent per barrel (a barrel contains 376 pounds of cement) may divert business from one seller to another.

Because of this tight market situation, imports on only relatively small quantities of dumped cement may break the price in the local market and have a serious adverse economic impact on the producing plants selling in the area in which such imports are marketed. Low-priced imports accounting for only 6 to 7 percent of the particular market in which sold were found by the Tariff Commission not only to have taken sales away from the mills supplying such areas, but also to have caused such price breaks resulting in serious loss of revenues. In addition, cement prices unfairly depressed in one market readily spread to adjacent areas in a type of ripple effect. Within the past 7 years, four portland cement manufacturing plants in the Lehigh Valley section of eastern Pennsylvania have been permanently shut down, resulting in the elimination of some 900 jobs. Our area seeks to develop and grow, and when jobs of our fellow citizens are affected by unfair, unjust, and unequal foreign competition, the Chamber of Commerce of Allentown feels it should raise its voice in opposition.

We are mindful of the fact that Pennsylvania Senators SCOTT and CLARK, as well as a total of 15 Pennsylvania Representatives, introduced and supported antidumping legislation with similar objectives during the 88th Congress * * * we earnestly solicit each Member to introduce and lend his efforts on behalf of the proposed amendment.

Many industries and labor organizations, in addition to the cement industry, have indicated their sponsorship of effective antidumping legislation * * *. The Chamber of Commerce of Allentown is not opposed to fair and desirable foreign competition. Your continued guidance in the development of our State is appreciated, and we urge you to lend active support to the 1965 Antidumping Act Amendment.

By order of the legislation committee and board of directors.

ALFRED KRAMER,
President.

JEANNINE LYERLY DAY AT KENAI

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the first few weeks of 1965 an important decision was made. That decision made possible the establishment of what we now know as Head Start projects in hundreds of communities in the United States.

We all realize that the full benefits of this year's program will not be realized until the children who participated in it have been in school a number of years. It is already apparent, however, that the program will have far-reaching and beneficial results.

Alaska has Head Start programs in nearly every community. The city of Kenia, on Alaska's fabled Kenai Peninsula, is no exception. The city was likewise no exception in recognizing the solid worth of the program, but city leaders expressed their view of the program in an unusual way. Mayor James G. Dye declared July 28 "Jeannine Lyerly Day" in honor of the person responsible for making a Head Start project possible in the community.

Jeannine Lyerly is due much praise for her work. Children are our most important resource and those who

contribute to their future deserve the thanks of all of us. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the proclamation of the city of Kenai which Mayor Dye issued on July 26.

CITY OF KENAI—PROCLAMATION

Whereas Jeannine Lyerly has demonstrated a dedication beyond the ordinary call of duty to her position as an itinerant public health nurse by her involvement in civil activities in Kenai and all surrounding communities; and

Whereas the Project Head Start at Kenai would not be in existence except for the diligent preparations and supervision so generously donated by Jeannine Lyerly.

Therefore, by the authority vested in me as mayor of Kenai, I proclaim:

1. That Wednesday, July 28, 1965, shall be Jeannine Lyerly Day in Kenai, Alaska.

2. That this proclamation is a formal "thank you" of the community of Kenai for the civic action and dedicated efforts of Jeannine Lyerly as the motivating spirit behind the educational "Project Head Start."

3. That Jeannine Lyerly exemplifies the best in governmental service and established a standard of service deserving respect and imitation by all employees of the State of Alaska.

4. That involvement of Jeannine Lyerly in the civic life of the Kenai Peninsula has extended to service as a director of the Kenai Chamber of Commerce, as an active participant in Kenai Peninsula Concert Association and other civic organizations essential to the true vitality and life of a community.

5. That this expression of gratitude be distributed to Gov. William A. Egan of the State of Alaska and all interested persons and agencies.

Kenai, Alaska, 26th day of July 1965.

JAMES G. DYE,
Mayor.

Attest:

FRANCES TORKILSEN,
City Clerk.

CONSUMER CREDIT EDUCATION AND CONSUMER DEBT COUNSELING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was most happy to note the amendment in section 205(a), of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, which provides authority for the Director to pay all or part of the costs of consumer education programs under community action projects, specially focused on the needs of low-income families. It specifically provides for "consumer credit education," and "consumer debt counseling," and gives concrete recognition to a problem in which I have long been interested.

This amendment will allow the Poverty Director to furnish education and counseling especially designed and geared to the needs of low-income families, in recognition of the fact that many of these families have subaverage educational achievements, and reading and comprehension levels around third and fourth grade level. For there is a special class of consumer among the low-income families and the poorly educated, whose particular needs require a specialized approach. A study was made recently of the buying practices of over 450 families living in low-rent public housing by Dr. David Caplovitz of Columbia University, in which Dr. Caplovitz found that the urban poor are confronted with a merchandising system quite unlike that which serves most Americans.

In addition, the panel on consumer education for persons with limited incomes, organized to advise the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, reported just this year that the poor pay more for comparable merchandise that people in middle-income areas, and that the poor are targets for not only devious merchandising practices, but also lack the basic knowledge and information to help them get the most for their money. For example, the poor could be taught to buy wherever possible for cash—and not on credit—that they would extend their shopping horizons, and compare the prices of merchandise and credit terms, that they would be educated on what to look for in making purchases—such as how to distinguish between new and used items, current and obsolete merchandise, and that which is solidly constructed as against that which is poorly built.

They could be advised on where to seek additional information on purchasing and merchandising from community agencies; such as the local legal aid society, the State attorneys general, the chambers of commerce, the better business bureaus, and the various agencies of the Federal Government.

Consumer education can play a very important part in overall poverty programs, and it should be included as an integral part of overall projects directed at the poor. Under past law, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been authorized to make consumer education eligible for funds under community action programs, and the director has urged communities throughout the Nation to take advantage of this opportunity. The people helped by the poverty program buy food, clothing, shelter, automobiles, appliances, and most of the other goods and services that our economy offers. If we can give them the awareness and sophistication that other consumers possess, it will supplement their incomes by making their hard-earned and difficult dollars stretch just a little bit further. It will prevent whatever increased earnings they may receive from being eroded by poor buying habits.

As former attorney general of the State of Minnesota, I know that there are a number of devious and sophisticated merchandising and sales practices that all too often deceive not only the low-income buyer, but also the intelligent and sophisticated middle and upper income purchaser. For example, the files of my consumer protection unit in the State of Minnesota, were filled with cases involving bait-switch advertising, referral selling practices, pyramid practices, misrepresentation of price and contract terms, and the use of fictitious selling prices. Many of these people are able to withstand the loss of tens or even hundreds of dollars. But the low-income families, earning less than $3,000, need every cent for rent, clothing, and food. They can ill afford the opportunity to learn in the school of hard knocks and a sad experience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report from Mrs. Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, as well as an article from the August 13 New York Times be reprinted at this point.

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

PANEL ON CONSUMER EDUCATION FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS REPORT TO MRS. PETERSON

The poor pay more for comparable merchandise than people in middle income areas, a Panel on Consumer Educations for Persons with Limited Incomes reported today.

The panel, appointed last year to advise the President's Committee on Consumer Interests on consumer education for the poor, included representatives from business, labor, community organizations, and government at all levels. In its report, it emphasized that it received no documentation to support the charge that businessmen and merchants deliberately charge more in low-income neighborhoods than they do in middle-income areas for the same or even inferior merchandise.

"No doubt there are some instances where such a situation occurs," the report states, but there is no documentation to indicate that this is a widespread practice on the part of business concerns." Nevertheless, the panel reports that stores which operate in poor neighborhoods only often charge their customers more and seldom have "one price" for high-cost items. The panel took special notice of a study of the buying practices of 464 families living in low-rent public housing made by David Caplovitz of Columbia University, in which he finds that the urban poor are victims of a merchandising system quite unlike the system that serves most Americans.

In his book, "The Poor Pay More," Caplovitz points out that in every city, some fringe operators profit by the special problems of the poor—their inability to obtain credit from conventional sources, their lack of knowledge and sophistication, and their eagerness to buy. Comparing the poorest families with those somewhat better off, Caplovitz points out that the poorest pay most for such commodities as TV sets, phonographs, and washing machines. This does not mean that they are buying better products, he says, it means they are paying more for what they buy.

In releasing the report, Mrs. Peterson praised the panel for shedding light on a relatively neglected subject. She emphasized the important part consumer education can play in overall poverty programs, and supported the panel's view that consumer education for the poor should be included as an integral part of overall projects directed toward the poor. She noted that the Office of Economic Opportunity has included consumer education as eligible for funds under the community action program, and urged that communities throughout the Nation take advantage of this opportunity.

"The massive efforts to sell the products and services of our economy," Mrs. Peterson said, "affect the poor as well as the affluent. In addition, the poor are often the objects of offbeat marketing techniques in their neighborhoods. Door-to-door peddlers, marginal retail operators, and loan dispensers extend credit—at high interest rates—to those who can't afford to get credit 'uptown.' The poor are often the targets of 'bait and switch' merchandising and other devious schemes. Lack of knowledge and information often leads them to accept poor quality merchandise at high prices."

Mrs. Peterson said that President Johnson, in his message on consumer interests on February 5, 1964, directed the President's Committee on Consumer Interests "to develop as promptly as possible effective ways

and means of reaching more homes and families—particularly low-income families—with information to help them get the most for their money."

"The work of the panel," Mrs. Peterson said, "should be considered a beginning, not by any means the last word on this challenging and difficult subject. It is our hope that the panel's report will stimulate further efforts in this field. Consumer education for the poor will be one of the high priority programs carried on by the President's Committee during the coming year."

Consumer education can help the poor get the most for what little money they have to spend, the report says. "Its object should be to subtract from poverty. On another level, it can help people understand the available choices, to balance preference against price and utility, and match quality against realistic expenditure. * * * The goal of consumer education is to achieve higher standards of living through more discriminating consumption."

The panel warns that consumer education should not be considered a panacea for poverty. "Consumer education cannot cure poverty," the report states, "it can only ease the pain."

Among the report's recommendations are the following:

Federal, State and local governments undertake factfinding studies to identify the problems encountered by the poor in the marketplace.

Communities and appropriate civic, professional, and service organizations include consumer education as an integral part of programs designed to deal with the problems of poverty.

Consumer education be included as a component part of Federal programs directed at the poor, especially elementary and secondary education, adult literacy, Job Corps, public housing, and public assistance.

Grants be made available by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the training of teachers in consumer education.

Demonstration grant by the Office of Economic Opportunity to a university or other nonprofitmaking organization, for the development of a clearinghouse for low-income consumer education materials and techniques.

The stimulation of research by public and private groups to develop more and better education materials and techniques for low-income families.

The strengthening of existing government information and protection programs specifically to deal with the problems of fraud and deception encountered by poor consumers.

Mrs. Peterson stressed that the poor comprise a significant and sizable market. She said that there are approximately 34 million individuals living in poverty in the United States. These people buy food, clothing, shelter, automobiles, appliances, and most of the other goods and services of our economy. "If consumer education is related to adult education, health and welfare programs, and other services," she said, "it will supplement the higher incomes these programs may bring about. It can also help prevent higher earnings from being eroded by poor buying habits, and help low incomes go a little further."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1965]

U.S. AGENCY PLANS TO INTENSIFY CONSUMER EDUCATION FOR POOR

WASHINGTON, August 12.—The Office of Economic Opportunity said today it was ready to finance a second front in the war on poverty.

Improving the earning power of the poor is not enough, according to Theodore Berry, the agency's Assistant Director for Community Action.

A second front, he said, would show the poor how to avoid hidden exploitation when they spend their meager earnings.

"Borrowing to buy coal and paying twice for it in interest is an example that can be multiplied a million times," Mr. Berry said, recalling his experiences as a lawyer for straitened consumers in Cincinnati.

His office has financed 17 consumer education projects at a cost of $893,000, compared with total antipoverty outlays of $113 million.

"We haven't begun to scratch the surface in this field," he said.

President Kennedy and President Johnson have voiced concern about consumer problems, but this is the first time that significant sums have been made available for consumer education.

Mr. Berry opened a 2-day consumer action conference sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

Dr. Sanford Kravitz, chief of research and development for the Antipoverty Community Action Division, and Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, are conducting the conference, which is attended by officials of community action programs, Government regulatory agencies, and consumer groups.

Dr. David Caplovitz of Columbia University, who wrote the book, "The Poor Pay More," said the marketplace for the poor is a commercial jungle in which exploitation and fraud are the norm rather than the exception."

Dr. Caplovitz described many of the gimmicks used by door-to-door salesmen and junk furniture stores to beguile the unsuspecting into signing contracts to pay twice as much money as they thought.

A store on East Harlem's furniture row, he said, offered three rooms of furniture for only $149 or only $199.

Investigation showed that these consisted of two flimsy bureaus and one bed frame, a fragile-looking sofa, and an unmatching chair. The spring and mattress were extra.

The unwary consumer, he said, ends up buying a $400 set for $600.

"Given their vulnerability to easy credit and the excessive burden of debt foisted upon by high-pressure salesmen," Dr. Caplovitz added, "it is not surprising that many of the poor find themselves overextended and unable to keep up the payments on their purchases. We found that one in every five families had experienced legal pressures because of missed payments."

ARMY CAPTAIN'S LETTER SUMMARIZES NEED FOR COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from an Army captain stationed in Hawaii, which told the story of the educational disadvantages of our men in uniform with words of great human feeling and understanding. Illustrating his arguments with the statistics of the men in his company, this captain presents a strong case for the cold war GI bill, as well as concern for the future of the men who serve under him. The men in service need this bill. The 5 million cold war veterans represent only about 40 percent of the draft eligible men during the cold war or draft period, but the percentage of unemployed among the cold war veterans is double the percentage on the same age nonveteran group.

To illustrate the convincing evidence presented by the Army captain, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to thank you for your sponsorship of the cold war GI bill. There is a definite need for a measure such as this. Your predecessors saw the need for this legislation in World War II and during the Korean conflict. The need for such a measure is even greater now.

I am a 1962 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, having received my appointment from the then Senator Johnson. I am presently a company commander in the 25th Infantry Division in Hawaii.

There is certainly no disagreement that there is an increasing need for more education in today's technical society. Even a high school education is barely sufficient for the average worker. So many of the draftees and volunteers in my company have not completed their high school education for one reason or another. In my company, out of 150 men, 20 did not reach the ninth grade. An additional 20 did not complete high school. Another 10 men did not complete high school, but have received a diploma equivalent to a high school education from the U.S. Armed Forces Institute. This means that 50 out of 150 men have not completed a normal resident high school program. I feel that these statistics are valid on a wider level.

As you know, the Army is failing to retain between 75 and 80 percent of its first term volunteers and draftees. The administration and the Department of Defense seem to object to this bill because the bill would make it more difficult to retain personnel. To me, this line of reasoning belongs in the same category of illogic as that of paying a man only $78 per month because he is obligated to the service and cannot get out, or paying an officer $240 per month for the same reason.

In a statement to the House Armed Services Committee on June 16, 1965, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, in commenting on the failure of the Army to attract more than 82 of 5,500 Reserve officers invited to return to active duty said, in part, "It could also indicate that the Army needs to do a better job of describing the advantages of a military career, or it could mean that opportunities are inadequate in the Army. We simply do not know the answer." Certainly no one knows the complete answer. However, the Armed Forces needs to develop a more competitive attitude in attracting quality personnel. What better attraction; what better selling point would the Armed Forces have for attracting good people than the prospect of aiding their further education? This asset would far outweigh any adverse affect from loss of personnel.

As to this latter point, the threat of the loss of personnel due to the enactment of this bill—men make up their minds to stay in or get out of the service for far more fundamental reasons than this. The Armed Forces must begin to think positively about how to attract quality personnel and how to motivate them toward a career in the service. Positive steps must be taken. The service must be made attractive. The young man facing his service obligation should not look upon it as an unpleasant drudgery. It should appear as an opportunity to him. Failing to pass legislation similar to this prohibits the formation of that image which the service so desperately needs.

I do not believe that a limitation of service in combat areas should be placed on receipt of benefits under this bill. Every man in the service has the prospect of immediate deployment in a combat zone. Thousands

of men are serving away from their families. All servicemen work extra hours, and in the field much of the time. To limit the bill to those serving in a combat zone would be an acknowledgment of only one of the many hardships which the serviceman experiences.

Almost all major industries presently have tuition assistance or other similar programs in effect. Thus this bill would not create a program unlike that of many civilian companies. The steady deterioration of service fringe benefits and the increase of similar benefits in private industry is well documented before both the House and Senate committees. The enactment of this bill would do much to arrest this deterioration and begin to put the Armed Forces on equal footing with private industry.

From an economic standpoint, this bill will pay for itself many times over. The income of the Federal Government in taxes alone from the increased productivity of the people who have participated in the program should reimburse the Government for its cost. The benefit to the Nation as a whole is unquestionable. I also have strong feelings as to the inadequacy of the U.S. Armed Forces Institute program, and how there would be no duplicity of expenditure between this bill and the USAFI program. However, I will not go into that in detail at this time.

I would appreciate any information you might be able to give me on this bill—its present status and its prospects of passing this session. Also, who might I write in Congress to most influence the passage of this bill?

Thank you very much for your indulgence.

Sincerely,

_____.

RURAL POVERTY EMPHASIS URGED

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Act, which we are considering today, has been aimed for the most part at the poor in urban areas. This is because it is relatively easy to wage a war on poverty in our cities, which have large concentrations of poor people and groups that can work together in a coordinated way.

But we also should recognize that many of the poor in our urban areas are there because they literally were starved out of their rural communities. For that reason it is just as important to fight poverty in rural areas and slow this movement of poor people to the cities.

It is disturbing to learn that of the 30 percent of our people living on farms or in small towns, about 46 percent have incomes of less than $3,000 a year. This means the proportion of poverty in rural areas is twice as high as in the cities.

Unless more assistance is provided, a large portion of these rural poor families will be forced to move. If they do, they will join the already large numbers in the most impoverished slums of our large cities.

There are a number of Federal programs, including the Economic Opportunity Act, that can help rural people who are most in need. Yet we find that these programs are used much less by rural people, partly because they are spread out over several hundred counties and thousands of small towns and partly because branch offices of Federal agencies administering these programs do not reach into each rural area.

In view of the long history of inadequate service to rural areas, I have been disappointed to learn that the poverty program passed last year has made little impact in rural areas. The figures show that only slightly more than 5 percent of the money for community action programs had gone into rural areas by the end of the 1965 fiscal year.

Because of cooperation between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Agriculture, I understand this percentage is being improved. But I think the emphasis on solving rural poverty problems must be dramatically increased if we are to make any real headway in slowing this movement of poor rural families into our urban areas.

I would urgently hope that Mr. Shriver will work more closely with Mr. Freeman during fiscal 1966, making it possible to draw more heavily on Department of Agriculture personnel well acquainted with rural problems and rural people. I would urge Mr. Shriver to use all the provisions of the law authorizing him to work with other agencies so he can delegate both responsibility and poverty funds to the Department of Agriculture. It is essential that we do more to make sure that the rural poor are treated equally under the poverty program.

DREAMS COME TRUE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is a wonderful experience for a man to live to see accomplished some of the good works he fought for in earlier years.

Such a man is I. B. Finkelstein, who now lives in the community of Arden near Wilmington, Del.

He was fighting for slum clearance and urban renewal in Wilmington long before such efforts had achieved the general popularity they enjoy today.

Bill Frank, whose column in the Wilmington Morning News is an institution in Delaware, commented the other day on Mr. Finkelstein's reaction to what has now been done in one former slum of Wilmington.

In further recognition of Mr. Finkelstein's civic contributions, and in the interest of illustrating how good ideas eventually succeed, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Dreams Come True" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Aug. 9, 1965]

DREAMS COME TRUE

(By Bill Frank)

I. B. Finkelstein, 81 years old, went down to Compton Park Square on the East Side of Wilmington last Thursday and toured the newly built homes on Lombard Street, near sixth.

There were no tears in his eyes, but there were emotions within him.

In his own quiet way I. B. said, "It's very wonderful. It shows what can be done."

Only a few of us there at the time realized the full import of what I. B. said.

Cy Liberman, News-Journal reporter, was there. He knew what it meant to I. B. to tour these marvelous town houses, the real beachhead of urban renewal in Wilmington.

But there were many people who should have been there alongside I. B., people like Barbara Jones, Raymond Baker, Frank Norton, Mary E. Power, Thomas Herlihy, Jr., and Carolyn Weaver.

They were part of the small, valiant group who yapped and howled, exhorted and pleaded, cajoled and screamed that something be done about getting rid of slum houses and replacing them with decent houses.

But even before the people I've mentioned, I. B. was the great warrior in the cause of decent housing in town—just as he was also the great pioneering crusader for many ideas that are now commonplace.

Go back 30 years—or even further, if you please—and look at this businessman of Wilmington, known as I. B., who preached what seemed to be idealistic and utopian ideas:

More recreation for the workingman who was eventually to have shorter working hours.

Renovate Wilmington but do more than just paint up and clean up and fix up. Do a sound, permanent job.

Encourage business and industry to take more interest in art.

Develop our folk and musical cultures in and for the Wilmington area.

Link Delaware and New Jersey with a bridge and get rid of the slowpoke ferry out of New Castle.

Funnel traffic along limited access highways, but make it easy for people to get into the business areas.

I. B. was not born with a silver spoon, nor did he live on the right side of the tracks. He personally knew the problems of tight budgets and forced dropouts from school.

He also felt the barbs of being a member of a minority group and was well aware of the snickering that often went on behind his back in the old days. He despised any form of forced or even voluntary ghetto.

Better housing was one of his great dreams for Wilmington. For more than 10 years he was president and sparkplug of the Wilmington Housing Association in the days when its members were regarded as crackpots.

Well, the years have crept upon I. B. He lives a quiet life in a lovely home in Arden, surrounded by the superb paintings of his late wife and the furniture they collected years ago. The din of public battle is merely an echo to him now. Others have taken up the lances which he once kept bright and sharp.

But the wonderful thing is that he has lived to see so many of those utopian ideas blossom and come into fruit.

Compton Park Square and its homes now ready for occupancy and customers represent a great idea come true.

As he wandered through the houses, guided by Leon N. Weiner, a young man with imagination, I. B. recalled the days of battle to convince legislators, politicians, and people that all this could and should be accomplished.

I noticed that I. B. looked skyward the other day to see the shining silver domes of St. Mary's Church rising majestically above Compton Park Square. Almost 20 years ago, he remembered, these domes rose above some of the worst slums in Wilmington—particularly on the alley oddly named Lord Street.

If one is regarded as old at 81, then it can not be said I. B. is a lonely old man. He has

lived to be revered by those who caught the fervor of the causes he once espoused.

What greater satisfaction can a man have in his advanced years?

FAMILY PLANNING AND THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 lists various fields in which the community action programs may operate. A significant addition to that list is made by the bill pending before us. It specifically names the field of family planning as a possible target for a community action program.

It is true that specific reference to family planning will have no substantive effect on the scope of the poverty program. As presently written, the law allows family planning assistance to be given as part of a community action plan. Already 2 percent of the community action programs established under the law include family planning components.

Nonetheless, express statutory reference of family planning is a significant step. It marks the first time that legislation has authorized Federal funds for the express purpose of providing birth control information to the Nation's low-income families. At present the District of Columbia is the only area in the country which has received Federal funds explicitly for birth control assistance.

It is my hope that this reference to family planning will give communities the much-needed impetus to create centers for the dissemination of birth control information and devices.

Recognition of this need is long overdue. I cannot commend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] enough for sponsoring the family planning amendment in committee.

We can no longer ignore the all too obvious relation between poverty and unwanted children. A report of the National Academy of Sciences documents the case for family planning assistance. It states:

> The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right.

Surveys show, however, that ignorance has prevented many of our Nation's poor from exercising this right. Planned Parenthood estimates that 9 out of every 10 impoverished women lack advice on "family planning." Moreover, many of them have wildly inaccurate notions of the conception process.

The result of this ignorance is that those who are already poor intensify their poverty by producing large families. Among married women between 40 and 44 years of age in 1960, the average number of children born was 2.6 per family, but in families with annual incomes of less than $2,000 the average was 3.4.

According to the available evidence, low-income families do not want more children than do higher income families. They simply have more because they lack the information or resources needed to limit family size. The fact that family planning assistance is desired by many for whom it is not now available is indicated by a survey made in a Chicago slum neighborhood. There, Planned Parenthood's intensive campaign to distribute birth control information led to a 25-percent decline in the birth rate from 1960 to 1964. Such results can be expected in other impoverished communities if and when family planning assistance becomes available.

Fortunately, our attitudes on birth control have changed markedly in recent years. Polls show that over 80 percent of all Americans think that birth control advice should be made available to anyone who wants it. Two years ago only 53 percent of the Catholics surveyed felt this way. Gallup reports that today 78 percent support this view.

The National Academy of Sciences has stated:

> No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot care for.

I am in total agreement with this conclusion. Couples from the lower economic brackets should not be denied the ability to limit births if they desire to do so. The Poverty Program is the appropriate vehicle for making family planning assistance accessible to those who want it and who need it most.

POLICE AND HOSPITAL PROCEDURES IN PROCESSING RAPE VICTIMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee of Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I announced in the Senate on July 28 that my subcommittee planned to conduct a thorough study of procedures of the Metropolitan Police Department and the District of Columbia General Hospital in connection with the processing of rape victims in the District of Columbia. We have completed that survey.

At the direction of the members of the subcommittee, the District of Columbia Committee staff has worked closely with the police department and the health department officials having direct responsibility in these areas, to help develop procedures that would correct the problems which have existed.

Several members of the Senate District Committee recently met with the chief of police to discuss the problems which have confronted the police department in this regard.

The Acting Director of the District of Columbia Health Department, Dr. Frederick Heath, has recommended to my subcommittee additional procedures for the handling of rape cases. I have studied these recommendations and believe that if they are promptly carried out, they will help solve the problems we have had in the past.

Chief of Police Layton advises me that the new procedures outlined by the District of Columbia Public Health Department, for handling of rape cases at District of Columbia General Hospital, have been reviewed by him and that he feels that from his standpoint, they are appropriate corrective measures.

As chairman of my subcommittee, I believe that the procedures outlined by the Public Health Department and the Police Department are adequate, provided the recommended procedures are, in fact, diligently carried out. I urge that the Director of Public Health and the Chief of Police watch the situation carefully to insure that the proposed procedures are put into effect at the earliest possible time and that employees of their Departments understand the procedures and carry them out in each instance.

I want to express my sincerest appreciation for the deep interest in this problem shown by my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]; also the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], as well as the members of the full Committee on the District of Columbia, particularly the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. The men whom I have named worked closely with me in our conferences with the District of Columbia officials on this important matter. Every member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia gave to me unequivocal support in our mutual endeavor to devise some new procedures which would meet the problems which have concerned all of us in connection with rape cases in the past several weeks.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the fine cooperation my subcommittee received from Chief of Police Layton and the Director of the Department of Public Health, Dr. Frederick Heath. I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to be my Mr. John B. Layton, Chief of Police, dated August 6, 1965, concerning the problem.

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

> GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
>
> *August 6, 1965.*
>
> HON. WAYNE MORSE,
> *Chairman, Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me first of all to express my appreciation as Chief of Police for the interest in and concern with our police problems expressed by you and your colleagues in the informal meeting of this morning which was initiated as a result of the two most recent rape cases in the Georgetown area being two of a number of recent offenses which point up the shocking situation in the District of Columbia regarding heinous crimes in which bodily attacks are made on the victims.
>
> As I reported to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia just recently, a look at the preliminary tabulation of serious offenses for the month of July indicates a sizable increase for this period in 1965 over that for 1964. I would point out, however,

that the category reflecting the sharpest increase is that of robbery, and while the offense of forcible rape is particularly atrocious, still in number of offenses we fortunately have not had a sharp increase in this category of crime and our success in clearing such cases by arrest has been above average. As indicated to you and your colleagues, our efforts in the current cases of this category goes on unabated, and in the Montrose Park case our personnel are working closely with the investigating officers of the U.S. Park Police in a determined effort to locate and identify the assailants.

The concern of you and your colleagues with the administrative procedures in the handling of sex offenses by the Metropolitan Police Department and the medical examination and treatment of victims is also appreciated. The new procedures outlined by the Department of Public Health for handling of such cases at District of Columbia General Hospital have been reviewed and appear to us to be appropriate corrective measures for the particular problems in which your committee expressed interest.

I concur in the need for expeditious handling of such cases and assure you that the Metropolitan Police Department will do all that we can to expedite presenting the victims in such cases to the District of Columbia General Hospital for examination and treatment.

While our rate of robbery cases for the month of July appears to be 50 percent above that of July 1964, I would want to point out that since the 235-man tactical force recently authorized by the Congress was activated on July 20, the average daily rate for the last 12 days of the month has been down 30 percent over the daily average for the first 19 days of the month in the area of patrol and an even greater effect has been noted during the hours when the tactical force has been patrolling. Another request made by the Department which has been authorized by the Congress will shortly be fruitful in the placing in service of additional scout cars in the precincts as well as additional vehicles for plainclothes investigating officers. I expect that as soon as these vehicles can be placed in service, the effect of this added patrol will be felt. One of our needs which has not yet been satisfied is that of a planning and development bureau looking to installation of data processing equipment and which I expect to urge on the Congress in a later budget request.

We are also working closely with staff agencies of the District government toward proposals which we hope will provide recruiting incentives to enable us to meet and maintain the strength of the force as authorized by the Congress.

The interest and concern of you and your colleagues, therefore, is much appreciated in our joint efforts to provide effective law enforcement in the District of Columbia for the full protection of its citizens.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. LAYTON,
Chief of Police.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a statement which I received from Dr. Frederick C. Heath, Acting Director of the Department of Public Health, section 2 of the memorandum sets forth the present procedures at District of Columbia General Hospital effective on July 28, 1965, section 3 sets forth Dr. Health's recommendations for additional procedures to be followed. I endorse them; the members of my committee endorse them. We commend Dr. Heath for his fine cooperation. We think that his recommendations are entitled to a trial.

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

SECTION 2. PRESENT PROCEDURES EFFECTIVE JULY 28, 1965

Present procedures for handling sex cases in the emergency and admitting service

1. The nurse is to be alerted to see that prompt processing and examination of sex cases are accomplished to the extent possible, depending upon other patients present with critical conditions at the time the sex case is registered.

2. Examine the patient as soon as possible after arrival. A representative of the Woman's Bureau will accompany the patient at all times.

3. During the general physical examination note the following: The emotional state of the patient, order of the breath, contusions, scratches, or lacerations on any part of the body. Note the appearance of the clothing, whether any article has blood stains or other secretions of suspicious nature which can be turned over to the Police Department for chemical analysis if necessary.

4. During the gynecologic examination note the following: Evidence of violence about the vulva, introitus, or inner aspect of the thigh. When the hymen is not intact pass a speculum to search for abnormalities. Make smears of the cervical and unrethral areas for laboratory examination. Describe carefully, all findings of speculum examination.

5. The examining doctor renders a concise statement, giving his opinion whether or not evidence exists of forceful entry, and other data which will be of medico-legal value. This information should appear on the medico-legal form and the emergency treatment record.

6. All specimens taken during this examination must be clearly labeled indicating the source, date and patient's name.

7. At the conclusion of the vaginal examination, the vaginal vault will be thoroughly swabbed with a germicidal solution. After the speculum is removed the perineum will be lavaged with a germicidal solution.

8. Treatment will be rendered as indicated in the normal manner, depending upon the injury. As an example; open wounds and lacerations are cleansed, treated and repaired as necessary. Fractures and dislocations would be reduced and treated as indicated.

9. Serum Test for Syphilis (STS) will be taken, to establish a base line for future reference.

10. Any therapy that the examiner deems necessary in rendering emotional support and assurance shall be given.

11. Every attempt will be made to examine the patient and give germicidal cleansing within 2 hours from the time of the alleged forceful sexual exposure. This is desirable as a prophylaxis against gonorrhea and syphilis.

NOTE.—Paragraphs 7, 9, and 11 are recent amendments.

WILLIAM J. BROWNLEE, M.D.,
Chief Medical Officer, Admitting and Emergency.

Approved July 28, 1965.

FREDERICK C. HEATH, M.D., M.P.H., F.C.H.,
Acting Director of Public Health.

SECTION 3. RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES

(a) Public health nursing followup and confidential register of sexually assulted patients. This is a rough draft of a proposal to initiate a followup service and study. The purposes of the followup will be:

1. To provide reassurance and support to the patient following treatment at the District of Columbia General Hospital.

2. To assist the patient who wants such assistance.

3. To refer the patient to a private physician or clinic as indicated, for further diagnosis or treatment.

4. To cooperate with the physician or clinic in getting the patient back for a revisit, if necessary.

5. To observe the patient for possible onset of gonorrhea, syphilis, or pregnancy.

6. To ascertain what happens to these patients from the mental, emotional, and physical points of view during the followup period and to ascertain the effectiveness of medical and nursing preventive services.

Procedure: The procedures will have to be worked out, particularly with the associate director for medical care and hospitals and with the Medical Director of the District of Columbia General Hospital and his representatives. It should be possible to put the procedure in operation in 1 month.

Referral of patient:

These may include all patients who have been sexually assaulted in the opinion of the medical officer in charge of the emergency service at the District of Columbia General Hospital. In other words, patients who have been raped and others where there has been only an attempt. If it is considered best, the latter group may be eliminated.

The referral will be made by telephone, preferably on the same day that the patient is seen in the emergency room. The referrals should be made by one person, preferably the nurse in charge of the emergency room (or this may be done by the medical officer in charge of the emergency room, or by the admitting officer). The followup will be done by one nurse, who will be in charge of the confidential register.

(b) Alleged sexually assaulted patients should be taken to the nearest participating hospital or family physician.

In order that the victims may be medicolegally examined and receive germicidal cleansing as quickly as possible (hopefully in less than 2 hours after the alleged exposure), it is recommended that the police take the patient to the nearest hospital agreeing to participate in the program, or to the private physician requested by the patient.

There is no law or regulation requiring the police to bring all sexually assaulted cases to District of Columbia General Hospital. In fact, victims with serious injuries in addition to the alleged sex assault, are taken to the nearest hospital.

The present practice of taking most of the victims to District of Columbia General Hospital was inaugurated in 1946 by the health officer in a letter to the chief of the Metropolitan Police Department.

(c) Authority for victims of a crime, where the police determine a felony has been committed, to be eligible to participate in the department's medical care program.

This recommendation is intended to be tentative at this time, since a detailed study must be made to determine its feasibility before a firm recommendation can be made.

Under present practices victims of crime are considered in the same manner as patients suffering from other types of accidents. Eligibility and payability are determined in accordance with the Commissioners' regulations governing eligibility for medical care. To my knowledge, no one has been denied emergency treatment at District of Columbia General Hospital, or at the voluntary contract hospitals. However, if the patient's income or modest financial resources are above the standards set by the Commissioners, payment for medical care must be made by the patient, the insurance carrier, if any, or an agency of the Health and Welfare Council. I do not feel a victim of a felonious act should be required to reduce his modest savings in order to pay for his medical care, since the medical bills for extensive injuries such as fractured skulls, deep knife or bullet wounds, are usually

quite expensive, and would probably wipe out modest financial resources. In addition, serious injury would disable the victim to the extent that he would not be able to work for a long time.

(Submitted by Dr. Frederick C. Heath, Acting Director, Department of Public Health.)

Mr. MORSE. In behalf of the Chief of Police, Layton and Dr. Heath, they have made very clear to me that they intend to watch very carefully the operation of the new procedures, and if they decide some additional improvements are needed, they assure me that they will be bringing forth new procedures as experience shows that they may be needed.

AMENDMENT OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Thursday I sent to the Press Gallery a bill and speech that I planned to make in respect to needed amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act. I was called away from the Senate on a very important emergency and was not able to get back to the Senate in time officially to file the bill and to make the speech, although the speech was in the Press Gallery and it was entirely proper for the press to release any comments that members of the press cared to make on the bill and the speech, which they did, because the press release showed that it was to be released on that day.

Mr. President, the time has come to improve and perfect one of the major pieces of reform legislation enacted during the Eisenhower era. I refer to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

That law, as enacted, contains various special-privilege exemptions and exceptions. We regulated many bank holding companies but we left some of them out. In particular, two major bank holding companies—two giant financial-industrial combines—were left wholly free of the act's provisions. These billion-dollar combines are the Alfred I. du Pont Estate of Jacksonville, Fla., and Financial General Corp. of Washington, D.C.

The record will show, Mr. President, that during the debate on the bank holding company bill back in April of 1956, I warned the Senate that such special exemptions and exceptions in the bill would come back to haunt us. And so they have. They are haunting us now.

I might add that President Eisenhower expressed a similar view in this case. When signing the Bank Holding Company Act into law, he remarked that "the exemptions and other special provisions will require the further attention of Congress."

More than a year ago, Mr. President, I drew the attention of the Senate to certain grave abuses on the part of the Du Pont Estate down in Florida. I suggested that the Du Pont Estate's special-privilege exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act be ended, so as to curb its potential for abuse of power. Several other Senators expressed interest in the matter, but nothing was done last year.

Since then, under the leadership of a great legislator, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, extensive hearings on this subject have been held in the other body. The House Banking and Currency Committee, by overwhelming bipartisan votes, has now reported out two bills. These bills would close a number of loopholes in the Bank Holding Company Act, including those used by the Du Pont Estate and Financial General Corp. Following my remarks today I shall introduce a bill that embodies the provisions of these two House committee bills. It is time we acted, Mr. President. It is long past time that we close these special privilege loopholes and exemptions in the Bank Holding Company Act.

I shall now briefly summarize the nature and purposes of that act. I shall then describe the Du Pont Estate and Financial General Corp. and how they came to be exempted from the act. And that is an interesting tale, Mr. President. There was trickery involved in it. Members of our Banking and Currency Committee—including the senior Senator from Oregon—were misled. Finally, I shall conclude by telling what my loophole closing bill would do.

Mr. President, the Bank Holding Company Act is an antimonopoly measure. It is a fine and salutary law. Its goal is to prevent abuses of power by one particular form of banking combination, the bank holding company. And here let me pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. This law is his handiwork, above all others. It took years of effort on his part to get the bank holding law on the books. I may have differed with the Senator from Virginia about allowing certain exemptions and exceptions into the law, but these were essentially differences on strategy. I never for one moment doubted his good faith. The Senator from Virginia wanted as tight a law as he could get. With so many powerful forces arrayed against him, he felt that certain exemptions and exceptions would have to be allowed. He so stated to us at the time. And he did get the bill through. For 9 years now, scores of bank holding companies—including the biggest of them all—have been regulated and limited by this law. In the climate of the 1950's, that was a remarkable achievement. When the definitive biography of the Senator from Virginia comes to be written, I predict the passage of this act will rank high among his notable achievements for the Nation.

The aim of the Bank Holding Company Act is stated concisely in its title. It is an act to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. The act requires bank holding companies to register with the Federal Reserve Board. They must obtain the Board's approval, based on certain public interest standards, before acquiring more banks. They must divest any control over nonbanking enterprises. They may not acquire banks across State lines unless the State law specifically allows this.

In general, the act places on bank holding companies some of the same restrictions placed on banks. As the Senator from Virginia stated when we were considering his bill back in 1956:

> Nothing is more fundamental in the Banking Act of 1933 than the principle that banks should be restricted to banking activities and not engage in other types of business. Since 1933 both State and national banks have been so limited, but this limitation has been evaded by the bank holding company device.

The Senator explained how his bill, which became the Bank Holding Company Act, would meet the problem. His bill, he noted:

> Not only would divorce bank holding companies from their industrial empires, but also would put any future expansion under the control of the Federal Reserve Board.

As enacted, however, the definitions section of the Bank Holding Company Act was drawn so that it exempts various kinds of enterprises which are in fact bank holding companies. The two largest enterprises now benefiting from these special-privilege exemptions are the Du Pont Estate and Financial General Corp.

The Du Pont Estate is a perpetual testamentary trust created under the will of the late Alfred I. du Pont. Mr. du Pont belonged to the well-known Delaware family, but his estate is not affiliated with the Du Pont Co.

The Du Pont Estate controls 31 banks in the State of Florida. This "Florida National" group has become the largest banking group in Florida, with over $785 million in assets at the end of 1964.

The Du Pont Estate also controls, through 75 percent ownership, a large paper manufacturing company, over a million acres of timberland, some valuable city real estate. a small railroad, and a small telephone company. The estate further controls a class I railroad, the Florida East Coast, where the longest strike in railroad history is still under way after 2½ years.

Beyond all this, the Du Pont Estate owns 764,280 shares of Du Pont Co. stock and 719,758 shares of General Motors stock. These two stockholdings alone are currently worth over $240 million. Altogether, the Du Pont Estate rules an empire of banks, industries, railroads, land, and stockholdings with a value of well over a billion dollars.

Turning now to Financial General Corp., its banking group at the end of 1964 included 26 banks with 104 main offices and branches in 6 States and the District of Columbia, with assets of more than $1.1 billion. A 27th bank was acquired early in 1965.

In addition to banks, Financial General also controls two life insurance companies with assets of $130 million at the end of 1964, plus three fire and casualty insurance companies with assets of $63 million. Financial General also controls an industrial holding company, a lease financing company and a mortgage company.

Here, too, as with the Du Pont Estate, we find a billion-dollar empire of banks, insurance companies and industries—an empire of the very kind that the Bank Holding Company Act aimed to split up and regulate. But Financial General and the Du Pont Estate have gone scot free of the act. We told the other bank holding companies: Without regulation, there is too much potential for abuse of power in your kind of operation. So we

will regulate you. If you want to keep your banks, we told them, you must get rid of your nonbank companies. If you want to buy more banks, you must first get permission from the Federal Reserve. And this was not done in a spirit of punishment. This is not a punitive law; it is a preventive law.

But we defined certain bank holding companies out of the act. They got, in effect, a special privilege. That is what happened with Financial General and the Du Pont Estate. How did it happen?

I said a while ago that Senators were misled on the matter. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee—and I was one of them at the time—were misled. To put it bluntly, we were deceived as to the facts. I do not think any member of any Senate committee appreciates having that happen to him.

Financial General Corp. has escaped from the Bank Holding Company Act through a so-called "investment company exemption." At the time our committee was considering the bank holding company bill in 1955 and early 1956, Financial General Corp. was known as Morris Plan Corp. of America. It was controlled at that time by a registered investment company called Equity Corp.

Mr. Ellery Huntington, chairman of the board of Equity Corp. and president of Morris Plan Corp., proposed the investment company exemption in 1955 to the Senate subcommittee. The substance of Mr. Huntington's proposal was later put into the bank holding company bill. Mr. Huntington explained that the chief aim of his proposal was to allow Equity Corp., the investment company, to keep its diversified investment holdings and to avoid double regulation under both the Investment Company Act and the proposed new Bank Holding Company Act. He stated that their bank holding company, the Morris Plan Corp.—now known as Financial General Corp.—would itself still be "registered and supervised" under the proposed new act. He further displayed a table purporting to show the "Results of Amendments Proposed by the Morris Plan Corp." The Morris Plan Corp. was labeled on Mr. Huntington's table as a "Registered Bank Holding Company." All this can be seen in the committee's printed hearings on the bill.

The wording of the investment company exemption did appear to bear out Mr. Huntington's assurance that the actual bank holding company would still be obliged to register as such. I myself so stated during the Senate debate. I had that impression at that time. I have no doubt this assurance was one of the major elements in our committee's favorable consideration of the amendment proposed by the Morris Plan Corp.

In fact, however, Financial General Corp.—which is the new name taken by the Morris Plan Corp. a few days before the Bank Holding Company Act became law—has never yet registered under the act. Financial General has evaded the act through the trick wording in the investment company exemption. That exemption applies to any investment company that registered with the SEC before May 15, 1955, or any affiliate of such a company, unless they control "directly" two or more banks. Note that word "directly." It does not appear in the rest of the act. The rest of the act deals with direct or indirect control. Only this special exemption speaks of "directly" controlling banks. Of course, the Financial General people took advantage of this.

To evade the act, Financial General has spawned a whole army of "shell" holding companies. These wholly owned shell companies in turn own Financial General's banks and other enterprises. Thus, Financial General controls "directly" no banks at all. For 9 years it has been free to acquire new banks, to hold and acquire outside industries, to cross State lines, without any of the restrictions imposed on other bank holding companies by the act. And Financial General has vigorously done just this. Financial General never registered under the act at all, despite Mr. Huntington's representations to the contrary.

Mr. President, turning now to the Du Pont estate, I regret to report that Senators were misled on that matter also during committee consideration of the bank holding company bill—though not in the same way as with Financial General. During those hearings the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] raised the question of why the Du Point estate, with its great holdings, should be exempted from the bill. Other Senators assured him, as a reason for this exemption, that according to their information the Du Pont estate's money went wholly or predominantly for charitable purposes.

For myself, I do not consider that a valid reason for any exemption. The point of the Bank Holding Company Act is not who gets the money but who holds the power—and how that power shall be wielded. Nonetheless, some members of the committee clearly felt that the Du Pont estate's supposed charitable nature made a strong argument for exempting it from this law. Unfortunately, their information was incorrect. Someone had misled them. Since Mr. du Pont's death in 1935, nearly all the income from his estate has gone to his widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont. Of course, there is nothing whatever wrong with that. It is a fine thing to leave one's widow well provided for. And I am told Mrs. du Pont is a very gracious and generous lady. Apart from many other gifts, she has assigned 12 percent of the income due her from the estate to a charitable foundation. Eventually all of the estate's income will go to that same foundation.

The fact remains, however, that the Du Pont estate is not now and never has been a charitable enterprise. Since 1935, Mrs. du Pont has drawn a total of $108,-731,491.56 in income from the estate. Her income from the estate last year year amounted to $9,208,128.90. These figures come from reports of the Du Pont estate's trustees.

Someone gave a wrong impression to members of our committee back in 1955 and 1956 about where the Du Pont estate's money has been going. I cannot say who spread that misleading information. The Du Pont estate's dominant trustee has been Mr. Edward Ball. Some weeks ago, when Mr. Ball appeared before the House committee, he was asked what role he played in connection with the Du Pont estate's exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act back then. Mr. Ball replied, "I do not think I ever conferred with a Member of the House in regard to the pending bank holding company legislation, and I am not sure that I conferred with Members of the Senate here in Washington." That is what he said: "I am not sure I conferred with Members of the Senate here in Washington."

Whoever it may be that spread the misleading information, there is no doubt in my mind that Members of the Senate were trifled with, as regards both the Du Pont estate situation and the Financial General situation.

Mr. President, I do not want to leave the impression that my bill—which is the same as the two House committee bills—would deal only with the Du Pont estate and Financial General situations. It would also deal with other bank holding company problem areas, as well as many potential situations that could arise if the act's present exemptions are left standing. My bill would close a whole spectrum of unjustified exemptions in the act.

And here let me say that the Federal Reserve Board has testified very strongly in favor of the two bills on the House side. The Federal Reserve Board is 100 percent behind this. The Independent Bankers Association is 100 percent behind it. The Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission also testified before the House committee and completely exploded the supposed excuse for the investment company exemption in the act, which my bill would remove. Extensive hearings were held before the committee of the other body, and members of the committee there are fully persuaded of the need to close these loopholes in the act. They reported out the first of their bills by 21 to 4. They reported out the second bill by 27 to 0. Those are the two bills that I have combined into one Senate bill.

My bill would do several things. First, it would remove the so-called investment company exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act. Financial General Corp. is the only bank holding company now using this exemption. But there are 275 investment companies that registered with the SEC before May 15, 1955, and the way the law now stands, any bank holding company could escape completely from the act simply by buying 5 percent of the stock of one of these 275 investment companies—thereby becoming an investment company affiliate—and by then setting up the kind of shell corporations that Financial General has done. In short, this investment company exemption is an open invitation to evade the act.

Second, my bill would cause long-term trusts that control two or more banks to register under the act as bank holding companies. The usual kind of trust, either testamentary or inter vivos, which terminates within 25 years or not later

than the death of a named beneficiary, and which is for the benefit of named individuals or for the benefit of identifiable individuals related by blood or marriage to the settlor, would continue wholly exempt from the act. My bill also contains a provision to prevent evasion of the act by the device of multiple trusts. Let me emphasize that both of these trust provisions are very carefully drawn. I recognize that the field of trusts is a complex one, but I believe these provisions of my bill will enable the purposes of the act to be fulfilled while not hampering any trusts or trust departments that should not be brought under the act.

Third, my bill would bring under the act any tax-exempt foundations or similar organizations that control two or more banks. This reform has long been urged by the Federal Reserve Board, which points out that "The dangers aimed at by the Holding Company Act are not absent simply because a holding company is operated for religious, charitable, or educational purposes." Likewise my bill would bring under the act any partnerships that control two or more banks.

These are the chief provisions of my bill. They are broad but not, I think, unreasonably broad. They aim not to punish but to regulate. They aim to provide neither special favors nor special hardships. They aim to treat all organizations as much as possible alike, insofar as those organizations are alike in their control of long-term banking industrial power.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the Bank Holding Company Act as an antimonopoly measure. That is what it is—and a good one. Looking back over the past hundred years, observing the rise of giant corporations in almost every field, I thank God we have enacted measures of regulation like this one into law. Our antitrust laws—our agencies and commissions to enforce competition or to supervise the monopolistic industries—are absolutely vital to a free and healthy economy. They are a vital part of our way of life. Not socialism—not unbridled capitalism—not cartelism—but a free competitive economy operating under strict but fair rules of the game: that is the American way. That is one of the prime secrets of the world's most productive economic system.

And yet, not one of our "rules of the game" laws has been fully adequate to begin with. It would be a miracle if they were. We all know the immense effort, the immense patience needed to achieve any kind of new regulatory law. That is why I paid tribute earlier to the Senator from Virginia. I can appreciate what he went through to get these pioneer bank holding company regulations enacted.

But we know also that the time arrives—it arrives with everyone of our "rules of the game" laws—when another forward step becomes both needed and feasible. On occasion, such forward steps involve a fight. My colleagues know I do not shun a fight when the bugle sounds. Here, however, I anticipate no major battle. The time has surely now arrived, after nearly 10 years, to improve and perfect the bank holding company law. These amendments I offer today would do the job about as well, I think, as it can presently be done. This represents no issue of liberals against conservatives. Rather, it is a simple question of justice and fairness. I have no doubt that a consensus will develop on this issue, both in the Banking and Currency Committee and among Senators generally.

I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and ask that it lie on the table for 3 days to give other Senators who may wish to do so a chance to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2418) to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MONDALE, and Mr. MCINTYRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IS THIS JUSTICE?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, with reluctance, but out of a sense of duty, I call the Senate's attention to a situation in one of the courts of the District of Columbia which has become, in the opinion of many persons familiar with our legal system, increasingly intolerable, odorous and downright disgraceful.

I am referring to the outrageous conduct of Judge John H. Burnett of the Domestic Relations Court for the District of Columbia.

This man time and time again has been called down by his superiors on the bench, among others, by no less than the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for conduct in the courtroom which is, to my mind, almost inconceivable.

Admittedly, the type of cases that come before a domestic relations judge for settlement—involving, as they do, tragic instances of bitterness and acrimony between married couples who seek to prove each other unfit parents of their small children—do not make for pleasant listening.

But this judge's repeated mistreatment of the principals who appear before him, of the witnesses called in these cases, his sarcasm, his intemperate manner and, above all, his salacious pursuit, his goatish preoccupation with dragging from the women who come into his court every erotic detail of their sexual lives; this conduct far, far exceeds the bounds of decency and ethical behavior, to say nothing of proper judicial inquiry.

The most recent criticism of this judge arose less than a month ago and it came—significantly, I think—from the Honorable David L. Bazelon, the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Judge Bazelon was commenting on a case which had come to his court from the District appellate court, and he noted the remarks of one of the lower appellate court judges that Judge Burnett seemed—and I quote—"preoccupied" with the subject of sexual relations.

Judge Bazelon also mentioned examples of what I can only describe as the "gutter language" used during the hearing by Judge Burnett in questioning the wife in this case.

It is language I hesitate to repeat to the Senate, but it is language such as I never imagined could be employed by a judge in any court in these United States.

Example after example in the same vein can be cited—have been cited to me—concerning the misconduct of this man who—unfortunately—sits in judgment of others.

Long before this latest instance of Judge Burnett's misconduct, I had heard, from many sources, complaints of his rudeness, of his apparent delight in harrying and harassing persons who came before him—lawyers, litigants, and witnesses alike—for no good reason.

It may be asked why a Senator from Alaska should have any interest in what goes on in a domestic relations court in the District of Columbia. Mr. President, my interest was aroused when I testified in a case on trial before Judge Burnett. At that time his rudeness to me—altogether uncalled for—not only angered me but aroused my curiosity as to why a judge should act in such a manner. During the same trial Judge Burnett demonstrated a like rudeness to the wife of my colleague in the Senate from Alaska. It was then that I started to inquire into this man's judicial conduct. It was then that I discovered the appalling facts which I place before the Senate today. This is not all, Mr. President. I could go on and on in a demonstration of this man's absolute unfitness to be where he is, but I do not propose at this time to burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with quotations from trial transcripts where Judge Burnett has said things so absolutely unbecoming to one occupying such a high office that one is left to wonder. If it were not for the fact that sympathy must be confined almost altogether to those who have appeared before him and have been made the victims of his seemingly salacious interest in sex, one would have a large measure of pity for this man. My own opinion is that he needs help.

The judicial process is the very foundation upon which our society rests, and a respect for the law, and for those who administer it, and interpret it, is the crucible in which it has always been tested.

The Domestic Relations Court for the District of Columbia is a small crucible in the overall picture, to be sure.

But it is not small in the lives of those who come under it jurisdiction, and not small at all to those who enter the courtroom of Judge Burnett.

To those parents, bereft as they are of understanding of each other's problems and as concerned as they may or may not be with the ultimate welfare of their innocent children, this man's courtroom, it has become clear to me, is a witches' cauldron in which there is brewed that which is the most salacious, lecherous, libidinous, and prurient.

The record of his court is replete with instances of his microscopic obsession with sex.

Time after time he has badgered the woman in a case for the most intimate, step-by-step account of her sex life, forcing her, in some cases, to describe it to him much as a radio announcer broadcasts a prize fight.

I do not propose to offend the Senate with examples of some of this man's more lascivious cross-examinations of the women who have had the misfortune to appear in his courtroom, although let me assure Senators that they extend far beyond any bounds of decency.

But this is only one side of the nature of his courtroom conduct.

Judge Bazelon himself commented last month:

> Even more disturbing than the trial judge's conduct (of this case) is the absence of any inquiry concerning the best interests of the child.

It is almost impossible for me to believe that a man charged with the high responsibility to decide which parent will have the most regard for the best interests of his or her child could completely ignore the subject, but here we have the evidence that this is so from no less a jurist than the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

I say it is almost impossible for me to believe. I should have said it would have been impossible for me to believe it had I not been made acquainted by research with this man's prurient obsession with sex, his seemingly pathological preoccupation with the details of other people's sexual experiences.

As I say, I do not intend to open this cesspool in the Senate of the United States.

Instead, let me cite one or two examples of what his peers have said about this man's judicial conduct or, rather, the lack of it.

Chief Judge Andrew M. Hood, of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, commenting on an appeal by a young mother just last February:

> It is my opinion that appellant was denied a fair, impartial, and judicial hearing.
>
> Notwithstanding the free admission of her adulterous conduct, the trial judge seemed preoccupied with her sexual relations. The record discloses more than 20 occasions when the trial court asked questions concerning, or made reference to, "intercourse," "sleeping with," "having it," "laying up with."
>
> During the trial the judge lectured appellant respecting adultery * * *. He argued with appellant's counsel regarding the immorality of adultery, citing the Commandment "Thou shalt not commit adultery." At the conclusion of the case the court denounced appellant as "just one step above a prostitute," "a common, ordinary, everyday tramp" whose way of living was a "stinking situation," and stated: "I am so incensed by the way this common tramp acts that I could go down and do something to her myself."

Let me break into Judge Hood's comments here to remark on the striking similarity between the scene he has described and Somerset Maugham's play "Rain". Who can ever forget the fate of the self-righteous Reverend Davidson at the hands of Sadie Thompson?

There is, unfortunately, a frame of mind in which the possessor zealously guards the public morals by a compulsive wallowing in a moral cesspool, but I do not believe that the judicial bench is any seat for one so possessed.

But let me continue with Judge Hood's remarks:

> The questioning of appellant by the judge in a manner designed only to ridicule or humiliate her, the judge's moralizing, his denunciation of appellant, and his expression of personal animosity toward her, convince me that the judge's personal emotions and concepts were permitted to completely override his judicial views. I do not say appellant is entitled to custody of her child, but I do say she is entitled to a judicial hearing.

Judge Hood's remarks, I think, speak more eloquently than anything I might say.

But Judge Hood is not alone in his criticism of this man's conduct, or misconduct.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in reversing a decision by Judge Burnett in another child custody case, referred to a comment by one of the lawyers—the lawyer, in fact, whose client was awarded custody of the children.

This is what the court of appeals said:

> On brief in this court counsel for the appellee with commendable candor felt bound to concede that he "had a personal aversion and professional aversion to the manner in which (the trial judge) had conducted proceedings in his court."

The lawyer who gave this opinion before the court of appeals is one of the most respected attorneys in Washington and, let me repeat, in this instance he had won his case before Judge Burnett.

The opposing attorneys before the U.S. Court of Appeals told the judges there that this same lawyer had stated to the lower appellate court that Judge Burnett's conduct "is a matter of shocking concern to every attorney who appears before that trial judge."

Their argument to the court of appeals also contains this statement, also attributed to the lawyer for the husband in the case:

He was quoted as having said in the lower appellate court:

> Judge Burnett cannot be accused of prejudice toward the wife because the trial judge treats everybody in the manner (she) complained of in the court below—
>
> Judge Burnett, in other words—
>
> that the temper and personality traits of this particular trial judge were as well known before his appointment by the President and his confirmation by the Senate, as now, and therefore that must be what was wanted.

Let me say to the distinguished lawyer who made those remarks that "that" most certainly was not what was wanted, not by the Senate and certainly not by anybody concerned with the honor and fairness of our judicial system.

Let me say to the Senate that this man's term expires next year and that this Senator from Alaska is irrevocably committed to oppose any attempt by this man to seek another term on the bench of this or any other court.

His behavior, his inexcusable manner, his utter disregard for the interests of the children whose parents come before him—due apparently to his strange and pitiable obsession—make him unfit to wear the judicial robe.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

UNTHINKABLE THAT THIS NATION WOULD DESTROY COMMUNIST CHINA'S NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the statement made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives in a speech he delivered recently in Connecticut. He asked a rhetorical question:

> Should we use our atomic power to wipe out Red China's atomic capability?

Then he added:

> We must get ready to do this very thing if we want to stop Red China. I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

In this same speech the gentleman also stated:

> And even if we win the war in South Vietnam, I cannot help but think that we are merely postponing the final victory of Red China unless the Nation is prepared to risk the possible consequences of destroying her nuclear capability. And unless we make that decision, it is possible that all of our

fighting in South Vietnam will have been in vain.

In other words this Member of the other body really outdid some hard-nosed militarists in our Armed Forces who in the past have been advocating preemptive war against the Soviet Union and in recent months have raised their voices advocating a sneak attack or preemptive war on Red China to destroy the crude nuclear installations of the Red Chinese. The very suggestion of this is so un-American as to be abhorrent. Yet, here is a Member of the other body occupying the position as chairman of one of the most powerful committees in that body advocating this procedure.

Mr. President, the facts are that I am a fervent believer in the seniority system. It is one of the advantages of our Congress that under that system, men who have served long years in the Senate and in the House of Representatives attain promotions within the committees of which they are members, and finally some of them with long years of congressional service become chairmen of committees. By and large, chairmen of all the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are eminently respected, are most knowledgeable, and deserve the promotion to chairmen by reason of the experience that they have acquired over the years.

Nevertheless, it is somewhat shattering to my faith in this seniority system to read of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives advocating a suicidal policy on our part, and I feel obligated to speak out against this without delay lest in this country and overseas such a rhetorical question would be taken seriously.

That the person making this statement is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body causes me to fear that in Europe and Asia, among the heads of states, it might be regarded as authoritative and that his views are respected and might be followed. Were we as a nation to undertake any such course, we could gain nothing except, at most, a very temporary advantage and at a great price—loss of respect and degradation.

Now let us consider the facts. No matter what single location or several locations we might bomb and utterly destroy into ashes within the mainland of China, that nation—Communist China—with its great population, its far-flung geographic area, and its scientists and scholars would retain the capability of very soon again producing even more nuclear weapons and far better and more powerful than the first crude warheads produced there. We should realize that in this nuclear age of change and challenge even a small group of scientists are just as valuable or more valuable to any nation, to China and to this Nation, than any existing nuclear installations.

Assuming that we could destroy China's capability for producing nuclear weapons for a short time and that we did destroy all the existing nuclear installations, how could we possibly bar or prevent the access of the Chinese to the raw materials necessary for the production of fissionable nuclear charges? Assume we did hurl our air power over the Chinese mainland, as this gentleman suggests. Would we have our Air Force attempt to lay waste all of the factories that they beheld below them where they might suspect that some use was being made of raw materials to manufacture nuclear bombs? How could we do that anyway when it is readily possible for men of intelligence to disperse such installations and even locate them in cities in the midst of massive centers of population or underground in other sections of the country in such manner that our bombs could not destroy them?

Then, above everything else, it would not be possible for us with our missile power, air power, and land forces to kill all of those individuals who comprehend how atomic weapons are made. In other words, even now in a preemptive war in a day of infamy followed by other days of infamy, were we to destroy the lives of million of Chinese men, women, and children, we could not possibly kill off all the scientists.

I am mentioning this to state how foolhardy the gentleman's proposal is. Let us realize that China is a huge nation that has great diversity and a great quantity of natural resources; that there are 700 million men, women and children living within the borders of China; that China is a nation with a great history and its people have a tradition of being industrious. The Chinese are people of high intellectual attainments and business and scientific achievements. They have a great cultural background. It is obvious to all that China is now a great power and within 10 or 20 years it will be one of the three greatest powers on the earth.

We are proud of the American citizens we have in our midst, in Hawaii and elsewhere, men, women and children of Chinese descent. We have in this body as a U.S. Senator from the sovereign State of Hawaii HIRAM FONG, one of the ablest and most respected Members of this body, whose father and mother and all his ancestors were Chinese and lived in China.

I advert to that fact to indicate another facet and to indicate how foolhardy that suggestion or rhetorical question was.

Furthermore, there is nothing Representative RIVERS or anyone else can do to stop China's advance. Even the grossly inhumane use of atomic and bacteriological weapons could not do that. Let us hear no more about this rhetorical question. A proposal to do anything of this sort would be foreign to the American way of life, foreign to the great history and noble traditions of our country from colonial days to the present time. Furthermore, it would be so inhuman and so callous that we as a Nation would be downgraded before all of the world, even to a greater extent than was Adolph Hitler's Germany.

The distinguished Congressman who made this bombastic speech gave little or no thought to the fact that were we to bomb the nuclear installations within the Red Chinese mainland, immediately Communist China with its population of 700 million and with its tremendously powerful land army would go to war against the United States, overrunning southeast Asia, and in doing this killing many thousands of American GI's.

Any self-respecting nation attacked in such a manner as was proposed in this Connecticut speech made by the gentleman from the other body would have no other course open to it. Furthermore, as certain as sunrise follows the sunset, the Soviet Union, obligated by its commitment and alliance to Communist China, and despite the fact that its leaders and the Russian people seek friendship and not war with this Nation, would inevitably mobilize its forces and unleash its missiles, and the third world war—and this a war on annihilation—would begin.

Mr. President, this arm-chair militarist says:

> I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

It would be difficult to find anywhere a more bombastic statement than that. Unfortunately, this particular arm-chair militarist has the title of chairman of a powerful committee.

The President, who is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has repeatedly announced his desire and hope that representatives of the Vietcong and North Vietnam and other nations meet with us at a conference table, that we are glad to talk settlement and seek a ceasefire.

He has said time and time again—and that is our position at the present time, despite the bombast from the gentleman from the other body—that we should seek negotiations unconditionally, without any conditions whatsoever.

Our situation is bad in South Vietnam. It is far worse than it was a year ago or when President Eisenhower first committed our Armed Forces in South Vietnam. It is too late now for us to say a mistake was made, because we were committed in 1954 and we have been involved there since that time, and apparently things have gone from bad to worse.

Despite these statements that should never have been made—he said:

> I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable.

We Americans seek and hope for a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides which will offer the Communists and Vietcong a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory.

We seek a ceasefire and seek the time when the neighbors to the North and certain people in South Vietnam will cease their aggression. Then we look forward to withdrawing our forces from southeast Asia.

Such a ceasefire or peace similar to that attained in South Korea is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Let us try to attain it.

I yield the floor.

UNIVERSITIES GROUP NOT IN COALITION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on July 7, I inserted in the RECORD—page 15817—an article from the Des Moines Register which purported to describe a coalition of organizations working together for legislative and partisan political purposes.

In a letter to the editor of the Register, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, one of the organizations included in the article, said the report as far as it was concerned was without foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, entitled "Universities Group Not in Coalition," from the Register of July 19, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 19, 1965]

UNIVERSITIES GROUP NOT IN COALITION

TO THE EDITOR:

A July 6 news story by Nick Kotz [purported] to describe a "coalition" of interest groups "working quietly behind the scenes in Congress to reelect Democratic Congressmen and to lobby for Johnson administration legislation." The name of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges was included in the list of organizations which, Mr. Kotz says, have been "meeting regularly in Washington under the chairmanship of Donald Ellinger of the Democratic National Committee."

The article is completely without foundation as far as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is concerned. The association has not, does not, and will not participate in partisan political activity of any kind * * *.

With respect to education legislation, it has long been customary for organizations interested in this area to meet together with or without representatives of the administration currently in office * * *. At no time have I or members of my staff participated in meetings of this kind at which there was discussion of or plans for support of or opposition to candidates for public office, or of proposed legislation in partisan terms.

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,
Executive Secretary, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the Senator in charge of the bill agreed to this?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then I shall not object.

VIETNAM—THE REAL MEANING OF "UNCONDITIONAL NEGOTIATIONS"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, ever since President Johnson's speech at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore on April 7, all kinds of interpretations have been made of the meaning of "unconditional negotiations"—the phrase which appeared in his address.

All peace-loving people are prayerful that there will be a prompt end to the war in Vietnam and that peace will come to that area. But few peace-loving people will tolerate an end to the war at the price of freedom or the profit for aggression. The national interest of the United States and South Vietnam—indeed the national interest of all nations, large and small, whose people live in freedom—repudiates a policy of peace at any price. There is a price to be paid for peace and it is only with a clear understanding of what that price is that those who speak of "negotiations" can speak meaningfully.

The President has emphasized on several occasions that the United States will take such action as is necessary to achieve our objectives in Vietnam. These objectives, he has pointed out, are to persuade the North Vietnamese to leave their neighbor, South Vietnam, alone—to cease and desist from directing, controlling, and supplying war materiel and manpower to the Vietcong military forces in South Vietnam; further, to assist the South Vietnamese in ending the attacks of the Vietcong so that the people can live in peace and freedom. This is the price of peace in South Vietnam.

These objectives could be achieved through peaceful negotiations—if the leaders in Hanoi were willing to pay this price. They understand very clearly that this is the price and they have to date been unwilling to pay it. They have chosen, instead, to pay a higher price by forcing South Vietnam and her allies to achieve these objectives in a war.

The President has said that "We do not intend to be defeated." This is another way of saying that we do not intend to fail in our military efforts to achieve our objectives.

The President has also stated a "win" policy for our war effort when he declared on June 1:

> In the future I will call upon our people to make further sacrifices because this is a good program, and the starts we are making are good starts. This is the only way that I know in which we can really win, not only the military battle against aggression, but the wider war for the freedom and progress of all men.

Winning the military battle would naturally mean attaining our objectives.

I might point out that earlier this year Secretary of State Rusk stated that we are going to help the South Vietnamese win the war.

There are some who say that no one ever wins a war. While it is true that war brings great hardship and suffering, it is not true that the objectives stated by the President of the United States cannot be won. They are moral objectives and completely in character for the people of the United States, whose history bears testimony to those moral principles.

It is not responsive to say, as some do, that there is no military solution to the problems of South Vietnam. Everyone knows this. What must be recognized, however, is that because of the intransigence of the leaders in Hanoi, military victory is essential to lay the foundation for the political, economic, and psychological solutions to these problems.

Again in his address at Johns Hopkins University, the President firmly declared:

> We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

And what are the essentials of a meaningful agreement?

Quite obviously these are the minimal objectives which the President has many times clearly stated and to which I have previously referred. Indeed, in the very same speech he said:

> Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country. These are the essentials of any final settlement.

The interpretation of "unconditional negotiations" can be accurately made only in light of these statements by the President. The President could hardly clearly and succinctly state our minimal objectives and disdain a "meaningless agreement" in one part of his address and then impliedly repudiate his position by agreeing to negotiations which could lead to a "meaningless agreement."

For all their faults, the leaders in Hanoi were quick to understand this. What is so remarkable is that many leaders of other nations, political analysts, and news commentators apparently failed to understand it. Possibly in their zeal to end the hostilities in Vietnam, they have taken the phrase "unconditional negotiations" at its face value, standing by itself, without realizing that to do so would lift the words out of context of the full text of the Johns Hopkins address and attach a meaning which would undercut the integrity of the President's clearly stated objectives.

What the leaders in Hanoi understand and what others should understand is that any negotiations which lead to something less than the achievement of the minimal objectives stated by the President would be meaningless, and that only with respect to matters beyond these objectives can the negotiations be unconditional. There are many possibilities here. For example, the degree to which the leaders in Hanoi and the leaders of the Vietcong will be brought to trial and punished for war crimes, including the slaughter of South Vietnamese civilians and the murder of prisoners of war would be subject to negotiations, as would be the subject of reparations for damages to South Vietnam. The degree to which economic assistance would be extended to North Vietnam would be subject to negotiations. But our minimal objectives for South Vietnam cannot be subject to negotiation any more than, as the late President Kennedy said on July 25, 1961:

> The freedom of that city [Berlin] is not negotiable.

There is another way of considering the meaning of the phrase "unconditional negotiations" and that is in light of the minimal demands by Hanoi, name-

ly: First, American withdrawal from South Vietnam; second, temporary neutralization; third, communization of South Vietnam by the so-called Vietnam National Liberation Front; and fourth, reunification of North and South Vietnam. Obviously to the extent that these points undercut our minimal objectives, they cannot be the subject of negotiation. Bitter history has taught us that neutralization to the Communists does not carry the same meaning as it does to us. A neutralist government containing militant Communists sooner or later ends up being subverted by the Communists who consider such a status as merely an opportunity for the communization of the government and the people. Accordingly, it is difficult to see how any of these points could be the subject of negotiations. Of course, withdrawal of American forces would follow upon achievement of our minimal objectives for South Vietnam, and to this extent such withdrawal would be readily agreed to and would not even have to be negotiated.

Theoretically, perhaps, reunification of North and South Vietnam might be the subject of negotiations. I say "theoretically" because of the difficulties in assuring elections that are truly free which would be the only possible basis for such reunification. Here, again, is where the Communists interpret the phrase "free elections" differently than we do. Their interpretation would permit the use of terrorist and coercive activities as a means of persuading the people to vote "freely" for a Communist government. The world has witnessed for a long time the distorted meaning of "free elections" as practiced in the Soviet Union.

It is for this reason that overemphasis has been placed on the words of President Johnson in his news conference of July 28, when he said:

> We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory, but we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

The President would, of course, like to see truly free elections, and I am sure, he would like to see some kind of international machinery which would guarantee such free elections. But he is just as familiar with the distorted concept of free elections held by the Communists as anyone else, and he is equally aware of the impossibility of establishing the international machinery needed to guarantee truly free elections throughout North and South Vietnam in the foreseeable future. That is why I believe there has been an overemphasis in some quarters on his words "or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision", as contrasted with his words in the Johns Hopkins speech:

> Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam.

Obviously such an independent South Vietnam would have to precede free elections throughout all Vietnam in the short range period of attainability.

Perhaps it would have been well for the President to have made this point clear instead of leaving it for logical inference from his earlier statements.

William R. Frye, writing in the Des Moines Register of August 3, said the United States has significantly modified its Vietnam peace terms in what he called "a major effort to negotiate its way out of the war." He went on to say:

> The change in the American position consists essentially of three parts:
>
> 1. Washington now is prepared to envisage reunification of Vietnam by internationally supervised elections, as called for in the Geneva accords of 1954, even though, as many diplomats believe, this could lead to a Communist takeover.
>
> Reunification has long been North Vietnam's objective. The United States has held out for partition, with guaranteed security and independence for South Vietnam.
>
> 2. The United States now is willing to regard Hanoi's oft-cited four points, which include an American withdrawal from Vietnam, as part of the agenda for negotiation—though not the exclusive agenda nor as a precondition for a parley.
>
> This is regarded as a major concession. Previously, although President Johnson had offered to take part in "unconditional discussion," the four points had been considered an unnegotiable demand for surrender.
>
> Third. The United States is willing to find some face-saving formula for including the Vietcong—National Liberation Front—at a peace table. Previously Washington had been unwilling to negotiate with the Vietcong, except as part of the North Vietnamese delegation.

And Mr. Frye concludes that the American peace drive has two facets:

> Private overtures, through U Thant and other intermediaries, offering to scale down the American asking price for peace; and public gestures, primarily to the U.N., inviting action by Thant and the U.N. Security Council.
>
> These are provocative words by a perceptive writer. They lend credence to the report in the Des Moines Register of August 8 that the Johnson administration last fall rejected a proposal for peace talks which had been accepted without conditions by North Vietnam.

Let me quote from that report:

> The proposal * * * did not set any conditions, but the Johnson administration rejected it, it is said, for two reasons:
>
> 1. Mr. Johnson was engaged in the election battle with former Senator Barry Goldwater, who was advocating stronger U.S. military action in the Vietnam war. If word of peace talks had leaked out, Goldwater might have capitalized on it as a sign of weakness and damaged the Democratic campaign.
>
> 2. The South Vietnamese Government was in turmoil. Opposition to the military regime of Premier Nyguyen Khanh was growing and Washington believed that negotiation with the Communists might cause the government to fall.

It is for this reason that I hope the President will not leave to conjecture any interpretation of the policy objectives which he has heretofore so firmly set forth. His every word is being scrutinized most carefully by writers, columnists, commentators, those who have been critical of his policies, those who have, as I have, been supporting his policy in Vietnam, and, most particularly, the Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. The slightest deviation from our minimal objectives will be seized upon as a sign of weakness by the Communist World.

In evaluating any agreement to enter into negotiations, I believe it would be prudent to take note of a memorandum from Red China's Mao Tse-tung to the Soviet Union in March of 1953. It appears on pages 5707–5708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29, 1954, volume 100, part 5, 83d Congress, 2d session. This memorandum should be read and studied by everyone and particularly by our policymakers in the State Department and by those who would, in effect, have us bargain away the peace and freedom of South Vietnam and southeast Asia.

The memorandum is a blueprint of conquest of Asia by the Communists.

It outlines a program which has succeeded all too well, even though parts of the timetable have been thrown off to some degree. Though Mao's timing has been off—because the United States unexpectedly intervened and because of the Red China-Soviet Union dispute over how best to further Communist imperialism—the memorandum serves as a Mein Kampf of Communist conquest and domination.

It should be emphasized that Mao anticipated that most of the gains are to be made through armistices and negotiations.

First of all, Mao declared:

> It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. In Asia—

He said—

> tactics of internal revolution, infiltration or intimidation into inaction or submission will yield an abundant harvest.

Pointing to the weakness within the Communist World, Mao wrote:

> Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.
>
> One course—

He continued—

> is to isolate the United States by all possible means.
>
> Then Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is a possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

Listen to what Mao had to say about France:

> In the case of France, her war weariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the Western countries.

And on Japan:

> Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

Before I turn to specific areas of conquest set out in the blueprint, let me quote the section on military preparedness:

As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

Note the emphasis of liberation. The idea of a "war of liberation" is the chief propaganda weapon in the hands of the aggressors in Vietnam today.

Mao also had some comments on the Korean war, which was raging at the time his memorandum was written.

He said:

The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951, I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

Here is what Mao had to say about Formosa:

Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

This should serve as a warning to those who advocate that Red China be admitted to the United Nations regardless of the fact that she does not qualify for admission under the Charter of the United Nations.

Now let us examine Mao's pronouncements on Indochina. It should be remembered that at the time the memorandum was prepared France was still fighting to maintain her colonial interests there. And those who talk of "free elections" in Vietnam would do well to keep his words in mind:

We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

Two years later France was out of Indochina.

But Mao's blueprint for complete domination of what was formerly Indochina was stalled when the United States decided that freedom for the people and the peace of southeast Asia required our assistance.

To those who maintain that South Vietnam is of little importance to us strategically, that we have no business there, that the Communists would settle for "that one little piece of ground," Mao's own words supply the answer:

After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indonesia, which will fall to the Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can.

If war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

Even then Mao considered Indonesia ripe picking. And who can say he was in error when one considers the actions of Indonesia's Sukarno, who continues to castigate the United States and act like a puppet of Red China? That is why our continuation of aid to Indonesia makes so little sense. And it makes even less sense that the United States has paid Indonesia $350,000 to assist that nation to operate a small atomic research reactor, as reported in the Washington Post of August 7. The funds were provided only last month.

The second secession of Singapore from the Malaysia Federation could signal the start of another period of chaos in southeast Asia, as one commentator put it, with serious consequences for the struggle to resist communism there.

Finally, the memorandum states that India should not bear the brunt of hostile actions, that only peaceful means should be adopted. Why?

Because—

Said Mao—

any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

Mr. President, these are the main points of the memorandum of 12 years ago from the one who was then and who now is the leader of Red China. He was not writing for literary effect. He meant what he said.

With so much talk about negotiations today, I view with misgivings that our Ambassador W. Averell Harriman and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as reported in the Washington Post on August 9, suggested that Hanoi is not a likely target of American air attacks against North Vietnam.

According to the report, General Taylor argued against bombing the North Vietnamese capital because "we need the leadership in Hanoi to be intact to make those essential decisions we hope they will make at some time."

This seems to contradict Secretary of State Rusk's statement that there will be no privileged sanctuary for supporters of the Vietcong insurgency.

And it recalls that there were no privileged sanctuaries for Adolf Hitler and his leaders during World War II. Nevertheless, the Nazi leaders were sufficiently "intact" to make the essential decisions to end the war.

It is not helpful to our cause to give comfort to those who promote aggression. If our leaders intend to pursue a policy of firmness, they should avoid any statements which might be construed as a sign of deviation from that policy.

I am concerned over suggestions, which seemingly appear as trial balloons, that we may settle for less than what the President has stated to be our minimal objectives. I am concerned also that the President's critics—some from within his own party—appear to look only at Vietnam without considering the whole picture so carefully considered by Mao Tse-tung. They ignore the Communist objectives in Thailand, in Laos, in Cambodia, in Burma, in Japan, in the Philippines, in India, and even in Australia.

That is why it is time for all to understand the true meaning of the phrase "unconditional negotiations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum to which I referred in my speech, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, pages 5707, 5708, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION

(Carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March 1953)

1. ASIA TO BE THE IMMEDIATE GOAL

Due to the profound leadership of Comrade Stalin, amazing achievements have been made in the great task of world revolution. The success that has been attained both in Europe and in Asia after World War II is entirely attributable to Comrade Stalin's able and correct guidance and direction. May his wisdom still guide us.

It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. Under the present circumstances, any vigorous action in Europe such as internal revolution, effective infiltration, or intimidation into inaction, or submission is now impossible (Communist terminology is different, this represents what it really means) more forcible measures may bring about a war. In Asia, on the contrary, such tactics will yield an abundant harvest.

2. WORLD WAR TO BE TEMPORARILIY AVOIDED

There is no assurance of victory because of the higher rate of industrial production and larger stockpile of atomic weapons on the

part of the capitalist countries, incompletion of antiatomic defenses of the industrial areas and oil installations in the Soviet Union, and immaturity of China's agricultural and industrial developments. Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

3. DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE

The United States must be isolated by all possible means.

Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

In the case of France, her war weariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the Western countries.

Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

4. MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

5. THE KOREAN WAR

The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951 I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the Continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

6. FORMOSA

Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the Government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

7. INDOCHINA

We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

8. BURMA, THAILAND, INDONESIA, AND MALAY PENINSULA

After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indochina, which will fall to Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can. We expect that the whole process will be completed in or before 1960.

9. JAPAN AND INDIA

By 1960 China's military, economic and industrial power will be so developed that with a mere show of force by the Soviet Union and China, the ruling clique of Japan will capitulate and a peaceful revolution will take place. We must be on guard against the possibility that the United States will choose to have war at this moment. She may even want the war earlier. The defensive and offensive preparations of the Soviet Union and China must, therefore, be completed before 1960. Whether we can prevent the United States from starting the war depends upon how much success we have in isolating her and how effective is our peace offensive. If the war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

In the case of India, only peaceful means should be adopted. Any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

10. ARABIC COUNTRIES AND AFRICA

After India has been won over, the problems of the Philippines and the Arabic countries can be easily solved by economic cooperation, alliances, united fronts, and coalitions. This task may be completed in 1965. Then a wave of revolution will sweep over the whole continent of Africa and the imperialists and the colonizationists will be quickly driven into the sea. In fact this powerful movement may have been underway much earlier.

With Asia and Africa disconnected with the capitalist countries in Europe, there will be a total economic collapse in Western Europe. There capitulation will be a matter of course.

11. THE UNITED STATES

Crushing economic collapse and industrial breakdown will follow the European crisis. Canada and South America will find themselves in the same hopeless and defenseless condition. Twenty years from now, world revolution will be an accomplished fact. If the United States should ever start a war, she would do so before the liberation of Japan, the Philippines, and India. The courses of action in that event are outlined in the memorandum on military aid.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed an article entitled "The Big If," by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, dated August 6; an article entitled "Major U.S. Modification of Viet Peace Terms," by Mr. William R. Frye, in the August 3 issue of the Des Moines Register; an article entitled "Johnson Throws Support to Thant," by Max Freedman, published in the Washington Evening Star on August 5; an article entitled "Report U.S. Rejected Peace Bid Last Fall," by Darius S. Jhabvala, published in the August 8 issue of the Des Moines Register; an article entitled "Hanoi Seen as Unlikely Air Target," by Frank C. Porter, published in the Washington Post on August 9; and finally, an article entitled "United States Gave $350,000 for Indonesia Reactor," by Richard Halloran, published in the August 7 issue of the Washington Post.

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

THE BIG IF

(By Joseph Alsop)

The history of the American role in the war in Vietnam has thus far been stamped all over, in large letters, "Too Little and Too Late."

A good illustration is President Kennedy's 1961 decision to make an important increase in the American contribution.

The people who were trying for Brownie points by carrying on a personal vendetta against the late President Ngo Dinh Diem elaborately pooh-poohed the results of this decision by President Kennedy. General Harkins and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara were bitterly denounced for overoptimistic estimates of the war situation in 1962.

By now, however, prisoner interrogations and other undoubted intelligence have revealed that the Vietcong came fairly close to defeat at that time. The modern weapons that the United States supplied to the South Vietnamese Army, and the major step-up in South Vietnamese fighting power, knocked the Communists temporarily but rather completely off balance.

Instead of being criticized for overoptimism, in fact, Secretary McNamara should have been attacked on another point—the failure to act on one of the 1961 recommendations, to backup the South Vietnamese army with American tactical airpower.

Very few people are aware of it, but the fact is that the most important part of President Johnson's Pleiku decision last winter was not the order to bomb North Vietnamese targets. As the decision was implemented, the bombing sorties against the north were more for show than effect for many months on end. But President Johnson's simultaneous removal of all wraps from the use of American tactical airpower in South Vietnam had a profound effect.

Without this other, much less publicized step, the war might well have been lost by now. And if this same step had been taken when the American contribution was increased in 1961, the war might well have been won in the period when the Vietcong were so badly knocked off balance.

These facts are relevant at the moment, because the increase in U.S. troop strength in Vietnam, which President Johnson announced last week, is currently being denounced as "too little and too late." For

once in a way, however, this appears not to be true.

In brief, the U.S. field commander, General Westmoreland, was given quite literally everything he asked for. The armed services were not, however, given all that they asked for as soon as General Westmoreland's requests were in. Thus the callup of Reserves was deferred, for instance.

In these circumstances, the really disquieting aspect of the President's news conference was the interminable and effusive discussion of negotiations with the North Vietnamese. This has left the impression, in the country and throughout the world, that the United States is prepared to stop fighting the next morning after being asked to begin talking.

The big "if," of course, is whether enough progress can be made in Vietnam to force the Communists to ask for negotiations. If that happens, one may be quite certain the circumstances will broadly resemble those in Korea in June-July 1951, when the Chinese Communists asked for negotiations.

The reason for the Chinese request was simple. The United States and South Korean armies had made a superb recovery in the months since the disaster on the Yalu. In June-July 1951, a powerful offensive threatened the whole Chinese and North Korean front. That was why the Chinese were ready to begin talking.

Unhappily, the offensive was stopped dead in its tracks when talks were requested. The Chinese got a respite. Two more bitter years of fighting followed before the signature of the unsatisfactory peace. The war in Vietnam is a direct sequel and result.

It is a serious matter, therefore, if the impression is conveyed that the United States is again ready to commit the same silly folly that was committed in Korea in the summer of 1951.

In reality, this impression that President Johnson conveyed is almost certainly misleading. He talks of unconditional negotiations because the intention is to keep the pressure on the enemy until an acceptable settlement is agreed upon. But the President will still be wise to remove the false impression, for there are plenty of people who have forgotten the Korean folly and will howl like banshees for a repetition of it, unless the President clears the air in advance.

Major U.S. Modification of Viet Peace Terms

(By William R. Frye)

New York, N.Y.—The United States has significantly modified its Vietnam peace terms in a major effort to negotiate its way out of the war, it has been learned here.

Chief U.S. Delegate Arthur J. Goldberg informed U.N. Secretary General U Thant of the new stand on Wednesday. Thant, who thereupon publicly vowed to redouble his peace efforts, is expected to relay the proposals to Hanoi and Peiping promptly.

The change in the American position consists essentially of three parts:

1. Washington now is prepared to envisage reunification of Vietnam by internationally supervised elections, as called for in the Geneva accords of 1954, even though, as many diplomats believe, this could lead to a Communist takeover.

Reunification has long been North Vietnam's objective. The United States has held out for partition, with guaranteed security and independence for South Vietnam.

2. The United States now is willing to regard Hanoi's oft-cited "four points," which include an American withdrawal from Vietnam, as part of the agenda for negotiation—though not the exclusive agenda nor as a precondition for a parley.

This is regarded as a major concession. Previously, although President Johnson had offered to take part in "unconditional discussions," the four points had been considered an unnegotiable demand for surrender. The points involve (a) American withdrawal; (b) temporary neutralization; (c) communization of South Vietnam; (d) then reunification.

3. The United States is willing to find some face-saving formula for including the Vietcong (National Liberation Front) at a peace table. Previously, Washington had been unwilling to negotiate with the Vietcong except as part of the North Vietnamese delegation.

This large-scale United States "peace offensive" has placed Hanoi and Peiping under significant new pressure to negotiate an end to the Vietnam war, U.N. diplomats believe.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC MOVES

The American peace drive has two facets: Private overtures, through U Thant and other intermediaries, offering to scale down the American asking price for peace; and public gestures, primarily to the U.N., inviting action by Thant and the U.N. Security Council.

U.N. diplomats and observers are more impressed by the private moves than by the public gestures, though they believe both contribute to useful pressure on the Communists.

In offering to negotiate the reunification of Vietnam under internationally supervised elections the United States has offered, in effect, to reverse its 10-year effort at partition, provided only that the elections are genuinely free, and certified as such by an international authority.

SOMETHING TO WORK WITH

It was never clear in the 1950's that the Communists would let the elections be free, even though many observers believed they could win them. They wanted victory to be not merely probable, but certain. This point could easily prove once again to be a major stumbling block. But if so, the United States will be in a strong moral and propaganda position, U.N. people believe.

The Secretary General is represented as feeling he now has something negotiable to work on. But whether the Vietcong having believed themselves on the verge of military victory, will agree to negotiate on any basis for any purpose is considered problematical. Strenuous efforts will be made to persuade them to do so.

It is presumed here, without firm knowledge, that Presidential roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman went to Moscow hoping to induce Moscow to join in this pressure on Hanoi.

DOESN'T WANT U.N. DEBATE

If after a reasonable period—the word "reasonable" has not been made precise—the Communists still refuse to negotiate, even on a basis which includes their own proposals, the United States is expected to plunge into the war on a major scale.

The public phase of the American "peace offensive" is regarded here as useful but less meaningful.

The U.N. does not believe the United States really expects, or even wants, a public debate on Vietnam in the U.N. Security Council at this stage, despite an invitation to Council members Friday by Delegate Goldberg to "somehow find the means to respond effectively" to the southeast Asia "challenge."

A public debate would virtually oblige the Soviet Union to take a violent public posture critical of the United States, it is pointed out, at a time when efforts are being made to cushion the damaging impact of Vietnam on Soviet-American relations and avoid a future confrontation.

Moscow, too, is said to be opposed to a Vietnam debate in the U.N. Neither the United States nor any other country has formally moved for one.

Repeated statements by Washington that the United States is willing are taken as gestures to American domestic critics, who want the U.N. to help make peace, perhaps without fully realizing what U.N. intervention would mean at this stage.

Johnson Throws Support to Thant

(By Max Freedman)

The effect on the United Nations of President Johnson's new initiatives on Vietnam can be summarized in two sentences. Up to now Secretary General U Thant has been following his own instincts, working often at haphazard, and always barren of results. Now he is supported by the full authority of the United States, the whole world knows it, and he can act with new confidence and assurance. In a situation filled with uncertainty and danger his new bargaining power is at least one small hope for peace.

In the past there has been rather savage criticism of the Secretary General in the American press. He has been accused of being so impartial that he has seen no difference between Communist subversion and the resistance offered by the United States.

This press criticism has received no support from the Johnson administration. As a matter of deliberate and far-sighted policy, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the President all wanted to preserve the Secretary General's undamaged authority. They knew the time might come when the Secretary General could be very useful in bringing the problems of Vietnam to the conference table. Perhaps that time has not yet arrived but at least he has begun to move in that direction.

It has often been said that the Secretary General has no mandate to do anything in this dispute since neither North Vietnam nor China belongs to the United Nations. That is not correct. Under the charter he has a general mandate to bring to the attention of the United Nations any problem disturbing the peace. He is now able to use the powers of his office not only as they were defined in the charter but as they were interpreted and expanded by the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

Beyond all question any hope of a negotiated settlement rests on the Secretary General. Any effort made by an individual government to promote a settlement will be coordinated with the work of the Secretariat even if nothing is said of this cooperation in public. Thus, the United Nations always will be in the background and its authority can be used at the right moment.

When he was asked if the United States would support an immediate cease-fire, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg replied that a cease-fire is without meaning unless it leads to a negotiated settlement of the dispute. There is another answer that is equally important. The United States must be very skeptical of any arrangement that seems to give the Vietcong the title to the land that they are holding at the time of the cease-fire. Any such formula would weaken and dismember South Vietnam and make its survival as an independent political entity completely impossible.

This explains why the rulers of South Vietnam are being so cautious about the role of the United Nations. They want to know what the United Nations can do to guarantee that South Vietnam will in fact have a free choice in a supervised election to chart its own political course. The United States is pledged to respect the freedom of South Vietnam while being willing to accept the unity of all Vietnam. This is a pleasant and ingenious formula, so long as it does not have to be tested, but it enshrines a contradiction and may fall apart under the pull of events.

By every token, the Secretary General knows better than officials in Washington

how fragile and contradictory this principle really is. He has asked for urgent studies to be made on the problems of supervised elections so that South Vietnam's freedom of choice will be a reality rather than an illusion. He also has made it clear that the conference room must be a place for genuine negotiations instead of being a place where the military gains of the Communist forces are ratified and accepted.

These two principles, deeply held at the United Nations, should reassure South Vietnam that no one is contemplating a diplomatic sellout in the abused name of peace.

In these early stages it is impossible to know what the Soviet Union will do. If she is ready to minimize the risks of war, she will not use her veto or organize resistance to the United Nations effort. It all depends on how far the Soviet Union wishes to go in widening her quarrel with Communist China and in reducing her influence in North Vietnam. The Secretary General is now trying to find the answer to these questions by delicate personal diplomacy.

Even China may hesitate before she rebukes and defies the United Nations. Yet the Secretary General, even if his present efforts should fail, would have provided another and conclusive proof of the desire of the United States to find an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.

REPORT UNITED STATES REJECTED PEACE BID LAST FALL

(By Darius S. Jhabvala)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The Johnson administration last fall rejected a proposal for Vietnam peace talks that had been accepted without conditions by Communist North Vietnam, it was learned Saturday.

This information, from reliable sources, is in direct conflict with President Johnson's statement at his July 28 press conference that "we are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table."

The opportunity for a private and unpublicized discussion with representatives of the Hanoi regime occurred early last fall, at the height of the U.S. presidential election campaign.

NO CONDITIONS

The proposal, made by a non-Communist Asian diplomat, was accepted by Hanoi, which did not set forth any conditions.

But the Johnson administration rejected it, is is said, for two reasons:

Mr. Johnson was engaged in the election battle with former Senator Barry Goldwater, who was advocating stronger U.S. military action in the Vietnam war. If word of peace talks had leaked out, Goldwater might have capitalized on it as a sign of weakness and damaged the Democratic campaign.

The South Vietnamese Government was in turmoil. Opposition to the military regime of Premier Nguyen Kanh was growing, and Washington believed that negotiations with the Communists might cause the government to fall (it did fall later).

Saturday, an informed State Department source, asked about the story, replied, "The President was never involved in that one." He said it was one of many contacts over a long period of time. "There were contacts going on almost every other week."

ABOUT PROCEDURE

But, he said, this particular contact concerned only the procedure for a meeting and there was no hint that anything would come from it.

He said "the election did not have anything to do with it."

The effort to initiate direct talks was made shortly after the August 1964 Gulf of Tonkin crisis, in which the United States conducted its first two air strikes against North Vietnam in retaliation for PT boat attacks on American warships in the gulf.

That was 6 months before the present U.S. air offensive against North Vietnam began last February 7.

Not long before it accepted the proposal for direct talks, Hanoi had rejected an invitation by the United Nations Security Council to participate in a debate on the Gulf of Tonkin crisis with the comment that only the signers of the 1954 Geneva accords were competent to study "the war acts committed by the United States." The United States was not a signatory.

AT RANGOON

The proposal, suggesting Rangoon, Burma, as a meeting place, was discussed at the U.N. and then relayed to Hanoi by an emissary of the Soviet foreign ministry. There were hints of such a proposal at that time, but its fate was never made public.

Later proposals for peace talks were turned down by Hanoi, and the sources said Saturday they believed the U.S. rejection of the Rangoon talks caused Hanoi to stiffen its resistance to negotiations and to intensify its support of the Vietcong guerrilla war against South Vietnam.

U.S. officials have said several times that on no occasion has Hanoi shown a willingness to talk.

The sources pointed out Saturday that last fall's U.S. rejection and Hanoi acceptance of a negotiation proposal is now a footnote in history. They maintained, however, that had a meeting taken place, a road to peace in Vietnam might have been mapped out.

HANOI SEEN AS UNLIKELY AIR TARGET—HARRIMAN, TAYLOR HINT STRONGLY THAT CITY WON'T BE HIT

(By Frank C. Porter)

W. Averell Harriman and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor both suggested yesterday that Hanoi is not a likely target in American air attacks against North Vietnam.

"Although there has been no assurance that we won't bomb Hanoi," Harriman said, "we are a long ways from it at the present time."

Taylor argued against bombing the North Vietnamese capital on grounds that "we need the leadership in Hanoi to be intact to make those essential decisions we hope they will make at some time." He would not say categorically, however, that the city is ruled out as a future target.

RUSK'S WARNING

Although the Johnson administration has repeatedly said it has no present plans to strike Hanoi, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has warned there will be no privileged sanctuary for supporters of the Vietcong insurgency.

But Harriman and Taylor appeared to throw out strong hints that Hanoi may be indefinitely exempted.

And Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large who recently returned from talks with Russian Premier Alexei N. Kosygin and four other chiefs of state, went out of his way to calm American fears of further escalation of the Vietnamese conflict.

Asked about a serious military confrontation with Communist China, Harriman said, "I see no reason we should stir up the public to believing that is the danger. I do not believe it is a danger."

But should such a confrontation with China occur, Harriman told a panel on "Face the Nation" (CBS, WTOP), "we would have to count upon Moscow standing with Communist allies."

At the same time, Harriman said he came back from Moscow "with a very strong feeling that Mr. Kosygin and his colleagues are as anxious as we are to prevent escalation."

MOSCOW'S STAND STATED

He stressed that the Soviet Union cannot play an overt role as peacemaker because of its competition with Peiping for leadership of world communsim. "They may be able to do things privately they are not able to do publicly," he added.

And although Moscow supports North Vietnam and liberation movements generally as the trend of the future, Harriman said Kosygin told him the Russians "believe in the 17th parallel (the dividing line between North and South Vietnam), indicating that there should be recognition of the rights of the South Vietnamese people."

In the same vein, Harriman said President Tito of Yugoslavia made it plain to him that South Vietnam should be allowed to have its independence and that Tito regards China as an aggressor nation and a dangerous one.

"And I wouldn't be surprised if that was not only his view but also the Soviet view," Harriman added.

Taylor, former U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, was interviewed on Meet the Press (NBC-TV-WRC).

He said he would expect additional American forces to follow the buildup to 125,000 men announced by the administration. Asked if he thought a commitment of 300,000 to 400,000 might be needed later, Taylor said he did not think such a large force will be required.

He also was asked how long it might take to end the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

"I wouldn't expect anything less than 1 to 2 years," Taylor said.

General Taylor was reminded that in 1962 he and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara had said the United States might be able to wind up its involvement by Christmas of that year.

"At that time we had not had the political turbulence," Taylor said, referring to the subsequent overthrow of the Diem government and the long series of Saigon coups that followed.

The lack of governmental stability and of sufficient trained military manpower are the two most pressing problems in South Vietnam today, said Taylor.

But "the new and broadened U.S. commitment" to fill that manpower gap has given an "enormous lift" to South Vietnamese and Americans alike, he explained.

American air attacks north of the 17th parallel, Taylor said at another point, have had "a very clear depressant effect" on infiltration from the north.

UNITED STATES GAVE $350,000 FOR INDONESIA REACTOR

(By Richard Halloran)

The United States has paid Indonesia $350,000 to assist the southeast Asian nation to operate a small atomic research reactor.

A State Department spokesman said yesterday that the sum was paid to fulfill an atoms-for-peace agreement made in 1960.

The reactor, situated at the Technical Institute of Bandung, was purchased from General Dynamics and went into operation last spring with uranium fuel leased from the United States.

Under terms of the agreement, the United States granted the $350,000 after Indonesia got the facility running. The funds were given to Indonesia last month.

The United States must now decide whether to renew the 5-year agreement, which expires September 20. In light of Indonesian President Sukarno's pointed anti-American stance recently, the decision has strong political overtones.

No negotiations for renewing the agreement have been started with the Indonesian Government. The decision to go ahead or not will be made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and may go to President Johnson for approval.

If the United States decides not to renew the agreement, a problem in getting Indonesia to return the fuel may arise. Indonesia so far has observed the inspection and safety

aspects of the agreement. But Sukarno's reaction to an adverse decision is unpredictable.

A second consideration is Sukarno's recent claims that Indonesia will soon have an atomic bomb. Informed sources say that the atoms-for-peace reactor cannot technically be used to build a military weapon.

The Bandung reactor is the only one known to be operating in Indonesia. A Russian-built subcritical reactor stopped running in 1963 when the Russians did not replenish the fuel.

Another Soviet reactor is under construction but not operating.

American assistance to Indonesia's atomic program has been criticized at home and abroad.

In Kuala Lumpur Thursday, Reuters reported Malaysian Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman said:

"Although America says the reactor is only meant for peaceful purposes, what guarantee is there that Sukarno will not use it for destruction purposes?"

Sukarno has vowed that Indonesia will "crush" Malaysia, which he considers a neocolonial federation.

Earlier this week, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Michigan, was critical of American assistance to Indonesian atomic research.

THROWING AWAY MARKETS—AND FARMERS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Al Capp, who is famed for his Lil Abner comic strip, recently conjured up little beings he designated as "Kigmies."

"Kigmies" in the cartoon world, ushered in an era of improved human relations because they enjoyed nothing more than a well-planted foot in the posterior. Angry and frustrated human beings could get relief from their frustrations and anger by kicking a Kigmie.

I mention this because of efforts to make real life Kigmies out of the wheat producers of the United States.

American wheat producers have just lost a share in the sale of 6.9 million tons of wheat to Russia and Eastern Europe within the past 2 weeks because of an unbelievably foolish policy, demanded by maritime unions and maintained by our Government, of requiring 50 percent of any wheat sold for dollars to Soviet bloc countries to be carried in American ships at nearly twice what it would cost to move the wheat in foreign vessels.

The news last week told of Canadian sales to a Russian trade delegation of 27.7 million bushels of wheat for shipment from western Canada, and another 187 million bushels for shipment from eastern Canada, including wheat equivalent of 400,000 tons of flour. A sale of 7 million bushels to Czechoslovakia was arranged during the week, and an independent purchase of 1.1 million tons was made from Argentina.

The delivered cost of this wheat will be about $500 million. The Canadian wheat producers will receive in excess of $300 million.

Russia is going to need even more wheat.

Dr. Richard Goodman of the Great Plains Wheat Council advises me that the best available information indicates the Russian crop this year will be 40 to 41 million tons.

Between 1959 and 1963, the Russian crop has averaged 60 million tons.

Russia's requirements are 55 million tons for domestic consumption and 3 million tons for export to satellites.

Assuming a 41-million-ton crop and 7 million tons of purchases to date, Russia is still 7 million tons short of a normal supply for domestic use and 10 million tons of wheat short if her exports are calculated. Russia still needs wheat which we might sell if our unwise shipping rules were rescinded.

According to press reports, Izvestia has started indicating to the Russian people that corn is a fine cereal.

There are indications that Mr. Kosygin is conditioning his people for the news that they must tighten their belts on wheat consumption in the year ahead. She has booked just about all the wheat Canada can spare until she is certain of yields from the bumper crop that appears sure to be harvested in the western provinces. Argentina and Australia are out of the market at least until they know the size of their 1966 crop. And Russia has made one thing clear in the past: she will not pay more for American products than other purchasers from the United States have to pay, which is one effect of our 50 percent U.S. shipping requirement.

We are denying American wheat farmers access to a profitable commercial market by our self-defeating shipping requirement. We are asking Soviet purchasers to pay 11 to 12 cents per bushel more for wheat than other countries are asked to pay—because of the requirement that 50 percent must be shipped in U.S. ships. As a consequence, we are not selling a single bushel of wheat to the Russians or Eastern Europeans and there is every indication that they will continue to buy from our competitors or substitute corn as a cereal, before they will patronize us at extra cost, even as a residual demand supplier.

The shipping regulation, designed to placate two or three maritime unions, is helping no one at all. It is giving them 50 percent of nothing. It is depriving the United States of an opportunity to improve its balance of payments position by hundreds of millions of dollars.

While Canadian farmers are experiencing an economic boom and going into all out production, our wheat farmers are suffering from inadequate markets and from drastically curtailed production. While we develop a farm program paying people not to produce, the Canadians are forging ahead, increasing wheat acreage.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no reasonable justification for this self-defeating shipping restriction. It helps no one. It hurts virtually everybody. If anyone draws any satisfaction from the false hope that this silly shipping restriction is hurting the Russians and the East Europeans he should simply take a look at the Russian purchase missions which are securing grain from our competitors all over the world. All we are doing is sticking our heads in the sand at a cost of several hundred million dollars a year to ourselves while we invite our competitors to develop a monopoly in the Russian and East European wheat markets.

It is hard for me to understand how the same labor leaders who ask us to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law on the ground that it hurts the economy can now stand in the way of removing a much more damaging restriction on our economy. There are many more compelling reasons for removing the irrational restriction on American wheat sales than there are for repealing section 14(b). I for one have very little enthusiasm for a crusade against 14(b) at a time when top labor leaders are insisting on pointless restrictions on the shipment of American wheat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point two editorials from the Minneapolis Tribune. The first appeared Sunday, August 8, and calls for termination of the 50-percent shipping requirement. The second appeared Saturday, August 14, as a reply to an article by David Lawrence, appearing in the same paper, in regard to wheat sales.

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

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 8, 1965]

LET'S SELL MORE U.S. WHEAT ABROAD

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, has asked that America drop the requirement that 50 percent of cash sales to the Soviet bloc be shipped in U.S. vessels. The regulation boosts the price of U.S. wheat by 11 to 15 cents a bushel and exports have dropped to almost nothing.

Yet a Russian delegation is in Canada right now negotiating for wheat. The United States clamps acreage controls on wheat-growing and has a carryover of 800 million bushels. Canada and Australia have virtually no carryover, thanks largely to sales to Communist countries, and they are encouraging farmers to grow more wheat. Canada's wheat acreage last year was up 30 percent from the 1955–59 average, Australia's 60 percent.

The U.S. maritime industry, and particularly its labor force, exacted the 50-percent promise from President Kennedy when American wheat went to Russia in 1963–64. But the uproar then, and the consequent higher price for U.S. wheat because U.S. ships charge higher rates, has turned away Russian buyers and there are no shipments. Thus Senator MCGOVERN sensibly called for giving up the 50-percent-or-nothing regulation.

A big share of Canadian and Australian wheat exports go to Red China. In part the wheat replaces more expensive rice which the Chinese sell abroad for hard currency. The United States is not presently interested in trading with Communist China, but certainly American agriculture would benefit from more farm product sales to the Soviet bloc in Europe.

It's time to talk turkey to maritime management and labor.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 14, 1965]

END EMBARGO ON U.S. WHEAT TO RUSSIA

David Lawrence implies in his column on this page that the sale of American wheat to the Soviet Union would undermine our war effort in Vietnam. That's a highly questionable argument.

First of all, we aren't selling any wheat to Russia. Our Commerce Department won't issue export licenses unless the U.S. sellers promise to send half the wheat in U.S. ships. That boosts the costs so high that U.S.

wheat can't compete with Canadian, Australian or Argentine wheat, which is sent in cheaper foreign vessels.

We send the Soviet Union soybean oil, tallow and just about every other farm commodity without export licenses. But maritime unions and some shipping lines raised a fuss 2 years ago about wheat going to Russia in foreign bottoms. President Kennedy, to appease the unions, said half of future shipments would go in U.S. craft.

The Commerce Department enforces the arrangement by requiring export licenses for wheat. The Department of Agriculture has asked the Commerce Department to rescind the wheat license requirement. The White House has said that farm exports to the Soviet bloc are in the national interest. It therefore seems time for President Johnson to tell Commerce to end its arrangement with the maritime unions.

Labor isn't getting anything out of the present deal, since there are no wheat shipments. But the taxpayer may get soaked. As U.S. wheat surpluses pile up it may be necessary to pay farmers to retire more wheat acres. The storage costs on Government-held wheat are enormous. But Canada and Australia have no wheat surpluses. They are selling vast amounts to the Soviet Union.

Russia is sending little or no wheat to Red China. The U.S.S.R. has a short crop this year, far less than it needs at home. And relations between Moscow and Peking continue strained. Rather than U.S. wheat sales to Russia circumventing our efforts in Vietnam, they might help us indirectly there.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 13, deploring our loss of a share of the Eastern wheat trade and condemning political strikes by the maritime unions.

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

LOST OPPORTUNITIES IN WHEAT

The United States is the odd man out in the huge wheat purchases being made by the Soviet Union. Canada and Argentina have received windfalls largely because U.S. wheat is too costly as a result of the Government's discriminatory requirement that 50 percent of wheat exports to Soviet-bloc countries must be shipped in American vessels.

The United States exclusion is unfortunate on many counts. Sales from the Nation's surplus would have meant greater prosperity in farming districts. They would also have increased the trade surplus in the Nation's balance of payments. Beyond these economic gains, the sales would have given tangible expression to the Johnson administration's desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

Even so, the big Russian purchases are important to the West. For Canada they mean higher incomes in agriculture, the one area of her economy that has not been enjoying boom conditions, and a cut in the big deficit in the Canadian balance of payments. As far as Argentina is concerned, the inflow of scarce dollars will have an even more significant impact on her inflation-racked, capital-short economy.

The United States itself will reap benefits indirectly. If the Russians pay for a good portion of their purchases by selling gold in London, the Treasury will not have to supply as much gold from its own dwindling stock to meet the demands of private and official sellers of dollars. Thus the Russians will be helping to calm the nervousness that has threatened to curb international trade and investment.

The West also is bolstered by the continued demand for grains from the country that had once been the granary of Europe. The Soviet Union has made great advances in industrialization and technology. but it has utterly failed to match the revolution that has taken place in American agriculture. And because Russia has to depend on outside sources of food supply, its leaders must recognize the desirability of strengthening their relations with those who can meet their needs.

It is ironic that the United States, which is the champion of liberalized trade and which has wheat to sell, cannot participate in this trade with Russia because of the high cost of American shipping. Yet the very unions that have done most to make the American merchant marine uneconomic are the chief insisters on quota preference guarantees. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has accurately testified that, if the shipping restrictions were eliminated, the almost certain result would be a protest strike by dock and maritime unions.

A large part of the merchant fleet is already strike-bound for reasons that are a compound of economics and interunion warfare. Political strikes are just one more of the factors that contribute to the demise of American shipping; they also undermine our prosperity and our foreign policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Star, urging that we sell wheat to Russia on the same terms as anyone else, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

Considering the hullabaloo raised in rigid anti-Communist circles by Canada's wheat sale to Russia 2 years ago, it is encouraging that the announcement of a new whopping 214-million bushel deal has aroused hardly a murmur of criticism.

In fact it is a good deal from everyone's point of view. The Canadians of course are delighted to find such a ready market for what promises to be a record wheat harvest this year. For the Russians the purchase is a necessity forced on them by the still glaring deficiencies of their agricultural program. For the rest of the world it is a hopeful sign of growing maturity and reasonableness in dealings between the Soviet Union and the West.

From an economic standpoint there is nothing in this transaction which favors Russia in a competitive way. Leaders of the Soviet trade mission in Toronto have made it clear that they hope to increase their exports to Canada to cover some of the $450 million cost of the wheat purchases. In the meantime, however, there is a lively possibility that they will be forced to dispose of a fairly hefty chunk of Russia's dwindling gold reserves to foot the Canadian bill.

From a political point of view the West has no more interest in keeping Russians on short rations than the Soviet Government has. Liberalization of trade between the two blocs is, indeed, an essential feature of the interpenetration of goods, people, and ideas, along with decreasing antagonism which is the announced policy of virtually every Western government.

There are still some, to be sure, who feel that any "traffic with the enemy," in wheat or anything else, is little short of treason. But fortunately this adamatine brand of anticommunism is a good deal less fashionable today than it used to be. And dogmatic rigidities on both sides of the Iron Curtain are beginning to give way.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a release by Great Plains Wheat, Inc., reporting a telegram sent by the association to the President and the other indicating that the United States might have had half of the Russian wheat business which amounts to 1,260 trainloads of wheat—359,785 truckloads, and about 25 million bushels more wheat than is produced in South Dakota, North Dakota, and Colorado combined.

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

PRESS RELEASE BY GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.—The announcement today that Russia has just completed the purchase of 6.9 million metric tons of wheat from Canada and Argentina has prompted an urgent request by Howard W. Hardy, president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc. to President Lyndon Johnson.

In the telegram to President Johnson, Hardy urged that every effort be made to lift the restriction of the 50 percent U.S.-flag requirement on shipping of U.S. wheat to the Soviet bloc. "Much of the business that has gone to Canada could have been ours had it not been for this shipping requirement," Hardy said. "Additional wheat export business with Russia as well as a large amount for Eastern Europe is yet to be contracted and the United States can still realize most of this business if the shipping requirement is lifted."

Of the 6.9 million tons sold to Russia, 700,000 metric tons were purchased from Canada via Vancouver last week, 1,200,000 metric tons from Argentina late Tuesday and 5 million metric tons from Canada via the St. Lawrence Seaway Wednesday.

According to Hardy, more than one-half of this sale would have been purchased from the United States had there been no 50 percent shipping requirement. In explaining the U.S. shipping barrier the grain marketing association's president said the Government's requirement that a full 50 percent of wheat cargoes to Russian bloc countries move on U.S.-flag merchant ships is a major deterrent in American marketing programs.

"The requirement is understandable in terms of foreign aid cargoes," Hardy said, "but makes little sense when applied to purely commercial dollar sales."

Hardy pointed out that the 50-percent requirement is only an administrative ruling and could be removed by the stroke of a pen.

"The effect of this recent wheat sale to Russia by Canada and Argentina is a tremendous loss to the economy of the American wheat farmer. The 6.9 million metric tons of wheat is equivalent to 251,850,000 bushels of wheat or a total acreage of 8,930,000. This represents 17.9 percent of all acres planted in the United States, including all classes of wheat," Hardy said.

"The American wheat farmer is by no means the only segment of our economy affected by this recent Russian wheat sale," he said. "Railroads, trucking firms, and steamship lines, and the thousands of men and women employed by them have suffered a great loss.

"The Russian sales represent 125,925 railroad boxcar loadings or 1,260 trainloads.

"The sale represents 359,785 truckloadings.

"The sale represents 460 steamship loadings figuring 15,000 metric tons per load.

"Another aspect of this sale to Russia shows that the purchase represents 25½ million bushels of wheat more than the total production of all classes of wheat from the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Colorado.

"This figure is nearly the entire anticipated wheat production of Kansas for 1965 and is 111,751,000 bushels more than the total production this year in the State of Oklahoma.

"On the average price of $70 per ton, this Russian wheat sale represents a staggering $483-million volume loss to the United States," Hardy said.

DOMESTIC WHEAT BATTLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I would like to turn to what is happening to wheat producers on the domestic market scene.

The House of Representatives will vote tomorrow or the next day on an omnibus farm bill. The bill contains a provision that U.S. producers who limit their production shall receive certificates assuring them 100 percent of parity return for wheat used for food in this country.

Two bakery unions and two dozen baking companies, including giant concerns which have pleaded nolle contendere to price fixing, have organized a wheat users committee to oppose the higher certificate value.

The higher certificate value would increase the cost of wheat in a 1-pound bakery product by 7 mills—seven-tenths of a penny. It would thus increase the cost of bread from 21.6 cents per pound loaf to 22.3 cents if passed on to the consumer.

In 1948, Mr. President, a loaf of bread cost 13½ cents.

The farmer got 2.7 cents for the wheat in it.

Today the farmer gets only 2.5 cents for the wheat in a loaf of bread—less than in 1948.

But the price of the bread has gone from 13½ to 21.6 cents to pay higher wages, increased transportation costs, and increased bakery returns.

When the bakery workers go for higher wages and increase the cost of bread to consumers, nothing is said of a bread tax by the labor unions. When transportation rates go up, nothing is said of a bread tax. When the giant bakery concerns stretch out their returns a bit, they do not accuse themselves of levying a bread tax.

But let it be proposed to give the farmers of America a fair return for the product of their labor and capital, and it becomes a bread tax.

When wheat prices look as if they might go down, the bakeries and their allies regard wheat price as an inconsequential part of the cost of bread, which have little or no effect on price.

In May 1963, after the wheat producers had voted "No" in a referendum on compulsory acreage controls, and it looked as if the price of wheat would drop 75 cents a bushel, the immediate response from the baking industry was that there would be no effect on bread prices.

The New York Times of May 22, 1963, quoted a baker as saying that the price of bread would not be affected by the wheat price decline because wheat is too small a part of the cost of bread, adding:

As long as the customer wants a fresh, wholesome loaf of bread produced by a decently paid bakery employee in an extremely competitive market, we will have to spend the money on preservative chemicals, vitamins and other additives, packaging, salaries, and other things, of which flour is the least important factor.

The National Grange has suggested that perhaps Congress should take a look at the bakery companies which have jointly announced that an increase of seven-tenths of a penny in wheat cost would cause bread prices to rise 2 cents a loaf. It is a different story when wheat prices are going up—entirely different. Then wheat becomes a big factor in price.

On Friday, August 13, the Grange called on Attorney General Katzenbach to "take prompt and vigorous action to protect consumers from the illegitimate trust."

The Grange names members of the Wheat Users Committee, now threatening the Nation with a rise in bread prices of nearly 300 percent of the proposed increase in wheat value, in their effort to defeat the proposal to pay wheat farmers a decent return.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the Grange statement in the RECORD.

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

FOR RELEASE BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 13.—The National Grange today protested the antitrust activities of the bread bakery industry.

In a telegram to U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the Grange called for "prompt and vigorous action to protect consumers from the illegitimate trust."

The trust involves American Bakeries, of Chicago, Ill., and Ward Baking Co., of New York, N.Y., both recently enjoined by Federal court in Jacksonville, Fla. A third member is General Baking Co., which has an interlocking directorate with Ward. Others operating under Federal restraining orders are Derst Baking Co., of Savannah, Ga.; Flowers Baking Co., of Thomasville, Ga.; Southern Bakeries Co., of Atlanta, Ga.; and the Nations largest—Continental Baking Co.

In the telegram, the Grange praised the U.S. Department of Justice for its July 29 consent judgment which forbids the companies to engage in anticompetitive activities.

"The judgment," National Grange Legislative Representative Harry L. Graham said, "applies to civilian consumers only in Florida and Georgia." He pointed out it does not restrain the companies from price fixing in the other States in which they operate.

According to their last annual reports, American, General, and Ward bakeries operate 131 bakeries, with 206 distribution centers including subsidiaries and affiliates.

"The three," Graham said, "represent the largest sales and second largest earnings in the bread bakery business."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it has been extremely gratifying to me that many leading newspapers have supported the proposed increase in domestic wheat certificate values.

The Des Moines Register and Tribune, in an editorial June 29, called the bread tax argument being made by the bakeries and the bakery unions, a "phony" argument.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls the bread tax charge an exaggerated argument and suggests that one way or another, additional returns must be provided "if the Great Society is ever to incorporate its diminishing rural population."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the two editorials in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, June 29, 1965]

BREAD TAX CHARGE

The attack against the wheat acreage diversion and price support program as a bread tax on consumers is one of the more cynical pieces of political demagogy to be practiced lately. This program requires domestic processors of wheat to buy certificates worth 75 cents a bushel and exporters to buy certificates worth 30 cents a bushel. The certificates are given to farmers as a part of their payment for complying with acreage restrictions.

Since the certificate program began, the price support loan on wheat has been reduced from $2 a bushel to $1.25. The average "blend" certificate value, which depends on the ratio of domestic to export sales, last year was 43 cents and this year is to be 44 cents. The total support price to wheat growers this year will average $1.69 per bushel, as compared with $2 in 1962.

The domestic miller will pay about the same for wheat this year as in 1962, since the market price plus the certificate will cost about $2 per bushel.

The "bread tax" charge is based on the fact that part of the price support cost now is paid by the public as consumers instead of taxpayers. The flour millers pass on the cost of the certificates in the price of flour.

The bread tax charge is cynical because everyone knows the price of bread is only slightly related to the price of wheat. The cost of wheat makes up less than 20 percent of the retail price of bread and other bakery products. About 80 percent of the price is made up of processing and marketing costs.

The total cost of wheat to flour millers is no higher than it was 3 years ago and is lower than it was in the early 1950's when price supports were higher. Yet the prices of bread and other wheat products are considerably higher because of increased labor and other manufacturing costs.

The price of white bread has risen every year since 1950 but not because the price of wheat went up. If the wheat program is extended by Congress and the administration recommendations are approved, the wheat certificates will be increased in value. Since the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread is around 2 cents, raising the certificate value to $1.25 (a 20-percent increase in the total cost of wheat to the miller) could not justify as much as a 1-cent increase in the price of bread.

If this part of the subsidy is paid in the form of a charge on consumers instead of taxpayers, it cannot affect low-income consumers perceptibly.

Whether it is a good idea to raise the returns to wheat growers by any method is a separate question. But the method of a higher certificate value should not be discarded on such phony ground as the bread tax argument.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Aug. 10, 1965]

A RURAL RESCUE ACT

If the Johnson administration could apply the same consensus strategy to farm policy that it has so successfully applied to several major new bills, the result would be a bold new farm program. But there is no consensus on farm policy.

Consequently Congress faces a fight over the administration bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee. The fight pits what Secretary of Agriculture Freeman calls the

Bread Trust against what his opponents term a bread tax.

These charges focus public attention on only one aspect of the farm bill: the wheat provision. It would require wheat processors to buy certificates at $1.25 a bushel, instead of 75 cents. The 50-cent increase, plus regular price supports at $1.25, would give the farmer $2.50 a bushel—or nearly parity.

No doubt the processors would pass the increased certificates charge on to consumers. So the processors, joined by the American Farm Bureau Federation, speak of a bread tax. It is an exaggerated charge. The Agriculture Committee majority doubts that the new costs to processors would add as much as a penny to their costs on a loaf of bread. The farmer receives only about 3 cents for the wheat in one loaf, and though the retail price has gone up 8 cents in recent years, the farmer has not had any share of the rise.

Secretary Freeman bases his counterattack partly on the fact that five major processors among 3,500 baking firms enjoyed 57 percent of the baking industry's profits (after taxes). His exaggerated talk of a bread trust does not prove, however, that a few companies set the price of bread. It does suggest the irony of such industrial giants suddenly rushing to the defense of the poor farmer and the poor consumer.

In all this flamboyant propaganda there is the question of the extent to which the burden of farm subsidies should be transferred from the taxpayer to the consumer. In theory, tax-supported subsidies are fairer. In practice, if the House committee and Mr. Freeman are right, the consumer should pay very little more for bread—while the Government saves more than $150 million a year and raises wheat farmers' income by as much.

This will be a neat trick if it works, and it is worth a trial. It is worth a trial because the alternatives of no farm bill or of continued high Federal costs are unacceptable, and because a slight shift in the cost of food to the people who buy it makes some sense.

Primarily it is worth a trial because rural America lives increasingly close to poverty and needs help. Only 400,000 of 3 million farmers earn anything near parity income despite the flight from farm to city. We would prefer to see a farm program with payments graduated to individual need, but surely the Nation's food costs must be graduated to the needs of its food producers.

Today 8 percent of the population produces food for all the population. Despite this record of general efficiency, farm prices have dropped 15 percent in 17 years while living costs have increased 35 percent. America spends less on food, proportionately, than any other country, but farmers as a whole do not enjoy a proportionate share of the prosperity they have helped to create.

Well-fed Americans can afford to pay a little more for food. One way or another they will have to do so, if the Great Society is ever to incorporate its diminishing rural population.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if America wants to continue to enjoy abundant food at the lowest real cost any nation ever enjoyed—less than 18½ percent of income—some consideration is going to have to be shown for the producers of that food.

The producers are not Kigmies.

If they continue to be treated as such, the day will not be far off that a few huge corporations will control agricultural production, as they now control the bulk of baking, and food prices will, in my opinion, begin to rise substantially.

The Nation will then know what bread taxes and food taxes, assessed by a monopolistic food production industry, really are.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

Job Corps—Cuban refugees

SEC. 2. Section 104(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States."

Job Corps—Enrollee affidavits

SEC. 3. Section 104(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "(d) Each enrollee (other than an enrollee who is a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 104(a) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic'. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required under this subsection."

Job Corps—Application of Federal Employees' Compensation Act

SEC. 4. Section 106(c)(2)(A) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended retroactive to January 1, 1965, to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Corps."

Job Corps—Enrollee work activities

SEC. 5. Section 110 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting the word "male" before the word "enrollees" in the first sentence.

SEC. 6. Section 114(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act is amended by adding a new unnumbered paragraph following the end of subsection (a), as follows:

"For the purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States."

Work training programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 115 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out ", or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

Work-study programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 8. Section 124(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out "or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Community action programs—Public information

SEC. 9. Section 202(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) which includes provision for feasible access of the public to information including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or agencies engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with procedures approved by the Director."

SEC. 10. Section 205(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act is amended as follows:

Between the words "including" and "employment" in the last sentence of subsection (a), insert the words: "but not limited to".

Between the words "management," and "welfare" in the last sentence of subsection (a), insert the words: "family planning, consumer credit education, consumer debt counseling,".

Special programs for the chronically unemployed poor

SEC. 11. Section 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f) and adding after subsection (c) a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The Director is authorized to make grants under this section for special programs (1) which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, (2) which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, and (3) which are conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment."

General community action programs—Self-help housing rehabilitation

SEC. 12. Section 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) In extending assistance under this section the Director shall also give special consideration to programs which will, through self-help, rehabilitate substandard housing and provide instruction in basic skills associated with such rehabilitation: *Provided*, That such programs will not result in the displacement of employed workers."

General community action programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 13 (a) The first sentence of section 208(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three", and by striking out ", or June 30, 1966, whichever is later,".

(b) Section 208 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Director is authorized to prescribe regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which assistance may be reduced below 90 per centum for such community action programs or components as have received assistance under section 205 for a period prescribed in such regulations."

(c) Section 208(c) of such Act (as so redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved."

Participation of State activities

SEC. 14. Section 209(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting before the period the following: "including, but not limited to, continuing consultation with appropriate State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of such programs".

Disapproval of plans

SEC. 15. Section 209(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is repealed. Subsection "(d)" is redesignated "(c)".

Notices

SEC. 16. Section 209 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) When the Director receives an application from a private nonprofit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs, he shall, within five days, give notice to such community action agency of the receipt of such application. When the Director determines that a separate contract or grant is desirable and practical and that special cause has been shown, he is authorized to make a grant directly to, or to contract directly with, such agency.

SEC. 17. Section 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is retitled to include the words "POLITICAL ACTIVITIES AND" preceding the word "PREFERENCE".

Section 211 of such Act is further amended by inserting a new subsection (a), as follows, and redesignating existing section 211 as subsection "(b)";

"(a) Any person who is employed by any agency administering or conducting a community action program receiving assistance under this part and whose salary is paid in principal part from funds appropriated pursuant to this part, shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of a State or local agency for the purposes and within the meaning of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), as amended."

Adult basic education programs—Payments; Federal share

SEC. 18. Section 216(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966," and inserting in lieu thereof "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years,".

Adult basic education programs—Teacher training

SEC. 19. Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by striking out "From the sums appropriated to carry out this title" in section 213(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "From so much of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part as is not reserved pursuant to section 218"; and

(2) by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and inserting immediately after section 217 the following new section 218:

"Teacher training projects

"SEC. 218. Not to exceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part for any fiscal year may be reserved and used by the Director to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 212, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Director may by or pursuant to regulation determine."

Voluntary assistance program for needy children

SEC. 20. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out part C thereof, and by redesignating part D as part C and section 221 as section 220.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAM TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

SEC. 21. In title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the heading "PART A—AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS AND LOANS", delete the words "GRANTS AND" and the dash after the word "make" in the first subsequent sentence and the subsequent number "(1)".

Cooperative associations—Prohibition of loans to assist manufacturing

SEC. 22. Section 305(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance."

Assistance for migrant and seasonally employed agricultural employees

SEC. 23. Section 311 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"Migrants and seasonally employed agricultural employees

"SEC. 311. The Director is authorized to develop and implement a program of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which will meet, or substantially and primarily contribute to meeting, the special needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children."

SEC. 24. Section 331(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act is amended by striking the words "January 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1966".

AMENDMENT TO TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

SEC. 25. Section 502 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purposes of this title.", and (2) by striking out of the last sentence the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965,".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Vista volunteers—Assignment; application of other provisions and Federal laws

SEC. 26. (a) Subsection (a) of section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out everything in paragraph (2) following the clause designation "(C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) Each volunteer shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(2) All volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS–7 under the Classification Act of 1949.

"(3) For the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), a volunteer under this section shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government."

National Advisory Council

SEC. 27. Section 605 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 605. (a) The President shall, during 1965, appoint a National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council") for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of programs under this Act, evaluating their effectiveness in furthering the purposes of this Act, and making recommendations for the improvement of such programs, administration, and operation, including proposals for changes in this Act.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twenty-one persons who shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. From among the members of the Advisory Council the President shall designate a Chairman, who shall not be a regular full-time employee of the United States. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year. The Director shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Council.

"(c) The Advisory Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Director shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such perti-

nent data prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(d) The Advisory Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1966. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations."

Programs for the elderly poor

SEC. 28. Part A of title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Programs for the elderly poor

"SEC. 610. It is the intention of the Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act."

Affidavits

SEC. 29. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 616 thereof and substituting a new section 616, as follows:

"Transfer of funds

"SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations under any title of this Act, not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out programs or activities under such title may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out programs or activities under any other such title; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available under any title by more than 10 per centum."

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 30. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 131 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $412,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $535,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law."

(b)(1) The first sentence of section 220 of such Act (as so redesignated by section 14 of this Act) is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $880,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law; $150,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1966 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title may be used for the purposes of section 205(d)."

(c)(1) The first sentence of section 321 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law."

(d)(1) The first sentence of section 503 of such Act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorized by law."

(e)(1) The first sentence of section 615 of such Act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than for purposes of making credits to the revolving fund established by section 606(a)), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law."

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT—MORATORIUM ON STUDENT LOANS TO VISTA VOLUNTEERS

SEC. 31. (a) Paragraph (2)(A) of section 205(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 425(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking out "or" before "(iii)" and by inserting before the proviso and after "Peace Corps Act" the following: ", or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the then obligee institution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, only a year ago President Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act into law, and the war on poverty was officially declared.

When we began this endeavor to lift one-fifth of our Nation from the depths of poverty, we knew that success would not come quickly or be easily attained.

Yet we have made a beginning on an enterprise that is probably as difficult as any peacetime program this Government has ever undertaken.

Taking both the good and the bad, it is, I believe, a beginning that holds solid promise for the future.

The bill we now consider, H.R. 8283, does not greatly increase the scope of the legislation under which we are waging this war.

Nor does it make any major changes in the character or direction of existing programs.

It does, however, sustain the effort we have begun, and it reaffirms this Nation's commitment to prosecute the war on poverty with maximum effectiveness.

From a purely statistical point of view, the record of the first 9 months of operation under the Economic Opportunity Act is an impressive one.

It is a record that includes the establishment, from scratch, of 47 operating Job Corps centers with 10,000 assigned enrollees; the inauguration of 639 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects to provide work and training for close to 300,000 young men and women; the initiation of work-study programs for 54,000 low-income students in 648 colleges and universities during the first spring semester of operation; the making of 771 separate community action grants, and nearly 2,400 grants of Project Head Start for over half a million 4- and 5-year-olds who are receiving special attention in 13,000 child development centers all across the country; the provision of basic rudimentary education for nearly 43,372 functionally illiterate, poor adults; the making of low-interest loans to 11,000 low-income rural families to improve their farms or to inaugurate or expand nonagricultural enterprises; the extension of housing, sanitation, day care, and education assistance to 75,000 migrant agricultural workers under 53 separate grants; the provision of constructive work training and other assistance to unemployed fathers and other needy persons through 164 separate projects serving 88,700 participants with 276,000 dependents.

These accomplishments, it seems to me, are even more impressive when one considers that in the short time this war on poverty has been underway, the Office of Economic Opportunity also had the task of recruiting and organizing a staff, of formulating these programs, and of developing the regulations and procedures for their administration.

Obviously, these accomplishments do not show ultimate success. The record does, however, show progress.

I am sure there have been mistakes. I am sure there have been administrative mishaps that occur even in well-established agencies, much less one that has been in existence only a few months.

But it is important that criticisms of the Economic Opportunity Act—and its administration—is placed in the proper perspective.

We cannot let sniping at the program overshadow the fact that, here at last, is a determined, concentrated attack on one of civilized man's oldest enemies—poverty.

To permit that would be to officially ignore the millions who live under poverty conditions and refuse to tackle the barriers that keep them and their children from enjoying our unprecedented prosperity.

Rather, we must constructively assist OEO in meeting the objectives set for it by the President and the Congress.

The record to date suggests that, if there are many problems still to be met

and considered, there are also a good many hard problems that are now behind us.

The bill before us is framed in this context.

The new authorizations that it would provide are generally somewhat below the amounts contained in the House passed bill, but essentially consistent with what the President has recommended as necessary to permit sound and prudent operations over fiscal year 1966.

In this respect, the bill is neither reckless, nor restrictive.

It is consistent neither with the view of those who contend that all of our present efforts are so small as to be insignificant, nor with the argument that because the road ahead is difficult we should stop short, turn back, and start over.

It is not designed to make speed an overriding goal. But it is designed to build upon and take advantage of what has already been accomplished.

Apart from providing new authorizations, the bill makes a number of changes in the existing provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Most of these are essentially technical or perfecting amendments, and I shall touch upon most of them only briefly.

The bill includes the various amendments recommended by the administration.

One would extend, for 1 additional year, the authority for 90-percent Federal funding of the work-training, work-study, and adult-basic education programs.

Another would expand authority to assign VISTA volunteers so that these unusually dedicated Americans could be employed and their talents used in support of any activity eligible for assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Another amendment would provide Job Corps enrollees with Federal Employees' Compensation Act protection while they are on authorized pass or traveling to or from a Job Corps site, and provide more adequate benefits under that same act to VISTA volunteers as well.

An amendment would clarify the Director's authority to carry out effective programs to aid migrants and seasonally employed agricultural employees, and permit limited use of funds for the training of teachers or instructors in techniques of working with adults under the adult basic education program.

The bill also generally includes the several program amendments adopted by the House.

These would, for example, enable Cuban refugees to enroll in the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps and assure that workers in very low-income farm families will not be excluded from work-experience projects under title V of the act.

In addition, the bill includes several amendments adopted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which merit special comment.

One of these authorizes special projects directed to the needs of chronically unemployed persons who have poor employment prospects.

These would be persons who, because of age or other reasons, are unable to secure employment or training under other programs.

They would work on projects contributing to such things as the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, parks, highways, and other lands.

These special projects would, of course, have to be conducted in accordance with standards which will assure that they are in the public interest and consistent with the labor policies applied in connection with other programs under the act.

The committee believed that a substantial attack on the employment problems of these otherwise unemployable poor should be mounted as soon as possible. The bill accordingly contemplates that $150 million will be used for this purpose during the first year.

The committee also deemed it advisable to remove from the act the present provisions giving State Governors the authority to veto local community action programs, adult basic education, and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects.

This does not reflect any belief that State governments, through appropriate State agencies, do not have an important role to play in the development and conduct of many antipoverty programs.

Obviously, many State agencies do have a proper and legitimate interest in these programs.

The committee did not believe, however, that such an interest is served by a provision that has no real precedent in any other legislation, which cuts across established governmental patterns at the State and local levels, and which confers upon Governors control over projects and activities for which they have no legal responsibility.

Such a provision, in the view of the committee, serves no program purpose and, in fact, does more to impede than foster the harmonious intergovernmental relations.

Finally, the committee has added an amendment which reflects its concern over the millions of elderly people who are living in poverty, and for whom poverty is especially difficult to overcome.

The plight of these elderly poor clearly deserves particular attention, and an amendment has been added to assure that the problems of the elderly poor shall be considered, whenever feasible, in the development of any program under this act that can contribute to meeting their needs.

It is the committee's belief that the bill before us will give the Office of Economic Opportunity the funds and other tools it needs to carry on the war against poverty.

I certainly urge its adoption.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that such additional staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as it may be found necessary to have present in the Chamber may be authorized to have the privilege of the floor during this consideration of the bill, H.R. 8283.

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

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] in regard to the program on economic opportunity.

There is a need for this type of work. I have a very high regard for the Administrator of this national program.

I want to know if the distinguished chairman of the committee went into the possibility of obtaining closer local cooperation. I have had some contact with the matter. I have followed it with some interest.

I find that groups of private citizens, who have taken an interest in this field in various communities, seem to be ignored at the present time.

Has the chairman any suggestion on that?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, I do not have any suggestion as to how it might be improved. It has been the experience of the committee, through the hearings we conducted, that while there has been some competition among local groups for leadership in the program, there was no charge that local people did not have an opportunity to participate. I do not know where that situation prevails; therefore, I have no suggestion.

Mr. CARLSON. I am not criticizing the way the bill has been set up to carry out the program. My point is that we have citizens who for years have been interested in welfare programs. They know the conditions in their communities better than anyone else, and they should be allowed to participate.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator will yield, the proposed act provides for participation of local groups. There is every indication that in the implementation of the act they have been consulted with respect to the program.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator for that information. I sincerely hope they will be. These people have been interested in the welfare of their communities and are still interested. That does not mean that there is nothing else that needs to be done, but I hope that those people will be tied into the program.

Mr. McNAMARA. I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I know there are amendments at the desk. I know of none on the majority side. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope the staff will contact minority Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may discuss a subject not immediately germane to the matter pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on August 10 there was filed with the Senate a dissenting opinion concerning the wisdom of adopting the Consular Convention With the Soviet Union. This Consular Convention contains a provision that is unprecedented in the history of our country. The convention that is to be approved between the Soviet Union and the United States contains a provision granting complete immunity from criminal prosecution to consular agents of Soviet Russia in the United States and those of the United States in Soviet Russia.

The general practice has been that immunity from criminal prosecution is granted to consular agents only in regard to misdemeanors.

This convention goes beyond that and it, in effect, declares that no criminal prosecution shall be brought against a consular agent of Red Russia in the United States, even though he has committed a felony. It means that if proof is existent concerning espionage by a consular agent, let us say in Chicago or San Francisco, that agent is granted immunity from prosecution.

I repeat that it will be the first time we have ever entered into such an agreement. In the past the immunity has been limited against prosecutions for misdemeanors.

The minority views are signed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

It was the intention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that he would also be a signatory to the minority views. Inadvertently the name of the Senator from Kansas was omitted.

I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed in the RECORD, and that the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be added as one of the participants in the minority views expressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION—MINORITY VIEWS

We do not concur with the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the Consular Convention With the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We believe that the disadvantages of the convention for the United States are sufficiently grave to outweigh the advantages which are claimed for it.

Our concern relates principally to the provisions in the convention under which consular officers and employees of the sending state are given immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. This convention is the first to which the United States has been a party which provides for unlimited exemption from criminal jurisdiction for consular personnel. Previous consular conventions have provided for immunity from criminal jurisdiction for consular personnel with respect only to misdemeanors but not to felonies. We believe that if the provisions regarding immunity had not been included in the convention, the Soviet Union would not have agreed to it and that, in fact, these provisions were a principal Soviet objective. The testimony of witnesses from the Department of State has been contradictory on the question of whether the Soviet Union or the United States first proposed including these immunity provisions in the convention.

In any case, we believe that the extension of immunity to include felonies would open the way to espionage and other forms of subversion on the part of Soviet consular personnel. If this convention is ratified, and if the Soviet Union then establishes a consulate or consulates in the United States, the officers and employees of these consulates would be able to engage in espionage and subversion knowing that they will not be liable to prosecution but only to expulsion.

It is true that the establishment of a Soviet consulate or consulates would mean only a small increase in the number of Soviet officials with immunity from criminal jurisdiction (as of July 1, 1965, there were 249 Soviet officials and 150 dependents who enjoyed diplomatic immunity). We are convinced, however, that there is a predisposition on the part of Soviet officials to engage in espionage and subversive activities, a predisposition which is an important consideration regardless of the numbers involved. In this connection, it is important to recall the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on March 4, 1965. In a statement inserted in the record justifying the appropriations being requested for the Federal Bureau of Investigations, Mr. Hoover said:

"In regard to the Communist-bloc espionage attack against this country, there has been no letup whatsoever. Historically, the Soviet intelligence services have appropriated the great bulk of official representation and diplomatic establishments in other countries as bases from which to carry on their epionage operations. Over the years, the number of such official personnel assigned to the United States has steadily increased."

In testimony relating to this statement during the March 4 hearing Mr. Hoover stated that "our Government is about to allow them [the Soviet Union] to establish consulates in many parts of the country which, of course, will make our work more difficult." Mr. Hoover then inserted in the record of the hearing several other brief statements. The first read, in part, as follows:

"The methods used to collect data sought by the Communist-bloc intelligence services are almost as varied as the types of data which they endeavor to collect. One of their mainstays is the collection of information—classified and otherwise—through espionage operations involving personnel legally assigned to official Soviet and satellite establishments in the United States. The focal points of these operations continue to be the United Nations and the Communist embassies, legations, consulates, and news or commercial agencies in our country. Such gathering of information is conducted by the Communist representatives using the legal cover of their diplomatic or other official status to cloak their spying activities.

"Historically, the Soviet intelligence services have appropriated the great bulk of official positions abroad, primarily using their official representatives and diplomatic establishments in other countries as bases from which to carry on their espionage operations."

A second statement related specifically to the question of new Soviet consulates. It read as follows:

"Long seeking greater official representation in the United States which would be more widely spread over the country, a cherished goal of the Soviet intelligence services was realized when the United States signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on June 1, 1964, providing for the reciprocal establishment of consulates in our respective countries.

"One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations.

"In involving the great bulk of their official personnel in intelligence activity in one way or another, the Soviets utilize to the fullest extent possible any and all official means such as the United Nations, trade delegations, and the like, as transmission belts to carry additional intelligence personnel into this country."

More recently, on July 14, 1965, Mr. Hoover, reviewing the major phases of the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the past fiscal year, stated:

"The great majority of the 800 Communist bloc official personnel stationed in the United States, protected by the privilege of diplomatic immunity, have engaged in intelligence assignments and are a dangerous threat to the security of the United States."

We believe that these statements of the chief investigative officer of the United States should be given serious consideration. It is also worth looking at the record of the activities of Soviet officials in the United States. According to information supplied by the Department of State, since 1946, 27 Soviet Embassy and consular officers and personnel in the United States have been arrested or expelled for intelligence activity. These 27 included personnel assigned to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, the Soviet consulate general in New York (which was closed in 1948), the Soviet mission to the United Nations, and the United Nations Secretariat. In the same period, 13 diplomatic, consular, and international organization officials from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania were expelled from the United States for intelligence activities.

There is another grave aspect to these immunity provisions, and that is the chain reaction that will be set off if this convention is ratified. The provisions regarding immunity will then apply not only to Soviet consular personnel but may also apply to consular personnel of the 27 other countries with which the United States has consular conventions or agreements which contain a most-favored-nation clause. These 27 countries include 2 other Communist countries: Rumania and Yugoslavia. As a practical matter, as there are no Rumanian consulates in the United States at present, there would not be any immediate increase in the number of Rumanian official personnel enjoying complete immunity from criminal prosecution. If any Rumanian consulates were established in the United States in the future, however, their consular personnel would enjoy such immunity.

We are thus opposed to the convention because we consider the provisions granting unrestricted immunity from criminal jurisdiction to Soviet consular personnel to be unwise. We believe that these immunity provisions will encourage Soviet subversion

by placing Soviet consular personnel outside the criminal jurisdiction of the United States. We also believe that it is not in the interests of the United States to extend this immunity to several hundred, perhaps as many as 400, persons which would be the case given the fact that most-favored-nation clauses are found in consular conventions and agreements the United States has with 27 other countries.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
BOURKE HICKENLOOPER,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
KARL E. MUNDT.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that the clerk report it, but what I should like to do is to have the amendment printed so that it will be available tomorrow for voting. I shall discuss it today, but I send the amendment to the desk for information at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not wish the amendment stated at this time?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. I send it to the desk for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment to the committee amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment to the amendment is as follows:

On page 28, line 24, strike out "$535,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$412,500,000".

On page 29, line 10, strike out "$880,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$490,000,000".

On page 29, line 23, strike out "$55,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000,000".

On page 30, line 22 strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have the floor, I believe that I should say something about the amendment.

This amendment is similar to the one I offered in committee. It would control the spending on a program which is beset with difficulties, a program in which more was authorized last year than was appropriated, a program which has not been clarified so far as the administration and the good it is doing for the poor are concerned. Therefore, my amendment is designed to bring back to last year's authorization the proposed figures in this year's bill. In other words, I will be cutting back on the extension of the authorization from double last year's authorization to the same amount as last year's authorization.

I believe that I can do this in figures, for the information of Senators, by the chart which was before us during the executive committee hearings, showing what last year's authorization and appropriations were.

Mr. President, I hold this chart in my hand, and it shows that last year, for example, there was authorized for fiscal 1965, $947.5 million. When the bill was studied by the Appropriations Committee, however, for last year, the total appropriation was $793 million, or a total of approximately $150 million less than was authorized by Congress.

Ordinarily, this would be considered normal in the first year of a program. Then I would say that in the second year of a program, as we start working out problems and trying to solve the unforeseen difficulties involved in a new program, we would probably add a little more money to it.

My purpose would be to bring the authorization for this fiscal year up to the same authorization as last year, plus an additional $150 million which is called for under the so-called Nelson amendment.

Instead of the $947.5 million, the committee reported a proposal which is $1,650 million—more than $700 million over what was spent last year when the appropriation was not as much as the authorization.

To me, it seems absolute nonsense to take a program which is so beset from the beginning to the end with problems on a nationwide basis, and say that we are going to double the amount of money involved in it.

Accordingly, my amendment, when it is reported and brought up for a vote—and I hope that it will be brought up for a vote—will have the purpose of cutting back the total authorization to $947.5 million plus $150 million for the Nelson amendment, which brings it to just slightly over $1 billion, or at least $600 million less than what was called for in the program.

Mr. President, I should like to be able to support H.R. 8283 because along with every other Senator in this body, regardless of political party, we share a sense of responsibility to the poor of America, and would like to do something which would enable us to provide a mechanism by which the poor themselves could get on their feet, regain their self-respect, and enjoy an economic livelihood. I cannot think of anything better than to be able to participate in the enactment of a bill which would begin a true war on poverty.

However, so long as the Great Society's efforts against poverty continue to be so blatantly political and so fraught with blunders, I cannot support a bill which would serve only to compound the errors and exacerbate the weaknesses of the existing laws. I am speaking particularly about the poverty program in this respect.

In order to implement debate and the functions of the antipoverty program in the Office of Economic Opportunity, I wish to review briefly some of the troubles of the poverty program in my own State of Colorado.

Colorado has been fortunate in that the poverty war programs in the State have not been hit by such horrible scandals as have occurred in Florida, Indiana, and elsewhere.

In that connection, I believe I should say at this point that the minority views detail the scandals. I believe that it is worthwhile, for the purpose of making the record, to recite them once again.

On page 61 of the report, in the minority views, we state:

One of the best demonstrations of what can happen under the shoddy mismanagement of OEO is the fiasco that occurred in the St. Petersburg, Fla., Women's Job Corps Center. The troubles began when OEO picked as a site for the center a resort hotel in a quiet residential district. Residents of the area experienced some difficulty in adjusting to what an OEO spokesman described as "the animal spirits of the young."

Let me say at this point that what the residents described it as was a far cry from the innocuous statement of the OEO spokesman.

Continuing reading:

The enrollees, however, did not object to the hotel, remodeled for them at a cost of $40,000, nor to the welcome they received from the 122 staffers employed to care for a student complement of 237. Even with this degree of supervision, trouble with the enrollees soon began. Eight girls were expelled for drinking, and one was described as an alcoholic. Another girl disappeared after writing that she was leaving the center because some girls were using narcotics and staying out overnight with male companions. As a result of the whole mess—

And this is the Florida situation, in St. Petersburg—

the local school board, which was under contract to help in administering the center, voted to terminate its contract with OEO as soon as possible.

Similarly, criticism has been voiced of a men's Job Corps training center in Indiana. A Columbus, Ind., newspaper reported that some of the trainees had attempted to purchase guns while on leave. Seven of the trainees were arrested for a sexual assault on a 17-year-old boy, but at least some of the seven were promptly bailed out and returned to the center. Following these incidents a military discipline was imposed on the boys, and they now are made to stand at military attention at 6:30 in the morning. Serious trouble also arose at a Job Corps camp near Astoria, Oreg. After a number of fist fights occurred at the camp, the U.S. marshal for the State of Oregon considered deputizing State and local police officers to control further outbreaks of violence.

This is only a part of the additional minority views that we have expressed, which show what has happened in some of these camps. I am sure that the proponents of the bill, those who are supporting the administration's policy, will say that these are isolated examples, and, therefore, we cannot criticize the whole management because of these examples. However, these are graphic examples of some of the problems that are occurring in the war on poverty.

What has happened in Colorado?

The problem in Colorado has been one of local dissatisfaction and opposition to the establishment of programs as well as an overall sense of frustration at the lack of results accomplished by the war on poverty.

In Denver, the capital and largest city in my State, there has arisen a consensus of opinion to the effect that little, if anything, has been done in the way of actual combat against poverty.

The Denver Post recently reported that 10 of the community action programs proposed for Denver had been lost

in the shuffle of OEO in Washington. The newspapers said that much of the blame was due to Denver personnel, but added that "OEO's dealings with Denver have done very little to sustain the reputation of OEO Director Sargent Shriver as a man who can cut redtape, minimize delay, and get swift action."

As a result of the lack of progress of the antipoverty effort in Denver, there has developed within the poverty program a struggle to fire the present director, a former Democratic State legislator. I served with him while I was a member of the State legislature. This dispute has served to further check the efforts of antipoverty shock troops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point several articles from Denver newspapers which document this situation. In the process of doing this I should like to read a few headings:

Denver "Losing" War on Poverty.
Mayor Wants New Chief for Poverty War.
Valdez Favored To Head City's Poverty War.

That is another indication of the fight I was talking about with reference to who is to operate the program. Apparently Mr. Allen, the former State legislator, is about to be fired, even though I know his own heartsick attitude and his efforts in trying to do something for this program.

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

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, June 20, 1965]

DENVER LOSING WAR ON POVERTY

For several months, this newspaper has been making a careful study of the problems of Denver's war on poverty, an organization which was formed nearly a year ago at the initiative of Mayor Currigan.

We have been attempting to find out why this organization, which was one of the first to start in the Nation, has had so little success in bringing the benefits of the Federal antipoverty program to the assistance of the poor in the Denver area.

As of this writing, none of the 10 community action projects proposed by Denver's war on poverty has yet won the approval of the Federal antipoverty agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

Most of these project proposals, involving about $1.5 million, have been sent back to Denver for revision—some of them several times—and the revised versions are still stalled at various levels of the administrative machinery in Washington.

In addition, the Federal administrative grant, which has financed the operation of Denver's war on poverty to this point, is about to run out and the organization has not sent in its application for more funds in time to meet the deadline.

Only extraordinary action by the Office of Economic Opportunity can save the Denver organization from having to close down altogether for lack of funds.

The blame for Denver's poor progress in the poverty war, as this newspaper is able to appraise it, has to be shared by Washington and Denver, with Denver itself bearing the larger share.

The delays and confusion in the handling of Denver's proposals by OEO in Washington are, to some extent, understandable in a new agency just getting organized and determined to exercise caution in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

But, at the same time, OEO's dealings with Denver have done very little to sustain the reputation of OEO Director Sargent Shriver as a man who can cut redtape, minimize delay, and get swift action.

The major trouble, however, has rested in Denver. The staff of Denver's war on poverty has been slow and inefficient. Its relations with the war on poverty board, and its chairman, have been unsatisfactory.

Project proposals have been poorly prepared and budgetary and administrative details have not been properly attended to. The work of the office has been poorly organized, and deadlines and priorities have been neglected.

This newspaper takes no pleasure in criticizing the hard-working and dedicated individuals who have labored unsatisfactorily in the poverty program to this date.

But we do fear that the poor of Denver will continue to be shortchanged unless the program can be put on a more efficient basis. Whatever the faults in Washington, the faults in Denver are badly in need of correction.

We believe the responsibility for getting the Denver poverty war back on the track rests with Mayor Currigan, whose alertness and enterprise brought Denver into the poverty field, in the first place, far ahead of other cities.

It is not the mayor's fault if the organization he brought into being has failed to do the job. But it will be mayor's fault if the existing inefficiency is allowed to continue and Denver's poor do not get the help they need.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, July 24, 1965]

MAYOR WANTS NEW CHIEF FOR POVERTY WAR

(By Del W. Harding)

Mayor Currigan believes Robert E. Allen should be replaced as executive director of Denver's War on Poverty Inc. (DWOP).

Currigan was out of town Friday but his administrative assistant, Bill Miller, said "The mayor feels in 7½ months the program hasn't moved as it should."

Miller said Currigan believes problems with Washington, D.C., redtape also have slowed the local program, but said the mayor believes Allen's leadership at the local level has been indecisive.

Allen, 41, a former Democratic State senator, was named to the $12,000-a-year post last December 15. The appointment was made by the DWOP board of directors, headed by Dr. James Galvin.

The board reportedly will meet soon to consider whether Allen should be retained. The mayor is on the 35-member board.

Miller said the mayor has suggested loaning Denver Welfare Manager Bernard Valdez to DWOP to act as temporary director if Allen resigns.

Allen said neither the mayor nor any other board member told him they are dissatisfied with his work.

He confirmed, however, that there has been friction between himself and Dr. Galvin.

He said he doesn't believe Dr. Galvin has given the time to the chairmanship post that he should, and that the local program has suffered as a result.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 23, 1965]

VALDEZ FAVORED TO HEAD CITY'S POVERTY WAR

Mayor Tom Currigan said Friday he will propose that Bernard Valdez, director of the Denver Welfare Board, be named to replace Robert E. Allen as executive director of War on Poverty, Inc.

Currigan said he would be willing to lend WOP the services of Valdez for no more than 60 days until the 35-member board of directors can find a new executive director.

Allen said he will not give up his post without a fight.

Allen, 41, said he has allies on the WOP board to defend him against the attempted ouster.

One of his allies, he said, is Herrick S. Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council.

Roth, said Allen, has prepared a letter for distribution among the board members saying that "our actions should not be based on the recommendation of the mayor or his citizen chairman (Dr. James Galvin)."

Roth was not available for comment on the letter which Allen claimed was given to him by Roth for his information.

"I am not at this moment of the opinion," Allen quoted Roth as stating in his letter, "that Bob Allen has been given the proper administrative opportunity to determine whether or not he can fulfill the responsibility of executive director."

DR. GALVIN BLAMED

Roth was quoted by Allen as urging the board members to "avoid political maneuvering" and instead "act on the basis of our own judgments."

There was no doubt that Allen blamed Dr. Galvin for instigating the move to remove him as executive director.

He said Dr. Galvin had never contacted him to notify him of any "dissatisfaction with my work."

The Denver Post also had been unable to contact Dr. Galvin. Attempts to reach him Thursday, when rumors of the movement to remove Allen became known, and again Friday, failed.

COULDN'T BE REACHED

"He's out of the city," a spokesman at the Job Opportunity Center, 1360 Speer Boulevard, said Friday when the second attempt was made to reach him.

Reports that Dr. Galvin would step down as board chairman accompanied those that Allen's ouster would be sought.

Allen claimed Friday that "dissatisfaction" with Dr. Galvin as chairman dated back to before he (Allen) became executive director last December.

He said Dr. Galvin, a Denver psychiatrist, had not given as much time to his job as he should because of "conflicting activities."

Dr. Galvin, in addition to conducting his private medical practice, also is a Curriganappointed member of the Denver Board of Health and Hospitals.

"I believe it is up to the War on Poverty board to name a chairman who can give adequate time and leadership to the job," Allen said. "That leadership has been lacking."

Mrs. E. Ray Campbell, a member of the board, said she believed a stronger leadership is needed in the WOP staff—leadership to pull together the various elements in the community.

However, she said she was opposed to hasty action by the board in obtaining this goal.

One report that Allen had failed to communicate successfully with minority groups in formalizing WOP projects was denied by Rudolph (Corky) Gonzales, a member of the board and a spokesman for Denver's Spanish-American population.

HEAR BOTH SIDES

But Gonzales, like Mrs. Campbell, refused to take sides in the dispute.

"I want to hear both sides of the story before I make any comment," he said. "His administration capacity appears to me to be the only issue."

The move to seek the removal of Allen, the Post learned, began last Tuesday when Dr. Galvin and other members of the eight-member executive board called a meeting of the full board for Thursday night.

The board was to be asked to remove Allen and replace him with Valdez. However, the meeting was canceled after a check of the bylaws showed 7 days' notice was required, it was learned.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some other problems Coloradans have had with OEO and the poverty program. I have received a great deal of mail from my constituents complaining of the bungling in many phases of the war on poverty. A resident of Boulder, Colo., wrote to tell me that he had applied for work on a Job Corps conservation camp in September of last year. On January 14 of this year I asked the Office of Economic Opportunity to inform me what action was taken on the application. On April 8, 1965, after I had again written demanding an answer, I received a letter with a one-sentence rejection of my constituent's application. I do not understand why someone applying for a simple staff position with the Job Corps should have to wait 7 months for the mere courtesy of a reply.

I have also received a number of letters vehemently opposing the establishment of Job Corps training centers in several communities in Colorado. Many residents of these cities and towns have read of the violence and immorality that have occurred in other Job Corps centers and so have put pen to paper to state their opposition to establishment of Job Corps centers. Many have done so even before there was any real movement underway to put such centers in their communities. They were afraid that the centers would move in whether they wanted them or not.

These letters thus point to the danger that, with the undesirable notoriety of the camps noted in the minority views, we may well find such widespread opposition to the Job Corps that no community will consent to the establishment of a center nearby.

As a final example of the problems that have arisen from the operation of the war on poverty by OEO, I should like to call Senators' attention to a letter written by a resident of Denver, Colo. She is well qualified to speak on the subject, for she was a member of VISTA, the domestic peace corps, until she resigned from the program in protest over the mismanagement. She gives a detailed and lucid account of the waste of enrollee's time and taxpayers' money in the operation of VISTA. These letters, written by a former frontline combatant in the war on poverty, should be read by all who have the responsibility of passing legislation on the war on poverty.

I ask that these letters be entered into the RECORD for all to read.

Mr. President, before doing so, I believe it would be interesting to read a few excerpts from these letters. The first one is dated July 2, 1965, and reads:

DEAR SIR: This may be a little different letter than you are used to getting, or again it may be often and gain nothing.

I'm wondering just how this war on poverty and the VISTA programs are supposed to be helping the war on poverty.

You see my experience is not just hearsay, I've been a part of both programs.

Denver's war on poverty is only a setup for a few high paid people to keep doing better for themselves both monetarily and politically, these 50 who were to get training to take jobs that never materialized, while just the money they were paid was enough to have kept a family for quite awhile. The big people of the program didn't give a darn whether it worked or not, in fact, to cite an instance, the first night of class I told Dr. Hyman for a couple of weeks I'd probably have to miss a couple of nights. His reply, "It really makes no difference to me. I'm an employee of the university."

The letter goes on in that style. When she went to Chicago to go into training she received the same sort of treatment. The letter is signed by Miss Dorothy Lindsay. I do not know her. I wrote Miss Lindsay and asked her whether I could use her letter publicly in the debate. She replied on July 20, 1965:

MR. DOMINICK: Thank you for your letter of July 13. By all means use my letter. I am so tired of people griping about things as they happen but when they are given the opportunity to try and do something about it they lose interest, so please use it any way you think it can be of help.

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

DENVER, COLO.,
July 2, 1965.

DEAR SIR: This may be a little different letter than you are used to getting or again it may be often and again nothing.

I am wondering just how this war on poverty and the VISTA programs are supposed to be helping the war on poverty.

You see my experience is not just hearsay, I have been a part of both programs.

Denver's war on poverty is only a setup for a few high paid people to keep doing better for themselves, both monetarily and politically, these 50 who were to get training to take jobs that never materialized, while just the money they were paid was enough to have kept a family for quite awhile. The big people of the program did not give a darn whether it worked or not, in fact to cite an instance, the first night of class I told Dr. Hyman for a couple of weeks I'd probably have to miss a couple of nights, his reply "It really makes no difference to me. I am an employee of the university."

Then there is VISTA, my—the money wasted. I am wondering how some of the group I was with in Chicago answered their applications. When I arrived there was such a lack of communication I missed a part of the first meeting. The desk clerk told me what room to go to, I went; the receptionist told me the room wouldn't be ready for an hour and I could wait in the lounge, there I sat about 45 minutes, then a group came out of a room, I noticed a VISTA folder, I asked if they were in VISTA. "Ha, ha" the little gal said, "We are VISTA," so I joined the group. Sixty people, one man 77, myself 41, the other 58 college kids, boy—they are having a ball in Chicago.

Assignments? You go around and talk to people, you draw a map. My assignment was a little different, I actually had a schedule 5 days a week. I did five different things, always being told to build friendships with these disadvantaged people. How, may I ask, do you build friendships or even good will when you have been told to find out what these people need, write out your report, then you are told to "just put it in the drawer." Well, I know enough about the disadvantaged to know if there is anything they do not need it is more stupid, hollow promises.

Thursday in our group discussions I was finally able to get a straight answer from our group leader. I asked if all this mixup was lack of communication. "Yes," she said, "I think you've hit it on the head, the Friday before you all came we were told we'd have 8 people, then Saturday we were told 45, then finally we ended up with 60, so really we weren't ready for so many." Now maybe I don't know enough about Government spending but it seems to me it would have been much more efficient to have notified those volunteers to postpone their coming for a week or two to give the people in Chicago time to sufficiently prepare for them, than to set us up for the planning period.

I couldn't stand the inefficiency any longer, I asked to be relieved, I came home, others have the same idea. If there are 15 people who stick out their year I'll be very much surprised.

Now when I get back to Denver, I read in the paper the war on poverty heads are getting big raises, guess I'll go down Tuesday and try and get on the gravy train, if they ask for my credentials I'll tell them I have no conscience on accepting Government money.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LINDSAY.

P.S.—I am sending copies of this letter to several people who I hope are interested enough to read it.

DENVER, COLO.,
July 20, 1965.

MR. DOMINICK: Thank you for your letter of July 13. By all means use my letter. I'm so tired of people griping about things as they happen but when they are given the opportunity to try and do something about it they lose interest, so please use it any way you think it can be of help.

I thought you might be interested in a paragraph from a letter I received from the OEO Office written by Gary L. Price:

"I am sorry that you found the training so disappointing and regret you did not stay on for the full 6 weeks. Often at the beginning of a program trainees are skeptical of the benefits to be derived. From my experience, however, I have found once training is completed the individual has a better perspective from which to evaluate the program. It is usually at this point that the benefits become clear."

Suppose I would have stayed, that would have been $252 more of the Government money I could have spent, suppose 10 people drop out at the end of the 6 weeks, see what amount this would be. Of course $2,000 or $3,000 is really just a drop in the bucket to what is being spent on this program.

One girl was sent home from Chicago the end of the first week, out drinking every night and one night came in and vomited all over the elevator pilot.

I sent a copy of the first letter to Mayor Tom Currigan, parts of his letter in reply: "Your letter of July 3 was quite disturbing. I have taken the liberty of referring it to the board of directors of Denver's war on poverty. I have suggested to the chairman of the board, Dr. James Galvin, that perhaps the board would like to invite you to a meeting to see if there is not a solution to some of the shortcomings that you mentioned. I have great hopes for the war on poverty program. There is a great need in America today for the type of assistance available through war on poverty funds. Like you, however, I don't wish to see funds wasted. I am sorry you have become disillusioned with the program and I hope that our board of directors can help clear up some of the misunderstandings you have."

Mayor Currigan's letter was dated July 12 and as yet I have heard nothing from Dr. Galvin or the board of directors.

I am anxious for Denver's medical proposal to be funded, this is the one I became interested in during the training program here in Denver. I personally think this project will help more on this war on poverty. You and I both know when a person is getting the medical attention they need they are more able to face up to their problems.

I hope some day in some way these things can be worked out and that people who want to do better for themselves will be able to do so.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LINDSAY.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I believe this can be of great help in showing the problems of administration inherent in this program. It should be noted that the problems to which I have referred in my discussion today are by no means unique.

As I mentioned earlier, Colorado has been lucky enough not to have such difficulties as occurred in St. Petersburg, in Indiana, and in Oregon. The minority views submitted with the report on the bill point out some of the problems. The speeches in this and in the other Chamber in Congress further detailed them.

The great tragedy of this situation is that many of these problems could have been avoided when Congress first created the war on poverty or when the Office of Economic Opportunity first established the programs. These problems are not ones that will always be with us—they can be avoided.

A great deal could be accomplished merely by putting the structure of the OEO in some sort of order. Confusion in the ranks is to be expected when the $1 billion war on poverty is directed by a part-time general. Again, as we said in our minority views, we are speaking of a program which is operated by a part-time general with a colossal number of brass hats, and with very few Indians to operate the program, with no tactical or visible successes, and with very little ammunition with which to shoot.

It seems incredible to me that we should have an organization in which the ratio of supervisors to workers is 1 to 18. In the Department of Agriculture the ratio is 1 to 500; in the Defense Department it is 1 to 1,000. But in the program about which we are speaking there is a ratio of 1 to 18. So, as I have said, there are more brass hats than Indians with which to fight the war.

Adding to the confusion is the large number of supergrade positions combined with a comparatively small staff. It is easy to see why the antipoverty program has run into trouble when we consider that a large part of the day-to-day work is done not by regular employees, but by highly paid consultants who are brought in to handle the burdens that the supergrade poverty czars seem too busy to handle.

I shall have a little more to say about the consultants at a later date. It is my recollection that there was one in the State of New Jersey who was being paid a consultant's fee of approximately $100 a day while he was holding down two public service jobs for which he was receiving a salary. I shall document that case at a later date when I have the material again. I do not have it in front of me.

Speaking about New Jersey, while I am at it—and I do not mean to be kicking all the States around; what I am doing is talking about the OEO administration of programs within the States—the minority views, again on page 59, point out the following:

In New Jersey the State director of the Office of Economic Opportunity receives $25,000 a year, a higher salary than is paid to any member of the New Jersey Governor's cabinet. One county in New Jersey received a grant of $67,000, but unfortunately the poor did not benefit greatly from the grant. All but $15,000 of the grant was earmarked for salaries and administrative expense.

So here we have a grant of $67,000, $52,000 of which goes for administrative expenses and salaries. It strikes me that if anyone could ever say that there is a program administratively designed to trickle down funds to the poor, the program about which we are speaking is certainly one of those.

Again the minority views state:

In Indiana OEO paid salaries 25 percent higher than those paid by the State for comparable positions in public schools. One final comparison should be drawn. One of two brothers from an Indiana community graduated first in his high school class. He is now serving under enemy fire in Vietnam for $78 per month. The other brother dropped out of school, taking the occasion to beat up his mother and his teacher. He is now being paid $200 monthly by the Job Corps for running a power mower.

I submit that that is a peculiar way in which to wage a war on poverty. In one case there is a young man who has done a fine job. He has gone through school and is now serving his country in Vietnam as an enlsited man, receiving $78 a month. At the same time the Government pays to a dropout $200 a month for the privilege of operating a powermower. If there is anything more inconceivable than saying that this type of program will cure poverty, I do not know what it is. What it really does is to provide an incentive for young people to drop out of school and do similar things, so that the dropout can get money under the program.

Many of these problems could have been avoided if only OEO had applied a little old fashioned commonsense. But I suppose it is difficult to ask OEO to use commonsense when Congress, at least in its committee work, has not displayed very much of it in dealing with H.R. 8283.

The action of the House of Representatives in providing for overriding the Governors' veto provision was very unfortunate. What the House did was to say that we are going to eliminate the Governors' veto. We will not eliminate it entirely. A Governor could veto the action of OEO, but the action would be only illusory because the Director could override the veto.

The Senate committee was not satisfied with that provision. The committee went further and eliminated entirely the provision for a Governor's veto. We cut it out. That action makes no sense. It was carried out in the face of a resolution adopted, with only one dissenting vote, at the Governors' Conference in Minneapolis, providing that the provision for a veto by the Governors as it was in the original law be left untouched.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Normally, the Governors' Conference, which the Senator has mentioned, is attended by practically all the Governors of the 50 States. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Colorado to say that there came before the recent convention of Governors, made up of Republicans and Democrats, the issue as to whether or not the Economic Opportunity Act should contain a provision which would give the Governors the right to veto a program?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the judgment of those Governors?

Mr. DOMINICK. If I may interpolate, what was done was to have a resolution submitted to the Governors urging Congress to retain the veto right which was in the bill before it was amended by the House, and before our committee worked on it. The judgment of the Governors, in assembly at Minneapolis, with only one dissenting vote, was that the original right of veto by the Governors should be retained. A copy of the telegram reporting the action was submitted to our committee, but the majority of the committee chose not to follow that recommendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Colorado remember what the relative proportion of the political affiliation of the Governors of our Nation is at the present time?

Mr. DOMINICK. Speaking as a Republican, I am afraid that the proportion is heavier on the Democratic side than it is on the Republican side. The resolution was submitted by Governor Sawyer, who was, I believe, Chairman of the Governor's Conference. He is the Governor of the State of Nevada, and a Democrat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My belief is that the overwhelming preponderance of Governors is on the side of the Democrats at the present time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But whether they are Republicans or Democrats, all but one voted for the retention of the power to veto a program in the Governors.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the information we have received by wire from Governor Smylie of Idaho.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that it has always been felt by the Governors that programs of Federal aid are not to circumvent the duly selected governmental authority of a State, but should be channelized through the States. Can the Senator from Colorado tell me the reasoning that has been advanced for the retention of the veto power in the Governors?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that with accuracy, I can tell the Senator from Ohio, who is a distinguished friend, that the main impetus of the proposal was the result of a fight between a particular Senator and a particular Governor.

The Senator and the Governor were from the same State. But the other

argument that was raised, other than that, was that a Governor should not have any right to determine whether a Federal program should operate within his State.

This was the basis upon which the committee acted, I presume.

For the knowledge of the Senator and because it will add to the force of this debate, I shall read the resolution which was presented to the Governors' Conference and the telegram which was received by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The telegram came from Governor Smylie, of Idaho.

The resolution reads as follows:

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Whereas under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, although a number of antipoverty programs and projects bypass the State level, a substantial portion of such programs and projects require clearance through a Governor's office and are subject to the Governor's veto; and

Whereas the gubernatorial clearance and power to veto provide a measure of coordination and orderliness in the administration of those programs to which they apply; and

Whereas with respect to those programs and projects not requiring clearance through a Governor's office and not subject to his veto, negotiations and contracts are between the Office of Economic Opportunity or a delegate Federal agency and the local applicant, which may be a nongovernmental agency, thus producing conditions of chaos; and

Whereas legislation has been approved by the U.S. House of Representatives to permit the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to override a Governor's veto disapproving a program or project to be undertaken in his State by any public agency or private organization with respect to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, the community action program and the adult basic education program, to all of which programs the veto presently applies, if, in the opinion of the Director, the application for the program is consistent with the law and would further the purposes of the act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Governor's Conference express its firm opposition to any diminution of the power of a Governor to veto proposed projects and programs under the Economic Opportunity Act and respectfully request the Congress to preserve intact the relevant provisions of the current law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress.

We then received a telegram dated July 29, 1965, which reads as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Governors Conference at Minneapolis adopted resolution by Governor Sawyer, of Nevada, expressing firm opposition to any proposal reducing the power of the Governor in acting on antipoverty programs.

There was only one dissenting vote.

Regards,

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Governor of Idaho.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the Governors' Conference, which I attended for 10 years, although not 10 consecutive years, the principle was constantly followed that as to Federal-aid programs the circumvention of a Governor or other State officer ought not to be tolerated.

The argument was that channeling the program through the State executive office would prevent duplication; that it would keep the central office informed and would prevent confusion.

That was the principle, and constantly the argument was made that the Governor should insist that the programs clear through the State office.

I observe that in the telegram it is pointed out—and it is a fact—that this program can be given to and directed by nongovernmental agencies.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It can be given to municipalities and counties. Does it include also the States directly? I assume it does.

Mr. DOMINICK. The States do not operate directly in this field.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the significant aspect is that it can go to existing nongovernmental agencies and even new ones formed to implement the program.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is exactly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The telegram that was sent and the resolution that was adopted by the Governors point that out.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is true. Two factors make that clear.

The distinguished Governor of New York, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, had to threaten to veto some of the programs in order to be able to have any voice whatsoever in determining how the program would be organized and how it would affect neighborhoods and communities within his State.

The same thing happened with respect to the distinguished Governor of Texas, Hon. John Connally. He, too, had to threaten a veto to maintain control of the program, so that it would have coordination and not be turned into a blatant political move. In many cases this is exactly what happened.

It will be noticed by reading the minority views that many Democratic mayors of cities have asked, "How are we supposed to run our cities when all these people are recommending to the poor that they should march on city hall?"

They wanted to prepare a resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. We have had a somewhat similar experience in Pennsylvania. Some of the officials or other persons connected with the poverty program, including Mr. Charles W. Bowser, executive director of Philadelphia's Antipoverty Action Committee apparently felt it to be a part of their responsibility to exert pressure and organize a big march on the Governor of our State, whose record for progressive legislation in the public interest is as high as that of any other Governor in the Nation.

As an article in today's Washington Post points out, Mr. Bowser, whom I respect personally, not long ago was extremely active in leading a band of petitioners to Harrisburg to object to the Governor's veto of two items in a welfare bill.

In Pennsylvania the Governor may exercise an item veto; that is, he has the right to veto separate items in an appropriation bill without invalidating the entire bill.

Mr. Bowser went to Harrisburg with many other people in buses, allegedly paid for out of antipoverty program funds, although that is denied by Mr. Sargent Shriver.

They held a caucus in the Democratic caucus room of the house of representatives in the State capitol. They prepared their protest there and, still politically motivated, moved in on the Governor, demanding, "Show your face," so as to create the impression that the Governor refused to see them. Actually the Governor had not even been asked to see them. He did agree to see representatives of the group, including Mr. Bowser, and saw them.

Their complaint was that the Governor had vetoed items providing $10 million and $7 million in the public assistance and child welfare areas, in which the Governor's program is and has been as generous as the constitutional limits allowed.

Under the Pennsylvania constitution, appropriations in excess of the constitutional bar of deficit spending are of doubtful legality, so the Governor felt obliged to veto those items.

As the Governor pointed out:

If I had the money for these programs, you could come back and talk about them.

I question whether or not the attempt to say that the buses were not paid out of poverty funds really holds water, because the way these activities are conducted is to advance the money from the poverty program. Funds are advanced on expense accounts to officials of the antipoverty program. Then, they can pay for the buses out of the expense account.

This may have been one way in which they did it. However, what they did was to confuse their responsibility under the poverty program with their political desire to embarrass the Governor of Pennsylvania. The difficulties that we have had with the program—and I have supported the program—is the problem of getting the money to the poor.

Under the Poverty Act, in effect the money goes to the poor by way of the politicians. Anybody knows that, if it is a program to help the poor by way of the politicians, the politicians will scrape as much of the cream off it as they can. Anybody holding a job, that I know of—and I do not know them all—is holding his job under the program at a considerable increase in the amount of money over what he received in his previous job. They are all politicians.

I stated to a labor meeting today, "You supply the assistance to the Democrats in Philadelphia, particularly by your votes. However, when the poverty program comes along, do you get the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth jobs?" No, Mr. President, the jobs are given to political hacks, except for the top man,

Charles Bowser. Mr. Bowser is doing a good job. However, he should not have gone up to Harrisburg to embarrass the Governor of the State and confuse his poverty program responsibilities and his political desires.

The poverty program does not require that one be a Democrat or Republican. It requires that one be poor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the people who are supposed to get the jobs do not get them. I appreciate the contribution that the Senator has made to the discussion today.

The minority report again points out, as I mentioned before, and want to verify, that:

Time and again we have heard protests that the Office of Economic Opportunity was bypassing either local governments of the poor in establishing local programs. Early in June of this year a group of big city mayors attempted to get the U.S. Conference of Mayors to approve a resolution highly critical of OEO. The proposed resolution would have accused OEO of "trying to wreck local government by setting the poor against city hall." The resolution, drafted by two Democratic mayors of big cities, was stopped at the last minute at the urging of the administration. The mayor of Syracuse pointed out that in addition to his other problems the poor in that city were being "urged to storm city hall."

These are some of the problems that we are facing. I believe that what the Senator just said with respect to the head man in Philadelphia is applicable to what has been going on in Denver.

We had in charge of the program there, as I said earlier, a former State legislator, a Democrat. I know him quite well. He is a highly dedicated man for this type of work. However, with all the people he has working with him, he has not been able to put together a single program that has been worth a hoot. They are yelling for his head. He is the one who will be kicked out.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. The purpose of the antipoverty program is to help the poor. One of the ways to help the poor is to make jobs available to them. Another way is to work with the city, the county, and the State administrations in administering other programs of assistance.

The provision for turning over the administration of the program to local, nongovernmental agencies is having the effect of freeing those agencies from any responsibility to governmental units. They are deciding, with some irresponsibility, I believe, to use that freedom from responsibility to storm city hall, to storm State legislatures, and to storm the Governor's office in each State with a politically conceived protest march that may be suggested to them.

They are harming the poverty program. They are showing the whole country that they are more interested in political advantage and political jobs for political hacks than in carrying out the responsibilities under the program.

When I support a program in a State, I support it in the belief that it will be honestly implemented and fairly administered, and that it will be done without political overtones. That has not been the activity pursued in the poverty program. I am raising a warning signal at this time.

If the distinguished Senator from Colorado would permit me, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is perfectly agreeable.

POVERTY AND POLITICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD the article to which I alluded earlier entitled "Inside Report: Poverty and Politics," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak and published in this morning's Washington Post.

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

INSIDE REPORT: POVERTY AND POLITICS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just how antipoverty funds can find their way into partisan political action can be seen in a seemingly trivial incident recently outside the office of Gov. William Scranton in Harrisburg, Pa.

While the legislature debated a motion to override the Governor's veto of an appropriation in an adjoining wing of the capitol, 200 demonstrators supporting the bill were stationed at the door of the Governor's office chanting: "Show your face, show your face."

What makes this demonstration far from trivial in importance is the fact that the leader of the demonstrators (all of whom had bussed their way to Harrisburg from Philadelphia) was Charles Bowser—the aggressive head of the Philadelphia antipoverty committee.

Poverty officials in Washington had no knowledge whatever that Federal poverty funds were used to pay for the buses. But in Harrisburg, several of the demonstrators openly admitted that the Philadelphia antipoverty committee financed the political expedition.

Strangely enough, the target of this particular lobbying expedition was the "item veto" by the Governor of an issue that had no connection whatever with the Federal antipoverty program. The two items vetoed by the Governor, adhering to a constitutional ban on deficit spending, were $10 million for public assistance and $7 million for child welfare.

For months the Governor and Democratic State legislators had jockeyed back and forth over these and other appropriations. The Democrats stayed up nights seeking some way to embarrass Scranton politically and make him look like an ivy league scrooge.

When Scranton confronted the Democrats with his veto, the antipoverty fighters in Philadelphia organized their excursion to Harrisburg to coincide with the legislative debate to override the veto.

Significantly, the demonstrators' first stop in the capitol was not the Governor's office but the Democratic caucus room. They held a rally there and heard Democratic representative Joshua Eilberg, the house majority leader, deliver an emotional attack on Scranton.

The demonstrators next moved into the ornate, mahogany corridor outside the Governor's office and began chanting, "Show your face."

In due course, Bowser and a couple of other demonstrators were invited into Scranton's office (actually they never had asked for an appointment). Scranton again explained the constitutional reasons why he had to veto the two items. Whereupon the buses were loaded and returned to Philadelphia.

Sargent Shriver, the antipoverty chief, knew nothing about this until he received a telegraphed complaint on August 3 (the day of the demonstration) from Pennsylvania's secretary of state, John K. Tabor.

Acting on Scranton's orders, Tabor declared:

"We fully support the right and duty of the people, rich or poor, to support or oppose any State action, but we strongly object to antipoverty personnel, paid with Federal funds, mobilizing and leading such an effort."

Tabor noted that Shriver's own regulation No. 23 prohibits the use of poverty funds, "for any partisan political activity or to further the election or defeat of any candidate to public office."

Shriver's answer to Harrisburg, sent last Tuesday (August 10), denied that antipoverty funds financed the bus trip. Poverty dollars had been requested for the buses, his telegram said. This was rejected, he continued. Shriver stated strongly that he never would condone such use of poverty money.

But his reply skirted the question of Bowser's leadership in the demonstration. Bowser (who gets $17,000 a year) clearly was violating Shriver's regulation No. 23. (Bowser said privately later he felt it was his duty to lobby against the veto.)

Shriver, of course, cannot be held responsible for every infraction of regulation No. 23 in hundreds of projects in progress all over the country.

That's just the point. Both in the congressional act authorizing the program and in the administrative policy of Shriver's office, the dogma of "local control" is enshrined. Local leaders, sagacious or not, are given a free hand in dispensing a major Federal program. The ludicrous political expedition from Philadelphia to Harrisburg once again shows the danger of this policy.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania who has added a great deal to the colloquy.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I hope that they will study with some care the serious problem that we have outlined. I have tried to be as dispassionate as I can. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that, in discussing some of these things, I have tried not to make any accusations that have not been documented by something in my file. However, I shall say something that has not been documented as yet.

I was told on the telephone that the mayor of the city of Los Angeles has indicated that a part of the problem involved in their perfectly ghastly riot at the present time has been generated in part by activities of this nature under the program.

I shall try to obtain some verification of the mayor's accusation before I am through.

Many Governors have said that they must have the veto power in order to force the OEO to consult with appropriate State agencies before going ahead with these programs. They felt that the provision for the veto was the only means to obtain cooperation between the OEO and State agencies.

This phase of the argument concerning the veto was also brought up before the committee, but it was apparently overruled.

There is no reason why the veto power should be eliminated. The vast majority of the Governors want it. It is said that it is necessary in order to coordinate the program. There is objection to the action that has been taken by the House

in overruling their right to a veto. Now, we have eliminated it entirely despite the wishes of the Governors of the 50 States of the United States.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should think that the administrators and the sponsors of this program would want to provide for the intervention at some point of some responsible persons—in this case, the Governors—to keep such a program on the track. If I were among those responsible for this program, I should be very much afraid that the scandals and the marches and protest demonstrations which have occurred so far would cast such discredit on the program that it might have difficulty in being approved substantially in the form which the administration desires. This program is loaded with further possibilities for scandal. I predict that in the rest of this year and the coming year throughout the United States, in many large cities especially, there will be revelations of the most scandalous ineptitude, or worse, in the administration of this program.

Senators who are in charge of managing the bill ought to be very much concerned about having some right on the part of State Governors, or at least some agency, to step in and say, "Let us be very careful with what we are about to do." If that is not done, the poor will be set against the politicians. That is the last thing politicians want, because if the poor are set against them, the politicians will stop getting rakeoffs. As Montaigne said, "I speak truth, not so much as I could, but as much as I dare; and I dare more as I grow older."

We all know, as statesmen and politicians, if I may use the word in a reasonable sense, what is happening to the antipoverty program. Our warnings and cautions will be remembered next year as scandal after scandal will be written about on the front pages of newspapers, where, in this city or that city, all sorts of collusion, racketeering, high salaries paid, patronage feeding, and the promotion of hacks and incompetents, are going to lead the persons responsible for this program along a very stormy path. I promised Sargent Shriver, whom I know, that I would help with the program if it were made certain that politicians would be prevented from being put in the way of the poor. I plead with him, if he wants my help, to stop the headlong charges that people who criticize aspects of the program are necessarily obstructionists or that they do not have to pay attention to them.

Numbers are not so important, but there will be a time when they will be greater than some wish, and at that time the opportunity for correction in behalf of the people may have passed. I make these suggestions, not as one who is against the program, but as one who supports it.

The Senator from Colorado is right in pleading for the right of Governors to have the right of veto.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened to the Senator's speech with interest. It has been highly informative.

I voted for the Economic Opportunity Act because I believed as I believe now, that such a program is necessary to train and educate the young, and those who are older, to enable them to break from the cycle of poverty.

I shall vote to extend the program, but I will vote to amend the bill so that it will be more effective.

The Senator has detailed abuses. There have been failures in administration and some gross abuses. I do not believe we have experienced in Kentucky the type of abuse which has occurred in other States referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Colorado. There has been complaint in Kentucky about the establishment of so many offices and the selection of too many officials at high salaries. Also, the establishment of inflated wage levels by the Department of Labor is not good for recipients or the communities. It could remain in the programs, instead of moving into productive employment, and it could work hardships on community organizations wishing to participate and meet local needs.

The purpose of the program is good. What is needed is a willingness on the part of the administration to correct abuses and waste.

I would like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they should recognize mistakes and help to correct them.

If the President, the Congress, and Mr. Shriver do not make every effort to make these corrections, it will be tragic, in terms of waste of money. But most tragic will be the loss of a great opportunity for thousands of people, young and old, to break out of the awful cycle of poverty into the full stream of life.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Nelson amendment, which adds $150 million to title II, is designed to take those who are chronically unemployed and put them to work in gardening and landscape work not only in their local communities, as nearly as possible, but also to give them an opportunity to move outside. This is a program which I do not happen to be opposing in my amendment. The proposal deals with a part of the program which the Senator was discussing but it did not provide for any particular training. The Senator from Kentucky may have read, as I have, the recent article in Life magazine, in which industry itself has been having people from the welfare and unemployment rolls put through a training course for work in which they can engage as a result of their previous experience and degree of education, to try to give those people a motivation to support themselves and their families. They have not been completely successful, but, particularly in the Berkeley area of California, they have done a good job. It has been tried. This makes sense to me. It is not a program in which we are going to put $1,650 million of the taxpayers' money into programs that have been discredited in many places.

Mr. COOPER. I have read the Nelson amendment. It needs to be discussed. We need more information. But it is a public works amendment, as I see it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has discussed ably some of the defects in the program. I would like to have the Senator's judgment about the programs themselves—whether he considers them good programs, in substance and objectives, as I believe them to be.

For example, I refer to the community programs providing preparation for education for younger students, the work study program for students in college, and especially the work training program for high school students in their areas of residence.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is an excellent program, but I have some doubt about paying for it out of Federal funds. If it is designed to help the children continue their education, it is difficult for me to see why jobs should be made on campuses by way of picking up sticks, which is a part of the program, or cleaning latrines, which is another part of it, and paying them a dollar and a quarter an hour, as requested by the Department of Labor, and then requiring the schools to falsify their records submitted to the Government.

What they say now is, "You must pay $1.25 an hour for the work they are doing, but when you publicize what you are doing, include within it the number of hours when they are actually training and not being paid for work, and then you will reduce the total pay, so that it will come down to about 90 cents an hour, which is what you are paying ordinarily, and then you will not be driving out the people hired at that level."

Mr. COOPER. I am familiar with the practice. I raised the question with the Department of Labor, and was informed about the arrangement, which does not settle the problem and is not a faithful representation of the facts.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think it is plainly deceitful, and I said so.

Mr. COOPER. To go back to the programs, let me refer to the Head Start program, the work training program, and the work study program. The first is designed to help a child with no training at all—who is not prepared—to start school under equal circumstances. The work training and work study programs give young men and women an opportunity to stay in school or college. I do not see anything wrong with these programs. I believe they are good.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me tell the Senator what happened on the Head Start program in my own county in Colorado. Since no one had initiated any program, the county commissioners and the public school authorities got together and sent in an application for Head Start program work in the county.

Almost immediately, the Democratic district attorney, the only Democratic officeholder in my county, filed an application with someone else who was willing to come in on it with him, also a Democrat, not an officeholder but with some

influence in the community. Because of filing this conflicting application, no money of any kind is going into our county for this Head Start program. This is one of the problems I am talking about in the way of administration.

Mr. COOPER. I know. As to the substance of these programs, if properly administered, does the Senator not believe them to be helpful?

Mr. DOMINICK. Certainly I do.

Mr. COOPER. I believe they can be of great value.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to have the Senator's judgment as to the Job Corps.

Mr. DOMINICK. I cannot say that the Job Corps is a good program. I feel this way about the Job Corps and I am speaking frankly to my friend the Senator from Kentucky: I do not see how we can take a person who has problems because of his local environment and his educational ability and move him into a camp, train him for 6 months on how to saw wood, how to live in the open air, how to make trails through the forest, and then, when he returns to his home, expect him, by virtue of those 6 months or a year in the camp, to be able to pull himself up. I do not believe this is solving the problem.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that the Senator remembers the Works Progress Administration program and the old CCC camps.

Mr. DOMINICK. Indeed, I do.

Mr. COOPER. I was a local official in Kentucky at that time, and during the depression, I had the opportunity to observe the CCC program. Many boys went to the camps and came back interested in finding gainful employment and being good citizens. It seems to me that if the Job Corps program were followed by the other training programs taking boys and girls from the Job Corps who had been rehabilitated, and had developed incentive, the first stage in the Job Corps would then have valuable purpose and effect. I do not know whether an effort is made to follow through with boys and girls when they complete the course at the Job Corps centers. It is a little bit too early, probably. I doubt that many have completed their Job Corps enrollment at this time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Not very many, but the Senator has read examples in the minority report, and heard some of the things I mentioned in my talk today. The difficulty and the difference between this program and the CCC camps is that the latter were started when there was a massive unemployment situation and had a great number of young men and women who were perfectly fine persons, and educated, but who were simply unable to find a job. They were getting some training and some discipline and some motivation behind them.

At the present time, what we are dealing with is not a case of massive unemployment all over the country. I believe the Labor Department stated that we had the lowest unemployment rate, or the highest employment rate—I have forgotten which—in a long time; so we are dealing with a group which is of a somewhat different caliber from those who went to the CCC camps.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. I believe that the situation today is that some of those out of work are not prepared for work, either because of lack of education or character traits and that a program like this, properly administered, is necessary and can be very helpful; but it seems to me, that from this discussion—and the Senator from Colorado has rendered a fine service in provoking this debate—we have agreed that it demands better administration and a correction of abuses.

Mr. DOMINICK. I sincerely appreciate the contribution made by the highly distinguished Senator from Kentucky. It will be most helpful, I know, in general action on the amendments that will be proposed from time to time.

I do wish to point out quite clearly that in my amendment which I have sent to the desk, I have not tried to "gut" the program in any way whatsoever. What I have proposed is to hold the amount to last year's authorization for another year, before we again increase it, and to try to correct some of the problems while we are doing it. Last year's authorization still being $150 million more than what the actual appropriation was. Thus, we have much room to try and keep the program growing, even if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. I was very much interested in reading in the report, and also noted in the bill, the amendment which had been proposed, I believe by the Senator from Vermont, which was accepted by the committee, to create the advisory committee. The chairman would not be connected with the poverty administration, but would be an independent chairman, and would continuously oversee the program. I assume that one of those functions would be to discover abuses in administration, and also to determine whether it was actually working well or not. I see hope in that amendment, if it is finally accepted, and I hope very much that it will be.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would hope so, too. I was happy to support it. I may have another amendment, which would be most useful. I suspect that it will be presented by a member of the minority, in which, again, the effort will be to try to make the director of the program a full-time instead of a half-time director; namely, to have Mr. Shriver be either the head of the Peace Corps or the poverty program, but not both.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky made reference to the Advisory Council. I speak as a friend of the program. I wish it to succeed. I wished it to succeed last year. I expect to support it again. However, there are many examples of maladministration. The program is being used primarily for political purposes in many areas of the country. Some of us who support the program in principle wish to bring an end to this kind of administration. That is what we are trying to do.

Sometimes the suggestion is made that if we were to appropriate $2 billion instead of $1 billion, we would be able to do twice as good a job; and that if we were to appropriate $3 billion, it would be three times as good. Obviously, that is not true. The program has not been underway long enough to eliminate many of the "bugs" in administration. Thus, there is justification for restricting the funds to a level which can be spent efficiently.

Let me read from the last issue of the U.S. News & World Report, a quotation by a spokesman for the Illinois Farmers Union, which administers the antipoverty summer work facilities in 32 Illinois counties.

This spokesman said:

> A spokesman for the Illinois Farmers Union, which administers the antipoverty summer-work programs in 32 Illinois counties, said on August 10:
>
> "We definitely tried to go too fast on the thing. We put too many to work too fast. We put far too many to work in some places. There definitely was a misunderstanding on the local level."
>
> Said J. M. Watson, Illinois coordinator of the Neighborhood Youth Corps:
>
> "There was some political favoritism."
>
> The youths were being paid $1.25 an hour for 32 hours of work a week, the national rate in the Youth Corps.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A prominent Negro educator, Lester B. Granger, of Dillard University, New Orleans, called the antipoverty program a "slaphappy, sloppy, wasteful procedure." Mr. Granger told the National Urban League convention:
>
> "The fat should be taken out of it. We are going to waste two-thirds of the funds going into it, just like the New Deal. This doesn't mean I don't support it. If we get even one-third out of it, it would help."

Obviously these people are interested in making this program a success. I believe every Member of Congress should take that approach. Those of us who offer amendments are not trying to destroy the program. We are trying to strengthen it and make it work in order that it may achieve the objectives for which it is designed.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Vermont, who has put in a great deal of study and effort on this program and who, I know, will be offering some amendments in an effort to accomplish what he has referred to. Originally we were discussing the veto power. I should like to say a few words on that subject.

Despite the vote of a majority of the committee to eliminate the veto power on the ground that this was necessary, the fact is that the veto power has been used only four times in the lifetime of the war on poverty, and on two of those four occasions the veto was used to prevent the achievement of programs under contract with the National Farmers Union.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator is citing the infrequency of the use of the veto power granted the Governors as a justification for its retention.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. I was trying to show that the veto power has not been used by the Governors for the purpose of hampering the administration of the program, but has been used by the Governors, or the threat of the veto has been used in their efforts at coordination of existing local and State programs with the Federal program.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Rather than using the number of times that the veto has been threatened to thus coerce action, or the number of times it has been actually used, would not a better measure of its advisability be the soundness in principle of granting to the Governor of a State a power heretofore unprecedented, of vetoing a project of the Government of the United States within that State? It seems to me that the latter test is the proper one.

Mr. DOMINICK. One difficulty with that argument—and I said that was the basis used in committee, or at least I thought it was one of the basis, because there were others—is that this would be true if there were a Federal program with Federal direction all the way through. We are not dealing with that situation. We are dealing with local community groups, in many instances creating their own organization, and then obtaining Federal funds directly to support themselves. It seems to me that it is necessary to have some power by which a coordination of these programs can be required. If we do not have that there will be even more chaos than we have at the present time.

I hope the Senate will stand up for the principle of doing something to strengthen local-State government in this country.

We have been for far too long going in exactly the opposite direction. We are centralizing the Government in Washington and eliminating the State function. For instance, if someone wishes to get help on a sewage problem, he can go directly to the Cabinet officer instead of going to the local counsel. That is absolute nonsense.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I regret that our committee circumscribed the veto power of the Governors of the States. The Senator from Colorado presents at least in part my feeling on this subject. He will recall that we voted together on this issue.

Mr. DOMINICK. We are very happy to have the Senator's support.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel just as strongly today as I did during the consideration of the bill within the committee, that the exercise of the veto by a Governor in the administration of this program, which I endorse, is important to the cooperative and coordinated effort in this Federal-State effort to provide worthwhile work projects and to provide employment for needy persons. It is my belief that in the Senate we should have an opportunity to vote again on that matter, just as we did in the past and recently in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the help and support that we had on this matter from the Senator.

Mr. President, this bill has reached the floor of the Senate with a somewhat less than distinguished record of careful consideration by the Congress. The House hearings were only a farce. Only 1 out of the 10 antipoverty programs created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was discussed at any length. Moreover, in the hearings on this one program many accusations of confusion and political favoritism were brought up, whereupon the hearings were abruptly ended. The minority views submitted in the House summed the situation up in this way:

> The hearings were abruptly halted—over the protests of the minority members—on the grounds that time was of the essence. The chairman then proceeded with all deliberate speed to postpone executive sessions twice, presumably while conferring privately with the czar of all the impoverished. It was the publicly announced position of the chairman that drastic changes were required in the act.
>
> These changes were not forthcoming. Instead, the chairman received two letters from Mr. Sargent Shriver outlining administrative procedures to be followed by OEO which allegedly would give the poor adequate representation on the political-social committees which run community action programs and restrict excessive salaries. Presto chango—no changes need to be made now in the act; we have encountered the newest wrinkle in Great Society government: legislation by letter.
>
> The sorry truth is that a great congressional committee has betrayed the legislative process and in doing so has turned its back upon Americans who have been led to hope that a determined and imaginative war on poverty would be waged.

The Senate record is little better. The bill was reported on the Senate floor at noon on Friday last. On Friday afternoon it was made the pending business of the Senate. The committee print of the bill was not available until Saturday morning, or almost a day after the bill became pending business. The committee report, with its somewhat extensive minority, individual, and supplemental views, was not even made available to Senators until this morning. This is a highly important and controversial bill, and I fail to see why Senators should not be given an opportunity to review the bill and its report in order to prepare remarks and amendments.

This is the reason why I am glad to have had the discussion, because it has given us an opportunity to bring out many facts. I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee. I am somewhat disturbed over the speed with which the measure was reported and made the pending business before we had the bill or the report to read.

The U.S. Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. Its Members should at least be given the opportunity to see H.R. 8283 and its report in order that they be sufficiently informed to conduct the careful and extensive debate that this bill should receive.

The war on poverty has also been hidden behind a veil of bureaucratic secrecy. When we have tried to get anything done to improve the administration of the program, many of us have been derided as being in favor of downgrading the poor. It would be easy to sit back on this side of the aisle and rest easy while we put the proposed legislation through. It would be easy to sit back and wait, as my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania said, while the increasing scandal and political influence charges are brought up in the daily newspapers and the magazines. It would be easy to do nothing now and to reap political benefits when the poverty program blows up, as it inevitably will, unless there are changes in the program. But on our side, we believe in the fulfillment of our responsibility as legislators, and we shall propose a number of amendments to correct defects noted in the minority views. I hope that the majority will give the amendments the consideration which they deserve and will adopt some of them.

The dangers involved in continuing the poverty war in its present form are so great that the country can expect no less than full and careful review of the program and deliberate efforts made to try to improve on it.

One of the things that I cannot see is why in the world the Congress of the United States should double the amount of money involved in a program which is under attack from all corners, from Republicans and Democrats alike. If my amendment should be adopted, we would provide $150 million more than was authorized last year. I am sure I shall be accused of trying to gut the program. What I am saying is "Do not spend $1,650 million; spend $1,100 million. Cut half a billion off the program until we can have these problems ironed out."

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I should like to ask him several questions.

First, will the Senator tell us the amount of the appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity for the current year?

Mr. DOMINICK. The appropriation was $793 million for fiscal 1965.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator tell us the amount recommended by the administration early this year in its budget?

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe it was $1,500 million.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that that is absolutely correct.

In what amount is the proposed authorization now pending before the Senate?

Mr. DOMINICK. It is $1,650 million.

Mr. MILLER. So not only does the bill before the Senate propose to authorize even more than the administration asked for at the time the budget was submitted to the Congress early this year, but more than twice as much as the program authorized for the current year. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. The amount is more than twice as much as was appropriated for fiscal 1965.

Mr. MILLER. But we are talking about money that was actually appropriated for the current program.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Compared with that, the bill before the Senate would not only authorize more than the administration asked for last year but twice as much as was appropriated this year.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MILLER. Much has taken place since the administration submitted its budget. For one thing, the war in Vietnam has become worse, and the administration has been forced to come to Congress and ask for additional money.

Only the other day, following the President's decision to call up 50,000 more troops to go into South Vietnam, Congress was asked for an additional $1.7 billion for the war in Vietnam.

It seems to me that, of all times, this is the worst time to come before Congress and persist in increasing the amount presently appropriated for this activity. If anything, the program should be cut back; but failing in that, the program should be left where it is, and money that would go to this program would be used to provide proper equipment and support for our troops in Vietnam. Does not the Senator from Colorado agree with that?

Mr. DOMINICK. I certainly do. The amendment I sent to the desk would do just that. It would reduce the amount to last year's authorization—not the appropriation, but last year's authorization.

This would save $600 million that could be used to buy equipment which the Secretary of Defense has failed to supply up to now, in terms not only of our situation in Vietnam but of other sensitive spots around the world.

Mr. MILLER. I am pleased to learn of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and I shall support it.

I wish to reemphasize that I believe it is about time for Members of this body, if not the administration, to recognize that if we want to provide the morale and equipment and war materiel for our troops in South Vietnam to carry out successfully their very miserable undertaking, it would mean a great deal to them to know that we are giving priority to them, as distinguished from priority to an increase in what is being spent for this domestic program.

It is about time for us to recognize that we cannot fight a war in Vietnam and at the same time have all the other programs, let alone increase them, if we are to be successful in either case.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be offered; and I shall support it.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the helpful comments of the Senator from Iowa. He has done much work in a review of the difficult monetary situation that exists in this country.

I was interested in the comment of the Senator from Iowa on the Vietnamese situation. The minority views, on page 60—I referred to this in my earlier remarks—tell of one boy who finished first in his class at high school and is new serving in Vietnam for $78 a month. His brother, who was apparently a different breed of cat, beat up his mother and his teacher, dropped out of school, and is now in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, getting $200 a month. This is the most ridiculous thing of which I could possibly conceive. It is not only ridiculous; it makes me boil to think of it.

Mr. MILLER. That type of example has been repeated in newspaper columns in the past several months. This is another way in which the program will have an adverse impact on the morale of members of the armed services.

It is bad enough when they realize that they will have to leave their loved ones at home and subject themselves to imminent death, fighting a war far away from our shores—and it is a war in every sense of the word. Nevertheless, it is difficult for them to understand how the people back home, who were supposed to be supporting them, can tolerate such a program as will lead to an example such as the Senator has referred to.

But quite apart from that, assuming that the program was operated in a way in which there would be no waste, no extravagance, and no adverse impact on the morale of our Armed Forces because of the disparity between the pay received by them in Vietnam and the salaries of some of those who participate in this program, the fact remains that we cannot adequately support the military forces in South Vietnam and at the same time conduct programs like this.

I believe it would be a strong shot in the arm for our boys in South Vietnam if Congress were to decide that we are going to keep the poverty program where it is until the war in South Vietnam is over, and that then and only then would we properly consider increasing it along the lines of the bill now befor the Senate proposed.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Iowa. Since I was talking a while ago about objections in Colorado to the poverty program, I thought the Senator from Michigan might be interested in a letter from the publisher of the Denver Blade, the largest Negro newspaper in Colorado. Mr. Joe Brown, the publisher, wrote the letter to President Johnson, Representative POWELL, Councilman Caldwell, Mayor Currigan, Attorney Moore, four State legislators, both U.S. Senators, Representative ROGERS of Colorado, and State Senator George Broun. The letter is dated August 12 and reads:

THE DENVER BLADE,
Denver, Colo., August 12, 1965.

To President L. B. JOHNSON, Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Councilman ELVIN CALDWELL, Mayor TOM CURRIGAN, Attorney ISAAC MOORE, Hon. PALMER BURCH, Hon. EUGENE FOLEY, Hon. DAN GROVER, Hon. JOHN A. LOVE, Hon. GORDON ALLOTT, Hon. BYRON ROGERS, Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK, Senator GEORGE BROWN.

GENTLEMEN: Please rescue us from this Denver war on poverty. We, the Greater East Denver merchants, submitted a proposal for a small business development center over 2 months ago. We met on several occasions with Mr. Charles Bishop, who helped us rewrite the proposal. We have sat down with Mr. Clifford Rucker, of SBA, on two or more occasions. We are now told that both the board chairman, Dr. Gelvin and the Denver director of the program are either asked to resign or are going to be fired but won't quit, or that no one knows what to do.

We can't find either of them regardless of what time of day we call. The office under Mr. Allen is a maze of confused office help, all of which sounds like anything but efficiency.

Someone, somewhere please let us exercise some type of legal benefit from this program. My people represent the most depressed business area of the city. We are now told that the Denver war on poverty is holding our proposals, perplexed.

If you ask me, we shocked the city by taking the initiative. Can we have relief? Help. Help. Give us a way out.

Very sincerely,

J. BROWN,
Publisher.

On August 8, Mr. Brown wrote an editorial. In sending the editorial to us, he wrote in large handwriting, at the top of the page, "Help." The editorial is entitled "Woes of Poverty," and reads as follows:

WOES OF POVERTY

In the last couple of months we have heard cries of "Hang the mayor" coming from the Denver Democratic camp. We have read criticism of the poverty program, we have even read a dynamic absurd account of the program's progress in a local newspaper, and it appears to us that surely there must be something wrong when everybody is in a state of crossfire and different opinions about the program.

We have tended to criticize not only the program, but we go further, we don't even like the way the program is progressing. Never before have so few faked out so many and gotten away scot free. The citizens of Greater East Denver in an attempt to take the business initiative, submitted a SBDC proposal, a plan for the erection and functioning of a superbusiness, that in time would make all East Denver businesses successful. Not only has the program never reached Washington, the best comment on the subject has the proposal downtown in the Denver war on poverty director's desk, 2 months after the law said that the program had to be in Washington. We have cried for this program, we have written over 20 letters to Washington to everybody who has even a tinge of responsibility about their public life, yet nothing has happened; the mayor can't even fire the director. There is a limit to this phoney "pork barrel" and we think that the mayor is going entirely too far in allowing the "ole crowd" to gain control of the destiny of his political career again.

We say, "oust Allen" as director, clean that Denver war on poverty office out and do it now. And if someone else is really the mayor, just give us his name and we will make the same recommendation to him. Can't we get the plain and simple message through the heads of these Democratic poverty chiefs downtown, that there is a new order in our community and we will decide what is to happen to our progress.

Any attempt to steal our plans and install a "stupid politician" in the small business development center will be met with a protest and we mean a protest led by this institution. We think the mayor should oust the whole crowd and put the war on poverty in the hands of people for whom it was intended. Hell, the East Denver community can't even take the initiative. There are no

other SBDC proposals in the western region, what are we waiting for, war on poverty, someone else to develop one?

I state to the chairman of the committee, with all due respect, that this is the type of reaction the war on poverty is receiving in our State. This concerns the most depressed area in our city-county government.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to make the record complete, on page 38 of the report on the hearings, there is a recitation of the cost per person of teaching men and women in the Job Corps.

I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether it is his understanding that, for a 9-month period, the cost to teach each student in a conservation center is $4,482.65.

I am reading from a paper which was submitted to the committee by the officials of the Economic Opportunity Administration.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is my understanding. I have been exaggerating the figure. I have been saying that the figure is $4,500, which is $18 more than the amount discussed, I believe.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the cost to teach one male student at an urban center is $4,377.95.

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. In most colleges we can send a student for 4 years for that amount of money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The cost to teach a woman in an urban center is $4,483.37.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator for bringing these points up. This is a part of what I was trying to say to the Senator from Kentucky when he asked me whether I was in favor of these programs. I kept trying to say to him that I like the principle of the programs, but I do not like in any way the manner in which they are being operated. There is no excuse, evident to me, for obtaining that kind of a result from the expenditure of that much money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had a tabulation prepared of the cost of teaching a student in various Ohio colleges.

This tabulation covers Antioch, Ashland, Baldwin-Wallace, Bluffton, Bowling Green, Capital, Case, Central State, St. Mary's, Wooster, Defiance, Dennison, Fenn, Heidelberg, Hiram, Kent State, Kenyon, Mount Union, Muskingum, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Otterbein, Western University for Women, and Western Reserve.

It is shocking to see that we can send a student to one of these universities in Ohio at a cost, I should say, on an average of 50 percent of what it would cost to send a dropout to a job center.

Antioch College is rather widely known throughout the country. The cost of tuition there is $1,400. Board is $288. Room is $228. Books and supplies amount to $350. Extras amount to $56. I have not added those figures, but they would amount to approximately $2,300.

I shall take samples of the cost of each, and I shall mention those institutions of Ohio higher learning that are rather widely known throughout the country.

I mentioned Ohio Wesleyan, which is at Delaware, Ohio.

At Ohio Wesleyan, the tuition is $1,300. Board and room amounts to $800. Books and supplies amount to $75. That is a total cost of $2,200 to be taught at one of the outstanding colleges in the United States.

The cost at Kenyon, an institution that is probably 130 years old, and known for the excellence of its teaching and its facilities, is $1,400 for tuition, $510 for board, $320 for room, and $100 for books and supplies, and $100 for extras, making a total of $2,430.

I wish also to mention Oberlin College, which is considered one of the five best in the United States; at least, it is one of the five best in Ohio. The tuition is $1,350; board, $500; room, $400.

I shall not go through all the others except to mention Western Reserve University, which is nationally known. The tuition there is $1,050. Board is $510. Room is $340; books and supplies, $75.

Mr. President, back in April of this year, I made a statement of the costs of sending a girl to Radcliffe, compared to the cost of sending a dropout to one of the job centers. My figures were challenged by Sargent Shriver. I also mentioned the costs at Harvard. The result was a dispute, in which a statement was made by Harvard spokesman William Pinkerton. He challenged Shriver's figures. I read:

After a bit of detective work he reported that the tuition for a year at Harvard is $1,760, room and board $1,130. Personal expenses could add another $460. This total would be way below Shriver's claim that the cost of sending a student to Harvard was $6,410.

Pinkerton of Harvard made it clear, however, that Harvard wants no quarrel with Shriver, whose famous brothers-in-law, named Kennedy, are distinguished alumni.

My point is that the cost of sending a girl to Radcliffe or a boy to Harvard falls far below what it costs the taxpayers of the United States to manage and administer one job at one of these Job Corps centers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation of Ohio colleges, together with a recitation of figures dealing with Mount Hollyoke, Radcliffe, Harvard, Wellesley, and Vassar be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

	Tuition	Board	Room	Books and supplies	Extras	Total
Antioch	$1,400	$288	$228	$350	$56	
Ashland	992	750		100	80	
Baldwin Wallace	1,056	420	270	75	75	
Bluffton	770	370	240	100	54	
Bowling Green	400	700		100	25	
Capital	900	450	270	80	50	
Case	1,400	600	300	50		
Central State	70	426	300			
St. Mary's	600	550	250	100	80	
Wooster	1,320	500	340	80		
Defiance	915	432	[1] 180	80		
Denison	1,200	440	330	75	150	
Fenn	980	510	288	30	45	
Heidelberg	1,100	445	325			
Hiram	1,090	445	360	100	155	
Kent State	336	420	234	[1] 75		
Kenyon	1,400	510	320	100	100	$2,430
Mount Union	1,125	450	300	80		
Muskingum	1,090	510	220	100	70	
Oberlin	1,350	500	400	100	92	
Ohio Wesleyan	1,300	800		75		
Otterbein	850	450	250	40	110	
Western (Women)	1,375	1,100		[1] 150	25	
Western Reserve	1,050	510	340	75	59	+400-500
Harvard	1,520	620	475	100		2,715
Mount Holyoke	2,750	Included	Included		400	3,150
Radcliffe	1,760	1,170	Included	100	115	3,145
Wellesley	2,800	Included	Included		400-800	3,600
Vassar	1,500	1,300	Included	100	50	2,950

[1] And up.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that perhaps the reason why Mr. Shriver quoted Harvard as being that high is that he went to Yale Law School at the same time I did. I know him very well. He is a highly distinguished man.

I also point out to the Senator from Ohio that one of the highest costs in college is in medical school. The cost at a public medical school is $3,200. At a private medical school it is $3,981—well below what it would cost to send a youngster to the Job Corps. It still does not make any sense to me to have to pay so much money, so disproportionate to the result.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it can be said that it costs the taxpayers about $4,400 a year to teach one of the dropouts in the job centers for 9 months, as embraced in the bill. That sum would, of course, be shocking to the ordinary citizen—$4,400 to teach a dropout is unbelieveable.

PUBLICATION OF NAMES OF OWNERS OF RENTAL PROPERTIES UNDER TITLE I OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I send a bill to the desk for proper referral which has some bearing on the subject we are dealing with now. It is a thought which I have had in mind for some time. It is a bill which, if adopted, will require that the names of those who own property for

rent in slum areas must be published at least once a year in a public newspaper before they are entitled to any funds under title I of the Housing Act. I believe it is a good bill. It will encourage improvement in slum housing by making public the names of the landlords responsible for these horrible conditions. Up to the present time, the promotion of more effective building codes and code enforcement, as well as various tax reform studies, have been the primary weapons employed against urban blight. I support these measures, but I believe that the fear of widespread public notoriety will provide tremendous further impetus toward the goal of eradication of both urban and rural slum housing conditions.

Slum housing is sapping the strength of this country as a result of its impact on juvenile delinquency, discontent, racial strife, and social disintegration. Because of the low tax base in these areas, many communities are hard pressed to provide adequate utilities, streets, parks, schools, playgrounds, and other services. It is a national disgrace, and the landlords who are getting rich at the expense of literally millions of helpless tenants must be brought to the light of public scrutiny. According to the 1960 census of housing, there were about 4¾ million substandard housing units occupied by renters, and over 3 million of these units were occupied by families with incomes of less than $3,000 a year. These people simply do not have the resources or facilities to overcome this problem alone; and despite the millions of dollars spent by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other agencies in the ill-managed and ill-considered war on poverty, not much of a dent has been made in the elimination of slums. My bill, by publicizing the names of the persons responsible, would bring to bear the full weight and pressure of the entire community against the offending landlords. These owners and landlords themselves, have a responsibility to improve their properties so that they meet the standard of the law as well as the standard of normal decency that the community at large expects and demands.

Many landlords have neglected to meet their responsibilities simply because they knew that they were safely hidden from the public's eye. No one would know that the filthy, rat-infested tenement or shack over on the other side of the tracks belonged to one of the pillars of the community, or perhaps to a respected officeholder.

My bill provides that a locality must require that the names of all owners of rental properties used for residential purposes be published at least annually in a local newspaper before that locality would be eligible for a loan or grant under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. This would include the names of owners of both legal and equitable interests; the officers and directors of corporations which own such properties, as well as any person owning 15 percent or more of the stock of such corporations; both the trustees and beneficiaries where the owner is a trust; and the names of all partners, general and limited, where the owner is a partnership. There is no doubt that my bill would have a salutary effect in many of the problem areas of our communities. I sincerely urge prompt consideration and passage to help out on the problem with which we are faced, and which we are dealing with in this and another bill.

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

The bill (S. 2419) to make assistance to localities under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 contingent upon the publication of the names of the owners of rental properties in such localities which are used for residential purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banikng and Currency.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1648) to provided grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our regions, counties, and communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families, and waste invaluable human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their public works and economic development; that Federal financial assistance, including grants for public works and development facilities to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing development should enable such areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local conditions, provided that such assistance is preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range economic planning; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing public works and other facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

SEC. 101. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized—

(1) to make direct grants for the acquisition or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, including related machinery and equipment, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(A) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly (i) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities, (ii) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area, or (iii) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(B) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located; and

(C) the area for which a project is to be undertaken has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and such project is consistent with such program;

(2) to make supplementary grants in order to enable the States and other entities within redevelopment areas to take maximum advantage of designated Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined), direct grants-in-aid authorized under this section, and Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended), and the eleven watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented (58 Stat. 887), for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share.

(b) Subject to subsection (c) hereof, the amount of any direct grant under this section for any project shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

(c) The amount of any supplementary grant under this section for any project shall not exceed the applicable percentage established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary, but in no event shall the non-Federal share of the aggregate cost of any such project (including assumptions of debt) be less than 20 per centum of such cost. Supplementary grants shall be made by the Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, by increasing the amounts of direct grants authorized under this section or by the payment of funds appropriated under this Act to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of the applicable Federal programs. Notwithstanding any requirement as to the amount or sources of non-Federal funds that may otherwise be applicable to the Federal program involved, funds provided under this subsection shall be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to specific projects in redevelopment areas under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such project otherwise authorized by the applicable law. The term "designated Federal grant-in-aid programs," as used in this subsection, means such existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs assisting in the construction or equipping of facilities as the Secretary may, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, designate as eligible for allocation of funds under this section. In determining the amount of any supplementary grant available

to any project under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the relative needs of the area, the nature of the project to be assisted, and the amount of such fair user charges or other revenues as the project may reasonably be expected to generate in excess of those which would amortize the local share of initial costs and provide for its successful operation and maintenance (including depreciation).

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe rules, regulations, and procedures to carry out this section which will assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas. In prescribing such rules, regulations, and procedures the Secretary shall consider among other relevant factors (1) the severity of the rates of unemployment in the eligible areas and the duration of such unemployment and (2) the income levels of families and the extent of underemployment in eligible areas.

(e) Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State or Federal regulatory body, unless the State or Federal regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

(f) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

SEC. 102. (a) In addition to the assistance otherwise authorized, the Secretary is authorized to make grants in accordance with the provisions of this title to those areas which the Secretary of Labor determines, on the basis of average annual available unemployment statistics, were areas of substantial unemployment during the preceding calendar year.

(b) Areas designated under the authority of this section shall be subject to an annual review of eligibility in accordance with section 402, and to all of the rules, regulations, and procedures applicable to redevelopment areas except as the Secretary may otherwise prescribe by regulation.

SEC. 103. Not more than 15 per centum of the appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended in any one State.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended for any project in any area which is within the "Appalachian region" (as that term is defined in section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965) which is approved for assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

SEC. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title not to exceed $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

Financial assistance for sewer facilities

SEC. 106. No financial assistance, through grants, loans, guarantees, or otherwise, shall be made under this Act to be used directly or indirectly for sewer or other waste disposal facilities unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that any waste material carried by such facilities will be adequately treated before it is discharged into any public waterway so as to meet applicable Federal, State, interstate, or local water quality standards.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Public works and development facility loans

SEC. 201. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidence of indebtedness and to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, including public works, public service, and development facility usage, to be provided by agencies of the Federal Government pursuant to legislation requiring that non-Federal entities bear some part of the cost thereof, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, including related machinery and equipment, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly—

(A) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities,

(B) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area, or

(C) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available from private lenders or from other Federal agencies on terms which in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the accomplishment of the project;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) Subject to section 701(5), no loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, shall be made under this section for a period exceeding forty years, and no evidence of indebtedness maturing more than forty years from the date of purchase shall be purchased under this section. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, less not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum per annum.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202: *Provided,* That annual appropriations for the purpose of purchasing evidences of indebtedness, making and participating in loans, and guaranteeing loans shall not exceed $170,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(d) Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State or Federal regulatory body, unless the State or Federal regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

(e) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

Loans and guarantees

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participations in loans) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings; and (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with projections in redevelopment areas assisted under subsection (a)(1) hereof, upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such guarantee shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest, or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting, other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them: *Provided, however,* That such limitation shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment of the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by any agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision.

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is or will be located.

(4) No loan or guarantee shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or from other Federal agen-

cies on terms which in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the accomplishment of the project.

(5) The Secretary shall not make any loan without a participation unless he determines that the loan cannot be made on a participation basis.

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made or guaranteed unless it is determined that there is reasonable assurance of repayment.

(7) Subject to section 701(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor.

(8) Loans made and evidences of indebtedness purchased under this section shall bear interest at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purpose.

(9) Loan assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project, and shall, among others, be on the condition that—

(A) other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) not less than 15 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied as equity capital or as a loan repayable in no shorter period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance extended under this section is being repaid, and if such a loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing such Federal financial assistance: *Provided, however,* That, except in projects involving financial participation by Indian tribes, not less than 5 per centum of such aggregate cost shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, unless the Secretary shall determine in accordance with objective standards promulgated by regulation that all or part of such funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area or for other good cause, in which case he may waive the requirement of this provision to the extent of such unavailability, and allow the funds required by this subsection to be supplied by the applicant or by such other non-Federal source as may reasonably be available to the project;

(C) to the extent that the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors, and except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located, nor prevent the Secretary from requiring such periodic revisions of previously approved overall economic development programs as he may deem appropriate.

Economic development revolving fund

SEC. 203. Funds obtained by the Secretary under section 201, loan funds obtained under section 403, and collections and repayments received under this Act, shall be deposited in an economic development revolving fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, and which shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403, and for the payment of all obligations and expenditures arising in connection therewith. There shall also be credited to the fund such funds as have been paid into the area redevelopment fund or may be received from obligations outstanding under the Area Redevelopment Act. The fund shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the amount of loans outstanding under this Act computed in such manner and at such rate as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, during the month of June preceding the fiscal year in which the loans were made.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

SEC. 301. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment (1) to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act, and (2) to other areas which he finds have substantial need for such assistance. Such assistance shall include project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to appropriate public or private nonprofit State, area, district, or local organizations. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to defray not to exceed 75 per centum of the administrative expenses of organizations which he determines to be qualified to receive grants-in-aid under subsection (a) hereof. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equpment, and services. Where practicable, grants-in-aid authorized under this subsection shall be used in conjunction with other available planning grants, such as urban planning grants authorized under the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and highway planning and research grants authorized under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, to assure adequate and effective planning and economical use of funds.

(c) To assist in the long-range accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with other agencies having similar functions, shall establish and conduct a continuing program of study, training, and research to (A) assist in determining the causes of unemployment, underemployment, underdevelopment, and chronic depression in the various areas and regions of the Nation, (B) assist in the formulation and implementation of national, State, and local programs which will raise income levels and otherwise produce solutions to the problems resulting from these conditions, and (C) assist in providing the personnel needed to conduct such programs. The program of study, training, and research may be conducted by the Secretary through members of this staff, through payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants to such individuals, organizations, or institutions, or through conferences and similar meetings organized for such purposes. The Secretary shall make available to interested individuals and organizations the results of such research. The Secretary shall include in his annual report under section 707 a detailed statement concerning the study and research conducted under this section together with his findings resulting therefrom and his recommendations for legislative and other action.

(d) The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary may furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government wtih a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

(e) The Secretary shall establish an independent study board consisting of governmental and nongovernmental experts to investigate the effects of Government procurement, scientific, technical, and other related policies upon, regional economic development. Any Federal officer or employee may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency in which he is employed, serve as a member of such board, but shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such board may be compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 701(10). The board shall report its findings, together with recommendations for the better coordination of such policies, to the Secretary, who shall transmit the report to the Congress not later than 2 years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 annually for the purposes of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Part A—Redevelopment areas

Area Eligibility

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "redevelopment areas"—

(1) those areas in which he determines, upon the basis of standards generally comparable with those set forth in paragraphs (A) and (B), that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time and those areas in which he determines there has been a substantial loss of population due to lack of employment opportunity. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(A) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the current rate of unemployment, as determined by appropriate annual statistics for the most recent available calendar year, is 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in paragraph (B); and

(B) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(i) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(ii) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(iii) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

The Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data to be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required by this subsection;

(2) those additional areas which have a median family income not in excess of 40 per centum of the national median, as determined by the most recent available statistics for such areas;

(3) those additional Federal or State Indian reservations or trust or restricted Indian-owned land areas which the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior or an appropriate State agency, determines manifest the greatest degree of economic distress on the basis of unemployment and income statistics and other appropriate evidence of economic underdevelopment;

(4) upon request of such areas, those additional areas in which the Secretary determines that the loss, removal, curtailment, or closing of a major source of employment has caused within three years prior to, or threatens to cause within three years after, the date of the request an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment of such magnitude that the unemployment rate for the area at the time of the request exceeds the national average, or can reasonably be expected to exceed the national average, by 50 per centum or more unless assistance is provided. Notwithstanding any provision of subsection 401(b) to the contrary, an area designated under the authority of this paragraph may be given a reasonable time after designation in which to submit the overall economic development program required by subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(5) notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, those additional areas which were designated redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act on or after March 1, 1965: *Provided, however,* That the continued eligibility of such areas after the first annual review of eligibility conducted in accordance with section 402 of this Act shall be dependent on their qualification for designation under the standards of economic need set forth in subsections (a)(1) through (a)(4) of this section.

(b) The size and boundaries of redevelopment areas shall be as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That—

(1) no area shall be designated until it has an approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(2) any area which does not submit an acceptable overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act within a reasonable time after notification of eligibility for designation, shall not thereafter be designated prior to the next annual review of eligibility in accordance with section 402 of this Act;

(3) no area shall be designated which does not have a population of at least one thousand five hundred persons, except for areas designated under subsection 401(a)(3), which shall have a population of not less than one thousand persons; and

(4) except for areas designated under subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof, no area shall be designated which is smaller than a "labor area" (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), a county, or a municipality with a population of over two hundred and fifty thousand, whichever in the opinion of the Secretary is appropriate.

(c) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and such other heads of agencies as may be appropriate are authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse when appropriate, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(d) If a State has no area designated under the preceding subsections of this section as a redevelopment area, the Secretary shall designate as a redevelopment area that area in such State which in his opinion most nearly qualifies under such preceding subsections. An area so designated shall have its eligibility terminated in accordance with the provisions of section 402 if any other area within the same State subsequently has become qualified or been designated under any other subsection of this section as of the time of the annual review prescribed by section 402: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall not terminate any designation of an area in a State as a redevelopment area if to do so would result in such State having no redevelopment area.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as a redevelopment area.

Annual Review of Area Eligibility

SEC. 402. The Secretary shall conduct an annual review of all areas designated in accordance with section 401 of this Act, and on the basis thereof shall terminate or modify the designations of such areas in accordance with objective standards which he shall prescribe by regulation. No area previously designated shall retain its designated status unless it maintains a currently approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10). No termination of eligibility shall (1) be made without thirty days' prior notification to the area concerned, (2) affect the validity of any application filed, or contract or undertaking entered into, with respect to such area pursuant to this Act prior to such termination, (3) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 401 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (4) be made in the case of any designated area where the Secretary determines that an improvement in the unemployment rate of a designated area is primarily the result of increased employment in occupations not likely to be permanent. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the classification of any area.

Part B—Economic development districts

SEC. 403. (a) In order that economic development projects of broader geographical significance may be planned and carried out, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to designate appropriate "economic development districts" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such districts will be wholly or partially located, if—

(A) the proposed district is of sufficient size or population, and contains sufficient resources, to foster economic development on a scale involving more than a single redevelopment area;

(B) the proposed district contains two or more redevelopment areas;

(C) the proposed district contains one or more redevelopment areas or economic development centers identified in an approved district overall economic development program as having sufficient size and potential to foster the economic growth activities necessary to alleviate the distress of the redevelopment areas within the district; and

(D) the proposed district has a district overall economic development program which includes adequate land use and transportation planning and contains a specific program for district cooperation, self-help, and public investment and is approved by the State or States affected and by the Secretary;

(2) to designate as "economic development centers," in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, such areas as he may deem appropriate, if—

(A) the proposed center has been identified and included in an approved district overall economic development program and recommended by the State or States affected for such special designation;

(B) the proposed center is geographically and economically so related to the district that its economic growth may reasonably be expected to contribute significantly to the alleviation of distress in the redevelopment areas of the district; and

(C) the proposed center does not have a population in excess of two hundred and fifty thousand according to the last preceding Federal census.

(3) to provide financial assistance in accordance with the criteria of sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act, except as may be herein otherwise provided, for projects in economic development centers designated under subsection (a)(2) above, if—

(A) the project will further the objectives of the overall economic development program of the district in which it is to be located;

(B) the project will enhance the economic growth potential of the district or result in additional long-term employment opportunities commensurate with the amount of Federal financial assistance requested; and

(C) the amount of Federal financial assistance requested is reasonably related to the size, population, and economic needs of the district;

(4) subject to the 20 per centum non-Federal share required for any project by subsection 101(c) of this Act, to increase the amount of grant assistance authorized by section 101 for projects within redevelopment areas (designated under section 401), by an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of any such project, in

accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe if—

(A) the redevelopment area is situated within a designated economic development district and is actively participating in the economic development activities of the district; and

(B) the project is consistent with an approved district overall economic development program.

(b) In designating economic development districts and approving district overall economic development programs under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized, under regulations prescribed by him—

(1) to invite the several States to draw up proposed district boundaries and to identify potential economic development centers;

(2) to cooperate with the several States—

(A) in sponsoring and assisting district economic planning and development groups, and

(B) in assisting such district groups to formulate district overall economic development programs;

(3) to encourage participation by appropriate local governmental authorities in such economic development districts.

(c) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe standards for the termination or modification of economic development districts and economic development centers designated under the authority of this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "economic development district" refers to any area within the United States composed of cooperating redevelopment areas and, where appropriate, designated economic development centers and neighboring counties or communities, which has been designated by the Secretary as an economic development district.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "economic development center" refers to any area within the United States which has been identified as an economic development center in an approved district overall economic development program and which has been designated by the Secretary as eligible for financial assistance under sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(f) For the purpose of this Act the term "local government" means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, for financial assistance extended under the provisions of subsection (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof.

(h) In order to allow time for adequate and careful district planning, subsection (g) of this section shall not be effective until one year from the date of enactment.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Establishment of regions

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to designate appropriate "economic development regions" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such regions will be wholly or partially located if he finds (A) that there is a relationship between the areas within such region geographically, culturally, historically, and economically, (B) that with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii, the region is within contiguous States, and (C) upon consideration of the following matters, among others, that the region has lagged behind the whole Nation in economic development:

(1) the rate of unemployment is substantially above the national rate;

(2) the median level of family income is significantly below the national median;

(3) the level of housing, health, and educational facilities is substantially below the national level;

(4) the economy of the area has traditionally been dominated by only one or two industries, which are in a state of long-term decline;

(5) the rate of outmigration of labor or capital or both is substantial;

(6) the area is adversely affected by changing industrial technology;

(7) the area is adversely affected by changes in national defense facilities or production; and

(8) indices of regional production indicate a growth rate substantially below the national average.

Regional commissions

SEC. 502. (a) Upon designation of development regions, the Secretary shall invite and encourage the States wholly or partially located within such regions to establish appropriate multistate regional commissions.

(b) Each such commission shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the "Federal cochairman", appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in the region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the commission shall elect a cochairman of the commission from among their number.

(c) Decisions by a regional commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal cochairman and of a majority, or at least one if only two, of the State members. In matters coming before a regional commission, the Federal cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

(d) Each State member of a regional commission shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal cochairman of each regional commission. An alternate shall vote in the event of absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal cochairman for which he is an alternate.

(e) The Federal cochairman to a regional commission shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act up to level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

(f) If the Secretary finds that the State of Alaska or the State of Hawaii meet the requirements for an economic development region, he may establish a Commission for either State in a manner agreeable to him and to the Governor of the affected State.

Functions of Commission

SEC. 503. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, each Commission shall with respect to its region—

(1) advise and assist the Secretary in the identification of optimum boundaries for multistate economic development regions;

(2) initiate and coordinate the preparation of long-range overall economic development programs for such regions;

(3) foster surveys and studies to provide data required for the preparation of specific plans and programs for the development of such regions;

(4) advise and assist the Secretary and the States concerned in the initiation and coordination of economic development districts, in order to promote maximum benefits from the expenditure of Federal, State, and local funds;

(5) promote increased private investment in such regions;

(6) prepare legislative and other recommendations with respect to both short-range and long-range programs and projects for Federal, State, and local agencies;

(7) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

(8) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

(9) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

(10) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation; and

(11) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

(b) The Secretary shall present such plans and proposals of the commissions as may be transmitted and recommended to him (but are not authorized by any other section of this Act) first for review by the Federal agencies primarily interested in such plans and proposals and then, together with the recommendations of such agencies, to the President for such action as he may deem desirable.

(c) The Secretary shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and each regional commission.

(d) Each Federal agency shall, consonant with law and within the limits of available funds, cooperate with such commissions as may be established in order to assist them in carrying out their functions under this section.

(e) Each regional commission may, from time to time, make additional recommendations to the Secretary and recommendations to the State Governors and appropriate local officials, with respect to—

(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in its region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, transportation, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

Program development criteria

SEC. 504. In developing recommendations for programs and projects for future regional economic development, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking for such programs and projects, the Secretary shall encourage each regional commission to follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have a significant potential for growth;

(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

(5) the prospects that the project, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, will improve the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

Regional technical and planning assistance

SEC. 505. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide to the commissions technical assistance which would be useful in adding the commissions to carry out their functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such assistance shall include studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such region, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to the commissions. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of establishment of a commission, the administrative expenses of each commission as approved by the Secretary shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, not to exceed 50 per centum of such expenses may be paid by the Federal Government. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, for the purposes of this section.

Administrative powers of regional commissions

SEC. 506. To carry out its duties under this Act, each regional commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal cochairman on the commission and no member, alternate, officer, or employee of such commission, other than the Federal cochairman on the commission and his staff and his alternate, and Federal employees detailed to the commission under clause (3), shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel, and the Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with such commission for continued coverage of commission employees, who at date of commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government;

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia and establish field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate; and

(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

Information

SEC. 507. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, each regional commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a cochairman of such commission, or any member of the commission designated by the commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to such commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection.

Personal financial interests

SEC. 508. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of a regional commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the regional commission involved of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by such commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member of a regional commission, or his alternate, shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve a regional commission under authority of clause (4) of section 506 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from such commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal cochairman and his alternate on a regional commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to clause (3) of section 10 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) A regional commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract or other agreement pursuant to the Act in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

Annual reports

SEC. 509. Each regional commission established pursuant to this Act shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report each fiscal year to the Congress with respect to such commission's activities and recommendations for programs. The first such report shall be made for the first fiscal year in which such commission is in existence for more than three months. Such reports shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 31 of the calendar year following the fiscal year with respect to which the report is made.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in addition to those already provided for, shall supervise and direct the Administrator created herein, and coordinate the Federal cochairmen appointed heretofore or subsequent to this Act. The Assistant Secretary created by this section shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary may prescribe. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Economic Development who shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule who shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Secretary.

(b) Paragraph (12) of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)".

(c) Subsection (e) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(100) Administrator for Economic Development."

Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development

SEC. 602. The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, State and local governments, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

Consultation with other persons and agencies

SEC. 603. (a) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with any persons, including representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and government, who can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment or underemployment.

(b) The Secretary may make provision for such consultation with interested departments and agencies as he may deem appropriate in the performance of the functions vested in him by this Act.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Powers of Secretary

SEC. 701. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with such loans or evidences of indebtedness until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or evidence of indebtedness or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or evidence of indebtedness;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with loans made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Secretary, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 201, 202, 301, 403, and 503 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, purchasing, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(10) employ experts and consultants or organizations therefor as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided*, however, That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(11) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine which controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Secretary or his property. Nothing herein shall be construed to except the activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28, United States Code, and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316); and

(12) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Prevention of unfair competition

SEC. 702. No financial assistance under this Act shall be extended to any project when the result would be to increase the production of goods, materials, or commodities, or the availability of services or facilities, when there is not sufficient demand for such goods, material, commodities, services, or facilities, to employ the efficient capacity of existing competitive commercial or industrial enterprises.

Saving provisions

SEC. 703. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Administrator or any other officer of the Area Redevelopment Administration in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties under the Area Redevelopment Act, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary or the Administrator or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as may be appropriate.

(b) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties under the Area Redevelopment Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate.

Transfer of functions, effective date, and limitations on assistance

SEC. 704. (a) The functions, powers, duties, and authorities and the assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records which are vested in or authorized to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 29(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and all functions, powers, duties, and authorities under section 29(c) of the Area Redevelopment Act are hereby vested in the Secretary.

(b) The President may designate a person to act as Administrator under this Act until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following the effective date of this Act, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such person shall receive compensation at the rate provided by this Act for such office.

(c) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon enactment unless herein explicitly otherwise provided.

(d) Notwithstanding any requirements of this Act relating to the eligibility of areas, projects for which applications are pending before the Area Redevelopment Administration on the effective date of this Act shall for a period of one year thereafter be eligible for consideration by the Secretary for such assistance under the provisions of this Act as he may determine to be appropriate.

(e) No financial assistance authorized under this Act shall be used to finance the cost of facilities for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy, except on projects specifically authorized by the Congress, or to finance the cost of facilities for the production or transmission of gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed).

Separability

SEC. 705. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall

not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Application of Act

SEC. 706. As used in this Act, the terms "State", "States", and "United States" include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Annual report

SEC. 707. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such report shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made.

Use of other facilities

SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

(c) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Appropriation

SEC. 709. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out those provisions of the Act for which specific authority for appropriations is not otherwise provided in this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended unless otherwise provided by appropriations Acts.

Penalties

SEC. 710. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 or any extension thereof by renewal, deferment or action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary, in the administration of this Act (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, grant, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans, grants, or other assistance from the Secretary, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

Employment of expediters and administrative employees

SEC. 711. No financial assistance shall be extended by the Secretary under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, and other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, under this Act, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding such business enterprise, for a period of two years after such assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

Prevailing rate of wage and forty-hour week

SEC. 712. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 for such a project without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Record of applications

SEC. 713. The Secretary shall maintain as a permanent part of the records of the Department of Commerce a list of applications approved for financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403, which shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Department of Commerce. The following information shall be posted in such list as soon as each application is approved; (1) the name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applications, the names of the officers and directors thereof, (2) the amount and duration of the loan or grant for which application is made, (3) the purposes for which the proceeds of the loan or grant are to be used, and (4) a general description of the security offered in the cause of a loan.

Records and audit

SEC. 714. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this Act.

Conforming amendment

SEC. 715. All benefits heretofore specifically made available (and not subsequently revoked) under other Federal programs to persons or to public or private organizations, corporations, or entities in areas designated by the Secretary as "redevelopment areas" under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act, are hereby also extended, insofar as practicable, to such areas as may be designated as "redevelopment areas" or "economic development centers" under the authority of section 401 or 403 of this Act: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not be construed as limiting such administrative discretion as may have been conferred under any other law.

SEC. 716. All financial and technical assistance authorized under this Act shall be in addition to any Federal assistance previously authorized, and no provision hereof shall be construed as authorizing or permitting any reduction or diminution in the proportional amount of Federal assistance to which any State or other entity eligible under this Act would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of any other Act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1309) to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of financial organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 23, 41, 47, 49, and 50 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8639) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the

Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BOW, Mr. LIPSCOMB, and Mr. CEDERBERG were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9947) to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

U.S. POSITION IN REGARD TO ENFORCING ARTICLE 19 OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this afternoon, Ambassador Goldberg presented to the Committee of 33 at the United Nations a statement setting forth the position of the United States in regard to enforcing article 19 of the United Nations Charter.

This article provides that when a member becomes 2 years in arrears on assessments it shall lose its vote in the General Assembly.

The Ambassador's statement says, in effect, that we will not attempt to force a vote on France and Russia for their refusal to pay assessments levied for the purpose of maintaining a police force in the Congo, an operation to which both nations objected.

The fact is, it is doubtful whether the United States could force a direct vote on this issue, but, if we could, it is quite certain that our effort would be heavily defeated with many of our closest allies voting against us.

It should furthermore be understood that should article 19 be literally enforced, France and Russia would lose only their vote in the U.N. General Assembly, a body of 114 members.

Neither country would lose its seat in the General Assembly nor in the United Nations.

Neither country would lose its place on the Security Council nor its veto power in the Council.

It must also be recognized that if the United Nations should attempt to assess us for the cost of maintaining armed force in the Western Hemisphere, we would probably refuse to pay.

Since the prospect of either collecting these assessments from France and Russia or of punishing them for a violation of the charter is virtually nil, the United States was put in the position of either facing certain defeat in the General Assembly or accepting the fact that from now on the United Nations will be largely financed on a voluntary basis for, if action cannot be taken against Russia and France for nonpayment of assessments, it certainly should not be taken against the smaller, poorer nations.

The question is whether the United Nations is worth keeping as an international organization.

It is obvious that it cannot continue under rules to be observed by part of the membership and ignored by the rest.

Therefore, in announcing that the United States would no longer be bound to observe the provisions of article 19, Ambassador Goldberg took the only practicable course left open; the alternative would be to withdraw completely from this world organization.

It was not an easy decision to make. It does not by itself guarantee the effectiveness of the United Nations in the future.

It will be found thoroughly unsatisfactory and will be condemned by many people, some of whom are opposed to international organizations in principle.

It does, however, offer an alternative and perhaps the only alternative to a growing world crisis which could conceivably end in human disaster.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] yielded to me in order to make these remarks.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, numerous complaints have been stated as to the administration of the program by OEO. Much of the criticism is directed toward specific incidents of alleged maladministration. It would not be possible, nor in my opinion appropriate, for me to attempt to answer these statements. However, I should like to point out that this is a new agency in operation less than a year, designed to meet a gigantic problem—that of reducing poverty in the United States. To expect that there would not be problems in administration would be unreasonable. During the hearings, the Director, Sargent Shriver, and other OEO officials, gave us every assurance that this problem is recognized and every effort will be made to correct it.

Although I do not intend to minimize these statements, it does seem to me we should look to the achievements of the new agency, which was funded less than a year ago.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and myself—and the Senator from Wyoming is necessarily absent today—I send to the desk for reference and printing an amendment that we intend to offer to the pending bill.

The amendment merely reaffirms and strengthens the provision in title 1 of the bill, which would prohibit activities of the Job Corps when the effect would be to displace employed people or take over services which were being accomplished by private enterprise firms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in 1919, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

> Every one of us would like to see a state of perfection on earth; but we know that every great reform takes time and good judgment, and that too great haste often defeats its own ends.

Seventeen months ago the President of the United States announced a program to eradicate poverty in America. One year ago Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to put that program into operation. Now, after the expenditure of nearly $800 million, Congress should pause to take stock of its creation.

The basic underlying principle of the war on poverty is sound—and it is in the best tradition of the American people. It is not the principle of charity, nor of patronizing benevolence. It is not the principle of the freeload and the dole. It is the principle that it is right—and wise—for Americans to help their fellow Americans to help themselves.

President Johnson recognized this when he said, in his initial message to Congress:

> The war on poverty is not a struggle simply to support people, to make them dependent on the generosity of others. It is a struggle to give people a chance. It is an effort to allow them to develop and use their capacities, as we have used ours, so that they can share, as others share, in the promise of this Nation.

Walter Heller, then Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, put it this way:

> The essence of the President's attack on poverty is the creation of new economic opportunities, a chance for the poor who are able to do so to earn their way out of poverty.

There is scarcely an American today so callous, so ruthless, so flinthearted, as to repudiate this principle embedded so deeply within us as a people.

The great national debate on the poverty program today is not a debate on the merits of its fundamental principle. As so often occurs in American society, the debate rages over the means by which those in power seek to translate that principle into action. The issue before the Congress today is, simply, this: In view of the magnitude of the poverty problem in America, and in view of the resources committed to overcome it, has the war on poverty been a success?

Any attempt to answer this query must necessarily result in a balancing of positive and negative accomplishments. The administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity have emphasized the

positive achievements of the war on poverty, and their arguments are not without merit. Because of the war on poverty, for example, 561,000 young Americans are being introduced to the world of learning through Project Head Start. Eighty thousand young men and women have had the opportunity to earn the money they need to stay in college. Nearly 90,000 unemployed heads of families have received work training and experience that will help them to become producers instead of public charges. Ten thousand men and women in rural areas have received loans that will give them a new incentive to improve their incomes and standards of living.

Nor has the Office of Economic Opportunity rejected every criticism that has been made of the program. Commendably, the Office has candidly admitted that in some areas serious difficulties have developed. In view of the magnitude of the poverty problem in America, in view of the depths of its roots and persistence of its causes, some failures were inevitable. The Congress has no right to expect perfection from the administrators of its programs.

Yet, when all this is said and done, when every reasonable allowance has been made for extenuating circumstances, when the benefit of many doubts has been generously granted, the fact remains that this so-called war on poverty has exhibited classic examples of administrative bungling, haphazard haste and costly waste, shoddy coordination, bureacuratic secrecy, excessively high salaries, heavy-landed dictation, ugly politics and—worst of all—botched opportunity.

Let us examine the various charges brought against the operation of the war on poverty:

THE POVERTY ARMY IS LED BY A PART-TIME GENERAL

There is scarcely a position in Government more demanding of full-time attention than that of Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Yet, the present Director must devote part of his time and energy to the task of running the Peace Corps. In view of the present administration's predilection for appointing four where two could serve, it is truly surprising that here it has appointed only one to do what is admittedly the job of two. The sooner the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Peace Corps get separate, full-time Directors, the better it will be for both.

A. COMPARISON OF PREDICTION AND THE RESULTS SHOW A SIGNIFICANT PERFORMANCE GAP

When the poverty legislation was before the Congress last year, we were told how many people the various programs were to benefit in the first fiscal year of operation. In one program—the Neighborhood Youth Corps—the stated goal of 200,000 has been exceeded, with 277,000 young people employed. In view of the simple nature of this program, its success in reaching its numerical goal is not surprising.

Other programs, however, have been less successful. Last year it was estimated that 140,000 youths would benefit from the college work study provisions. At the close of the fiscal year the actual number was around 80,000. Even doubling the spring semester recipients to account for the fall semester of 1964, when the program was not yet in operation, the total would be only 114,000, far below the goal.

Last year it was estimated that 130,000 persons would be enrolled in the work experience programs under title V. At the close of the fiscal year 88,700 had been enrolled.

Last year it was estimated that 40,000 Job Corps men would be in the program by the first year. The actual number at the close of the fiscal year was only about 10,000.

Last year it was estimated that 1,000 VISTA volunteers would be in the field at the end of the fiscal year, provided only that enough young men and women stepped forward to enroll. Fifteen thousand did step forward to enroll—and as of June 30 a total of 202 were actually in service.

And even some of these OEO figures are open to question. Jack Steele of the Scripps Howard Newspaper Alliance gave a progress report on the war on poverty as of the end of its first fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from an article entitled, "Troubles, Delays, and Confusions—Poverty War Ends Year of Crisis," written by Jack Steele in the Washington Daily News of July 1, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

[Excerpts from Washington Daily News, July 1, 1965]

TROUBLES, DELAYS, AND CONFUSIONS—POVERTY WAR ENDS YEAR OF CRISIS

(By Jack Steele)

Bitter political warfare—still largely unsettled—has stymied the community action program in most of the Nation's big cities. This program is the keystone of the antipoverty war since it will provide the machinery for helping the poor. In rural areas, lack of community initiative has delayed the CAP program even more.

VISTA, the so-called Domestic Peace Corps, was originally supposed to enroll 5,000 volunteers to help the poor by June 30. As of yesterday it actually had 203 such volunteers working in the field and 842 more in training.

The Job Corps, which Mr. Shriver told Congress last autumn would have 30,000 to 40,000 teenage dropouts in some 75 camps by June 30, actually had 8,345 in 48 camps as of Tuesday. And more than 15 percent of those sent to Youth Corps camps had already quit the camps.

GLOSS OVER

Mr. Shriver and his battery of public relations experts have managed to gloss over most such lags and failures in the antipoverty program. Here's how they've done it.

In recent weeks, OEO officials have worked day and night to allocate funds for antipoverty projects and thus use up all the $793 million Congress appropriated last year for the program and clear the way for passage of this year's $1.5 billion fund request. Much of this money won't be spent—or the projects even started—for months.

Mr. Shriver listed 265,000 enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. But the 100,000th enrollee was inducted at a White House ceremony on June 11, less than 3 weeks ago. And Neighborhood Youth Corps officials, after whirling their computers, came up yesterday with a top enrollment estimate of 175,000—including 70,000 in a special summer "leaf-raking" project. The first-year goal for this program was 200,000.

Mr. Shriver's list included 88,000 in a so-called work experience program run by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. But HEW officials yesterday reported the program had 15,240 actual enrollees in 59 projects now in operation.

The OEO Director also listed 600,000 direct beneficiaries of community action programs. Yet most of the CAP projects approved thus far are so-called planning or demonstration grants which provide help or employment to relatively few of the poor. And only a few of these are yet off the ground.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a striking exception to the performance gap is the administrative costs of the program. The OEO Director said last year that his administrative budget would be about $3.5 million and that he would employ 300 to 700 people. As of June 30, 1965, the amount obligated for administrative expenses of the Office was over $6.1 million, and the number of employees was hovering around the thousand mark.

What has caused this gap between prediction and performance? Two answers suggest themselves: A lack of clear understanding of the complexities of creating these new programs, resulting in euphoric election-year predictions unrelated to reality; or administrative confusion and chaos in the implementation. The true answer is probably a combination of the two.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY HAS BEEN A SORRY STORY OF DELAY AND BUNGLING

The war on poverty has been a godsend to those mild mannered little fellows who take secret satisfaction watching the high and mighty goof up the works. Not even OEO has yet paid any one to add up the inches of newspaper lineage that have been used to describe the fumbling and bumbling of the poverty administrators, but it is said that around Washington one can get 3 to 1 that the stories laid end to end would reach from the White House Rose Garden to Catoctin, Md., and part way back.

In my own State the local Democrat in charge of the poverty program at the State level has assailed OEO for "inexcusable delays." He told how the Washington poverty warriors put on the heat to get all program applications submitted before the fiscal year deadline—then were unable to tell him the status of the projects thereafter. "There is no person or place we can go to get a reading on the status of our own programs," he said.

Just the other day, testifying before the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, Dr. Murray Grant, Health Director of the District of Columbia, stated that the District had applied for public welfare funds about 9 months ago, but the application was still pending. He went on to say that the District government had made repeated inquiries since that time as to when the money might be forthcoming, apparently with

no success. There is now a 2-month backlog of cases. Space, and perhaps the resources of the Government Printing Office, do not permit a complete listing of all such interesting examples, but the man so rash as to suggest these instances are uncommon has not yet stepped forward.

If unprocessed applications were negotiable, like bank drafts, I would advocate putting a strict security guard around the Washington poverty headquarters; for within those walls reposes what is probably the most massive collection of ignored, forgotten, and bogged-down applications known to the Western World since the halcyon days of the great South Seas bubble.

An otherwise sympathetic observer, Eve Edstrom of the Washington Post, characterized this abysmal situation succinctly when she reported:

> The confusion caused by the law itself has been compounded by the turmoil that exists at the Office of Economic Opportunity. "We operate from crisis to crisis," one Federal antipoverty worker said "We're always in perpetual motion but I'm not sure where we're going."

HEAVYHANDED DICTATION FROM WASHINGTON STIFLES LOCAL FLEXIBILITY AND INITIATIVE

One of the great virtues of the antipoverty program, as conceived a year ago, was that it was designed to allow maximum latitude for experimentation at local levels. True, there has been a great deal of experimentation—one Mississippi Head Start center has experimented with eliminating bookkeeping controls on a $1.2 million project, and the Memphis Neighborhood Youth Corps has experimented in requiring kickbacks from corpsmen to pay unauthorized supervisors. But in many cases the bureaucrats on top have squashed local initiative by laying down impossible requirements and meddling with even the smallest details.

Typical of this malady is the situation at that boon to antipoverty critics, the St. Petersburg Women's Job Corps Center. At this establishment, so I am told, no officer may talk to the press without reporting by long-distance telephone to Washington the substance of the conversation. These phone calls probably add up to quite a sum, since Washington may have a hard time getting the message over the rumbling of hot rod exhausts, the continuous rock-and-roll parties, the omnipresent police sirens that rise to a crescendo whenever an inmate makes a break for it, and, more recently, the angry mutterings of the local citizens. Pinellas County's assistant school superintendent, struggling to make this center less of a disaster, says:

> We were so deluged by so many people from Washington giving us information and advice on community relations, public health, and home and family living that it was just plain confusing.

In my own State of Vermont, the acting State director of economic opportunity has had occasion to state that local volunteer agencies have "done everything but stand on their heads. They've formed programs, then changed them or scrapped them to meet the Federal suggestions."

And yet, at the time of his statement, the applications were bogged down somewhere in OEO.

It is always necessary in a Federal grant program for the administrators to stay close enough to the various situations to see that proper procedures are carried out, and that Federal funds are not expended without justification. But this sort of intelligent supervision, in the hands of a zealous bureaucrat, can easily shade into the tyranny of centralized direction that stifles local programs. Happily, the European Communist world is learning this, and is decentralizing all but the most basic economic decisions. One hesitates to say that OEO should profit from this trend in the Communist world, but the point should be clear.

HASTE AND WASTE—THE ROMULUS AND REMUS OF OEO

According to legend, the great empire of Rome had its beginning in the birth of the brothers Romulus and Remus, suckled by a she-wolf on the banks of the Tiber. The analogous allegory for the economic opportunity empire would have to be "haste and waste," suckled to a sleek corpulence by the American taxpayer.

Haste holds sway whenever a well-intentioned project flounders due to inadequate preparation. The deft touch of haste appears behind the screening procedures that send a girl 5 months pregnant to the Women's Job Corps, accompanied by another who was emotionally ill, 2 who refused to heed curfews and no-drinking rules, and 20 who did not much care about the whole project.

Waste rears its ugly head when seamstresses are hired to remake clothes for Job Corps girls who are supposed to be learning to sew, maids are hired to make the beds of Job Corps girls who are supposed to be learning practical homemaking, and construction gangs are hired to spruce up abandoned forest camps for boys who are supposed to be learning basic job skills in carpentry and plumbing.

Waste gloats gleefully in city after city, including the Nation's Capital, where formerly anonymous political coadjutors emerge at succulent salaries of $18,000 and even $25,000. And it chortles with pleasure as OEO functionaries crawl over each other trying to find out what they are supposed to be doing, while the administrative budget continues its incessant march skyward.

THE RULES OF THE ROAD—AVOID STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS, KEEP LOCAL PEOPLE IN THE DARK

One well-documented example is sufficient to exemplify the way the "powercrats" prefer to deal with local officials and citizenry. The pattern was set when the very first Job Corps camp location was announced—at Yorktown, Va.—before any local people had been consulted. This excerpt from a statement by Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, of Washington, shows how the concept has been honed to near perfection in the months since.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD Representative MAY's observation.

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

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CATHERINE MAY, REPUBLICAN, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, JUNE 16, 1965

The first situation I would like to discuss is the announced establishment of a Job Corps conservation center to be located on the Yakima Indian Reservation near the small community of White Swan.

The official announcement concerning this Job Corps camp was contained in a press release from the Office of the Secretary of the Interior which detailed the locations of 14 Job Corps camps in 10 States to be activated early that fall. The Secretary's announcement states, "Each of these camps will also be a great community asset." This press release, which was received in my office on August 19, 1964, the date it was to be released, was the first notification received by me of this project and was, in fact the first official notification received by the people of White Swan, a community of approximately 200 inhabitants and approximately 2 miles from the announced site of the camp.

From information I was able to piece together later, it became evident that a great deal of secrecy had surrounded the circumstances in arriving at the selection of this site for a Job Corps camp. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, once a decision had been made, consulted only with the Yakima Tribal Council and it is my understanding the Bureau told the tribal council that Indians would be put to work and that the work to be accomplished would be in the nature of work which would benefit the Indian reservation. The Secretary of the Interior's announcement of August 19, 1964, in fact, stated: "The enrollees will be concerned primarily with timber and range conservation practices such as timber thinning and construction of fire roads and trails."

It is not difficult to understand the immediate reaction of the people of White Swan who naturally were concerned over the effect on their community of the arrival of as many Job Corps "guests" as there are inhabitants. Urgent requests for complete information on the impact of such a facility were made to my office. I point out again that no such information had been volunteered either prior to or following the brief original announcement. Inquiries were initiated by my office to the Bureau of Indian Affairs because the Office of Economic Opportunity advised they had no information with which to respond to the community concern. To give an example of this kind of bureaucratic attitude, we were told by a spokesman of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that "If a community wishes to protest it should do so to the Yakima Indian Agency superintendent." On August 28, 1964, we were also advised that this was only a "proposed" establishment since Congress had not as yet appropriated the money to establish any of the Job Corps centers. This fact brought out yet another interesting point because I was later informed that even prior to the August 19 announcement work crews contracted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs were busy clearing a site for the proposed establishment. I still do not know the source of the funds for this preliminary work.

On August 28, 1964, I asked Sargent Shriver, Director of the President's Task Force on the War on Poverty, to arrange for a public hearing on the announced establishment of a Job Corps camp near White Swan. I advised Mr. Shriver that since the August 19, 1964, announcement of the location of the camp a number of residents of nearby communities had indicated their concern over the location of such a camp in

their area and that many of these individuals were asking questions which deserved factual answers. I advised Mr. Shriver that I had discussed the situation with the Governor's representative appointed to handle antipoverty programs in the State (who incidentally had not been provided answers to the questions being asked) and that we both agreed that a full public hearing should be held in the area as soon as possible so that all the individual citizens would have all the facts upon which to base opinions. On September 2, 1964, I was advised by the Governor's representative that the Bureau of Indian Affairs regional office had notified him that they would hold a public meeting in the White Swan High School on September 9 to inform the community of plans for the proposed Job Corps camp. I initiated telephone calls to the Office of Economic Opportunity to ask whether this meeting was in response to my request for hearing and was advised that a representative of Sargent Shriver's office would attend the meeting. I did not receive any written response to my letter requesting a hearing.

The meeting was held in the White Swan High School the evening of September 9, 1964. I was subsequently advised that only written questions were allowed from an audience of about 350 persons and no oral discussion was permitted. One gentleman stood up and demanded that he be heard and was given the opportunity to make a brief statement. This, Mr. Chairman, was not the kind of hearing I had requested, although I was given to understand that generally speaking the audience seemed to be satisfied with the answers received to their written questions, mostly handled by the representative from Sargent Shriver's office.

The then Governor of the State of Washington subsequently approved the camp. It was about this time that a local attorney for a group of White Swan residents protested to the Office of Economic Opportunity the establishment of the camp, contending that work planned by occupants of the camp would benefit Yakima Indians only and therefore was discriminatory against non-Indians. The attorney based his contention on the Civil Rights Act passed by Congress in 1964. The General Counsel for the Office of Economic Opportunity advised the local attorney, "We are acquainted with no law or policy against discrimination on the basis of race which is violated by the operation of a conservation center on the Yakima Indian Reservation Center." The General Counsel went on to state in his letter, "Government policy against discrimination, whatever source, does not generally prevent the expenditure of money to benefit Indians on an Indian reservation." The local attorney said he could not agree and that he would seek a Federal injunction to stop the establishment of a camp. The new Governor agreed that before he would approve the camp that assurance would have to be given that the general public would have access to and use of facilities constructed by the Job Corps. There the matter rested for many months. However, as recently as early this month, Otis A. Singletary, Director of the Job Corps, said in a letter to the local newspaper in Yakima, Wash., the largest nearby community, that he was holding up approval of the White Swan Camp because of "poor community attitudes." Apparently recognizing the former Governor's approval of the site and not waiting for the new Governor's recommendation, Dr. Singletary indicated in his letter that the Office of Economic Opportunity had every legal right to proceed with the camp, but the delay was "based solely on my concern for the enrollees."

In the meantime, the new Governor, continuing to be concerned over the two questions, that of community acceptance and that of general public use of an access to the facilities, obtained from local communities assurances that public opinion had gradually changed to favor the camp and new letters were received from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Yakima Tribal Council giving assurances the public would have access to and use of the facilities after all. The Governor just last week wrote to the Office of Economic Opportunity approving the location of the camp and this last Friday evening, June 11, my office was called by the Deputy Director for the Job Corps to be advised that that office would now proceed with the camp.

I might say parenthetically that when I asked the Office of Economic Opportunity last Friday evening for details I was advised they had none. They assumed the camp would be established as originally proposed, but that the Bureau of Indian Affairs would have to provide the details. Once again, Mr. Chairman, the local citizens found themselves "in the dark" as to details of the situation.

I will not dwell long on the second Job Corps camp proposal in my district.

This is a camp to be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation to be located on the Columbia Basin reclamation project. In February of this year it was announced by the Bureau of Reclamation headquarters on the project that the Office of Economic Opportunity had requested a recommendation for a location of a Job Corps conservation center on the Columbia Basin project. This was undertaken and on April 27 of this year the President announced a number of new Job Corps conservation centers, including one on the Columbia Basin project. Accompanying the White House announcement was a detailed fact sheet which stated that the Columbia Basin center would be located on land owned by the city of Ephrata. The announcement went on to state, that two buildings consisting of a two-story dormitory building and a former messhall will be made available by the city of Ephrata. The city of Ephrata was delighted by this announcement because the people of Ephrata had actively sought the center and the Ephrata location had received a favorable recommendation from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Within a matter of hours after the President's announcement, however, the announcement was withdrawn, insofar as exact location is concerned, and I received from the Ephrata Chamber of Commerce an urgent letter wanting to know what had happened and reaffirming its wishes for the center. My office, Mr. Chairman, made repeated calls to the Office of Economic Opportunity from Dr. Singletary on down and about all we could learn was that the Office of Economic Opportunity thinks it will establish the Job Corps center at Larson Air Force Base near Moses Lake, Wash., instead of Ephrata. As nearly as I can tell, no local request for establishment of the center at Larson Air Force Base or at Moses Lakes was ever made. The people of Ephrata are understandably angry, especially because the center was announced for their town and then the announcement withdrawn. No one in the Office of Economic Opportunity has ever explained to me why the announcement was made for Ephrata in the first place and, as a matter of fact, they won't even admit that it was announced for Ephrata even though I have a copy of the announcement in my possession. This, Mr. Chairman, strikes me as a prime example of the right bureaucratic hand not knowing what the left bureaucratic hand is doing.

Again, Mr. Chairman, one would think the people in the Office of Economic Opportunity would have learned from the White Swan situation, but experience made no difference in the case of the Columbia Basin center. What I am afraid of now, Mr. Chairman, is that the Ephrata people will be hostile to the project and will not be in a mood to cooperate with the trainees. Ephrata is only 26 miles from Moses Lake.

RAISING FALSE HOPES

Mr. PROUTY—

I'm worried about a possible loss of interest and enthusiasm on the part of the people who have worked so hard on a volunteer basis to get this program started—

So spoke Vermont's director of economic opportunity when the program in our State came almost to a standstill because of delays in Washington.

Thousands upon thousands of eligible Job Corps youths across the land are disenchanted. Billboards, diskjockeys, and poverty missionaries have assiduously spread the word that "the Job Corps needs you"; yet, with 228,000 inquiry cards received, only about 16,000 corpsmen had been accepted and assigned at the end of the first fiscal year. What of those others, who seized the initiative—perhaps for the first time in their lives—to seek the help of the Job Corps in getting themselves out of the morass of poverty? What is the effect on them, in real, personal terms, of one more apparent rejection—this one after having been led on by all the OEO ballyhoo? If the poverty people are going to lure youths into the gingerbread house, they should be prepared to hand out cookies, not waiting room numbers.

Similarly, false hopes have been raised among the elderly. The Office of Economic Opportunity has not been able to find any way to focus on the needs of our older citizens. In desperation, faced with congressional murmurings, the Director has belatedly established—on June 14 of this year—a special task force to try to come up with something. In the meantime the elderly—a group for which poverty is both prevalent and serious—can hope only to catch on in some other program not designed to help them or meet their specific needs.

Nor was it fair to the elderly for the Director, a special assistant to the President of the United States, to come before the committee and express his support of my proposal to substantially increase the monthly social security benefits. Later, when the 1965 social security amendments were before the Senate, the administration forces battered down my proposal by an overwhelming margin.

OEO'S COAT OF ARMS; DUPLICATION RAMPANT ON A FIELD CHAOTIC

A good summary of the ineffectiveness of coordination of the Federal antipoverty effort is provided in an article from the Wall Street Journal of June 9, 1965.

This article by Jerry Landauer in my judgment is quite objective, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

OVERLAPPING UPLIFT—WAR ON POVERTY SPILLS OVER INTO MANY FEDERAL AGENCIES

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—It's been 6 months since Congress voted the first funds for the new Office of Economic Opportunity but Sargent Shriver's researchers haven't identified yet all the existing Federal activities that con-

ceivably could fall under his sway as generalissimo of the antipoverty crusade.

Admittedly the tabulating task is tough. The Library of Congress, restricting its count to those offering aid to State or local governments, cataloged 115 such programs or "closely related groups" last year; if "subcategories" are included the total swells to 216.

For sheer scope, these figures suggest Mr. Shriver's job is matched by none save the President's and the Defense Secretary's. Furthermore, his congressional mandate to "coordinate the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies" will become more demanding before, if ever, it becomes more manageable. The Library's count didn't include all 17 sizable programs enacted in the 88th Congress, nor, of course, the dozens more enacted or pending in this Congress. "We're starting to run out of new stuff to propose," one policymaker concedes.

No wonder. Nowadays a school dropout can get help from the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a variety of welfare programs and, at the option of local citizens' groups or school boards, from Mr. Shriver's community action grants and from the new billion-dollar school aid law.

Fifteen programs authorize aid for acquiring teaching equipment, nine provide teacher training, and four, all enacted since 1962, include funds to promote basic adult literacy. Needy students can reach for loans or scholarships offered by eight, not including President Johnson's higher education bill.

Overlap obviously isn't a new problem in big government. "Believe me, it's long been a department head's biggest headache," says the top assistant to a member of the Kennedy Cabinet. Democrats assert, moreover, that for all its talk of bringing businesslike techniques to Washington, the Eisenhower regime left scant dents in the many-layered bureaucracy. (To this observation must be added the fact that for all but 2 of his 8 White House years Ike faced a Democratic Congress.)

President Johnson, of course, wants efficiency and he's taken some small steps toward it, among them reorganization plans to tidy up the Customs Bureau and merge the Weather Bureau with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Another proposal, an old one, to upgrade the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet status, is similarly billed as an efficiency move.

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY

Yet, in greater measure than he can hope to untangle jurisdictional conflicts by such steps, the President contributes to overlap by dividing responsibility among his top men for the panoply of old and new programs designed to uplift poor people and renew poor places.

Rather than shake up a limping agency or beef up an existing endeavor, the White House piles on a new program. "If we don't catch 'em with one we'll catch 'em with another," according to a congressional aid who has helped write several administration bills. In this sense, Lyndon's administrative style is reminiscent of Franklin Roosevelt's.

Few who've heard Mr. Johnson, his voice wavering, recall desperate men garbage grubbing for grapefruit rinds in depression days doubt his fidelity to the poverty-conquering cause; nothing less than total war on poverty, or at least the appearance of it, satisfies the restless Chief Executive. So he applies several plows to the same sod.

Look at regional renewal. Deeply disturbed by rural distress, Agriculture Secretary Freeman first expanded his domain to embrace every poor person, whether farmer or not, who happens to live in a rural place, and he set his sights on 8 million new jobs in rural America. To reach that target his Department increasingly promotes industrial development, helps search for minerals, issue loans for industry-serving utilities, looks for tourists, and helps develop water sources for factories.

But with hardly a glance at Agriculture-sponsored renewal, the White House redesignated Commerce as the chief renewal agency. The Appalachia program authorizes Secretary Connor to approve and help finance local development districts in 11 States. And the administration's big public works and development bill would have him designate, and funnel aid to, a continent-spanning network of redevelopment areas and larger economic development districts containing "economic development centers." Higher up, he'll work with regional action planning commissions embracing at least two States.

Mr. Connor's areas and districts will crisscross many of the 2,000 county-based rural areas development committees already prodded into existence by Secretary Freeman. It's hoped that those of Mr. Shriver's community action groups functioning in rural spots will cooperate with Mr. Freeman's network of county committees (in a few places the two are identical) and where possible, with Mr. Connor's redevelopment areas.

As part of regional renewal the Government launched a pilot project in four distressed Indiana counties to speed the development of industry, land, water, mineral resources, recreation, and tourism. This sounds like something the Commerce Department's development planners might be trying; in fact, though, it's a Freeman project.

The troubles policymakers encounter just in thinking up names for the agencies they'd like Congress to establish reflect how tough it is to sort out clear lines of authority for the uplift effort, particularly in the unclaimed land between cow country and outward-creeping city.

Awhile back, Mr. Freeman set up what was called the Office of Rural Areas Development, a new agency offering advice and technical help to his Department's county committees. Now, asking Congress for money to establish small branches in 20 or more States, he wishes the agency to be known as the Rural Community Development Service. Note how "rural community" suggests a concentration of population more dense than "rural area" but less populous than "urban area."

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Last year, hoping to sidestep smalltown Congressmen's fears that giving HHFA Cabinet rank would enlarge big-city influence, policymakers dropped the word "urban" from HHFA's proposed name; they suggested calling it the Department of Housing and Community Development. But this year, enjoying bigger majorities in Congress, the White House stopped fiddling around; now it's proposed to baptize HHFA as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, thus leaving in-between "community development" to Mr. Freeman.

Understandable, then, is the wary eye Housing Administrator Robert Weaver's people cast at Mr. Freeman. Shortly after Agriculture asked for a $350 million fund to insure rural housing loans, the Federal Housing Administration sent word to its local offices that "no community should be considered too remote or too isolated for FHA to serve in a prompt manner."

Apart from big government's built-in overlap, believers in tidiness confront Lyndon Johnson's unique personality. He's just as determined to project a glowing record of economy as he is to lead the costly antipoverty crusade. The result is compromise. Rather than be selective among the 34.6 million Americans deemed "hard core poor" by Mr. Shriver's statisticians, the Government spreads money and effort every which way, boosting overhead, generating more overlap and, so critics claim, assuring mediocre results.

As always, politics plays a part. At least for the first year, all 1,000 counties that had been eligible for special subsidies from the spectacularly unsuccessful Area Redevelopment Administration can knock on Secretary Connor's door for similar help after the bigger development bill becomes law. And, to mobilize maximum congressional support for the billion-dollar-a-year bill to help "educationally deprived" children, Johnson men concocted a formula spreading whatever an eager Congress appropriates to all but 6 percent of the Nation's 3,000-odd counties.

Yet, months before Mr. Johnson ceremoniously signed the school aid bill outside his Texas boyhood schoolhouse, Sargent Shriver's office embarked on its own education program, intended for much the same purpose. Among other grants, antipoverty money went to Lansing, Mich., for remedial schooling; to Washington County, Va., for preschool training, and to Detroit for "expanded educational services."

Several parts of the antipoverty package are new. But Mr. Shriver also exercises partial responsibility for a batch of overlapping "delegated" programs which established bureaucracies manage: For small business loans; for rural loans, hitherto a Freeman preserve; for adult literacy, an ingredient of three existing programs; for "work study," launched in 1963 and assigned to HEW's vocational education administrators; and for "work experience," started in 1962 as part of the HEW's assignment to reduce relief rolls. Intruding into Interior Secretary Udall's reservation, Mr. Shriver operates a special program to help Indian tribes, many of which are also eligible to knock on Secretary Connor's development door.

A SHINY NEW PACKAGE

If the old programs were deemed insufficient the White House could have sought more money directly for them; or, if their results were disappointing L.B.J. could have replaced the administrators or sought revisions in the governing statutes. Instead he bundled them into a shiny new package for presentation to a cooperative Congress.

What with upward of 70 agencies operating several hundred programs to uplift people, communities, or regions, official Washington keeps hoping that Mr. Freeman's committees, Mr. Shriver's community action outfits, Mr. Connor's redevelopment areas, and the metropolitan planning agencies promoted by Mr. Weaver will somehow wrap all the available aid from all the sources into an uplift package that makes sense.

By shifting more responsibility for coordination to recipients of their grants, loans, and technical help, the Feds further hope to spur local initiative. Already the Agriculture Department professes to see a "real revival" in long-lagging rural places, with "people sitting down together as never before."

Another advantage of the "do it down there" approach is that it enables Federal administrators to hold down the roster of Federal employees. The directors, planners, and technicians hired by the 600 community action groups Mr. Shriver hopes soon to see functioning won't be added to the Government's employee rolls, although they'll be paid almost exclusively with Federal taxes. The staffs of Mr. Connor's redevelopment areas similarly won't be counted.

But few local politicians or planners willingly forgo rummaging in Washington's big kit for the tools allotted to them by law or for those to which they can stake reasonable claim. It was, for example, a rare locally drawn "overall economic development program" under ARA that didn't include a vocational school or an industrial park.

Still, it's widely believed here that reliance on local coordination will help untie Washington's tangled jurisdictions and slice through the overlap.

LETTING THE FARMERS FEND FOR THEMSELVES

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, not only have the elderly been left off the poverty bandwagon, the citizens of America's rural areas are also missing their fair share of participation.

Title III, of course, is directed at rural people, and loans pursuant to those provisions have helped some 10,000 persons make a new start toward economic self-sufficiency. But America's rural citizens are entitled to full participation in all programs for which they are eligible, and here they are decidedly on the short end.

Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has estimated that rural communities are getting only about 5 percent of the money doled out by OEO for community action programs. As of last April, Mr. Freeman estimated that while over 90 percent of the Nation's cities with populations of 50,000 and above have community action programs in progress, only about one-third of the Nation's rural counties have programs underway.

The August 5, 1965, rural areas development newsletter of the Department of Agriculture reports that $9.5 million had been allocated to 202 rural community action programs, as of June 30. By contrast, 569 grants totaling $127.6 million were approved for urban and suburban areas.

Representative CARL PERKINS, Kentucky Democrat and an original backer of the antipoverty legislation in the House, laments:

I am certainly not satisfied as to the assistance that the rural communities have received throughout the Nation.

Secretary Freeman sorrowfully takes the view that—

I am afraid that the going, for a long time, will be mighty slow.

One reason for this inattention to our rural areas is the admitted difficulty in constructing an effective community action program when the "community" is spread out over miles of farmland. But a more serious problem appears to be the lack of interest in rural areas among the antipoverty warriors, almost all of whom come from big-city backgrounds. In addition, it is not without some significance that the heaviest concentration of voting power for the administration's party finds itself in and around the large cities of every State.

The time for procrastination is over. The rural citizen of America, already beset with so many problems from other Federal programs and from the trends of the farm market, should be given full opportunity to take part in programs now so eagerly constructed for the benefit of his urban fellow citizens.

A CASE STUDY IN HOG-TROUGH POLITICS

"Giant fiestas of political patronage"—those are the words used by Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee in describing the actual operation of the war on poverty.

"A prize piece of political pornography" says veteran antipoverty fighter Saul Alinsky.

The records are full of direct political patronage.

Adds Rev. Lynward Stevenson, head of a local community organization in Chicago.

How do you think we (poor) feel when we know that men who drive Cadillacs, eat 3-inch steaks, and sip champagne at luncheon meetings, discuss our future while we are pushed off the highways of self-help and told to keep our hats in hand.

It would serve no purpose to prolong this laundry list of horrors. From the day that the administration delivered to each Democratic Representatives's office a "poverty kit" for use in the 1964 elections, the antipoverty effort has been political in conception, gestation, parturition, and infancy. Americans who sincerely want the war on poverty to live up to its lofty purposes—and that certainly includes the great majority of Americans of both political parties—must firmly insist that the Director and his staff leave no stone unturned to insure that the program not be, to paraphrase Chairman POWELL, seduced by politicians hoping to use the reservoir of poverty funds to feed their political hacks at the trough of mediocrity.

ACTIONS BY THE COMMITTEE

1. A SNEERING SLAP AT THE NATION'S GOVERNORS

Perhaps the most serious action taken by the committee was to strike from the act the Governor's veto provisions of section 209(c). This section provided that no community action program, adult basic education program, or Neighborhood Youth Corps project could be undertaken in a State if the Governor of that State disapproved the program within 30 days of its submission to him.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, to its credit, did not urge this change. The Senate, last year, endorsed the Governor's veto provision by a vote of 80 to 7. The Governors of the 50 States—who were present at the last Governors' Conference—have, with only one dissenting vote, urged the retention of this provision in the strongest possible terms. Yet, now, by the action of a one-vote majority of the Select Subcommittee on Poverty, the Senate will consider a bill to strip from the Governors the one meaningful tool they have for preserving a strong Federal-State relationship, integrating the Federal antipoverty programs into their own State efforts, and protecting the best interests of the citizens of their States.

One liberal Democratic Governor has written me:

One crucial issue at stake here is meaningful Federal-State partnership. This partnership can survive only if the States maintain a dynamic posture with respect to their responsibilities. And such a posture requires action by the Governor as the focus of political power and administrative coordination.

Another northern Democratic Governor writes, in support of the veto:

Even though the act provides for a direct relationship between the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity and the local entities in most cases, it is highly advisable to allow the States to play some role in the organization and initiation of the Economic Opportunity Act projects.

One midwestern Republican Governor writes:

Although it has not been necessary to exercise the veto, due to the fact that our Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity works closely in an affirmative way with the local organizations in the development of programs, I do feel that the Governor's veto power is a necessary deterrent to ineffective or wasteful uses of public funds.

A western Republican Governor writes:

[My opposition to repeal of the Governor's veto] is based on the conviction that removal of this authority from the Governor of the States would remove also the opportunity for strong leadership and direction of economic opportunity programs statewide. Such action would also weaken community interest in developing programs that can be enabled by this law, and for which the Economic Opportunity Act is designed.

These comments, representatives of the positions of the overwhelming majority of Governors of both parties and all sections of the country, show why it is important to continue to give the chief executive of a State some effective leverage with respect to these parts of the poverty program.

The drive for repeal of the veto provision derives not from an objective case study of the use of the veto during the act's first year of operation. Indeed, as of July 26 the veto had been used only 4 times—once each in Florida, Alabama, Texas, and Montana—while nearly 1,500 projects were started. The Office of Economic Opportunity has not been willing to say that the Governor's veto has been an impediment to the proper functioning of the poverty program. The real motivation for repeal of the veto power comes principally from the forces that would undermine and destroy effective State government in this country, expand and strengthen the bureaucracy at the Federal level, and consolidate their own political empires through the generous application of antipoverty funds. It is my hope that the one-vote majority of the subcommittee which struck the Governor's veto from the act will be overturned by a substantial margin on the Senate floor.

2. EVEN OEO FEARS DUPLICATION IN NELSON AMENDMENT

The committee added to the bill an amendment proposed by Senator NELSON to provide work experience programs to chronically unemployed poor adults with poor employment prospects. As adopted by the committee, this new program will be included in title II–A community action programs and will cost $150 million.

The Office of Economic Opportunity did not favor the adoption of this amendment. It argued, rightfully, that the proposed Nelson amendment program would duplicate the existing title V work experience programs, which attempts to do almost exactly the same thing.

"A work experience program," according to OEO, "provides up to 100 percent

funds for projects to help unemployed parents and other needy persons gain work experience and job training interwoven with adult education toward basic literacy instruction. It is directed primarily toward jobless heads of families in which there are dependent children."

If the Nelson amendment is retained by the Congress, we will be treated to the spectacle of two nearly identical programs administered separately by the same Administrator. What is needed is not a proliferation of new programs, but a weeding out of the present multitude of programs and some sensible coordination between them.

According to OEO, it would not be necessary to make any statutory changes to accomplish all the objectives of the Nelson amendment under the existing title V of the act. If there is any doubt on this point, title V could be amended to provide that a person need not be from a family receiving aid to dependent children to qualify for the work experience training. I would have no objection to such a change. But I believe the committee erred in accepting this "gimmick" amendment, when sound policy would dictate a strengthening of existing programs instead of the creation of substantially identical programs in new places under new names.

3. A BLOW TO THE BUREAUCRATS' "RIGHT OF SECRECY"

Due to the efforts of Senator JAVITS, the committee broadened the language in H.R. 8283 providing for public access to information about the community action programs. The present form of the Javits-Reid amendment (after Republican Congressman OGDEN REID, of New York, who secured its adoption by the House) requires a community action program to provide for feasible public information, including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or agencies in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with procedures approved by the Director.

It is hoped that this new language will put an end to the almost neurotic secrecy practiced by officials of community action programs in some places. If a Federal program is going to come into a community and stand it on its head—as has happened in a number of cases—the citizens of that community should have a right to find out exactly what is being done, by whom, for whom, and at whose expense. The Javits-Reid amendment is a long step toward meeting this need. It deserves the support of the Senate.

4. MURPHY-PROUTY POLITICAL ACTIVITY AMENDMENT WILL CAUSE LOUD LAMENTATIONS IN BIG CITY POLITICAL CLUBHOUSES

Those who have been trying—with conspicuous success, in some cases—to subvert the antipoverty program for their own partisan political advantage will take a body blow from Congress, if it enacts the Murphy-Prouty political activities amendment, adopted by the committee.

The Murphy-Prouty amendment brings under the Hatch Act two groups of people not previously covered: Employees of private organizations conducting community action programs, whose salary is in principal part paid from Federal funds; and VISTA volunteers, including those referred to State, local, and private antipoverty agencies and those assigned to work on Federal lands and on federally supported projects.

This amendment will not affect teachers, nor will it affect employees of organizations conducting antipoverty programs, whose salaries are paid from other than Federal funds.

The whole purpose of this amendment is to prevent unscrupulous political bosses from enlisting antipoverty fieldworkers and VISTA volunteers into a battalion of partisan precinct workers.

The Hatch Act already covers the employees of State and local governments who administer programs financed by Federal funds. These provisions were added to the Hatch Act in 1940, when the idea of Federal grant programs bypassing State and local governments was still in its infancy. The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, of all the recent Federal grant programs, introduced a new factor into the picture. Now, for the first time, persons paid from Federal funds but not directly on any public payroll are assuming the functions traditionally performed by the old-time ward bosses to help—and win the political allegiance of—the poor.

Take the man who is a neighborhood social worker for a private organization conducting a community action program. He is a resident of the neighborhood, familiar with its people and their customs. His job is to serve them—to help them press for the correction of housing violations, straighten out public assistance problems, enroll their children in special programs, solve their home economics and consumer credit problems, and get jobs and keep them. He is truly the link between the poor families of his neighborhood and the whole "outside" world of local and State agencies, schools, employment services, and host of other bodies, the workings of which often seem mysterious and incomprehensible to those at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder.

Now, if a local politician were seeking an efficient, respected, aggressive man or woman to organize a ward, how could he do better than the local poverty fieldworker? How could he do better than persons with built-in status among the residents, persons who do the multitude of favors and services that have always been the stock in trade of the ward leader? Similarly the VISTA volunteer, immersed in service to the poverty-stricken neighborhood, is a prime candidate for recruitment by a political machine.

Nor is it merely a question of local politicians trying to recruit poverty workers into their organizations. In case after case it has been shown that local politicians are intent on placing their own trusted lieutenants in these crucial community organization positions. Once it was necessary to support ward heelers from graft and local government payrolls. Then, with the advent of this new direct Federal-local war on poverty, it became possible, indirectly, to put ward heelers on the Federal payroll as well.

The Murphy-Prouty political activity amendment will be greeted with outcries and expletives from those whose dreams of political empire must crumble before its prohibitions. But, it will be welcomed by all Americans who believe that the war on poverty is too important to perish at the hands of the political hacks who seek to subvert it for their own pernicious purposes.

5. NOW, FOR THE FIRST TIME, THE PROMISE OF AN EFFECTIVE POVERTY WATCHDOG

I applaud the action of the committee in accepting my amendment to revise, expand, and strengthen the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.

Basically, there are three principal kinds of advisory groups or councils in Federal agencies.

The first is the interagency coordinating council, composed of operating agency heads or their delegates. These groups attempt to work out maximum coordination of effort when related programs are carried out by more than one agency. Section 604 of the Economic Opportunity Act entrusts this function to the Economic Opportunity Council.

The second is the in-house advisory committee, composed of persons with high professional or technical qualifications, which exists to assist the administrator in making policy decisions, issuing relations, and so forth. These are, in effect, part-time staff groups attached to the administrator of the program. Section 602(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes the Director to establish such groups "to advise him with respect to his functions under the Act."

The third is the "overview" type of advisory council, composed of knowledgeable and respected citizens, which exists to review the operation of the program and make recommendations to the Administrator, the President, and Congress for its improvement. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Youth established by section 212 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, established by section 12 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, are examples of this type of council.

Section 605 of the Economic Opportunity Act authorized a national advisory council which at first glance resembles this third kind of advisory council. It is charged, "upon request of the Director," with reviewing the operations and activities of the Office and making such recommendations to the Director as are appropriate.

Upon close inspection, however, it became obvious that this Council as originally created could not possibly fulfill the true function of an independent, conscientious overview of the war on poverty program.

Unlike advisory councils established by other acts for this purpose, this group was by statute "in the Office" of Economic Opportunity—and thus not an independent body.

Unlike the other councils, this Council had as its Chairman, by statute, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity—the very person whose activities the Council was supposed to review.

This Council could meet only at the request of its Chairman, the Director of OEO.

There were no provisions for any investigatory, clerical, or secretarial assistance. The Director-Chairman could provide as much or as little as he saw fit. Unfortunately, the bureaucrat probably has not yet lived who is eager to allocate staff and resources to a body charged with making a thorough and independent review of his activties.

The Council, unlike every other council I have been able to discover, was not responsible for making a report of its findings and recommendations to anyone but the Director of OEO, who was under no obligation whatsoever to make any such report available to the Congress or the American people.

In view of these rather singular facts, it is natural to raise the question: What does this so-called advisory council do? If the minutes of the Council's only two meetings to date are indicative, the answer is little more than fun and games.

The first meeting, on February 3, 1965, seems to have been a question-and-answer session, with various OEO functionaries helping to get the Council members squared away. Mr. Olivarez, of Phoenix, for example, was advised that noncitizens could participate in adult basic education programs. One Mr. Gilgoff, of OEO, announced that its research, program planning, and evaluation group was developing "an index of poverty oriented toward people," whatever that may be. When it became apparent that the full agenda could not be covered, Mr. Shriver said he would call another meeting in 30 days. "This suggestion," we are advised, "met with an enthusiastic response." This meeting culminated with a White House tea with Mrs. Johnson.

What is the Director-Chairman's view of the function of this "Advisory Council?" According to the minutes of the first meeting, Mr. Shriver indicated that one of the most meaningful jobs the Council could undertake would be to interpret and explain the war on poverty program to the American people. The Council was asked to keep OEO informed of any major criticism of the program which crossed their [sic] paths. At the second meeting, the minutes tell us:

Mrs. Robert S. McNamara asked what the members of the Council can best do to help. Mr. Shriver pointed out the most important things are to help get "the word" around the country, to take an interest in specific parts of the program, and to generate new ideas.

What does all this mean? It means that this impotent Council is little more than a public relations transmission belt designed to propagate the opinions of the Director of OEO and his associates.

Enactment of the new language adopted by the committee will, I hope, pave the way to the establishment of a new Council which is designed to conscientiously fulfill its overview functions.

The new Council will be an independent body of distinguished citizens representative of the general public and of appropriate fields of endeavor related to the antipoverty program.

The President is directed to appoint 21 members to the Council during 1965, with the Director of OEO as an additional member ex officio. The membership of the Council was increased from 15 to 21 (plus the Director) to comply with the administration's request for a larger and presumably more representative body.

The new Council, no longer "in the Office" of Economic Opportunity, is charged with reviewing the administration and operation of programs under the act, evaluating their effectiveness in furthering the purposes of the act, and making recommendations for the improvement of such programs, administration, and operation. The intent of these provisions is that the new Council should provide a conscientious, critical overview of the entire antipoverty program to insure that every dollar spent makes a maximum contribution toward reducing poverty in the Nation, and that the administration of the war on poverty is continued on a sound, effective, efficient basis.

In the hope of guaranteeing a truly independent Council, it is required that the Chairman not be a regular, full-time employee of the Federal Government. The Council is required to meet at least twice a year, and to make an annual report to the President for transmittal to Congress. Statutory provisions for staff assistance follow those of the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, established by the Social Security Amendments of 1956, and replicated in several other acts since.

But it should be emphasized that the mere revision of this Council, salutary as it is, will mean little unless the President appoints to it persons genuinely interested in carrying on a conscientious, independent review of the whole poverty program. In looking over the biographies of the present 12 appointees, one looks in vain for any person known to be publicly critical of the war on poverty program and its administration. I hope that President Johnson, who will presumably reappoint the present Council members to the new group, will also appoint nine new members of equal distinction who will make the Council truly representative of all the American people, not just those who are enthusiastic supporters of the administration's antipoverty program.

6. HOLDING THE LINE ON BUREAUCRATIC APPETITES

The pecuniary progress of the war on poverty can be seen by a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Pecuniary progress of the war on poverty

[Dollars in millions]

	Authorized for fiscal year 1965	Appropriated for fiscal year 1965		Fiscal year 1966 authorization, H.R. 8283		
				Senate		House
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Title I	$412.5	$371.5	100.0	$535	100.0	$825
I-A		183.0	49.3	235	44.0	
I-B		132.5	35.7	240	44.9	
I-C		56.0	15.0	60	11.1	
Title II	340.0	259.1	100.0	880	100.0	680
II-A		240.1	92.9	700	79.3	
II-B		19.0	7.1	30	3.4	
Nelson amendment				150	17.3	(?)
Title III	35.0	40.7	100.0	55	100.0	70
III-A		25.7	63.1	35	63.6	
III-B		15.0	36.9	20	36.4	
Title V	150.0	112.0	100.0	150	100.0	300
Title VI	10.0	9.7	100.0	30	100.0	20
Administration		6.5	67.0	10	33.3	
VISTA		3.2	33.0	20	66.7	
Total	947.5	793.0		1,650		1,895

Mr. PROUTY. The figures given for the Senate version of H.R. 8283, fiscal year 1966 authorization, are those figures originally requested by the President, plus the $150 million of the Nelson amendment. The administration requested that the committee substitute these figures for the higher figures authorized by the House. Given this choice, I was delighted for once to comply.

Because the program did not actually get underway in any meaningful sense until October of 1964, the fiscal year 1965 appropriation figures are substantially less than the amounts authorized. This is an unusual situation brought about by a program beginning a quarter of the way into a new fiscal year and will not be repeated henceforth. Thus in gaging the progress of the program it is necessary to compare the equivalent full-year authorization figures.

The first obvious fact is that the House blindly doubled all the fiscal year 1965

authorizations, unmindful of the wishes of OEO itself, which presumably is worried about the prospect of spending the extra money profitably. This fuzzy headed doubling of funds suggests an arbitrary action unrelated to the actual merits of the various programs supposedly reviewed.

By the same token it is not wise to slash funds across the board. Some of the programs under the war on poverty heading have been noncontroversial and reasonably well administered. If these programs are producing efficiently, it makes little sense to make them suffer for the sins of other programs lumped together in the same package.

There can be little doubt that the two chief offenders in this antipoverty grab bag have been the Job Corps and the community action programs. Some of the fantastic happenings in these two programs have been noted earlier during the course of my remarks, and in the news media over the past year. Although some of the other programs may have questionable merit as effective remedies for the causes of poverty, and one of them—VISTA—is still scarcely off the ground, on balance a reasonable man could accept the figures proposed by the administration in these areas.

But when we come to the Job Corps and community action, a long look is in order. The proposed fiscal year 1966 Job Corps authorization represents a 30-percent increase over the fiscal year 1965 authorization and a 44-percent increase in new obligational authority, if the full appropriation is granted. It is not clear in my mind that the Job Corps deserves a 30-percent increase, in view of the rather astonishing record it has made so far; but I am willing to give in the benefit of the doubt for 1 more year.

Community action is another thing. The Nelson amendment, first of all, was not asked for by the administration. In fact, when the House proposed to add an identical $150 million to the title V authorization, to be spent for precisely the same purposes as the Nelson amendment program, the administration asked our committee to restore the original figure. Only later, when it was apparent that the committee would accept the Nelson amendment anyway, did OEO relent by including the additional $150 million in its request. This amount of money should be pruned from the bill.

As for community action programs proper—title II–A—the new fiscal year 1966 authorization represents an increase of 106 percent over the corresponding fiscal year 1965 figures. By no stretch of the fevered liberal imagination can this drastic increase in title II–A funds be welcomed. There is only one way for Congress to force a Federal bureaucracy to tighten up its administrative practices and improve the operation of a poorly run program—starve it. An overfed bureaucrat is a sloppy bureaucrat. A bureaucrat worried about the next feeding of his pet program is a bureaucrat who will try to make his program look good when the gravy train rolls in.

The Job Corps, with all its amazing spectacles, is in line for a 30-percent increase. There is no reason why community action programs—valuable as they may well be in principle—should get any more of a boost, let alone a raise of 114 percent. A more reasonable bill would drop the $150 million for the Nelson amendment and authorize $442 million for title II, approximately 4 percent of which would go to adult basic education. This would make the overall authorization of the bill $1,212 million, more reasonable than the $1,650 million proposed by the committee and vastly more reasonable than the $1,895 million proposed by the big spenders in the House.

SENATOR PROUTY'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR H.R. 8283

Now that H.R. 8283 has come before the Senate, the following amendments should be adopted:

First. An amendment to restore to the Governors of the 50 States the authority they now possess to veto Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action, and adult basic education programs when the operation of specific programs promises to be inimical to the best interests of the people of their States.

Second. An amendment to delete the Nelson amendment and its authorization.

Third. An amendment to permit no greater than a 30-percent increase in the community action program authorization—as a warning to all those involved that Congress expects these programs to be run right before it will double the funds.

Fourth. An amendment to transfer the actual authority and responsiiblity for six programs—Neighborhood Youth Corps, college work study, adult basic education, rural loans, small business loans, and work experience—to the respective agencies by which those programs are presently administered.

SENATOR PROUTY'S FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ATTACKING THE CAUSES OF POVERTY

In addition, Mr. President, other problems are involved in the question of poverty. One of the first things Congress should do is to enact either the Ribicoff-Dominick or the Prouty tax credit plan to aid students to stay in and graduate from college.

The Ribicoff-Dominick bill (S. 12) permits a taxpayer to take a tax credit toward the amount spent by him for college tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment, according to the following sliding scale: 75 percent of the first $200 of tuition, and so forth; 25 percent of the next $300; 10 percent of the next $1,000; to a maximum of $325 when the allowable expenses equal or exceed $1,500.

Under S. 12 a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income greater than $25,000 would have the maximum amount of credit reduced by 1 percent of such income in excess of $25,000, until at $57,000 income no credit could be claimed.

My bill (S. 2023) differs in three ways from S. 12. The sliding scale is modified to afford relatively more assistance to taxpayers supporting students in public colleges and universities, as follows: 100 percent of the first $200 of tuition, and so forth; 10 percent of the next $300; 5 percent of the next $100; to a maximum of $280 when the allowable expenses equal or exceed $1,500.

Under S. 2023 taxpayers with an adjusted gross income greater than $10,000 would have the maximum amount of credit reduced by 2 percent of such income in excess of $10,000, until at $24,000 income no credit could be claimed. In addition, S. 2023 differs from S. 12 in that it provides for an absolute tax credit of up to $100, available to an otherwise qualified person whose tax liability is too low to permit him to take full advantage of the tax credit provision.

We should give serious consideration to enacting my College Student Tax Relief Act of 1965 (S. 1486), currently cosponsored by 26 other Republican Senators. This measure, which was defeated on a 47-to-47 tie vote in the Senate last year, would permit working college students to claim tax deductions of up to $1,200—$1,500 for graduate students—toward the student's expenditures for tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment.

Serious consideration should be given to the enactment of Senate bill 1130, which I have introduced and which I refer to as the Human Investment Act of 1965. It would permit employers to get a 7 percent tax credit for their investment in training programs to provide necessary job skills to potential employees and to upgrade the job skills of present employees.

The existing State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program, which has proven its merit in taking men and women off the relief rolls and getting them back into productive work, should be expanded.

I recommend that my proposal for the forgiveness of national defense education loans for persons who choose to teach in property impacted areas be enacted during this session of Congress. This provision is currently included in the Senate committee version of S. 600, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I hope that sometime in the near future my proposal to provide substantial increases in monthly benefits to social security recipients, with the minimum increase from $40 a month to $70 a month, will be enacted.

My proposal to blanket in under social security every American over the age of 70, whether or not he has been covered by social security during his working days, should be enacted.

I suggest that my proposal to permit older workers to earn up to $3,000 a year without losing any monthly benefits under social security should merit the consideration of Congress.

I feel that we should vigorously implement those provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which seek to guarantee to every American the opportunity to hold any job for which he is qualified, regardless of his race, creed, or color.

Likewise, I believe legislation should be enacted to guarantee that all Americans shall have the right to join the labor union of their choice and to take

advantage of its benefits without regard to race, creed, or color.

I believe that Congress should enact my bill to aid the States in the early detection of phenylketonuria—PKU—which if untreated leads to serious mental retardation of children, and an associated economic burden on the child's parents and the State.

Mr. President, top priority in the antipoverty program should be given to ways of combating the serious problem of poverty among the aged, the handicapped, and families headed by women.

I believe that we must recognize and come to grips with the problem of designing and implementing antipoverty community action programs in rural areas, where such programs are more difficult to organize than in large cities.

In its first year of operation the war on poverty has had both successes and failures. Its successes we applaud; its failures give us concern. With the passage of the amendments presently included in H.R. 8283, with the notable exception of the repeal of the Governors' veto, the legislative framework for the war on poverty will be essentially complete. The future progress of this great effort now lies in the hands of those who must administer it.

Despite my strong objection to the repeal of the veto provision, I presently intend to continue my support of the antipoverty program by voting for this bill, barring unwise changes in the Senate floor. But in so doing, I serve notice to those responsible for the bungling and blundering of the past 9 months: my support, and the support of many other Members of Congress who sincerely hope that the dollars we vote here will gnaw effectively at the deep and tenacious roots of poverty in America, will come to an end unless certain parts of this program begin to shape up—and fast. To risk political attacks at home for my support of a well-conceived, smoothly run Federal antipoverty program is one thing; to be forced to defend my support of a poorly planned, chaotic, wasteful, and defectively administered program is quite another. I sincerely hope that by this time next year, if not far sooner, the latter possibility will have substantially receded in likelihood.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word tonight about the Economic Opportunity Act, the amendment to which will be up for votes tomorrow, and the responsibility which we have in enacting this measure.

Let me emphasize first that I am a friend of the program from its very inception. I believe the war on poverty was long overdue. I can only say about the title of the program that I wish we had thought of it first. It is quite proper. We should have a war on poverty in this country. But I do not believe we should bedazzle—it is a clever slogan and can be so used in political terms—the American people, or those who are poor, into forgetting the great dangers inherent in the program, the tremendous waste for which it could be a coverall, the powerful political machines it could feed, the way it could affect politics on the municipal level. It would be a shocking tragedy if we, in our responsibility to avoid all these dangers, were to let them become so serious as to blacken the name of the program in the eyes of the American people and cause it to be abandoned, with all the frustration and despair which that would engender.

It is therefore my view that the Senate would be very well advised to pay sympathetic attention to the amendments which the committee has written into the bill. There are a number of very good ones. I am very proud that the minority, from a constructive standpoint, was responsible for a number of those amendments. The Senate should also give sympathetic attention to amendments which members of the minority will be proposing on the floor.

I very much hope that the majority, which has the votes and therefore the power in this body to ride over any amendments proposed by the minority members, will look with understanding on those amendments, recognizing that the adoption of some of them may very well be indispensable to protecting and safeguarding the program from what I have just outlined as its greatest dangers. Doing so may save the program from a reaction which, if strong enough on the part of the people—notwithstanding the heavy voting strength on the majority side—might cause the program to be eliminated.

I shall have something to say tomorrow about the terribly tragic Los Angeles riots. They are evidence of what people like myself have instinctively felt were involved when we have had before us civil rights bills, antipoverty programs, and similar matters. That is, unbelievable strains, which are almost impossible to sustain in terms of orderly society, are imposed on people who are in such despair that they feel, "What difference does it make what happens in the community? To us the situation is so desperate as to offer no hope or alternative, anyway." As I have said, I shall deal in more detail with that subject tomorrow.

For the moment, I call attention to the fact that in committee we have written into the bill a strong effort to provide that individual private nonprofit organizations, which feel that they have been overlooked or bypassed in community-action programs by citywide "umbrella" organizations, may turn to the Director as a sort of final court of appeals before whom they can make their case. I refer to section 16, amending section 209 (e) of the act. It is an amendment I had the honor to offer.

I call attention also to an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], which he described in his very interesting address, making the National Advisory Council under the act really meaningful.

I call attention also to a very important amendment, sponsored by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], with respect to the possibility of political manipulation, which extends the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act, now applicable only to State and local officials operating under the act, also to private persons whose salaries are paid predominantly by the Federal funds under the Antipoverty Act.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] offered an amendment specifically including consumer education, which is a crucial lack among the poor, in the list of areas which community action programs are encouraged to cover.

I call attention to another amendment which I had the honor to propose, under which the public is given a greater degree of information on the local level than the House provided. It is found in section 9 of the bill amending section 202(a)(5) of the act. It permits public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, as well as opening books and records of a participating agency to the light of day of the press, radio, television, and other agencies of public information, which can zero in on what is being done in the programs. This is the best cathartic I know of to deal with excesses and inequities.

Another amendment which I had the honor to offer calls for continuous consultation with State antipoverty agencies at every stage of the planning and conduct of community action programs, and is to be found in section 14 of the bill amending section 209(a) of the act. Too often, the office in Washington has announced approval of programs which the States have not seen before, this is clearly unreasonable in those States which are fully cooperating in the antipoverty effort.

We have not at all done what we ought to do about the right of a Governor to veto a proposed program. I feel that we made a great mistake in wiping out altogether the provision for a Governor's veto. It was done by a close vote in the committee; the vote was 8 to 7. We should have left in the bill an effective procedure, under a modified version of the House provision. A Governor should be given the opportunity to express his disapproval, as he has every right to do. If the Director wishes to override him, there should be a public hearing, which would put the Director of OEO in Washington to his proof. In short, the Governor should not be permitted to kill a program, but neither should his disapproval stand if the Director, in the court of public opinion, can prove his case.

That subject will probably be the most serious one we shall have to deal with tomorrow and the next day in considering additional amendments with respect to this legislation.

My colleagues, who also proceeded on such amendments in the committee, will be offering cuts in the authorizations of funds. Whether or not I favor such cuts, I believe the Senate should give them serious attention, because it is true we must not be profligate if there is no opportunity to retain control over the program.

In addition, there are other amendments with which we shall have to deal.

Finally, as I announced last week during consideration of the conference report on the Peace Corps, it is my intention to offer an amendment—and this will be my final effort in this regard—to confine the Director of the antipoverty program, Sargent Shriver, to one job,

namely, his direction of the antipoverty program. I feel that this subject should not be labored unduly, but I feel we must decide it in respect of how we want this poverty program to operate.

Senators should bear in mind, if we get into a discussion—and there are many openings for one—in which it is found that the administration of the program was at fault, that we should understand that we had an opportunity to correct the situation, and that we either did or did not do it in an advised way. I have grave concern as to the propriety and wisdom of continuing to let Sargent Shriver—an excellent public servant—carry both jobs. I deeply feel that it will result in a serious diminution of capability in bringing about success in both jobs—and most likely it will be felt most in the antipoverty program.

I therefore hope very much that the Senate will express itself firmly and finally on that subject. I shall be prepared to argue the question of constitutionality of such action taken by the Senate, as I believe it is entirely constitutional and entirely in accordance with the powers and authority of the Senate—indeed, its duty—in this matter.

I look forward, therefore, to disposition of the amendments and the bill in the spirit which I have described, the spirit of being very much for the war on poverty, and of understanding the pitfalls which are involved and therefore endeavoring, by every means open to us, to avoid them.

ATTACK ON REPRESENTATIVE MENDEL RIVERS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, earlier in the day, a Member of this body launched an unbridled attack on the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, Representative of the First Congressional District of South Carolina. The subject of the attack on Representative RIVERS was a report of a speech made by him in Hartford, Conn., on August 11, 1965. Representative RIVERS was quoted as saying: "I will insist on victory in Vietnam. Anything short of that would be treasonable." He is further reported to have stated "that Americans must be prepared to make the decision to attack Mao Tse-tung's homeland if Mao's forces start moving." The Representative asked rhetorically: "Should we use our atomic power to wipe out Red China's atomic capabilities?" He then stated, "We must get ready to do this very thing if we want to stop Red China."

These remarks were characterized on the Senate floor as "so un-American as to be abhorrent."

Mr. President, neither the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee nor his remarks need defense by me. Representative RIVERS has long years of experience in the field of military affairs from his dedicated service on the House Armed Services Committee. I should like to point out that his independent and objective views have caused confrontation with far more experienced officials, including even the Secretary of Defense. I should also like to point out, however, that the distinguished chairman has been dealing with military affairs firsthand, and from a responsible position, far longer than the Secretary of Defense, not to mention his johnny-come-lately critics.

In the final analysis, the American people must judge what is and what is not un-American. The President has stated categorically that we are engaged in a war in Vietnam. Representative RIVERS states that anything short of victory in this war would be treason, and his other remarks merely expressed the hard realities of what may be necessary to achieve that victory. I am sure that Representative RIVERS is satisfied, as I am, to leave it to the judgment of the American people as to which is un-American—victory in the war, or appeasement of the enemy.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a friend of the American merchant marine, I am extremely interested in the work of the Presidential Task Force on Merchant Marine Policy, which is headed by Alan S. Boyd, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

All the reports which have come to my attention indicate that this task force is conducting a most thorough investigation of the many and complex aspects of merchant marine policy. All of us who are concerned with this vital area await its recommendations.

This past weekend, I submitted to the task force an outline of my own views on U.S. merchant marine policy. Representing as I do the great State of Maryland, which contains the second leading port in the Nation, Baltimore, I have gained some experience in the problems of the maritime industry. This experience has led me to certain conclusions about our merchant marine policy. I submitted these conclusions to the Presidential Task Force for their consideration. I would like to review these policy suggestions in the Senate today.

Before I make any suggestions about the U.S. merchant marine policy, however, I would like to discuss briefly some of the reasons why I believe that a vigorous and progressive policy is necessary.

The declaration of policy of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 set forth the objectives of the Congress. Since these objectives have since been obscured and, in some instances, ignored, I would like to quote from this declaration of policy:

> It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.
>
> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

I believe that these are worthy objectives. From the point of view of national defense, there is no question that a large and efficient merchant marine, coupled with a healthy shipbuilding and ship repair industry, can make a major contribution to our national security. Vessels are needed for troop transport: The entire First Cavalry Division embarked for Vietnam last week by ship. They are needed for supply functions as well. Some 600 ships were required to supply American troops in Korea, and the present situation in southeast Asia has demonstrated the continuing need for such vessels. The shipyards, both naval and private, must also be ready, to activate and repair vessels for service in the national defense. The conclusion of the Harvard Business School study for the Navy Department in 1945 still holds true today:

> The controlling factor in the determination of the characteristics of shipping and shipbuilding activities in the United States in peacetime as well as in wartime is the national security.

The value to U.S. commerce of a healthy merchant marine is equally clear. There will be gains in employment, in returns to the American economy, and in reliability if "a substantial part" of our commerce is carried in U.S. bottoms. This is particularly important in light of persistent balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet today only 9 percent of our foreign commerce moves in American-flag vessels. Norwegian carriers transport twice as much of the American foreign trade as U.S. flagships; Liberia carries three times as much as we do. And even from this poor position, we are losing ground.

These concerns become all the more urgent in view of the rapid buildup of the fleets of other nations, most especially of the Soviet Union. The United States ranks only fourth in the world in number of ships afloat, even discounting the disastrous effects of the current maritime strike. The Soviet Union has already surpassed us in number of ships in the active fleet, and may shortly exceed us in total tonnage afloat.

While nations like Japan and Norway are engaged in determined efforts to build up their fleets, we are falling farther and farther behind. We now rank no higher than 11th among shipbuilding nations of the world. The United States—the leading trading nation in the world—risks becoming low man on the totem pole of international shipping.

The need, then, is clear. My suggestions fall into four general classifications.

First. Probably most important is the matter of subsidies. The Government pays out nearly $400 million a year in direct and indirect subsidies to the shipping and shipbuilding industries.

Under normal circumstances, a nation whose economy is based upon free enterprise regards a subsidy system as alien

and undesirable. It seems to me, however, that there are certain goals—the ones enumerated in the 1936 act—which can be achieved only through the maintenance of a healthy American shipping and shipbuilding industry. Due to several factors, notably the high standard of living of American workmen, these goals simply cannot be met without Government subsidy. It is for this reason that, although I sympathize with those who dislike the general principle of Government subsidy, I feel that certain forms of subsidy are essential in this case.

Construction subsidies are an important means of insuring the adequacy of the merchant marine and of the shipyards. It seems to me to be advisable to continue the present system of construction differential subsidies to the liner fleet. The U.S. liner fleet is the finest in the world, due in large part to the Government aid program—80 percent of the 20-knot cargo liner vessels in the world have been built and operated in the United States. This part of the program should continue, with up to 55 percent of the construction cost being paid by the Federal Government.

The first Subcommittee of the Maritime Advisory Committee, after long and careful study of U.S. needs, has concluded that a bulk carrier construction aid program is desirable. This has long been my position.

Given the requirement that ships be built in the United States, we must recognize that this country will never acquire an efficient bulk carrier fleet without Government subsidy. And it is most certainly in the national interest that such a fleet of dry bulk carriers be developed.

According to the analysis made by the Presidential Task Force, the average cost of each bulk carrier would be $11 million, approximately half of it to be paid by the Government. A fleet of 250 vessels, to be built by 1985, has been suggested.

Such a program would add $169 million to the annual subsidy of nearly $400 million, at the outset, for a total expenditure of approximately $570 million.

I do not believe that this is too large a price to pay for the development of a bulk carrier fleet, which can be of inestimable value to this country in the future. Moreover, as the Maritime Advisory Subcommittee has pointed out:

> Much of the cost will be recouped by the Government through additional revenues.

A substantial portion of every dollar of subsidy will return to the Government in the form of income or corporation tax.

I would not presume to give detailed advice as to the number and design of such vessels, of course. But I believe that subsidy for such construction would be highly appropriate. It would undoubedly prove to be one of the best investments that this Government could make.

It might prove necessary, once the contruction of the new dry bulk carriers is completed, to grant an operating subsidy to this segment of the fleet as well. I would propose, however, that no such action be undertaken until a detailed study of the requirements had been completed. With the modernization of the fleet and the continuation of the cargo preference assistance, the dry bulk carriers might well prove to be self-supporting.

I have already cosponsored in the Senate a bill S. 1858, which would allow the creation of tax-free reserve funds for the construction of new vessels. The enactment of such a proposal would provide construction assistance to the other nonsubsidized shippers. The continuation of present trade-in procedures is also to be recommended. Taken together, this construction assistance for liners, dry bulk carriers, and others would provide a well-rounded program of modernization of the U.S. cargo fleet.

Another important area in which Government assistance is given is that of operating subsidies. Due to the high standard of living of American seamen, there appears to be no alternative to continued operating subsidies, if we are to continue to hire American crews and operate vessels under the American flag. These subsidies must therefore be continued.

It may be noted, however, that a significant increase in construction subsidies, such as I have urged, would produce a much more modern and efficient American fleet. This in turn would reduce the amount of operating subsidy needed.

Second. Another area in which the Government can be of great assistance in promoting a healthy merchant marine is the policy of cargo preference. Public Law 664, enacted in 1954, provides that at least 50 percent of U.S. Government-generated cargo shall be carried in American flag vessels, if such vessels are available at "fair and reasonable rates." Public Resolution 17, enacted in 1934, declares that all agricultural products financed by U.S. loans shall be delivered in U.S. vessels, if they are available. In addition, all military cargoes must be shipped on American flag ships.

Three years ago, the late President Kennedy reaffirmed the importance of this cargo preference, stating in particular that the 50 percent requirement "is a minimum, and it shall be the objective of each agency to ship a maximum of such cargoes on U.S. flag vessels."

Despite this explicit Presidential order, there have been numerous occasions on which the requirement has not been met.

Rather than detail the instances, I would merely cite the 1962 report of the Commerce Committee on this subject:

> All too often, the committee has felt, there has been evidenced in at least several of the administrative departments an apparent desire on the part of those responsible for shipping arrangements to evade the cargo preference requirement whenever opportunity offered.

Close congressional supervision has resulted in some improvement of the situation since then, but American cargo shipping is still in a weak and rapidly deteriorating condition. The temptation for Government agencies to ship in foreign bottoms at lower rates still appears to be strong.

I, therefore, feel that a reaffirmation and extension of the cargo preference policy would be appropriate. The U.S. merchant marine cannot remain healthy without substantial amounts of cargo. The U.S. Government, which is the immediate beneficiary of a strong merchant marine in time of emergency, should be the first to give the American shippers that cargo. I, therefore, propose that 75 percent of this Government's cargo be shipped in American bottoms. I have respectfully urged the task force to make such a recommendation.

In addition, of course, I believe that the Congress should continue to oversee carefully the administration of the cargo preference laws. As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I will do my utmost to see that all Government agencies comply with these regulations whenever practicable.

The first subcommittee of the Maritime Advisory Committee made a recommendation that not less than 30 percent of all petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States be carried by U.S.-flag tankers, where they are available.

I agree with the subcommittee that such a regulation would not be unduly harsh on petroleum importers, and that it might aid significantly in restoring our tanker fleet to some semblance of strength. At present, American flagships carry only 2.3 percent of the petroleum imports of this country. Surely we can, and should, do much better than that.

In general, I feel that the Government should expand and intensify its efforts to promote shipping in American bottoms. Some of these efforts can be direct: Through an expanded and strictly enforced cargo preference program—the cost of which may be reduced as increasing modernization brings American shipping rates into line with foreign rates.

Other efforts can be indirect: The Maritime Administration's continuing promotion, "for trade or trips, American ships" is an example. Such a dual program, efficiently administered, would greatly strengthen the American merchant marine.

Third. The next general area of maritime policy which I feel deserves attention is labor-management relations. As I told a Senate subcommittee, the labor situation has been chaotic in recent years. I strongly feel that something must be done about this deplorable situation—operating as far as possible within the framework of free collective bargaining.

I concur heartily with what Secretary of Commerce Connor said at the Merchant Marine Academy last week:

> In our system of free, competitive enterprise, I would prefer to see a diminishing Government role and an expanding private rol in the maritime industry. But so long as the Government is involved—so long, for instance, as the Government is called upon to pay 72 cents or more of every dollar in wages aboard subsidized ships—the voice of the Government must and will be heard.

When the Government and the taxpayers of this country have as big a stake in the maritime industry as they do—to the extent of nearly $400 million

annually—they have a right to expect some stability in labor-management relations, and some continuity in the service for which they are paying a large part of the bills.

I believe that the Government should require a no-strike clause in the labor contracts of all construction and operation which it subsidizes. Only in this manner can some continuity of service be insured.

I would like to make it clear that I am not proposing compulsory arbitration of collective bargaining issues. When a contract comes up for negotiation, there should be free and unimpaired collective bargaining, aided perhaps by Federal mediation if such mediation would assist in preventing a work stoppage.

But once a contract has been agreed upon, issues which arise during the life of the contract should be settled by arbitration—not by strike or by lockout. And I respectfully submit that the Federal Government should make this a prerequisite of any construction or operating subsidy.

Fourth. Lastly, I offer several recommendations which bear on the Government's policies toward the private shipyards of the Nation. I think it should be the general objective of the Government to encourage the growth and continued health of the private shipyards.

This can be accomplished in several ways. I would oppose a total ban on the purchase of any vessels abroad, but I believe that no such purchases in foreign shipyards should be made without careful consultation with the Congress. Twice during the past year, such purchases have been suggested. The general rule—to be reached only under exceptional circumstances—should be that no work which could be done in American yards, thereby fostering a substantial American construction and repair capacity, should be given to foreign yards.

This rule should apply to Defense Department contracts as well as those of the other agencies. Moreover, the requirement that subsidized ships be built in U.S. yards is reasonable and very much in line with the 1936 declaration of policy.

The Defense Department can aid the maintenance of a strong private shipyard industry in another way: By guaranteeing a substantial portion of the naval repair and conversion work to the private yards. The 65/35 provision formerly included in the annual Department of Defense appropriation would be an effective means of guaranteeing a minimum of 35 percent of such work to private yards.

The proposals which I have made would not be without cost to the Federal Government. If adopted, they might raise the present total annual maritime expenditure substantially. But a nation which can afford $5.2 billion for space, it seems to me, can also afford to spend sufficient funds to insure an adequate merchant marine.

And it would be short-sighted indeed to assume that funds spent to assist the maintenance of our merchant marine are funds lost. Not only will they produce an effective and efficient merchant marine for wartime and peacetime activity, not only will they save the United States substantial amounts of dollars on her international balance of payments, not only will they provide jobs for American seamen and shipyard workers, but they will be paid back to the Government, in large part, in the form of taxes. Thus the additional spending which would be entailed would represent a relatively small but very important investment—one of the best investments, in my judgment, which the Government could make.

In summary, my proposals would involve additional subsidies, increased cargo preference, provisions for labor peace, and placing of work in American shipyards. The cost would not be prohibitive; the results, I believe, would be of great advantage to this Nation.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maryland for the speech he is making. I associate myself with his speech.

I tell the Senator that, as in years gone by, he can find me on exactly the same side that the senior Senator from Maryland is taking.

I believe that the senior Senator from Maryland is unanswerably right, and that the speech he is making is needed. I hope that the Navy and the Defense Department and the White House will take note of his remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. I appreciate the fact that he joins with me and lends his great prestige to the point of view that I am now raising and that he has so long espoused.

VIETNAM—FORMER SENATOR GOLDWATER'S COLUMN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a column written by a former Member of this body, Barry Goldwater—I believe that most of us still remember him—was published in the New York Herald Tribune for August 15 and in other newspapers which publish Mr. Goldwater's column. While it is highly critical of me, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

SCREWBALL IDEAS

(By Barry Goldwater)

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, suggests that there is a rising demand among the American people to impeach President Johnson. He made this astounding announcement recently in the Senate.

Senator MORSE, who is noted for going to any lengths to make a point in favor of his own position, claimed that this is due to the administration's Vietnam policy, which he opposes.

"In my trip across the country," the Oregon Democrat told his colleagues on August 3, "I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy.

"I have heard the word 'impeach' used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur.

"I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment," he stated.

"Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case."

Senator MORSE accused President Johnson in the same speech of conducting an illegal war in Vietnam. He added:

"In my judgment, we cannot justify the homicides for which the President or Rusk or McNamara or Bundy or Lodge and the rest of them are responsible in conducting an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam."

These statements, coming from a Democrat, raise some interesting questions.

One wonders just who Senator MORSE talked to during his trip across the country.

Since all the public opinion polls show the American people overwhelmingly support the President's policy in Vietnam, it must be concluded that the Senator spent his time consulting the intellectual extremists who keep suggesting that the President is "out of control" because he has decided to stand firm against Communist aggression in Asia. It is safe to assume that most Americans never heard the suggestion of impeachment until Senator MORSE cut loose.

What did he expect to accomplish by his remarkable statement?

He carefully says that he was "alarmed" by what he heard. But it is important to note that his concern did not prevent him from giving the widest possible circulation to a ridiculous suggestion of removing the President.

Senator MORSE also coupled his comments with a demand that the administration give heed to congressional critics of its Vietnam policy and that the Congress remain in session so that the stream of criticism can continue for the remainder of the year.

Senator MORSE should pause to consider why people with such an outlandish idea as impeachment of the President should seek him out for questioning. Such charges as one accusing administration officials of homicide make him the logical repository for screwball ideas.

This certainly should be the source of his concern. It proves beyond any doubt that the far-left critics of President Johnson's foreign policy have become irrational in their objections and that they are running far beyond the bounds of intelligent debate. They are certainly "out of control."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I could not find a better recommendation for my position on any issue than to discover that Goldwater is against it. The reason why he made such little imprint on American public opinion in 1964 is well illustrated by the tactics to which he resorted in publishing this article.

I should like to suggest to Mr. Goldwater that he give instructions to his ghost writers at least to tell the whole story. However, we do not expect that from Mr. Goldwater and his ghost writers.

Mr. President, the column takes great exception because I pointed out in the Senate that there are those in this country who seek to resort to impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States because of his undeclared,

unconstitutional, and illegal war in southeast Asia. But, there is not a word in the Goldwater distortions to show that I made perfectly clear that I completely disagree with the position taken by those talking about impeachment.

The first reference to communications which I received, and discussions which I have heard concerning impeachment, was in reference to comments I made in the Senate on August 3 setting forth again, as I have so many times, my disapproval of the President's executive handling of the conduct of the war without the slightest constitutional authority to do so. I pointed out in that speech of August 3 that the President has come under criticism for conducting a war without a declaration of war. Further, I pointed out that it should be evident that if Congress goes ahead with its present plan to adjourn by Labor Day, or shortly thereafter, the war in Vietnam will be even more completely an executive war than it is now, because Congress, at least at the present time, if it wills, has the constitutional checks which it can apply to the President, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense.

I also pointed out that Congress could do more to protect the President from impeachment talk if it remained in session, because it would be in a position to exercise its checking function; whereas with Congress out of session for 3 or 4 months, the President would be exposed to rising charges that he is conducting a war without reference to the Constitution.

During the past few weeks I have said over and over again that I believe the best friends of the President in Congress are those who wish to keep Congress in session. I have suggested that if Congress feels that its schedule permits it to take a recess of 1, 2, or 3 weeks at a time, it might consider doing that, but to adjourn sine die would be something different.

I do not believe we can morally justify adjourning Congress sine die with American boys dying in southeast Asia in a war that could spread rapidly.

We have a clear duty, connected with our positions of public responsibility, to stay in session, if it is for no other reason than to remain here to participate in our constitutional duties as a check upon the executive branch of the Government under our system of three coequal and coordinate branches of government while a war, even though in this instance an unconstitutional war, is being fought and supreme sacrifices are being made.

There is not the slightest reference in the Goldwater trash that he published in his column yesterday about the speech I made on August 4. He quotes from my August 3 speech. On August 4 I repeated the language to which Goldwater refers from my August 3 speech. Then I went on to say, quoting from my August 4 speech:

Then I went on to make a statement as why, in my judgment, Congress should not adjourn sine die but should remain in session until January 1. I pointed out that we should remain in session and carry out our constitutional responsibility of serving as a legislative check upon executive action.

There are those, judging from the interviews with the press today, and from telephone calls that the senior Senator from Oregon has received, who interpret my remarks as indicating that I advocate the impeachment of the President.

Of course, such an interpretation is nonsense.

Then I proceeded to develop my reasons for opposing any suggestion about impeachment, and set out the contents of the letters that I had sent out in answer to such suggestions, in which I made perfectly clear that I thoroughly disapprove of any impeachment proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the August 4, 1965, speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I said in a speech on the floor of the Senate.

"Mr. President, in my trip across the country and back since I spoke on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy. I have heard the word "impeach" used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur. I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment.

"Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war, in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case."

Then I went on to make a statement as to why, in my judgment, Congress should not adjourn sine die but should remain in session until January 1. I pointed out that we should remain in session and carry out our constitutional responsibility of serving as a legislative check upon the executive action.

There are those, judging from the interviews with the press today, and from telephone calls that the senior Senator from Oregon has received, who interpret my remarks as indicating that I advocate the impeachment of the President.

Of course, such an interpretation is nonsense.

Mr. President, I have been receiving a great deal of mail in regard to this matter and many people have talked to me at meetings at which I have spoken in opposition to the President's war in Vietnam. I have been answering all of the mail on the impeachment matter with a letter that contains these two paragraphs. I read two paragraphs from a letter dated July 6, 1965. I have sent similar letters before and since that time:

"In your letter, you asked me for my views concerning your suggestion that steps should be taken to impeach President Johnson and perhaps some other officials. It is my view that such an impeachment attempt would be a very serious mistake. All it would do would be to divert attention away from the basic issues involved in American foreign policy in Asia and center attention on President Johnson, as an individual. It would cause many people who disagree with his foreign policy to rally behind him, because they would consider such a movement to be an ad hominem approach. Attacking Johnson, personally, will not change his course of action, and it will not win supporters for a change of foreign policy in Asia, but to the contrary, it will drive supporters away.

In my opinion, there is no question about Johnson's sincerity or his patriotism or his desire for peace. It is Johnson's bad judgment and mistaken reasoning in respect to the war in Asia that constitute the basis of the crucial problems that confront us in trying to get a change in Johnson's policies in Asia. To attack him, personally, by proposing impeachment would be the most serious personal attack that could be made upon him. It would rally the Nation behind him and result in his policies being escalated into a major war at a much faster rate. Those of us who oppose Johnson's foreign policies must meet his views on their merits. We should never attack him, personally."

I wish the RECORD to show that this letter represents the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in all correspondence on the subject. Also, it represents my answers to questions on impeachment at all rallies I have attended, and in all my conversations with those who urge impeachment of the President.

Those that I have talked to and who have written to me suggesting impeachment of the President are not extremists in the sense that they are irresponsible persons. Many of them are on the faculties of American universities. Many of them are out of the professional life of our Nation.

I have no intention of joining them in such a program. Nevertheless, I believe it is a significant fact that there is growing discussion in this country of an attempt to stop the President from his illegal war in southeast Asia, even to the extent of circulating impeachment petitions.

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say in reply to the Senator from Ohio that it is not at all surprising for people in the country who think the President is following an unconscionable and illegal course of action in South Vietnam to turn to the Constitution and look for what procedural protection they have. They have a perfect right to turn to the impeachment procedure. I believe that they are making a great mistake in judgment. I, of course, would defend them in their right to exercise their constitutional rights. But, in one sense, I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that until the President follows his constitutional obligation by coming before this body and asking for a declaration of war, the President is engaged in an illegal war. It is a war now conducted by the Chief Executive, in South Vietnam without a scintilla of constitutional right. This Congress is likewise guilty of violating its duties under the Constitution by seeking to delegate to the President a power that it cannot constitutionally delegate. It is the duty of the Congress under article I, section 8, either to declare war or to stop the President from slaughtering American boys in southeast Asia. I have no doubt that impeachment talk will increase if the President continues to conduct an unconstitutional war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me make very clear that the more Barry Goldwater attacks me the better I like it, because that will only show how right I am. He was dead wrong throughout the campaign in his shocking proposals for military action which would have involved us in a major war in Asia. It is with great regret that I find my President has followed to too great a degree the very unsound position that Goldwater took during the campaign.

I still hope, upon further reflection and as more and more evidence comes in with respect to the great concern that

exists throughout the country with respect to our military course of action in southeast Asia, that my Government will return to the framework of international law and that we will put the members of the United Nations on the spot by formally submitting the entire subject to the Security Council, and in that way find out who it is who really believes in substituting the rule of law for military might as a means of settling disputes which have raised this serious threat to the peace of the world.

THE DEADLOCK IN CONFERENCE ON THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the country now knows, the Senate conferees and the House conferees have been in deadlock over the foreign aid authorization bill. The Senate committee and the Senate adopted the Fulbright-Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. The first part of the proposal submitted by the Senator from Arkansas would authorize a 2-year extension of foreign aid. The second part, the amendment which I offered—and which I have offered for several past years—seeks to bring the present program of foreign aid to an end. The date of my amendment this year was the beginning of fiscal year 1967. In the intervening period a thorough study of foreign aid would be made by a special committee, to the end of starting a new foreign aid program on the basis of new rules and procedures and policies, to the extent that the old program needs to be changed, as found by that study; and the objective should be that the new program should seek to limit the foreign aid program to 50 nations, although we made very clear, as the RECORD will show at the time the Senate debated the matter, that there is nothing fixed about the figure 50, and that if the study showed that it ought to be a higher number or a lesser number, another number ought to be selected.

Mr. President, it is highly significant that the Foreign Relations Committee this year formally adopted my amendment. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. LONG of Louisiana], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, knows that for the past 2 years serious consideration has been given to the Morse proposal. In my two dissenting reports in the past 2 years on foreign aid I pointed out that the majority in their report was kind enough to point out that their feeling was there had been great errors in foreign aid, but that they felt the administration should be given a further opportunity to bring about the necessary changes and reforms.

The Presiding Officer knows that in the past 2 years I have said that the majority of the committee had made my case for me, and that when they admit that reforms are necessary it clearly becomes the responsibility of the Foreign Relations Committee to make recommendations for reforms.

This year, in contrast to the majority position of the last 2 years, the committee started adopting some reforms. The Fulbright proposal for a 2-year authorization, coupled with the Morse proposal for ending the program at the beginning of fiscal year 1965, and starting a new program, was really a matter of major moment in connection with foreign aid.

Without disclosing any privileged matter, as the papers have stated, the Foreign Relations Committee met last week, on August 12, with the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and the director of foreign aid, Mr. Bell, and they discussed the impasse that has developed between the Senate conferees and the House conferees, and it was pointed out that there was a deadlock.

The Presiding Officer knows that deadlocks are resolved. The Presiding Officer knows that someone will recede.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate that I pay high tribute to the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I am indeed proud of the insistence of the Senate conferees in conferences with the House, in their attempt to work out a conscionable accommodation of the differences which exist between the two conference groups.

We also know that the administration has put on the heat. The administration wants a conference report. I can understand that. However, I believe that in getting a conference report, unless the suggestion I am about to make is accepted, the end result will be closer to what the House wants than what the Senate has passed. I hope not, but that is my fear.

I have made clear that I cannot vote in conference for the renewal of the old program. The American people are entitled to something better. I believe that the real friends of foreign aid should insist on something better. In my judgment, if we continue foreign aid on the basis which has characterized it in the past, the American people will rise up against it at the polls and make perfectly clear to the Members of Congress that they are fed up with it.

They should have done it several years ago. Since 1946 we have had a program costing some $111 billion which is so honeycombed with inefficiency and shocking waste, and is the cause of so much corruption in so many parts of the world, that it ought to be stopped. I believe the military aid aspects of foreign aid explain to a remarkable degree some of the serious plights in which the United States finds itself in those areas of the world where strong anti-American feeling is developing; and more of that is entering. I mention it in passing tonight only because I wish to say that those of us who are insisting upon a reform of foreign aid are the true friends of foreign aid. Officers of the present administration who wish to continue foreign aid as it has been will, in my judgment, run into such strenuous opposition from the American people that they are the ones who will do great damage to the positive, affirmative aspects that could characterize a sound foreign aid program.

I shall not sign a conference report and I shall not vote for a conference report, as I made very clear to the conference, and as I have made very clear heretofore in the Senate, that is merely a conference report that would give the American taxpayers more of the same—more waste, more inefficiency, more corruption, and more expedients to postpone the day of reckoning in the underdeveloped areas of the world. So I have proposed a continuing resolution on foreign aid on a temporary basis until there can be some crystallization of a foreign aid program that will at least include some procedures therein which will make it possible for us to go ahead with the reform of foreign aid.

But, it is said, "What about Vietnam?" Let us face it. Vietnam no longer has anything to do with the foreign aid program. Vietnam is in a class by itself.

The funds for Vietnam are included in the foreign aid bill, but everyone knows that, in the months ahead, we shall receive requests from the administration for additional funds for Vietnam, and those measures will be passed.

I do not believe, in connection with the continuing resolution with respect to foreign aid, that Vietnam presents any sound argument against such a continuing resolution.

What we should do is to give consideration to a continuing resolution on foreign aid. The Senate ought to consider a continuing resolution rather than a new foreign aid bill which, in my judgment, would entrench more deeply the existing evils of our present foreign aid bill. I make these comments today because I wish to make them as a matter of public record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to express the hope that my President, the Secretary of State, and the director of foreign aid, Mr. Bell, will give careful thought to the suggestion.

I am not alone in making the suggestion, because other members of the committee, in effect, said in the presence of the Secretary of State the other day that they would like to have the Department of State be prepared to advise us as to what insurmountable problems would be created by such a continuing resolution, if any—and I do not believe there are any.

It is better for the Senate and for the House to adopt a continuing resolution of aid as it now exists rather than to go ahead and adopt a new foreign aid bill before we have had the time to make the necessary reforms or time to make the necessary reforms for a new foreign aid program. So I make that suggestion tonight in the hope that the administration will consider it. If a conference report based upon a receding by the Senate conferees, or a majority thereof, comes to the floor of the Senate, it will stir up a considerable discussion in the Senate and in the country, because the public generally, in my opinion, wishes foreign aid cleaned up.

The bill before us for conference with the Fulbright-Morse amendments eliminated would give the American people no hope for cleaning up of foreign aid under that bill. The Senate should consider and adopt a continuing resolution

because of a deadlock in conference and because there is a growing recognition of the situation on the part of the conferees, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Members of the Senate; and the sentiment is also prevalent in the House. There is one House conferee who goes even further than I go in regard to foreign aid. He would lead one to believe that he would be perfectly willing to end it for all time.

Interestingly, I consider myself a stronger advocate, or an advocate of foreign aid as strong as any Member of the Senate, bar none, but an entirely different type of foreign aid than has been fleecing the American taxpayers out of billions of dollars for so many years.

So if we really wish to be friends of foreign aid, the Senate and the House ought to support a resolution that would continue, for another year, foreign aid as it was administered under the old bill. Such action would not prevent it from being adopted with the clear understanding that Vietnam is excluded, and Vietnam will be considered by itself in the light of the needs as that illegal war progresses.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Barry Gray Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a national magazine, in discussing the Barry Gray program, offered this cogent, but highly perceptive appraisal of the broadcast:

> The best in the business * * * his (Mr. Gray's) guests say whatever they please.

Barry Gray, one of the most astute and well-informed radio commentators in New York, recently celebrated his 15th anniversary with WMCA, and I submit that he has recorded a number of major accomplishments that merit attention, and account for his enormous popularity.

He has interviewed an estimated 30,000 guests, men and women in the arts, politics, science, and the literary field, conducted more air interview hours than any of his competitors, nearly 20,000, and, to his great credit, enjoys the largest evening radio audience in New York City.

A veteran of nearly 30 years in broadcasting, Mr. Gray can point with justifiable pride to the fact that his program is one of the most discussed shows on the air. His achievements, one esteemed radio critic has stated, have proven that listeners "will stay up late to hear discussion, opinion, and controversy."

Mr. Gray is more than a moderator of a talk program. He is a man gifted with keen reportorial instincts, an interviewer with rare insight who is able to get to the heart of a subject, and a broadcaster who has demonstrated repeatedly that he has the courage to express his convictions on the air.

His work is in the tradition of such renowned figures as Edward R. Murrow, Elmer Davis, and H. V. Kaltenborn, in that he has spoken with courage and vigor when presenting views he believes are meaningful and of profound interest to the public, and when analyzing men and events that shape our lives.

Mindful of the fact that in a democracy, disparate opinions on major issues must be aired and every effort must be made to provide answers to searching questions, Mr. Gray has made his program a forum for all viewpoints on vital local, national, and international matters.

He has made his microphones available to men of all political persuasion, and though ideas have been advanced that are anathema to Mr. Gray personally, he has permitted them to be articulated fully in order to give his listeners the broadest possible perspective.

In a media that has been criticized at times for its timidity on controversial matters, Mr. Gray himself has often been the center of controversy—but he is to be commended for consistently refusing to compromise his beliefs.

A man of varied activity, lively intelligence, and broad interests, Barry Gray has illuminated and brought distinction to nighttime radio. The New York City broadcasting scene is a better place for his presence.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE SCHISLER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, in a very short time the full body of the House of Representatives will be called upon to consider the 1965 agricultural proposals. As one who was born and raised on an Illinois farm, I am especially interested in seeing a workable farm program enacted by this 89th Congress.

I firmly believe there are no easy solutions to attaining this workable program, but I feel if all interested parties will sit together at the negotiating table, all views and every possible program can be brought to light and discussed. Our district has taken this approach: the Illinois Agricultural Association, citizens groups representing our farmers, and other interested organizations have met with me to discuss in detail the 1965 agriculture proposal.

On August 6 and 7 we had the distinct pleasure of having Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman visit the 19th District of Illinois. Secretary Freeman's remarks to large gatherings in Monmouth and Rock Island, Ill., were indeed timely and extremely helpful in understanding what the 1965 agricultural proposals seek to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I share with my colleagues excerpts from Secretary Freeman's remarks, delivered at the Monmouth College Student Center, August 6, 1965:

EXCERPTS FROM SECRETARY ORVILLE FREEMAN'S REMARKS

The old adage that economic depressions are farm-bred and farm-led still applies. But today we prefer to think of it in positive terms—that millions of jobs and the health of many great industries depend on farm products and farm dollars.

Representative GRAHAM URCELL made a survey of 625 farmers in 10 big wheat States relative to their prospective investment in farm machinery. He received replies from 466 of the 625 farmers surveyed. Under current wheat prices these 466 farmers plan to buy only about $836,000 worth of equipment. On the other hand, if the price of wheat for domestic use is increased to full parity, they indicate they would buy almost 10 times as much, or $7,840,000 worth. We estimate that for every $10,000 of additional farm machinery bought by farmers, one added job is created by industry. For just these 466 farmers, therefore, an adjustment in the domestic wheat price would mean about 700 more jobs in the farm machinery industry.

Last year, for example, gross farm income was $4 billion more than in 1960—and farmers spent over $600 million more for automobiles and $400 million more for capital goods and machinery. In the past 4 years farmers have spent more than $3 billion more on autos, tractors, and other farm machinery and equipment than would have been possible with a 1960 style income. In addition, they spent about $5 billion more on such production and consumer items as feed, fertilizer and lime, food, clothing, and household furnishings.

Our farm people are prime consumers. They spend about $30 billion a year on the goods and services related to agricultural production. They use more petroleum than any other industry. The take 9 percent of all the rubber consumed in the United States each year. They use 5 million tons of steel a year—a third as much as the automotive industry. They consume about 4 percent of the Nations' electric power.

Then they spend another $12 billion a year on family living—for food, clothes, furniture, medicine, and other products and services from town and city sources.

About 6 million people are employed directly on farms. But this is only the beginning. Agriculture is the cotter key holding