

the country have opportunities to develop and utilize their talents more fully.

This is real seed time for our society—a time when we must go into new fields and go into old ones, to sow the seed for the harvest of a finer life by generations who come after us.

The effort we make to support and to sustain and to advance our science is vital to the success of this Nation's purposes. The challenge is great—but we accept it and we shall meet it, to the fullest degree.

Our objects today remain the same as when an early resident of this House said that "the

main objects of all science are the freedom and happiness of man."

Science in America has done much to provide us with the health and the happiness and the hopefulness we enjoy. But we are proud and grateful that the benefits of our science serve not our ends alone. Whether in the keeping of peace or the exploration of space, whether to study the seas or combating of disease and poverty and ignorance, the cause of our science is the cause of all mankind.

As Thomas Jefferson once wrote to a friend in another land, "The field of knowledge is the common property of mankind, and any

discoveries we can make in it will be for the benefit of yours and every other nation, as well as our own."

So this morning as we honor our outstanding men of science, let all the world understand that science in America is—and shall remain—dedicated to mankind's freedom, and mankind's justice and peace and not to mankind's oppression or enslavement or destruction.

Now let the citations be read for the 1964 awards of the National Medal of Science.

Thank you all for coming here and letting me enjoy seeing you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

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

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

Our gracious Father, before Thy ever blazing throne, we ask no luster of our own. Yea, rather, we bow in the dust of abject failure, asking that Thou wilt grant us the cleansing grace of penitence.

Through the gates that are swinging on ancient hinges, we glimpse revealing new vistas of a fairer world where humanity will at last be free from the blood-rusted chains which have debased and degraded those who also are Thy children.

Empower us to lay aside the weight of every selfish prejudice and the sins of covetousness that do so easily beset us, and with glad and eager feet to march with the armies that go to free, not to bind—to develop, not to rule—to cooperate, not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, will cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BAYH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 10, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 158. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 2594. An act to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; and

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 158. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1647. An act to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; and

H.R. 2594. An act to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made in the morning hour be confined to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15; AND THEN IMMEDIATE ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. Monday, February 15; that immediately after convening on that day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, February 17.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF SENATOR PEARSON TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under an order of January 24, 1901, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 22.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:
A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the Honorable President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of Commerce of the United States and to the Honorable Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is reported that railroad and trucking freight rates, relating to interstate shipment and transporting of foodstuffs, raw materials, farm produce, farm equipment, and implements, vehicles, and all other consumer items, in the northwestern States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington are 100 percent to 150 percent greater than related freight rates in the remaining several States of the United States; and

"Whereas the higher freight rates are inequitable in relation to the current rates in the remaining several States and work a great and unnecessary hardship upon the farmer, retail merchant, producers, consumers, and general citizenry of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Interstate Commerce Commission should institute an orderly and exhaustive investigation into any inequities existing between the freight rates touching the States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington, as related to the remaining several States, that subsequent legislation, implementing their findings and removing from the citizenry of the States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington the economic hardships now existing as a direct result of the higher and unnecessary freight rates, be proposed in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce of the United States and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the investigation of existing inequities of freight rates in the northwestern States of Idaho, Montana, and Washington; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the House and to the president of the Senate of the State of Washington and the State of Montana, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 25th day of January 1965.

"W. E. DREVBOW,

"President of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted of the house of representatives on the 28th day of January 1965.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"ARTHUR WILSON,

"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. CLARK:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PENNSYLVANIA

"Considerations of humanity and justice compel the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to register this protest against the wrongs and sufferings of Soviet Jewry.

"We call upon the Soviet Union:

"To declare its policy of eradicating anti-Semitism through government and party; to eliminate discrimination against Jews in all areas of Soviet public life; to end all propaganda campaigns which use anti-Semitic stereotypes, implied or overt; and to halt the discriminatory application of maximum penalties, including the death sentence, against Jews for alleged economic crimes.

"To permit the practice of Judaism, synagogue worship, the training of rabbinical students in religious seminaries, the publication and distribution of prayer books, and the production and distribution of religious articles, kosher foods, and matzohs.

"To permit the organization of a nationwide federation of synagogues and to sanction the association of such a federation with organizations of coreligionists abroad.

"To permit Jews to make religious pilgrimages to the Holy places in Israel, and permit free emigration for those who wish to leave the U.S.S.R.

"To end the suppression of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union by permitting writers and other Jewish intellectuals to express themselves in the Yiddish language through books, periodicals, newspapers, and the theater.

"We also call upon the United States and the United Nations to exert every influence with the Soviet Union to bring about full equality and security for Soviet Jewry: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States.

"Attest:

"ROBERT K. HAMILTON,

"Speaker.

"ANTHONY J. PETROSKY,

"Chief Clerk."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 805. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (Rept. No. 67).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 1115. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1116. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 1117. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 1118. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1119. A bill for the relief of Julio Dumas, and his wife, Josephine Dumas; and

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ortelio Rodriguez Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1121. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1122. A bill to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1123. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the widow of an insured individual to become entitled to widow's insurance benefits prior to attainment of age 62, if such widow is under a disability which began before her husband died;

S. 1124. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age; and

S. 1125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FONG, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1126. A bill to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Ines Maria Fonseca Litto; and

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Simon Der Simonian, his wife, Hossannah Der Simonian, and their children, Knel Sebouh Der Simonian, Rebecca Der Simonian, Haroutune Der Simonian, and Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1129. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PELL (for Mr. PASTORE):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of April in each year as National Record Keeping Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. PELL (for Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) relating to the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PELL (for Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself, and my senior colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], a bill to increase to \$2,400 per annum the limitation on earnings of recipients of old-age insurance benefits.

The Social Security Act now requires that benefits be withheld from a beneficiary under the age of 72 at the rate of \$1 in benefits for each \$2 of annual earnings between \$1,200 and \$1,700 and \$1 in benefits for each dollar of annual earnings about \$1,700. This penalty upon self-reliance makes it difficult or impossible for social security recipients to supplement their benefits, which, in most cases, are totally inadequate to meet the financial needs of an elderly individual and his dependents.

There were a number of developments during the 88th Congress that showed the strong desire of Members of Congress and their constituents that this earnings limitation be liberalized.

First. There were a large number of bills introduced in both the Senate and House to bring about this result.

Second. The Senate Special Committee on Aging endorsed a recommendation for such liberalization as part of its report on "Increasing Employment Opportunities for the Elderly."

Third. The Senate itself amended H.R. 11865, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964, to further ease this restriction, before sending that measure to conference. Unfortunately, the conferees could not come to agreement and, as we all know, the measure was not

enacted in the last session of the Congress.

Of course, there are great differences between the needs of social security recipients aged 65 to 72 for income supplementation and between their desires, willingness, and need to work. But there are millions of them for whom enforced idleness means boredom, feelings of uselessness and futility, and bad mental and physical health, not to mention the excruciating financial problems visited upon them. Enactment of the bill which I am introducing would thus make a substantial contribution not only to the financial well-being of older Americans but also to their physical and mental health and to their morale and general outlook on life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1115) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SURVEY OF A LAKE TAHOE PARKWAY IN NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for an appropriation not to exceed \$100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation is directed at answering a vital need in one of the beautiful scenic areas of our Nation—the need to help preserve for this generation and those of the future the vast grandeur of Lake Tahoe. This Sierra lake is an inspiration of mountain splendor astride the Nevada-California border. But the advance of commercial development threatens to destroy the very qualities which make the name Lake Tahoe synonymous with beauty. This situation injects a note of urgency into this legislation and into other efforts to keep Lake Tahoe largely an unspoiled wilderness lake. It is already too late along some stretches of the magnificent shoreline. I consider it urgent to make certain this statement will never apply to all of Lake Tahoe.

Only a few days ago, in his message to Congress, President Johnson called for a program to increase the beauty of our Nation. As he put it:

For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage.

I submit that the bill I have introduced today strikes a chord with the proposals of the President's message. A study of a national parkway for Lake Tahoe is but an initial step in the overall program to

protect this prized scenic heritage, but I believe it is an important step. As one active supporter phrased it to me, we are fast running out of unspoiled Edens, and if we lose Lake Tahoe, we will never have one like it again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1116) to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$100,000 with which to make a survey of a Lake Tahoe Parkway in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce for appropriate reference proposed legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to authorize the construction of a rapid transit system for the Nation's Capital. Joining as a cosponsor is the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whose own State of Maryland has a vital role in this transportation problem.

The President has given the bill a strong endorsement and has requested that it be acted on favorably by Congress.

I believe strongly that an efficient, balanced transportation system is needed for the Nation's Capital area to meet its main purpose—service to the public. The President's recommendations provide a working basis for Congress to consider the Washington area's increasingly critical transportation problem. I believe the bill is needed and that there is every reason why it should be passed this session. Mass transportation in the National Capital region has held the attention of the Senate during the last four administrations. The problem is a visible one each day and each of us is a part of it.

I am advised that the bill meets the major objections that were raised with respect to the rapid transit bill that was transmitted to the Congress in 1963. First, the bill incorporates the labor protective provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1954 and thus assures that labor will be protected in Washington just as will be done nationally. Second, the system will be publicly owned but privately operated by management contract. The management contract will free the Government of the need for involvement in the day-to-day management of the rapid transit system, while at the same time assuring that there will be strict public control over fares, profits, and other key aspects of the operation. The management contract also insures that maximum use will continue to be made of private enterprise in the conduct of public transportation service in Washington. Third, the financing formula has been revised so as to lessen substantially the Federal Government's financial investment. The construction of the \$430 million rapid

transit system will require a Federal grant contribution of \$100 million—less than 25 percent of the construction cost.

The rapid transit system the bill would authorize is urgently needed. The National Capital region is the third fastest-growing metropolitan area in the country. Its downtown area is flooded with automobiles and their numbers grow daily. In the morning peak hour today, some 80,000 automobiles are in the downtown area, and the streets are all but impassable.

Unless a rapid transit system is added to our highway network, it is estimated that 25 percent more automobiles will pour into the downtown area in the next 15 years. Congestion will be, if possible, even worse than it is today.

There is no other answer to this problem than to accompany the construction of planned highways in the region with the construction of a rapid transit system. That is what Congress intended when it passed legislation 4 years ago authorizing preparation of a rapid transit plan. The bill I am introducing will authorize the construction of a modern rapid system that will incorporate the latest technology available and will speed thousands of people into the Nation's capital every day free of surface congestion. I believe, with the President, that it deserves favorable treatment.

Certainly, what Congress does—and I hope it may be done this year—will determine the capital area's transportation and traffic pattern for the next 50 years or more. A solution has already been delayed too long. Therefore, I am hopeful that a cooperative attitude toward a common goal will prevail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter submitting the formal National Capital Transportation Agency report, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1117) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the act of July 14, 1960, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 10, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting to the Congress herewith, with my approval, a report submitted to me by the National Capital Transportation Agency on February 1, 1965, entitled "Rail Rapid Transit for the Nation's Capital," and a proposed bill which would authorize the Agency to proceed with the transit development program described in that report. In preparing the proposed bill I have given full consideration to improvements that have been suggested to earlier bills.

The problem of mass transportation in the Washington area is critical. It is also a problem in which the Federal Government

has a unique interest and responsibility. As Congress found in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, an improved transportation system for this area "is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital."

There is widespread agreement that a high-speed and high-capacity rail transit system operating over separate rights-of-way through the more densely populated sections of the Washington Metropolitan area provides the most promising approach to a long-range solution. Such a system will preserve the beauty, the dignity, and the historic and monumental character of our Capital City. It will exercise a desirable influence on the pattern of growth of the metropolitan area. And such a system is vital if we are to achieve the goal of a balanced transportation system for the area. The highway network now proposed for the area is predicated on an adequate rail transit system.

The report and proposed bill which I am transmitting provide for a system which will furnish the Washington area greatly improved transit service and which can later be expanded to the total system eventually needed. The National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 authorized the negotiation of an interstate compact under which the District would join with Maryland and Virginia in creating an appropriate organization to develop a total system for the area. My hope remains firm that such a compact organization can be brought into being at an early date. In the meantime, however, work on the present proposals can and should go forward without delay.

The Agency estimates, based on engineering studies carried on over the past 5 years, that to construct and equip the system which it proposes will cost \$431 million, excluding interest costs. The proposed bill authorizes the appropriation of \$150 million—\$100 million by the Federal Government and \$50 million by the District. With these grants, system revenues will be sufficient to provide for both operating expenses and the balance of the capital costs. The grants will also supply all the funds needed for construction until near the end of fiscal year 1968. By that time I hope that there will be a suitable regional compact agency which can assume the responsibility for issuance and sale of the revenue bonds needed to meet the remainder of the cost. If such a compact agency is not timely created, I will be prepared to present alternative recommendations in time for the Congress to give full consideration to the course to be pursued.

The National Capital area should no longer be denied the forms of urban transportation which are vital to its welfare. The proposed program is an appropriate beginning—indeed, a long step toward the total transportation needs of the area. I hope that the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to the legislation which is needed to get the program under way.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson for the establishment of self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Already joining as cosponsors of the bill are four members of the Committee on the District of Columbia: the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a champion of the home rule cause here for many years; the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], an ardent home rule advocate; the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], whose fight for the causes of democracy in the Nation's Capital is well known; and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whom we expect to be one of the bulwarks for handling key legislation for the Nation's Capital City during this Congress.

The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], a home rule proponent both while serving in the House of Representatives and as a Member of this body, has also joined as a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week to permit other interested Senators to join as cosponsors. I sincerely hope that other Senators will join and thereby give added emphasis to a keystone to our democratic government—the right of the governed to elect those who govern.

Mr. President, legislation to establish self-government for the District of Columbia is not new to the Senate. Since 1949, the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses have seen the Senate pass home rule bills. Some may call our long efforts "an exercise in futility," but negative thinking never accomplishes positive results.

The President of the United States is an active supporter of this legislation, which will grant, as he says, "the fundamental American right of self-government." His active support should provide invaluable impetus to this cause.

Principally, the bill provides for:

First, a locally elected mayor, a 15-member legislative council, elected by wards, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

Second, a specific formula for annual payment by the Federal Government of its share of the expenses of the District government. As the President stated in a message to the Congress, the formula is "designed to reflect the amount the Federal Government is to pay toward the general governmental expenses of the District if it were a taxable entity."

Third, full protection of the Federal interest by—

First, specific retention by Congress of its full legislative powers over the District, including the origination of legislation or modification or repeal of enactments by the local council.

Second, authority for the President to veto any act of the locally elected council.

The District council would be given local legislative authority including taxing and borrowing power subject to certain restrictions and to the obvious overriding and constitutionally granted power of the Congress to repeal, amend, or initiate local legislation and to modify or revoke the charter itself.

As a practical matter, this delegation of authority would relieve a busy Congress year after year of the task of leg-

islating housekeeping and municipal matters for the city.

In my years as a member and as chairman of the Committee for the District of Columbia, I believe I have learned something about this great city, whose problems are multiplied by the inability of the local residents to govern themselves.

Washington, D.C., has two distinct roles. First and foremost, it is the seat of our Federal Government, a symbol of our great Republic, reflecting the spirit, history, and personality of our country.

Second, Washington is a great American city, with all the problems increasing as they are, that New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles has. The influx of record populations into urban centers, such as Washington, and the accompanying social upheavals that flow from this urbanization, are dramatic evidences of increasingly critical situations.

It is my best judgment that the District of Columbia cannot continue to meet its growing needs by the present system of halfway government where all of its housekeeping and municipal legislative problems are weighed on the national scale by a Congress whose concern should not be focused on the city's daily activity but on those of the Nation and the world.

I am not wedded to any rigid concept of home rule for the District. However, I believe that a Congress which seeks to help the world solve its ills is capable of bending itself to fashion some form of self-government for the three-quarters of a million people who live here.

Four months ago, Washington's voters went to the polls for the first time to vote for the President and Vice President. The Nation's Capital City deserves the full measure of democracy that self-government would bring.

Today, 87 cents out of every dollar of the \$350 million annual District of Columbia budget are taxes paid by local residents who have no voice in how their dollars are either collected or spent. Taxation without representation ended for Colonial America 185 years ago. The time is overdue for it to end at the seat of that American Government.

Mr. President, it is my intention to schedule hearings on this bill the first week of March. I ask unanimous consent that the President's message submitting his home rule proposal to the Congress, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The message from the President presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A DRAFT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ENTITLED "A BILL TO PROVIDE AN ELECTED MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND NONVOTING DELEGATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system, these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the *Federalist* that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital " * * * will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them; * * * "

Such a "municipal legislature" was established in 1802 under President Jefferson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their chief executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this "receivership" has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over "the seat of the Government of the United States." The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legis-

lature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act which I am transmitting to the Congress today will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) creates a representative local government for the District;

(2) provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected delegate to the House of Representatives; and

(3) preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by—

(a) an express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council,

(b) a provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council, and

(c) provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1965.

ESTABLISHING A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the United States is suffering from a policy gap in the transportation field. The gap exists because there is a difference between what is and what could be; in other words, there is a difference between the separate policies of the individual modes of transportation and the constructive policies which could exist if a unified approach were sought.

To close this gap, I am reintroducing my bill which would establish a Department of Transportation at Cabinet level—for the first time centering in the executive branch of the Federal Government the responsibility for formulating transportation policy. It is my hope that such a department—free from regulatory functions—would concentrate on promulgating a balanced, coordinated, and forward-looking transportation policy for the country.

In a message to Congress, the late President Kennedy had this to say of national transportation policy:

If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

The late President spoke of the ideal which we should pursue, but the history

of transportation has led us in the opposite direction. Rather than coordination, we have been beset with fragmentation. As each new mode of transportation sprang up, its problems were solved piecemeal with little or no regard to national patterns and needs.

As a result, the various modes have limped along on a patchwork of rules and regulations. Some forms are regulated—some are not. Some are subsidized and, again, some are not. One form of transportation may be promoted effectively, while another gets routine treatment. The competition for the tax dollar is vigorous. There are also inequalities in the size and kinds of subsidies granted to the different carriers.

In no way do these policies assure the preservation and promotion of the basic advantages of each of the carriers, which should be our main objective. Instead, our efforts to achieve this objective are hampered by changing technology, expanding but uncoordinated Federal financial aid, and often conflicting regulatory policies.

Each year the Government pours billions of dollars into the construction of highway and airport construction, into air navigation, river and harbor development, and the maintenance of port facilities. The airlines and the merchant marine get hundreds of millions more in subsidies.

Few, if any, of these Federal programs help the railroads. In fact, some of these programs, such as the improvement of river channels, often place the railroads at a competitive disadvantage, forcing them to lower their rates.

Over the years, a variety of Federal agencies have sprung up to administer or—in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to regulate the various segments of the transportation industry. These agencies operate independently of one another. And not only do they administer or regulate their industries, many also serve as their chief advocate and promoter.

The need, therefore, is to harmonize this chorus into a single voice representing the best interests of all forms of transportation, and the best interests of the taxpayer. A Department of Transportation could accomplish this by pulling all nonregulatory functions under one roof, by representing the general interest rather than special interests.

Such a department would have the responsibility for devising broad policy to bring about balance and cohesion in transportation—airways, waterways, railroads, and so forth. The improvement of railroad service, expansion of the Federal highway system, Government competition with private carriers, tax relief for the railroads, the fate of the merchant marine—all of these problems would come within the purview of such a department.

Not only would the department work on the problems of today, but it would especially concern itself with the future. Part of its duty, for example, might be to determine the role of the supersonic and hypersonic jets in the whole scheme

of transportation. Certainly it would want to examine the advantages or disadvantages of the proposed 200-mile-an-hour railroad.

A Department of Transportation also would take over the "odd job" activities of the regulatory agencies. Thus, the ICC would no longer need to administer railroad loan and safety programs as it presently does. The Civil Aeronautics Board would not have to concern itself with discovering new types of subsidies for air carriers; it would leave this job to the new Secretary of Transportation.

As a final measure, I would give the Department Cabinet-level status. Under present arrangements, the problems of transportation are vested in an Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in the Department of Commerce. Much valuable work undoubtedly had been done by this office, but as a practical matter such an individual does not carry the prestige necessary to marshal national support to accomplish his goals.

A Secretary of Transportation would not be as far removed from the President, would undoubtedly have his ear, and could move ahead with the support and guidance of the Chief Executive. Such a position would simplify the enormous tasks before the new Secretary.

Mr. President, I think it is important that this bill be given the greatest consideration. If the transportation problems which beset the Nation are to be unraveled, then we must have broad policy which will make the best use of our resources. The answer, as I see it, could come from a Department of Transportation.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT FOR DISABLED WIDOWS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I offer three bills to amend title II of the Social Security Act, each of which will correct inequities in the present law and provide small groups with most helpful and needed additional assistance.

The first of these is a small group of women who are left widowed by the death of a husband covered under social security, but who are themselves disabled and thus unable to earn a living. Such an amendment is one of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security in its report transmitted under date of January 1, 1965. Calculations provided there, in a table on page 84, show that the cost of such a benefit would amount to the very small sum of 0.05 percent of taxable payroll, or 5 cents per \$100.

I request unanimous permission, Mr. President, to insert at this point the statement of the Advisory Council to be found on page 66 of the report.

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

DISABLED WIDOWS

The disabled widow of an insured worker, if she became disabled before her husband's death or before her youngest child became 18, or within a limited period after either of these events, should be entitled to widow's benefits regardless of her age.

The Council believes that the disabled widow, like the widow who is aged 62 or over or the widow who has a child of the deceased worker in her care, needs benefits when her husband dies. The Council therefore recommends that benefits be paid to the widow so disabled that she cannot work—provided, however, that she was disabled at the time of her husband's death or before her youngest child reached age 18, or within a limited period after either of these events.

The widows who would be protected are those who, when their husbands die, suffer a loss of support and who, because they are disabled themselves, have no opportunity to work and thus to substitute their own earnings for that loss of support. On the other hand, the Council does not believe it would be in keeping with the purpose of the program to pay widow's benefits on account of disability to a woman whose disability occurred after she could have reasonably been expected to have worked long enough to earn disability insurance benefits in her own right. For example, it would not seem of high priority to pay widow's benefits to a widow who was, say, 30 years old and childless when her husband died and who did not become disabled until many years later. Such a widow would most likely have gone to work and earned disability protection in her own right, and, if she had not worked after she was widowed, it would seem unreasonable to pay her a benefit on the grounds that a physical or mental impairment that developed later in life was preventing her from working.

A theoretical case can also be made, perhaps, for providing benefits for other disabled dependents (almost all of them would be disabled wives who are under age 62) of retired or disabled workers. However, it cannot be assumed that younger wives of older retired men and wives of disabled men look to employment for support to anywhere near the extent that widows do. Thus extending the group of disabled dependents to include wives would result in the payment of benefits in many cases where the couple had not experienced any loss of earned income as a result of the disability of the wife. Considering this fact, the Council believes that additional information is needed to determine whether it would be desirable to pay benefits to disabled wives as well as widows.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to include, also, a letter on this topic which I have recently received from a constituent. Although she is herself a widow, unable to find other work than babysitting, her concern is for a friend who is completely disabled. This letter adds the human dimension to an abstract recommendation. I hope Members will pay heed and support this amendment.

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

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
January 22, 1965.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. HARTKE: I am pleading with you, as our Senator, to seek a revision of so-

cial security, to take care of widows under the age of 62, disabled or totally disabled to earn a living, and left without security for their welfare.

Social security is set up to take care of young widows left with dependents and older mothers of dependents, but not widows left unable to earn a living.

I have a friend, Thelma Baker, age 47, Nashville, Tenn. She has thrombophlebitis. Through a number of operations, and a prolonged time, she has had all her upper phalanges amputated, as well as her two great toes, and at the present time, has to have one of her second toes amputated immediately.

Mrs. Baker's husband, Thomas Franklin Baker, age 62, died suddenly, January 3. She went to social security, and with her handicap, was told she could only get the \$255 applied on his funeral; isn't that great for a person in her condition. Senator, she needs help now not at 62. More than likely she won't need anything from us at 62.

Social security is OK. But not set up right to take care of the public in general.

I am a widow, age 56, but God has given me good health and I have no comments personally, but knowing this lady's condition, brings the matter more to my attention. I can't get a job, all I can do is babysit, but thank God I am able to go.

Even if I have to be put on the shelf, put the age limit where I can get something out of it. But make an effort to see that us widows in this great United States, that are absolute invalids, are taken care of under benefits for mother and child care. Do something for us to show that you are interested.

Senator I voted for you, and am for you, and hope God is good to you and us, that your term is very successful, and with God's help and our encouragement, you are guided to make the right decisions for the good of all of us.

May God guide you, we selected you, you do your best, we will be proud of you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LOUISE FOX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1123) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the widow of an insured individual to become entitled to widow's insurance benefits prior to attainment of age 62, if such widow is under a disability which began before her husband died, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONTINUING CHILD'S BENEFITS TO AGE 22

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a second bill which I am submitting today would provide an extension of child's benefits under social security from the age of 18, when they now expire, to the age of 22, provided the child is attending school between those ages.

Such an amendment was passed by both the House and the Senate in 1964, but it does not appear as a part of S. 1, which we will soon be considering.

Such an amendment has the support of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which points out that the age of 18 was not unreasonable when the benefits were first provided by the 1939 amendments, on the theory that at

that age a child might be expected to become self-supporting. But now education beyond high school is an increasing necessity, and the period of reasonable dependency is lengthening.

At present, Mr. President, among the 2,951,000 child beneficiaries there are many who are in great need of such assistance beyond the age of 18 if they are to continue their schooling. The number who would become immediately eligible, having passed their 18th birthday, is estimated at 285,000, of whom there are an estimated 6,900 in my own State of Indiana. I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have included in the RECORD at the close of these remarks a table prepared by the Social Security Administration under date of October 5, 1964, showing the State-by-State breakdown of the numbers who would be affected.

The cost of the amendment is estimated, according to a table on page 84 of the Advisory Council report, at 0.09 percent for the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and 0.01 percent for the disability insurance trust fund, for a total cost of one-tenth of 1 percent on taxable payroll, or 10 cents for \$100.

Each Member, I am sure, could cite letters from constituents asking for this kind of assistance so that a dependent child can be maintained in higher education. I would like to cite a paragraph from such a letter which came to me under date of January 27. It personalizes the problem to have it stated in terms of one specific family and one specific child. The mother writes:

I am a widow of 6 years and have a daughter in her freshman year at Indiana University. When she reached 18 years old, our social security payments stopped. I will not be 62 until next August and just cannot find employment at my age. My daughter wishes to go to college 3 more years after this and does work during the summer months, but, of course, that is not sufficient to put her through school. Could you please do something to rush the social security law into effect so she and a lot of other students would receive payments while attending college?

Mr. President, in addition to the table mentioned earlier, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion also of the section dealing with this recommendation by the Social Security Advisory Council, as it appears on pages 64 and 65 of their report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1124) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The table and excerpt presented by Mr. HARTKE are as follows:

OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

Estimated number of children who would become immediately eligible for monthly

benefits under the proposal to pay benefits to children between the ages of 18 up to age 22 who are in regular full-time school attendance, by State, September 30, 1965:

	Number of children
Alabama.....	7,400
Alaska.....	400
American Samoa.....	(1)
Arizona.....	3,200
Arkansas.....	4,100
California.....	22,800
Colorado.....	3,000
Connecticut.....	2,700
Delaware.....	500
District of Columbia.....	900
Florida.....	8,600
Georgia.....	7,900
Guam.....	(1)
Hawaii.....	1,000
Idaho.....	1,200
Illinois.....	12,500
Indiana.....	6,900
Iowa.....	3,400
Kansas.....	2,800
Kentucky.....	7,300
Louisiana.....	6,200
Maine.....	1,600
Maryland.....	3,500
Massachusetts.....	5,900
Michigan.....	11,100
Minnesota.....	4,700
Mississippi.....	5,400
Missouri.....	6,600
Montana.....	1,300
Nebraska.....	1,700
Nevada.....	500
New Hampshire.....	800
New Jersey.....	6,800
New Mexico.....	2,400
New York.....	19,400
North Carolina.....	8,900
North Dakota.....	1,000
Ohio.....	13,700
Oklahoma.....	3,800
Oregon.....	3,100
Pennsylvania.....	15,100
Puerto Rico.....	9,000
Rhode Island.....	1,000
South Carolina.....	5,100
South Dakota.....	1,000
Tennessee.....	7,000
Texas.....	15,200
Utah.....	1,400
Vermont.....	600
Virgin Islands.....	100
Virginia.....	6,700
Washington.....	4,200
West Virginia.....	5,300
Wisconsin.....	5,400
Wyoming.....	600
Residing abroad.....	2,300
Total.....	285,000

¹ Less than 50.

Source: Courtesy Social Security Administration, Division of the Actuary—Baltimore, Oct. 5, 1964.

[From p. 64, Report of the Advisory Council]

4. CHILDREN OVER AGE 18 ATTENDING SCHOOL
Benefits should be payable to a child until he reaches age 22, provided the child is attending school between ages 18 and 22

Benefits under the social security program should be paid to a child as long as it is reasonable to assume that he is dependent on his family. Under the present law, child's insurance benefits (except for a disabled child) are payable only until age 18, presumably on the theory (not an unreasonable one at the time that benefits were first provided for children by the 1939 amendments) that by age 18 a child can be

expected to support himself.¹ With the growing importance of education in modern life it is becoming increasingly clear that this is not a reasonable expectation. Today, at least some education beyond high school is rapidly becoming part of our general level of living and will increasingly be necessary because of rapid technological advancement and the growth in the number of professional, technical, and other jobs requiring higher levels of education. As a consequence, the period of dependency of children has been lengthening.

There is precedent in other Federal programs for paying benefits to children after they reach the age of 18 while they are in school. The civil service retirement program generally pays benefits up to the end of the academic year in which the student reaches age 21. Under three veterans' programs—the dependency and indemnity compensation program, the non-service-connected death pension program, and the war orphans education assistance program—a child may get benefits after he reaches age 18 while he is attending school. Under an amendment enacted in 1964 to the program of aid to families with dependent children the Federal matching share in assistance payments may be continued up to age 21 where a child is attending a high school or a vocational school.

The Council does not recommend that mothers' benefits be made payable to a mother where the only child getting benefits is age 18 or over and is getting benefits on the basis of being a student. Benefits are paid to a wife or widow under age 62 who has a child in her care if she does not have earnings from work above specified limits, in recognition of her need to stay at home to care for the child. Where the only child is age 18 or over there is not the same reason to pay mothers' benefits, since there is no need for the mother to stay home to care for the child.

An amendment similar to that recommended by the Council, to continue social security benefits after a child reaches age 18 when the child is still in school, was passed by both Houses of Congress in 1964 but failed to become law because the conference committee was unable to agree on other provisions in the omnibus bill.

REMARriage OF WIDOWS OVER 62 WITHOUT LOSS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently a problem has come to light concerned with the results under Social Security regulations stemming from the remarriage of widows over 62 and receiving widows' benefits. This was rather poignantly noted in an Associated Press dispatch from Miami, Fla., under date of January 11, headlined by the Washington Post, "Thousands of Aged 'Living in Sin' Fear Benefit Loss if They Marry." The article cited the president of the Florida Council for Senior Citizens as saying that "thousands of old people are living together out of wedlock in the Miami area because marriage would mean loss of social security payments."

I have checked with the Social Security Administration, Mr. President, and I find that an amendment to the law to preserve the previous benefit rights of these widows would be statistically a

"costless" benefit. The reason is that the social security actuarial figures are based on the assumption that a widow over 62 will remain a widow until her death, and so the calculation of cost for her benefits is made on that basis and the sum provided at present to continue those payments for life.

Yet in actual practice, whereas the widow receives 82½ percent of her deceased husband's primary account, if she remarries she becomes eligible to receive only 50 percent of her new husband's primary benefit. This is not only a deterrent to marriage between the elderly who desire the comfort of a new companionship in their declining years, but it is actually a stimulus to what the headline calls in quotes, "living in sin." The same article, incidentally, quotes clergymen who have tried to give comfort to the troubled minds of those who have adopted this course but who are morally troubled by it, no matter how platonic their relationship.

The highly respected Protestant journal, *Christian Century*, in its weekly "Pen-ultimate" column for February 3, also took note of this situation in a tongue-in-cheek presentation of a "Form of Solemnization of Living Together," concluding with the ritual after the exchange of pledges in this parody of a wedding service, "Then shall the man and the woman exchange keys to each other's safety deposit boxes," and the admonition:

I now announce that you may begin living together, with all rights and privileges attendant thereto, including the right to lobby for change in social security legislation and the right to continue criticizing the adjustability and flexibility of moral standards in the younger generation. Now let us cut the cake.

I sincerely trust that my bill, which is identical to H.R. 2465 introduced in the House by Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, may be enacted and that these elderly people may indeed "cut the cake" at official wedding ceremonies.

I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the two articles to which I have referred may appear at the end of these remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1125) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The articles presented by Mr. HARTKE are as follows:

THOUSANDS OF AGED "LIVING IN SIN" FEAR BENEFIT LOSS IF THEY MARRY

MIAMI, FLA., January 11.—The president of the Florida Council for Senior Citizens says thousands of old people are living together out of wedlock in the Miami area because marriage would mean loss of social security payments.

And Mayor Melvin Richard, of Miami Beach, wants the law changed so these couples can marry.

Max Friedson, head of the Senior Citizens Council, said the law is forcing these old people "to live in sin—or what they think is sin."

The problem, he said, is so pressing that one rabbi has agreed to give unofficial blessing to such unions.

"Many couples even come to me for moral comfort," Friedson said, "and I give it to them."

When a woman outlives her husband, she gets part of his social security only as long as she stays single. She loses the money on remarriage, on the theory that her new husband is responsible for her support.

A retired man living on \$85 a month cannot afford the theory.

Richard wrote U.S. Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball asking if the law could be changed to permit widows over 65 to continue receiving benefits through their former husbands.

"This would solve the problem immediately," Richard said. "Of course, it might mean disaster to the social security system. That's what I have to find out."

The Reverend Benjamin Schumacker, president of the State Council of Aging, said he always tries to comfort the old couples who come to him.

"There's always somebody around to shake his Victorian head," Mr. Schumacker said, "but I see no moral religious problem."

"It's platonic. When I see them hold hands while they listen to a sermon, I don't feel any sin is committed in the church."

Henry Gillman, secretary of the Florida Senior Citizens League of Voters, says the sin is committed by "a society that causes them to do something wrong."

THE FORM OF SOLEMNIZATION OF LIVING TOGETHER

At the day and time appointed for solemnization of living together, the persons to live together shall come into the living together service center with their friends and neighbors; and there standing together, the man on the right hand, and the woman on the left, the senior citizens' service center senior member shall say:

Dearly beloved, we are gathered together here in the sight of these witnesses and out of the sight of the social security administrators, to permit the living together of this man and this woman in a relatively honorable estate, instituted by Florida senior citizens, signifying the practical exigencies of life betwixt and between the social security checks and the understandable desire for human companionship which estate has been honored by the long tradition of common law and is to be held honorable among all; and therefore is not by any to be approached lightly. Into this estate these two persons present come now to be regularized. If any man, other than a government employee, can show just cause why they may not undertake to live together, let him now speak, or else hereafter for ever hold his peace.

And also speaking unto the persons who are to begin living together, he shall say: "I require and charge you both, that if the social security laws are changed to permit the woman to receive her share of her monthly income as widow's benefit despite her remarriage in the eventide of life, ye will present the certificate for living together at the county clerk's office in exchange for a marriage license and will then report to a justice of the peace or a minister of the Gospel to be joined in holy matrimony."

He shall then say to the man: "(Name.) Wilt thou have this woman to be thy living-together partner, to live together after the manner of our agreement this day, in the estate of living togetherness? Wilt thou love her, comfort her, honor, and keep her in

¹Under the 1939 provision, benefits could not be paid to a child over 16 for any month in which he was not regularly attending school unless school attendance was not feasible; the school attendance requirement was repealed in 1946.

sickness and in health until legislation is passed which would permit you to marry?"

The man shall answer: "I will."

Then shall the senior member say unto the woman: "(Name.) Wilt thou have this man to be thy living-together partner, to live together after the manner of your agreement this day, in the estate of living-togetherness? Wilt thou love him, comfort him, honor, and keep him in sickness and in health, and wilt thou share thy social security widow's benefits with him until that day when ye can share such benefits in holy wedlock?"

The woman shall answer: "I will."

Then shall the senior member say: "Who endorseth this action?"

Then shall all senior citizens say: "We."

Then shall the man and the woman exchange keys to each other's safety deposit boxes. Then the senior member shall say: "I now announce that you may begin living together, with all rights and privileges attendant thereto, including the right to lobby for change in social security legislation and the right to continue criticizing the adjustability and flexibility of moral standards in the younger generation. Now let us cut the cake."

LOANS TO FARMERS OR RANCHERS SUFFERING BECAUSE OF SERIOUS ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize Farmers Home Administration emergency loans for areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions.

This legislation can serve as a valuable aid to agricultural groups throughout the Nation. Apple farmers in Washington, cattle ranchers in the West, potato farmers in Maine as well as other agricultural groups would receive consideration for loans when prices to the producer are below his costs of production.

At present, prices for Maine potatoes are at a relatively high level. The provisions of this legislation would not apply. However, if potato prices become depressed, the mechanism would be there to assist the farmer in his time of financial peril.

The Farmers Home Administration in Maine and throughout the Nation has done an excellent job in meeting the credit needs of the small farmer, but the administration needs this additional too. The lending authority provided in this legislation is essential if our Nation's pressing agricultural credit needs are to be met.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1126) to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senators from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] on the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Soviet Union has occupied, by force of arms, the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and deprived such countries of their independence; and

Whereas an unparalleled system of political oppression and tyranny has been established in such countries; and

Whereas by deportations and dispersion of the native population to the wastes of Siberia, and by mass colonization, the Soviet Union threatens complete extermination of these peoples; and

Whereas despite such treatment, the spirit of the citizens of such countries is not broken and they remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas the desire of the citizens of such countries for national freedom remains unabated; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of these countries; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of deportation in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps;

(c) persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States be punished; and

(d) the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the direct supervision of the United Nations to establish as quickly as possible legal democratic government for those countries.

STATEMENT OF MR. LAUSCHE

I am proud to join with my colleagues in Congress and with the American people in celebrating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. In our country on our own Independence Day, the Fourth of July, grateful citizens proclaim their faith in America and their loyalty to it, through speeches, parades, and fireworks. Independence Day is a day of celebration and a day when Americans can step back and look with pride at the accomplishments of their country.

In Lithuania today, however, there is no joyous celebrating of independence. There will be no meaningful speeches, because there is no such thing as freedom of speech. There will be no parades, because it is unlawful for citizens to come together for purposes not sanctioned by the State. There will be no fireworks displays, because fireworks are too closely associated with weapons that could be used against the regime.

There will be no celebration at all of Lithuanian Independence Day in Lithuania, because Lithuania is no longer independent. Instead of a day of gay festivities, this day serves as a sad reminder to Lithuanians and freedom-loving people all over the earth of the tyrannical enslavement of peoples seeking no more than to secure their freedom from foreign domination and to maintain their national identity. Twenty-five years ago the Soviet Union swallowed the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Since that time, it has done everything in its power to disperse the Lithuanian people and to stamp out any spark of Lithuanian independence.

For centuries Lithuania was a powerful kingdom in eastern Europe. She was a bulwark of defense against the barbarian hordes from the East and a champion in the advance of Christianity. Then Lithuania fell victim to the advances of the czarist empire during the partitions of Poland in the late 18th century. Although the fires of liberty smoldered, they burst into flame only after the First World War. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared herself independent, and stood ready to take her place in the councils of the independent nations of the world. Then indeed there was celebration for Lithuanians stood on the threshold of a bright future under their own free, democratic government.

For the next 22 years this nation prospered. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, and enacted many progressive social and economic measures.

On June 15, 1940, however, Soviet Russia, in direct violation of treaty agreements, put an end to Lithuanian independence and occupied the country and the other Baltic States. In successive acts of depredation, the Soviets, Nazi Germany, and again the Soviet Union decimated the people of Lithuania in one of the grimmest chapters in modern history.

Today Lithuania exists only as the Lithuanian S.S.R. Her resources have been exploited, her people enslaved or deported. But hope is not dead. Lithuanian patriotism has lived through occupation in the past, and it does and will continue to live in the future. In time, when the cancer of foreign domination has disappeared, Lithuanians will look back at this moment and extoll the courage and bravery of their fellow countrymen in preserving the culture and heritage of Lithuania. Someday, as surely as the sun rises, Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples will again be celebrating their independence. It is our sincere hope that day is not far off. But hope alone is not enough.

I believe that we Americans can do something positive to speed that day. I believe we should take the lead in placing the plight of the Baltic States and the suppression of their freedom before the United Nations. The United Nations should demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States, the return of all citizens of the Baltic States who have been deported, the punishment of persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States, and free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the supervision of the United Nations.

Such action by the United Nations would, at the very least, serve as the most effective notice possible that the plight of these countries has not been forgotten by the world.

community. And the pressure of world public opinion, expressed in this way, could bring about steps toward the achievement of independence. Accordingly, I am today reintroducing, for appropriate referral, a concurrent resolution which I first introduced nearly 2 years ago. It requests the President of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to bring this matter before the United Nations and spells out the points I have mentioned. It seems to me that all of us who celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day and the independence days of the other Baltic States will wish to support prompt action by the Congress on this matter.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS MAINTAIN CERTAIN RESERVES IN GOLD CERTIFICATES AGAINST DEPOSIT LIABILITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 24)

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 3818) to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 25)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS, RELATING TO PERMANENCY OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1108) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes, which I introduced on February 10, lie on the table until the close of business February 19 so that other Senators may join me in sponsoring this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC ACT OF 1965—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 2, 1965, the names of Mr. CLARK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. TOWER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S.

944) to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for others purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators) on February 2, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARING RELATING TO RULE XXII

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and other interested persons that the Senate Subcommittee on the Standing Rules has scheduled hearings on Senate Resolution 6, Senate Resolution 8, and Senate Resolution 16, resolutions dealing with changes in rule XXII, limitation on debate. The hearings will be held on February 23 and March 1 in room 301, Old Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify at the hearing should notify the staff director, Kent Watkins, room 133, Senate Office Building, extension 2235, in order to be scheduled as a witness.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 4, the 13th consecutive annual prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also there were present over 70 presidents of national and international labor unions, over 100 of our outstanding Nation's leaders in the field of industry and business, the chancellors and the presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, communications, and every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast but also to the millions of citizens across this Nation.

The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 13 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every Governor in the United States holds an annual Governor's prayer breakfast in his own State capital with the leaders of that State. And literally hundreds of smaller regular groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

Prayer groups now meet regularly in the National Canadian Parliament, the House of Commons in London, Tokyo, Paris, Madrid, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, and other places.

There is a growing appreciation for the values gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in our God.

The annual event grew out of the inspiration that has been received in the

prayer breakfast groups which meet weekly in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

New prayer groups which meet weekly are being organized among businessmen, civic officials, secretaries, clerks, housewives, college and university students. This should be most encouraging to all of us for it can do much to strengthen the spiritual character of our great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of program and proceedings:

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

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM
At 8 a.m., hymn: "Sweet Hour of Prayer," U.S. Army Chorus.
Presiding: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator.
Invocation: Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, U.S.M.C., retired.
Breakfast.
Remarks: Senator FRANK CARLSON.
Scripture: The Honorable HORACE R. KORNEGAY, representing the House breakfast prayer group, will read from the Old Testament.

The Honorable EVERETT JORDAN, representing the Senate breakfast prayer group, will read from the New Testament.

Prayer of intercession: Dr. Abraham Vereide, founder of ICL.

Remarks: The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Solo: Tony Fontane.
Message: Lt. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

The President of the United States.
Benediction: Dr. Richard Halverson, associate executive director, International Christian Leadership.

Closing hymn: "Sweet Hour of Prayer": U.S. Army Chorus.

Senator CARLSON. The invocation will be given by General Silverthorn, U.S.M.C. (retired).

General SILVERTHORN. May we bow our heads in prayer.

Our heavenly Father, we come before Thee with thankful hearts. We thank Thee for our Christian heritage, for Thy guidance to those who founded our country, for the opportunities afforded us in this land of freedom, and for the glowing lamp of Thy word and the gift of Thy Son, Jesus Christ.

Father, Thou knowest our innermost thoughts. Cleanse our minds and hearts of all thoughts that are unworthy of Thee. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go and lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust.

Especially do we pray, our Father, for Thy blessing on the President of the United States. May our country, under his leadership, be a shining light of wisdom in Thy work. Fortify him and all others in authority with the armor of Thy righteousness.

Father, as Thou didst tell Thy people centuries ago to humble themselves, to pray, to seek Thy face and to turn from their evil ways, so reveal to us here assembled this very hour the means of drawing nigh to Thee so that we may avail ourselves of Thy divine power.

Almighty God, teach all of us to be humble. Challenge us to dedicate ourselves to the honor and glory of Thy name so that we may faithfully represent Thee today, tomorrow and forever.

This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Senator CARLSON. At this time, I want to present the host for this occasion. An outstanding citizen and a great Christian layman. This is the eighth year that he has

been host to this outstanding Presidential prayer breakfast.

BILL JONES (of Los Angeles, Calif.). Mr. Chairman, prayer has played a significant part in my life, and I feel perfectly at home here. The reason I'm sure that Jesus Christ changes a life is because He changed mine, and in answer to a prayer 12 years ago, after being an alcoholic for 15 years, ruining my home, my friends, and everything. He put a new light into me and I've experienced this miracle in my own life.

Out of this light came a new perspective such as I've never known, under which discouragements and failures have the significance of God's method of maturing and giving a greater capacity. I found that my lot in life has been much more significant. I know that when I come to the point of wanting something I can't afford, I pray that God will take the desire away, and in that way I'm not stuck with the payments.

I've found that the more I give, the less I want. I knew there was something there that was beyond description: The more I give, the less I want.

I've found that God has taken things out of my life through prayer that permits me to enjoy that which, I'm sure, He intended—and that is my relationship with my wife, the respect of my children, the love and concern of my community, and my particular place in God's purpose—having come under His plan.

And I keep thinking: What shall it profit a man if he gained every ambition he has—and lose his wife and his children and their respect?

Mr. President, every day our five children and my wife and I, we gather and we pray. And we pray for you because, having tasted of the significance of prayer, we know that it's significant in your life, and we know that God knows your needs and that He's going to meet them in a much more significant way if we are constantly in prayer for you. And that's our partnership.

And Mr. Vice President, to add your name specifically to our morning prayer has really been a pleasure, and we sure pray God's virtuous blessings upon you.

Thank you very much.

Senator **CARLSON**. The Scripture lesson will be read by representatives of the House prayer breakfast group and the Senate prayer breakfast group. Reading from the Old Testament will be the Honorable **HORACE R. KORNEGAY**, from North Carolina, and reading from the New Testament will be the Honorable **EVERETT JORDAN**, Senator from North Carolina.

Representative **KORNEGAY**. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker of the House, distinguished guests, I bring you greetings from the House prayer breakfast group—a group of the Members of the House which meet regularly every Thursday morning in the Capitol for breakfast. It's the one time and the one place during the course of a busy week where we Members of the House can gather in quiet meditation and prayer, where there is no division, no controversy, no dispute and no quarrel. For regardless of party, State, or sections of the country from which we come, there is a genuine acceptance of each other and a common understanding of the purpose for which we gather.

And that purpose is to recognize and give thanks to Him who created us and for His bountiful blessings and the sacred privilege which He has given us to serve Him and all of mankind.

I shall read the first Psalm:

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of the sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord and in His law doth he meditate day and night.

"And he shall be like the tree planted by the rivers of water that bringeth forth his fruit in his season. His leaf also shall not wither and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

"The ungodly are not so, but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous, for the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish."

Senator **JORDAN** of North Carolina. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests, when I first became a Member of the Senate I was invited, I think, the first week I arrived, to become a member of the Senate breakfast prayer group which I accepted and which I have enjoyed and which I have gotten a great deal of benefit and satisfaction out of.

It is my pleasure and privilege this morning to bring you greetings from the senatorial prayer breakfast group, and to wish that we can continue on these breakfasts here as we have in the last 13 years.

I've been to seven of them and get more pleasure out of them every time I come to one.

I shall now read portions from the sixth chapter of Matthew and the seventh chapter of Matthew:

"No man can serve two masters for either he will hate the one and love the other or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

"If God so clothe the grass of the field, which is today and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.

"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?"

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

Senator **CARLSON**. At this time we are going to have the prayer of intercession which will be led by a truly great Christian patriarch, a founder of the ICL and its present executive secretary, Dr. **Abraham Vereide**.

PRAYER OF INTERCESSION BY DR. ABRAHAM VEREIDE

Somebody in this room that most of us, maybe, have not been aware of—He is here. And I suggest that we stand and address ourselves to Him.

Lord God, Almighty, help us to pray. We are in such great need of Thee for ourselves individually, for our Nation and for the world.

We remember today our leadership over in the Far East, our representatives around the world, how they are linked with us here.

And as we stand together here before Thee, O living God, to whom all men are accountable, we thank Thee that we can come presenting those who are our elected or appointed leaders to give Thee thanks.

Lord God, we thank Thee.

And now together we humbly pray Thee, once again, that the spirit of wisdom, of understanding, of love, and of power may rest upon our President in his tremendous responsibilities as our Chief Executive, upon our Vice President and all these leaders in their various capacities, and upon this great Nation, that we may learn to live together in understanding and cooperation for Thy sake, for the sake of the country as a whole and for the sake of the world that keep their eyes on us.

Grant us, O God, grace to repent and to be converted, that our sins may be forgiven and blotted out and that we in Thy presence may learn to live in humility and in harmony with a daring faith and in mutual appreciation.

Thank you, Lord God, for hearing us. And may now Thy peace fill our hearts, Thy joy, Thy love shed abroad by Thy holy spirit, and we thank Thee, Lord, that Thou will do it for Christ's sake.

Amen.

Senator **CARLSON**. This morning we are privileged to have with us a great parliamentarian, a dedicated public servant, a Christian layman and a very personal friend of mine. It's a pleasure to present the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable **JOHN McCORMACK**.

ADDRESS OF HOUSE SPEAKER JOHN McCORMACK

Representative and Speaker **JOHN McCORMACK**. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Senator **CARLSON**, reverend clergy, and distinguished public officials and distinguished gentlemen in all walks of human activity, the one area in which we can all be in agreement today is that the Presidential prayer breakfast comes clearly within the atmosphere of being a divine institution. For it is as godly as prayer itself, and yet it occurs under this impressive hospitality.

And because it brings us together under circumstances of good will and friendship and the breaking of bread, it creates an atmosphere for the better transaction now and in the months and years ahead to come of the business of our country and of the free world and of mankind in general.

For we are embarked on what may well—very well be the greatest legislative and leadership adventure of the 20th century. Those of us present and others hold in our hands a destiny upon which history itself hangs in the balance. It is important that we should not only work together, legislate together, commune together, in an understanding manner; equally important, but representing in our own life and in the life of our country what the meaning and significance of understanding minds are and can produce, that we should breakfast and dine together and thus on every level of human endeavor get to know each other for the best results in the management of the affairs of mankind.

It has well been said of the President of the United States that his political style is based upon the saying of Isaiah, the prophet, and I quote: "Come now, and let us reason together," saith the Lord."

The greatest and most lasting achievements of men and nations are brought about in this way—not by force in the exercise of arbitrary power, necessary at times for self-preservation, not by pretense and indirection, but by friendly discussion and persuasion.

The ecumenical spirit abroad—and this breakfast started 13 years ago, which is an ecumenical spirit—the ecumenical spirit abroad today in this land and all over the world is, I fervently believe, a manifestation of the spirit of God. In this spirit, people of differing religious beliefs are meeting, filled with devotion to God and with good will toward one another, to discuss both the differences and the similarities of their religious beliefs and customs and to join wholeheartedly in prayer, thereby extending areas of agreement—and, as a result, reducing areas of misunderstanding.

Whatever the differences of our faiths and traditions, we gain in moral strength and spiritual grace from meeting together, as we do today, in the love of God and in human fellowship to pray for the good of our country and for mankind.

It is for these reasons that I like to think of the institution of the Presidential prayer breakfast as an institution of the highest moral order of human betterment; to those

like President Johnson who are warm of heart and eager for achievement, whose leadership is dedicated to the unity of our Government in the eyes of the world, it is more than just a meeting at breakfast—it is the relaxed, but sincere, expression in the home atmosphere of a dedication to the great task for the coming year.

For we have the leadership in the President, we have the will, we have the understanding and the independence in you and I as legislators and Governors and all other public officials and businessmen and everyone throughout our country, and we have, as we know, the approbation of a divine providence.

Senator CARLSON. At this time we are to be favored with a solo by one of our Nation's outstanding television and recording artists, Tony Fontane.

(Tony Fontane sings "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," and "The Old Rugged Cross.")

Senator CARLSON. This morning we're honored to have as our guest speaker a great soldier, a great statesman, and a Christian layman. I could dwell at length on his outstanding military service, from graduation at West Point until the very present time. One thing I would like to mention is that he's a survivor of the Bataan death march and was a prisoner of the Japanese from 1942 to 1945. He has received many decorations for outstanding and meritorious service, not only from our own Nation, but from foreign countries. And, of course, coming as I do from Kansas, naturally I feel one of his most important assignments was Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson.

ADDRESS BY CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON

General JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Clark, distinguished guests, I suspect that I share with you the single question that is passing through most of your minds at the stage: What in the world is this Johnson doing up here this morning?

And I don't believe that it is because I happen to share the same name as my Commander in Chief, but because, like our President, I believe in the power and the glory and the strengths of Almighty God.

I believe that each of us can draw strength to do the things that are expected of us by believing firmly and fiercely in one God and His Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

And I want to tell you a story. Twenty years and 52 days ago this morning I sat huddled at the bottom of the ladder that led into a baggage hold with 487 other Americans on a Japanese prison ship named the *Orioko Maru*. We were under attack by American aircraft. The armed ship was putting up a desperate defense. An occasional shell whistled around the metal sides of the hatch leading into that baggage hold and some men were struck.

I bowed my head and prayed, and in the course of my prayer said: "Lord, I am ready if you want me." And I knew a great peace.

Ten days later on Christmas Eve there were 187 Americans in and on a single small freight car that was part of a trainload making its way across the plains of central Luzon toward a rendezvous with another Japanese prison ship in Lingayan Gulf in the northern Philippines.

Men's thoughts turned to God and to the birth date of our Saviour. A few feeble voices were raised in a croaking attempt at a Christmas carol. And there was a small measure of comfort in that group.

Twenty-two days later another ship made its way slowly out of a harbor at what was then Takao and is now Kaosung, Formosa, still en route to Japan. Each evening, after

darkness had settled over a stark and dreary cargo hold filled with a decrepit bunch of men, a strong voice was raised in a corner of the hold, and a Catholic priest asked for God's mercy and God's blessing for that group of men.

As the voyage neared its end, 2 weeks later, that voice, having grown more feeble with each passing night, was finally stilled in death. God had taken one of His children.

Fourteen years and two months ago on a lonely road just southeast of Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, a road that was deserted except for a small handful of American defenders, a lonely commander was deeply troubled by the threat of the men that he was charged with safeguarding. Could he do the job that was his to do and still give his men a fighting chance to survive? And out of the still of the night, as if from a great distance, came God's voice saying, "Be strong, have no fear, I am with you."

And in the years that have since passed by I continue to turn to God, both in my infrequent hours of accomplishment or achievement to thank Him and in my more frequent hours of tribulation to seek His help.

In short, I am here because I believe. I am sure that you are here because you believe. And my belief has been nourished by a homely story that, perhaps, many of you know, entitled, "One Solitary Life," which was written by an author whose name is not known.

And I quote:

"Here is a man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another obscure village. He worked in a carpenter shop until he was 30, and then he was an itinerant preacher. He never wrote a book; he never held an office; he never went to college; he never put his foot inside a big city; he never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He never did one of the things that usually accompany greatness. He had no credentials but himself. He had nothing to cope with this world except the naked power of his divine manhood.

"While still a young man, the tide of popular opinion turned against him. His friends ran away. One of them denied him. He was turned over to his enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed to a cross between two thieves. His executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had while he was on this earth while he was dying, and that was his coat. "When he was dead, he was taken down and laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend."

And I continue to quote:

"Nineteen wide centuries have come and gone. And today He is the centerpiece of the human race and the leader of the column of progress.

"I am far within the mark when I say that all the armies that ever marched and all the navies that ever were built and all the parliaments that ever sat and all the kings that ever reigned put together have not affected the life of man upon this earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life."

That's the end of the quote.

In the light of that man's "solitary life," each of us must wonder and ask what he can do to make this world better. Each of us wants to know what he can do to make our country stronger, greater, and in the image described in various places in the Holy Bible.

My own search for an answer has found and still finds encouragement in these words from Phillips' translation of First Corinthians, the 12th chapter and verses 4 through 11. And I quote:

"Men have different gifts, but it is the same Lord who is served. God works through different men in different ways, but it is the same God who achieves His purposes through

them all. Each man is given his gift by the spirit that he may make the most of it. One man's gift by the spirit is to speak with wisdom, another's, to speak with knowledge. The same spirit gives to another man faith, to another the ability to heal, to another the power to do great deeds. The same spirit gives to another man the gift of preaching the word of God, to another the ability to discriminate in spiritual matters, to another speech in different tongues, and to yet another the power to interpret the tongues.

"Placing all these gifts is the operation of the same spirit who distributes to each individual man as he wills."

And that's the end of that particular quotation.

Then to deepen the meaning of these words, we can turn to the 12th chapter of Romans and the 3d through the 8th verses. And again I quote from Phillips:

"As your spiritual teacher I give this piece of advice to each one of you: Don't cherish exaggerated ideas of yourself or your importance, but try to have a sane estimate of your capabilities by the light of the faith that God has given to you all. For just as you have many members in one physical body and those members differ in their functions, so we, though many in number, compose one body in Christ and are all members of one another.

"Through the grace of God we have different gifts. If our gift is preaching, let us preach to the limit of our vision. If it is serving others, let us concentrate on our service. If it is teaching, let us give all we have to our teaching. And if our gift be the stimulating of faith in others, let us set ourselves to it.

"Let the man who is called to give, give freely. Let the man who wields authority think of his responsibility. And let the man who feels sympathy for his fellows act cheerfully."

And that's the end of that quotation.

And, finally, there is a guide for each of us in the 16th verse of the 5th chapter of Matthew:

"Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Senator CARLSON. I have a wire from Dr. Billy Graham which reads:

WIRE, DR. BILLY GRAHAM

"Greetings from Hawaii, where I'm speaking this morning at the Governor's prayer breakfast and praying that you will have the greatest prayer breakfast in history.

"Please assure President Johnson, as he leads the Nation at this critical period of history, that he has my daily prayers. And God bless you all."

And it's signed: "Billy Graham."

Senator CARLSON. It is a high honor and a great privilege to present the President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Senator CARLSON, reverend clergy, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker McCORMACK, Justice Clark, members of the Cabinet, Mr. Minority Leader of the House, distinguished guests, Governors, ladies, and gentlemen, I'm very grateful for the opportunity to participate again in an occasion which has already come to be a very valued place in the life of Washington, our Capital City, and in the lives of so many of us who must labor here.

In our history it has been popular to regard with skepticism the private motives of public men and never more than when they participate in meetings such as this.

I'm sure such skepticism has been deserved by some. But I am more certain that only the unknowing and the unthinking would challenge today the motives that bring our public officials together on occasions like this for prayer and meditation.

In these times, more than any other, the public life is a lonely life. The burden of every vote, of every decision, of every act and, yes, even of every utterance is too great to be shared and much too great to be borne alone.

I find for myself, as I know men and women throughout this great Government of ours also find, a sustaining strength from the moments of prayer, whether we assemble together or whether we pray silently alone.

What has become a tradition and practice in our times is actually one of the oldest public traditions of our national life.

Long ago when this country was struggling to come into being, there arose at the Constitutional Convention a discussion and a debate about holding prayers before each session at that Convention. The great Benjamin Franklin spoke up to speak his views, and I believe it's appropriate and timely this morning to repeat and to endorse those words now.

Dr. Franklin told the framers of our Constitution, and I quote him:

"Without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests. Our projects will be confounded and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages.

"And what is worse," Dr. Franklin went ahead to add, "mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance and to war and to conquest."

Today, in our times, the responsibilities and the burdens imposed upon each of us are great and frightening and growing.

On us—on each of us—on our decisions that we individually and collectively make, rests the hope of mankind throughout the world for a world that is not left to chance or not left to war or not left to conquest.

I think that we could find no more appropriate way to begin our day, today, and our duties in this hour, than to pray for, as we are taught, "Except the Lord build this house, they labor in vain that build it."

Senator CARLSON. We will all stand and the benediction will be pronounced by Dr. Richard Halverson, associate executive director of International Christian Leadership.

BENEDICTION

Dr. HALVERSON. The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord make His face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon thee and give thee His peace, now and in the life everlasting. Amen.

(The U.S. Army Chorus sings "America.")

VIEWS OF SENATOR MANSFIELD ON THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader is unable to be present in the Senate today. He requested me to insert in the RECORD on his behalf a brief statement on an aspect of the Vietnamese situation. I consider his statement of such import and find myself in such wholehearted agreement with his thoughts, I shall read it into the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

There are reports that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom may no longer regard as operative their responsibilities as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference. It is to be hoped that these reports are inaccurate but if they are not, that these two powers would reconsider their position, and resume their responsibility with a view to a constructive surveillance of the serious situation in southeast Asia.

The 1954 Geneva Conference, despite its shortcomings, did help to bring several years of relative order out of the then chaotic and unstable situation in Indochina. It shut off, for the time, what had become a bloody war in the Indochinese peninsula and what was tending in the direction of a massive war in Asia.

The 1954 conferees may or may not have a contribution to make in the current deepening crisis in Vietnam. But in the light of the danger of that crisis to peace in Asia and, ultimately to world peace, it would appear desirable not to foreclose that channel of possible amelioration of the difficulties. The need is to keep open doors, not to shut them. That applies not only to the Geneva Conference of 1954 but to the Geneva Conference of 1961, to the United Nations and to every routine or special avenue of diplomatic communication. It would be helpful, therefore, if the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom did not regard as at an end their responsibilities as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference. Indeed, the responsibilities of all nations to contribute whatever they can to a just peace may be evaded but they cannot be lifted.

Mr. President, I completely support these views of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and believe that the suggestion he puts forward is an excellent and positive one. Having accompanied the Senator on a Presidential factfinding mission to Vietnam in 1962, I find myself possessed of an immense regard of his judgment and consider him in view of his many years' exposure to travel in and study of the Far East, the best informed member of our body on this part of the world. To my mind, his thoughts have great merit.

We are presently engaged in a war that appears as if it can only be won either by massive commitment of American soldiers ashore or by permitting escalation into nuclear warfare. I query whether our vital interests in that part of the world are equal to these alternatives. Nor, do I believe, can we pull out at this time.

Accordingly, I believe we must continue to hold on, seeking to arrive at a point where we can honorably negotiate a reasonable, solid, and forceful agreement that meets the interests of the Geneva powers, of ourselves, and, most important, of the Vietnamese people.

I also would strongly hope, too, that more of our SEATO Asiatic allies might see fit to help the South Vietnamese. So far, only the United States is playing a role in this regard and there are other countries closer to Vietnam with even more vital stakes at issue that should be more than carrying the load with us.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that at this time of decision and self-examination, I think it would be a great mistake if we withdrew from our present position, leaving a vacuum. To my mind we have no alternative but to show our determination and hold on as we are, seeking and probing for some reasonably solid and acceptable agreement.

AID FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at this time, when the President's education program is being discussed, I think it is most important that we keep in perspective the real objective of us all—the better edu-

cation of our Nation's children. All else that eventually results, the increase in college attendance, an increase in the number of our professional people, an increase in our country's gross national product, an enhancement of our general literacy, an increase in the relative strength in the world, all must build from this base of better education for all our children. Unless this base is there, preparation for jobs and careers, motivation to go on to college, and for all to take on increased responsibility in our Nation and world will fall short.

And when it comes to educating all our children, I mean all, not a portion, of our children. In this regard, I believe children in our parochial and private schools are just as important as children in our public schools; that they will play just as important a role in our Nation's life as those in our public schools. I think that much serious attention should be devoted to ways of improving their education as well.

As a Senator from Rhode Island, with 29 percent of our children in grade school attending parochial or private schools, I have a particularly deep concern with this matter.

In this connection, I believe that President Johnson has developed a very fine solution to the perennial problem of aid to nonpublic schools by his concentration upon the problems of the children themselves, as opposed to those of the schools. Much clearer thinking is needed on this whole problem, and, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks an interesting article by Carl N. Degler that appeared in the New York Times Magazine section on Sunday, January 31, 1965.

I do not necessarily believe this article may fully answer everyone's questions on this important issue. Nor do I believe that the situation rightly is not an issue. But, also, is it not time we stimulated discussion and thinking on it? I believe there is a fair and just solution in favor of assistance to the child in the private school.

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

AID FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS—A QUESTION OF EDUCATION, NOT RELIGION

(By Carl N. Degler)

It is time that Americans face the question of Federal aid to parochial schools. If we truly believe in the national goal to improve education for all we should stop our shifting and squirming and try looking at the problem realistically. With good will, understanding, and leadership from the national administration the conflicting views can be harmoniously resolved.

Although the question of Federal aid to private schools affects secular as well as religious schools, the issue centers upon the Roman Catholic parochial schools. They educate the preponderance of non-public-school children and when the issue is resolved for them, it will be resolved also for Lutheran, Jewish, Episcopalian, and secular private schools as well. Therefore, in what follows, the parochial schools are used as the example, though what is advocated for them applies to all others.

The issue, it should be stressed, is not a partisan religious one. Indeed, as one who was raised a Protestant, I hold no brief for

parochial schools nor for the virtues of religion as opposed to secular education. The case for Federal aid to private education, it seems to me, is pragmatic and secular.

The starting point of all discussions on the question is the simple fact that almost 6 million American schoolchildren—about one in seven—are educated in private schools, more than 90 percent of which are operated by the Roman Catholic Church. The proportion in some States is considerably higher. Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Hampshire, for example, have almost a quarter of their children in private schools; Rhode Island counts 29 percent and Wisconsin 27 percent. In cities like Pittsburgh, New York, and Chicago, the proportion of children in Roman Catholic schools alone is between 30 and 40 percent.

From the standpoint of numbers alone, Roman Catholic schools are functioning as quasi-public institutions. The immediate question is: As public education is steadily improved with more funds, better equipment, and higher pay for teachers, can the parochial schools match that improvement? The answer seems to be no.

Ever since the late 1950's, the parochial schools have been growing fast, considerably faster than the public schools. Between 1940 and 1963, the number of pupils in parochial schools jumped 129 percent, as compared with a 53-percent rise in the public schools.

Needless to say, this rapid growth has been a tremendous drain upon the financial resources of the parishes and dioceses, which support the schools. Stiff tuition charges are now common for parochial schools, and they continue to go up. A recent survey of 136 diocesan high schools showed that two-thirds had raised tuition since 1955; 90 of them charged \$100 or more a year. These charges, of course, are in addition to general contributions by the parishioners.

At the same time, one of the principal financial advantages of parochial schools has been waning. Because so many of the parochial schools have been traditionally staffed by nuns, instructional costs have been considerably lower than in public schools. But as the parochial schools have multiplied, the number of available nuns has not kept pace. In 1945, nuns outnumbered lay teachers in parochial schools 13 to 1; in 1959, the ratio was 3 to 1; by 1970 it is estimated that the number of lay teachers will be double that of nuns.

In itself such a reversal means a tremendous increase in costs. A nun's subsistence and allowance runs between \$650 and \$1,250 a year, while lay teachers in parochial schools are paid an average of \$3,400. Heavy as the increase in costs will be as the shift from teaching nuns to lay teachers is made, it will get considerably heavier as the parochial schools try to staff their schools with the best lay teachers. The present average pay of the lay teacher is considerably below the average of \$5,200 for public school teachers. Moreover, few of the parochial schools provide fringe benefits like pensions, which are taken for granted by public school teachers.

In short, the quality of teaching is endangered in the parochial schools, if it has not been reduced already. As the situation now stands, parochial teachers are working under tremendous handicaps, with class sizes far above the average for public schools. Class rolls of 50 or 60 students are common and ones of 90 are not unknown. The average class size in the public schools is 26. Although the educationally optimum number of students in a class is certainly debatable, it is safe to say that quality of education must be inferior, all other things being equal, when classes reach such size.

Two points in President Johnson's recent congressional message on education would provide some oblique Federal aid to parochial

schools. One calls for \$100 million of grants for library and textbooks for public and private schools. The other calls for \$100 million for the creation of supplementary education centers at which public school systems would allow parochial school children to use some of their facilities and attend some of their classes on a shared-time basis.

Revolutionary as these proposals may be considered by some, they are inadequate on both financial and constitutional grounds. Neither lifts much of the financial burden under which the parochial schools now stagger. Moreover, two States (New York and Iowa) have already indicated that shared time violates State constitutional bans on aid to religious schools. Other States, with similar explicit prohibitions in their constitutions, will undoubtedly arrive at the same conclusion in short order. In sum, the need for Federal aid to private schools in general, and parochial schools in particular, remains as crucial as ever.

To one not immediately involved with parochial education, the present crisis undoubtedly appears unfortunate, but outside his concern. He may simply shrug his shoulders, remarking that Catholic children should go to public schools. But this attitude is surely as socially shortsighted as it is insensitive. The enormous rise in parochial school enrollment in itself attests to the strong interest of many parents in religious education.

(Some critics have argued that this increased attendance is actually a result of a desire to escape racially integrated public schools, but the number of such cases is really negligible. The argument certainly does not apply at all in southern cities like New Orleans or Charleston, or in the South as a whole, where parochial schools have led the region in desegregation. Indeed, one could make a good argument that in many communities, North and South, the parochial school is more socially, as well as more racially, heterogeneous than the public schools simply because of the larger districts from which the parochial schools draw their students.)

The fact is that several million future citizens are going to continue to be educated in parochial schools, regardless of what others of us may think about their merits or demerits. In such circumstances, no one who is alert to the central role that education plays in our increasingly technical society can afford to be indifferent to the quality of parochial schools. What kind of improvement in job opportunities and in the technical skills of our people can be achieved when one-seventh of the children are left behind in inferior schools? One does not have to be a Catholic to be alarmed at such shortsightedness—he has to consult no more than his own self-interest.

There is a further social reason for including parochial schools in Federal aid to education. Unfortunately, in the debate over this question, some overzealous Catholics have muddied the waters. They assert that those parents who send their children to parochial schools are taxed doubly for education: once for public schools and again for parochial schools.

Legally, of course, the argument is specious. No law requires Catholic parents to pay for parochial schools or denies their children access to public schools. But if the argument lacks legal substance, it carries moral force. Catholic-school parents do in fact pay more for education than non-Catholics—and, in doing so, they actually save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Because of this, non-Catholics who smugly invoke the doctrine of separation of church and state are no more disinterested interpreters of the principle than are Catholics. The question of Federal aid to parochial schools needs recognition of the Catholic contribution and the national good, not slogan trading.

Nor does it mitigate the Catholic parents' sense of financial burden to recall that the doctrine of separation of church and state in America as it pertains to education grew up pragmatically and not as a result of an abstract principle. Many know that all public education in America began as Protestant education, becoming secular only when Catholics, in the early 19th century, protested and demanded a share of the school funds to open their own schools. The Catholics failed to get the funds, but America got secular public schools. The point is that rigid, automatic adherence to an absolute interpretation of the doctrine of separation is a real source of social division.

To achieve the social harmony necessary for any healthy society some recognition of Catholic problems in education needs to be made by the rest of Americans. For too long, non-Catholic Americans have viewed the Roman Catholic Church as something more (or less, according to some) than a religion. Many Protestants still see it as simply concentrated power, something to be feared and fought.

Today, however, Catholics constitute a quarter of the population. The first Catholic President is as memorable for his sophisticated style as the first Catholic presidential candidate is remembered for his lack of it. Indeed, it is the new power and prominence of Catholics that constitutes the dynamite in the school issue.

To meet every plea for recognition of the Catholic parents' problem with the automatic response of separation of church and state can only drive Catholics to an unwise use of their power. One adamant response begets another. The result is social division and, ultimately, national stagnation. Social amity requires that all Americans, not just Catholics, assume part of the burden of the parochial schools' pursuit of educational excellence.

The emphasis here is on understanding, not on right. It should be clear that no private school has a right to public aid. Some unthinking advocates of such aid, it is true, have argued that the constitutional doctrine of freedom of religion implies that the state must support church schools, else they are being denied their rights under the first amendment.

Such a contention is nonsense. Freedom of economic enterprise does not mean that all businesses must be kept afloat by the state. But, if the public good demands it, the Government may support certain enterprises, as it does the merchant marine and farming. That is a matter to be decided by public debate, not adjudicated according to immutable principles. Similarly, private education may be—indeed, should be—assisted by the Federal Government though not as a right.

But, it will be objected, the case is different in regard to education, where social need is not the only consideration. What of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state? Does not the Constitution prohibit any kind of support for religion, even for the schools? Actually, as I have been implying, the constitutional restrictions are less rigid than some opponents of Federal aid to parochial schools would have us believe.

Despite the decidedly pragmatic nature of their culture, Americans like to think that the separation of church and state in the United States is strict. Even John F. Kennedy fell into this cliché when, during the 1960 campaign, he spoke of believing in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute.

In truth, it has been neither absolute nor consistent. From the very first administration, Congress has provided for chaplains out of public funds, and the President has proclaimed days of thanksgiving. The Constitution itself recognizes Sunday, the Christian

Sabbath, as a day of rest. To this day, at the service academies, attendance at chapel is compulsory. And, above all, both the Federal and State Governments continue to support religion through tax exemptions of church property that run into hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

The one unbreachable tenet, and rightly so, has been that the Government may not support any religion or church directly. And this no advocate of Federal aid to parochial schools suggests. Nor is it an argument against Federal aid to religious schools to say it would be an opening wedge to direct support of religion. For more than 150 years, in one form or another, indirect aid has been given without breaching the essential principle; there is no reason why the effect would be any different now.

The Supreme Court has recognized that the doctrine of separation is not absolute. In 1930, in the case of *Cochran v. Louisiana*, the Court set forth its first major interpretation of the meaning of separation as applied to schools. The case concerned a Louisiana law that had provided for State-supplied textbooks for private schools, including parochial, as well as for public schools. When the law was challenged by a taxpayer on the ground that public money was being spent for a private purpose, the Court rejected the argument, asserting that the books served a public purpose, namely the education of the children.

Admittedly, the Court conceded, providing textbooks indirectly aided religious institutions, but that was not the intention of the State; hence, the law was not contrary to the constitutional prohibitions. Today several States provide free textbooks to private schools.

The principle of benefit to the child was also the basis of the Court's reasoning in the *Everson* decision in 1947, which permitted the use of public funds to pay for the transportation of children to a parochial school. A year later, in the *McCollum* case, the Court outlawed an Illinois practice of allowing religious classes, under the released-time program, to be held in public school buildings. Here the aid to the child was in support of religious teaching only.

Thus, the Court drew a line between those acts of Government that aid religion directly and those which aid religion only indirectly while pursuing a broader social purpose. Presumably, the child-benefit principle, as long as it does not support religious teaching as such, is capable of extension beyond textbooks and buses.

In fact, it has already been applied, though the Supreme Court has not considered the constitutionality of any of the applications. The best known instance, of course, has been the GI bill of rights, passed at the end of the Second World War to aid veterans education. Catholic colleges and universities received funds, through their students, along with secular institutions. Even veterans studying for the ministry and priesthood could call upon the law for benefits.

Parochial schools participate today in State and Federal school-lunch programs. Shared-time programs, endorsed in the President's message and already in operation in some cities, also constitute an application of the child-benefit doctrine. Purists may argue, as they have in regard to public buses being used by parochial school children, that any such services, by saving money for religious institutions, constitute a violation of absolute separation. But neither the American people nor the Supreme Court have been purists in the past in this regard; certainly there is no reason to begin now.

There is also evidence that many Americans are becoming aware of the need for some kind of accommodation on the issue. In 1961, the Gallup Poll reported that 57 percent of the population wanted no Federal

funds to go to parochial schools. But by early 1963, 49 percent favored including parochial schools in any Federal aid, while only 44 percent were opposed. (The remainder were undecided.)

With the child-benefit doctrine available in constitutional interpretation and with public recognition of the need for Federal aid to all schools increasing, the time seems propitious for the Johnson administration to take the final step. What precise form Federal aid should take is, of course, a matter to be decided in the public forum.

Obviously it should not include any direct support of religious instruction. Probably the most useful form it could take would be financial grants for augmenting salaries of teachers of secular subjects, for laboratory equipment, for new classroom construction and for outfitting libraries. The amount might well be in proportion to the total educational appropriation of the parochial schools, and be distributed on a per capita basis.

The expenditure of the funds would probably be most efficiently overseen by the U.S. Office of Education, but congressional concern about Federal control might well cause this function to be placed in the hands of State departments of education. Regardless of the level of Government that undertakes the supervision of the expenditures, though, it should be understood that with a grant of money goes the right to see that it is used as intended.

Moreover, since this aid is a matter of policy and not of right, the amount granted to any individual private school would be considerably less than the full cost of operation. Thus public schools would remain the principal recipients of public funds—indeed, the only recipients on the local and State levels. There would, therefore, be no need to fear that the public schools would be superseded either in money or in public attention by the private or parochial schools.

To bring the issue explicitly before the Nation will undoubtedly arouse heated discussion and perhaps even some latent fears and ancient animosities. But the question is too important to be weakly evaded and too urgent to be merely palliated. Of all recent Presidents, Lyndon Johnson, with his proved powers of public and private persuasion, is eminently fitted for the task of public education and leadership that the subject demands.

Certainly the Great Society he dreams of and the mutual understanding among Americans he cherishes deserve no less. Moreover, once the thorny issue is faced and Congress has acted, the effect may well be as socially healing as the passage of the Civil Rights Act has proved to be for another threat to national amity and social progress.

A SPEEDY RECOVERY FOR SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we are all deeply distressed over the illness of the senior Senator from Georgia, and I know that I can speak for other Members of the Senate when I say that his presence is greatly missed on the floor of this body.

I would like to join with his loved ones, his host of friends and associates, his colleagues here in the Senate, and indeed all Georgians in wishing Senator RUSSELL a full and speedy recovery.

Mr. President, there appeared in the February 9 issue of the Atlanta Constitution an editorial expressing concern over Senator RUSSELL's illness, and the hope that he soon will be back at his desk in the Senate.

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:

A SPEEDY RECOVERY

The illness of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL is a matter of deep concern and distress to all Georgians. He has served his State and his Nation well, and deservedly has been cited as the most effective of all Senators. His illness at a time of international crisis reminds us of his all-important role as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in which capacity he has been instrumental in keeping the Nation strong.

The Constitution joins with all Georgians in extending best wishes to the Senator for a speedy recovery. We trust that within a few days he will be back in his accustomed place on the Senate floor.

FREEDOM'S RESPONSIBILITIES— ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMATHERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on January 26 the able and distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] delivered a thought-provoking address before the Miami Woman's Club. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Florida has a great interest in foreign affairs. The address deals specifically with the situation that presently exists in southeast Asia. I believe it will be of great interest to all Senators and all readers of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE A. SMATHERS BEFORE MIAMI WOMAN'S CLUB, JANUARY 26, 1965

I congratulate you on selecting the theme for this 65th year as "Freedom's Responsibilities." For it implies an awareness on your part, not universally shared, that freedom is not free, and perhaps uniquely in our generation of human history, the cause of freedom can slowly rise or swiftly ebb, depending upon how we "the people" discharge the responsibilities it entails.

Here in the United States freedom is making great strides under a government that recognizes that it derives all of its powers from the consent of the governed. We are moving forward in giant efforts to push back the frontiers of literacy, of health, and of economic and spiritual opportunity. Plato said: "Governments reflect human nature; states are not made out of stone nor wood, but of the character of their citizens." Judged against this platonic standard, I foresee a continuing strive toward excellence in our own society, driven along by the character of a responsible citizenry.

However, as we pursue our own vital interests at home, we cannot be unmindful of the plight and conditions of those who inhabit this earth with us. In the past 40 years, freedom's responsibilities have fallen upon the United States to defend and to extend.

This is not a role we sought nor even wanted. But it is one which wisdom compelled us to take after absorbing the lessons of 20th century history.

Twice in my lifetime, America has watched from the sidelines as the world became embroiled in a global war; and twice the challenge to our own survival forced us, finally to take up arms, and twice we and our allies thought that total victory and peace had been achieved.

Out of these experiences we have learned two lessons—lessons that have guided this Nation's international policies since 1945. First, we learned that the costs of war inevitably exceed its rewards. Second, we learned that the maintenance of peace requires eternal vigilance, and more: It requires patience, perseverance, a willingness to be involved with other nations with whom we share common interests, and an understanding that our own freedom is inexorably entwined with the cause of freemen in every part of the world.

That is why we have made commitments to various nations of the world, and that is why 52 cents of every one of our tax dollars is spent to maintain a Military Establishment second to none.

As President Johnson said in his state of the Union address: "Our hand is out, in a gesture of friendship, but our guard must remain up." And that's the way it must remain so long as the Communist system in any country is dedicated to the destruction of individual freedom and the total domination of the world.

However, a proper understanding of the communistic system, and its evolution in various countries, is indispensable to a rational response to the challenge it poses.

Until 1948, communism could best be described as a monolithic gargantua, whose policies were dictated from Stalinist Russia, and whose purposes were identical in every Communist state. In 1948, however, two developments in the Communist world precipitated a disunity within its orbit of influence and made it imperative for the United States to have a flexible policy toward the various Communist nations. I have reference to the Mao Tse Tung victory over Chiang Kai-shek's forces in China, on the one hand, and the breakaway of Tito's Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc on the other.

In recent years, China has maintained that it, and not the Soviet Union, is the exponent of "pure" Marxian-Leninist communism. Its position in this regard was enhanced by the death of Stalin in 1953, and the subsequent de-Stalinization campaign within the Soviet Union. Loyal to its claim, Peiping is today, in the words of Communist William S. White "headquarters for the most poisonous agents for war and aggression, the most noxiously infectious core of trouble for the West in all the world."

She is dedicated to the spread of communism by the violent overthrow of democratic systems of government. That vast nation, once our ally and friend, has forced the United States to defend the Korean peninsula in the third most bloody battle in all of our history. It has forcefully taken over the Himalayan nation of Tibet. It has violated the borders of neutral India. It has fomented revolution among the newly independent nations of Africa and it is greatly responsible for the recent violence in the Congo. And it is now earnestly and energetically seeking to infiltrate and dominate all of southeast Asia.

In 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in his book, entitled "Democracy in America," that "it is [no longer possible] for men to remain strangers to each other, or to be ignorant of the events which are taking place in any corner of the globe." De Tocqueville's words, written 130 years ago, could not have more applicability than they do in 1965. For today the importunities of history have constrained the United States to commit 25,000 military advisers, and to suffer the loss thus far of 247 of those American advisers, in the remote and backward nation of South Vietnam, 15,000 miles from our shores.

All of that area of the world has long been an area of conflict and unrest. For nearly 100 years prior to the Second World War, the French occupied what was then known as French Indochina, consisting of the nations we know today as Cambodia, Laos, and North

and South Vietnam. Japan occupied these territories during World War II from 1941 to 1945, and thereafter, the French, largely with U.S. assistance, sought to reclaim Indochina for itself. But the Indochinese people, having developed some nationalistic feelings, rebelled and the result was the disastrous defeat for the French at Dienbienphu in 1954. They lost over 25,000 men.

A conference was called at Geneva in that year and an accord was reached among 14 nations including China, U.S.S.R., but not the United States of America, whereby North Vietnam remained in Communist hands, and South Vietnam, under Premier Diem, was supposedly guaranteed its independence.

But it soon became apparent that the independence of South Vietnam was being threatened by Communist North Vietnam, urged on and abetted by the Peiping regime. John Foster Dulles, our then Secretary of State, persuaded President Eisenhower to intervene, first with our economic assistance and later with military aid and a small number of advisers. Thus began the long struggle that continues today.

Notwithstanding policy statements issued from time to time by the State Department, I think it is accurate to say that South Vietnam, in and of itself, is of no military consequence to our Nation's strategic defenses. The United States has an impervious line of defenses in the Pacific, stretching from Alaska down through Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Formosa. We have SAC forces always on the alert on the island of Guam; our 7th Fleet is in command of the far Pacific, the South China Sea, and the Formosan Straits. We are in South Vietnam, not to aid in our own immediate defense, but as the result of a considered conclusion of the needs of the free world to check the advance of Chinese communism in southeast Asia.

If South Vietnam were to fall into Communist hands, it would precipitate the demise of freedom in all the nations of southeast Asia. Malaysia, Burma, Thailand, would inevitably fall behind the Bamboo Curtain. Cambodia which is today playing both sides of the fence would be sucked into the Communist morass. It appears that President Sukarno has Indonesia already headed straight for the Communist camp. It is not entirely unlikely that, with southeast Asia in its grasp, the next moves of Communist aggression would be into the Philippines, New Guinea, New Zealand, and perhaps even the Australian Continent. More than a billion people, people who are now free and want to remain free, would have fallen under the domination of Communist China. Her strategic position in the world would then be immensely more formidable, and her drive for world domination more aggressive and determined than ever. If that unhappy day should come, America would once again be forced to wage a great battle for survival, and while our capability for total destruction is such that we would win, it would be a victory that would leave, in the words of President Kennedy, "survivors who would envy the dead."

However, amidst this panorama of gloom, there are two facts that immensely weigh in our favor. First, while the Chinese Communists have exploded a primitive nuclear device, they do not presently have, nor will they have for perhaps another 10 years, a capability with which to wage nuclear war. Secondly, the Soviet Union, which does have such a capability, capitulated to the fearsome ultimatum of President Kennedy's in October 1962, and they withdrew their nuclear missiles from the island of Cuba. In the perilous calculations that one must make in this nuclear age, it is reasonable to believe that, having refused to risk total nuclear war over Cuba, the Soviet Union would demonstrate equal, if not greater, reluctance over triggering such a catastrophe in southeast Asia

for the primary benefit of her now restive and critical ally, who perhaps in the near future, might well be her mortal enemy, Red China.

The question of what course this Nation should now pursue in South Vietnam must be resolved with a full understanding of what is at stake for America and for the cause of freedom both now and in the future.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate have raised their voices incessantly for an immediate and complete withdrawal of all American forces from South Vietnam. Parenthetically, no one is more personally concerned about our involvement in that area of the world than Rosemary and I, for our son, John, is a naval officer aboard a destroyer operating in those very troubled waters.

But I believe that a policy of withdrawal is diametrically opposed to the long-range vital interests of the United States, especially at this time when the advantages would all accrue to the Vietcong and their ally, the Chinese People's Republic.

In the past several months, we have heard other public figures go the other way—100 percent, and say that the United States should not restrain its awesome military might; that we should unleash our forces against the Communist Vietcong rebels. In their view, the United States should not refrain from using even tactical nuclear weapons, not only in South Vietnam, but in North Vietnam, or wherever the enemy hides or supplies itself. The advocates of this bold action by the United States are not concerned if their course should precipitate a war with Red China or even the Soviet Union. It is their view that we should fight them now and get it over with.

I doubt not the patriotism nor good intentions of these people but I do believe that these well-meaning persons have let their impatience outstrip their reason.

The last time that President Johnson visited with General MacArthur, the general urged the President never to commit this Nation to fight a major land war in Asia. We could not win without using our nuclear power and by using it, we challenge the Communists of the Soviet Union as they have never before been challenged, and no man can with certainty predict their response. Six weeks ago the Soviet Union reaffirmed its commitment for aid to its Communist allies.

I do not believe that we should either precipitously pull out of South Vietnam and thereby surrender it and southeast Asia to the Communists, nor that we should initiate a greater war than that now needed to stop the Communist incursions through South Vietnam.

I think that the policy this country is following at the present time is the wisest course for incurring the independence of southeast Asia. While conditions in that country remain admittedly grave, still there are some hopeful signs that our objectives can and will be achieved.

There is beginning to come into evidence among the South Vietnamese people the determination to resist the forces of communism similar to that which caused them to fight so stubbornly against the French after the end of World War II. It is also evident that under the direction of our military advisers, the Vietnamese Army is now developing a military capability which, in the foreseeable future, should make these forces superior to that of the Vietcong.

As they recognize the growing threat that communism poses to their own safety and freedom other nations of Asia are beginning to join forces with the South Vietnamese. New Zealand and Australia have dispatched men and supplies; the Philippines and South Korea have offered to send troops, and there is a welding of thought and forces throughout

free Asia; intent upon putting a stop to Communist aggression on South Vietnam. Of course, there remains a very volatile political situation.

Victory over communism in South Vietnam cannot be won unless and until the South Vietnamese Government is stabilized. The political problems of that country are almost too complex for anyone to fully grasp.

Not only must the Buddhists, the Catholics, and the military, reach some accord; but there are more than 60 political parties which have varying degrees of power and influence. And this is in a country where the meaning of "democracy" is virtually unknown. Today the most we can hope for is a degree of stability adequate to unite the people under the common umbrella of a desire for freedom from Communist slavery. General Taylor believes he is finally achieving that.

The fact is that with a stable government, with a superior indigenous military force, and with technical help from the United States and the signators to the Geneva Treaty, the South Vietnamese can win their battle for independence, and a respect for their borders—and this is the course we are now pursuing in this changing and fluid world.

Developments in other areas of the world seem to indicate that time is on our side. There are encouraging signs that some governments, while still calling themselves Communist, are less intent upon world domination than they are upon their own national interests. A case in point is Yugoslavia, which broke with the Soviet bloc in 1948, settled its differences with Italy over Trieste, and stopped the use of its country as a springboard of Communist conspiracy against Greece. Yugoslavia continues to move toward the Western World.

Other nations of Eastern Europe, such as Rumania, Poland, and Hungary, nations whose traditions and whose culture have been historically tied to the Western World, are making some progress toward meeting the basic needs of their people, and the more they get and learn and hear, the more they are making overtures to the free world.

Here again, America must employ a high level of wisdom in its international diplomacy. While the winds of change blow all around us, we cannot adhere to an inflexible, rigid foreign policy.

It is essential that we encourage these nations to advance toward the freedoms they once enjoyed. Merely because we abhor anything called Communist, we must not smother all glimmers of hope that freedom may once again be asserting itself in Eastern Europe.

For we have come to the time when the outlook for militant worldwide communism is no longer bright; when the Soviet Union is doing some soul searching of its own, and has even begun to experiment with our profit motivated, capitalistic type of economy. Most of the nations of the world are becoming more and more concerned about their own vital interests and are less and less enamoured of alliances with worldwide conspiracies.

Nowhere is this retreat of militant communism more apparent than in Latin America today. As paradoxical as it may seem, this happy development has been fostered in no small measure by the experience of communism on the island of Cuba.

Castro's brand of communism has backfired in Latin America.

Unlike the situation in South Vietnam, where the advances of communism are posing a military threat to all the countries of southeast Asia, Fidel Castro has failed in his efforts to export communism into the other Latin American Republics. He tried but he failed in Venezuela—in the Dominican Republic, in Argentina, and in Chile. As a

matter of fact, he is even failing to establish a successful beachhead of communism in Cuba itself.

Far from being a showcase of success for the Communist system in Latin America, Cuba, is today, for all the world to see, communism's dismal failure and Fidel Castro's days are numbered.

His downfall is going to come from an uprising within the Cuban Army. There is already growing military unrest, and I would not be surprised to see a coup overthrowing him at any time.

As an encouragement to defectors within Castro's military, I would again urge the establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile. Such a move will encourage the enemies of Castro within his army and will hurry along the inevitable collapse of his government. Then, hopefully, Cuba will once again be free.

These are some of the areas around the world where the responsibilities of freedom weigh heavily upon this Nation of ours.

For, whether we like it or not, the United States of America is the leader in the battle for freedom.

In this role, we must have virtually a 360° vision for we must be mindful of what is going on all around us. The fight for freedom today is total, worldwide, and final.

Today we face a serious challenge in South Vietnam.

Events in Africa are uncertain and could get worse.

In the Middle East, the dissensions between the Jews and the Arabs could erupt into war at any time.

There are, however, areas of the world that offer encouragement and hope. As I said in Latin America and there are encouraging signs that things are looking better in Eastern Europe. And, even in Russia itself, we continue to see small but significant and increasing developments that may portend some further relaxation of world tensions.

But free men and women must remember that there are no pat nor easy solutions to any of these complex, ever-changing problems; that no one certain thing can be done to bring about the millenium and that no one can be certain that he alone has the answer.

The responsibility of freedom is to love and cherish it, to work at it, to be willing to sacrifice, even one's life, if need be, to protect and defend it.

This is the creed and the spirit that has made our land what it is today.

With that same devotion, with that same degree of faith in our country and in ourselves, and with divine guidance from above, we will most surely prevail.

ANTIPOVERTY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the antipoverty program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. I also ask unanimous consent that several insertions be included in the RECORD immediately following the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. These include Mr. Walker's letter and enclosure, a telegram from Mr. Sparks, and newspaper items from the Lexington Leader, the Louisville Courier-Journal, and the Louisville Times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Last year when the antipoverty bill was before the Senate, proponents argued that one aspect of the program offered an effective attack against our great national problem of the school dropout and unemployed youth. While I am as concerned over this educational, social, and economic problem as anyone, certain aspects of the proposal convinced me that a division of administration among various Federal agencies could lead to divisiveness working against commendable objectives. This was one of the reasons I was compelled to vote against the bill in the Senate.

Recent developments in Kentucky have confirmed my feeling that bureaucratic decisions could undercut the program and render it ineffective. Several communities in the Commonwealth had laid the groundwork for establishing National Youth Corps projects under the work training program provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Procedures had been established, pupils had been enrolled, and the communities were set to go ahead.

However, early enthusiasm and hope have been reduced to discouragement by the Department of Labor judgment that these young men and women must be paid a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour. Kentucky School Superintendent Harry Sparks reports that several approved projects have now been withdrawn. Other projects, although submitted but not approved, also will have to be withdrawn.

Paducah and Louisville, Ky., are two of the areas affected by Labor's preposterous decision, which appears to contradict the law as far as National Youth Corps wage rates are concerned. Section 113(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 states that rates of pay "will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee." The Commonwealth of Kentucky is seeking a more favorable wage ruling from the Department of Labor, and I concur that a more realistic wage rate is fully justified.

Mr. Newman Walker, superintendent of schools in Paducah, has summarized his community's experience under the program in a rather lengthy letter. I am sure that many of my colleagues have received this letter. If not, I commend it to your attention.

PADUCAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Paducah, Ky., February 3, 1965.

HON. THURSTON MORTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following letter sent by the Paducah, Ky., Board of Education to other school administrators and boards of education describes the recent experience that we have had in attempting to take advantage of the recently passed Economic Opportunity Act. It sets forth certain facts which show that our efforts to make this program work as intended by the Congress have been blocked by representatives from organized labor. We do not believe that those responsible for this obstructionism are familiar with circumstances which affect the majority of participating school systems throughout the Nation.

If after reading this letter you believe that this policy should be changed, we would greatly appreciate your expressing your opinion to the appropriate Labor Department officials. Should you desire additional information, please do not hesitate to make inquiry. We will appreciate any help that you can give us in this matter.

Sincerely,

NEWMAN WALKER,
Superintendent for Paducah Board of
Education, Paducah Independent
School District, Paducah, Ky.

PADUCAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Paducah, Ky., February 1, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I would like to seek your help in a matter which has become of great concern to school officials of Paducah, Ky., and other Southern and Midwestern States. As you probably know, the recently passed Economic Opportunity Act under section 1-B provides for a work-study program for in-school youth who appear to be potential dropouts due to lack of financial resources.

With the help of advice and materials from the Federal Government, the officials of the Paducah School System drafted a proposal for such a project and submitted it to the office of the National Youth Corps last October. Later, a Mr. Melvin Rogow of the National Youth Corps office in Washington flew to Paducah to tell us that our proposal had been given tentative approval and to assist us with some final revisions to bring the proposal up to date with the latest NYC policies. This was done and the Paducah work-study plan was resubmitted in final form on November 16, 1964.

The Paducah proposal contained the following provisions concerning pay rates for student enrollees:

"It is planned to pay all students holding any of the above specified positions an initial hourly wage rate of 75 cents. At the end of each school semester a 10 cent hourly wage increase would be given to those students whose work had been evaluated as completely satisfactory. However, in no case will the total hourly wage rate exceed 100 percent of the starting wage rate for inexperienced workers or 80 percent of the salary scale for adults employed in similar types of positions outside the program."

The above provision met with the approval of Mr. Rogow and seemed to be in accordance with the directions sent out by the National Youth Corps in their 10-2 guide which had been drafted to aid school systems in working up proposals. The following quotation is taken from the National Youth Corps 10-2 guide under section 7 entitled "Enrollee Wages and Conditions of Employment":

"The act requires that enrollee wages and conditions of employment be 'appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.' In general, enrollee wages should be a little below the prevailing entry rates for inexperienced workers in similar occupations."

In another National Youth Corps guide, the following paragraph is found:

"Rates of pay and other conditions of employment must be appropriate and reasonable in view of such factors as the type of work performed, in level of skill involved, and the locality where the project is situated. For new enrollees, rates of pay are set somewhat below, such as at 80 percent, of the rate paid to beginner workers in the same or similar occupations in the project area. Pay rates may be raised as enrollees make suitable progress in the project, up to the full rate of beginner workers in the occupation involved."

It should be obvious from the above quoted materials that the Paducah proposal met precisely the standards set up by the Economic Opportunity Act and the directives of the National Youth Corps which were provided Paducah in both written and oral form.

On November 24, 1964, the superintendent of schools at Paducah received a telegram from Mr. Jack Howard, National Youth Corps Director. It is quoted here:

"We are pleased to tell you that President Johnson announced today that your work-training project under the National Youth Corps of the U.S. Department of Labor will be among the first to be established. We are notifying your Governor. Our field representative will be in touch

with you within the next few days to work out final details.

"JACK HOWARD."

We had also been told by National Youth Corps representatives that since the project would soon be approved, we could proceed with the selection of pupils, job assignments, and establishment of administrative machinery so that the program could get underway soon after January 1, as the project proposal and budget had specified. This was done. The fact that the Paducah proposal had been approved for this project was announced to the press by National Youth Corps officials; and since it was the first in Kentucky to be approved, it naturally attracted considerable attention. Information concerning details of the already approved project was released to the press, including student wage rates. The State Department of Education of Kentucky mimeographed the Paducah proposal and sent it to every school system in the State to be used as a guide.

After 5 weeks had passed since the telegram of approval had been received and no additional information had been sent by the National Youth Corps, the superintendent of schools at Paducah called the National Youth Corps Office to make inquiry. He learned then that pressure from organized labor on the Secretary of Labor had caused a restructuring of policy concerning enrollee wage rates. The superintendent was informed that none of the already approved projects which did not provide for a minimum of \$1.25 per hour for student enrollee wages were being made operational. He was told that if Paducah was willing to pay this amount, the contracts would be forwarded immediately.

After this rather ridiculous reversal of Federal policy was discussed with the Paducah Board of Education, the following conclusions were reached:

1. That since the salary of many of our custodians, cafeteria workers, and school secretaries who would be responsible for supervising the work of student enrollees is slightly less or not much more than \$1.25 per hour, it would be impossible for us to accept this revised student wage scale. The implications are obvious. We would be happy if it were within the school system's financial resources to raise the salaries of adults working in these positions so that \$1.25 for unskilled student help would not be excessive in comparison. However, this is not the case. The financial plight of our schools is well understood. It would appear that an attempt is being made to raise the Nation's minimum wage rate by using this program as a wedge. It is not the business of the Paducah Board of Education to support or oppose such a movement, and neither will the Paducah Board of Education be made the fuse for igniting an explosion of labor-management dissension.

2. We believe that to pay \$1.25 per hour to students in Paducah for the extremely unskilled type of work being performed under this project would create a very poor attitude among them. Their sense of values would be distorted since prevailing wage rates in the area for this type of work are much lower. The "something-for-nothing philosophy" which has given certain other Federal programs a black eye would again be prevalent. A survey of the wage rates paid in Paducah for a number of relatively unskilled type occupations is listed here to support the above statements. These wage rates apply to adults as well as to part-time students who might be thus employed.

Average hourly wage rate of various service industries, adults and teenagers

Restaurant workers.....	\$0.75.
Laundry workers.....	\$0.75 to \$1.
Hospitals (beginning kitchen help).....	\$0.75 to \$1.

Average hourly wage rate of various service industries, adults and teenagers—Continued

Food markets.....	\$0.85 to \$1.15.
Theaters.....	\$0.75 to \$1.
Variety stores.....	\$0.75.
Department stores.....	\$0.75 to \$1.
Drive-ins (carhops).....	\$0.75.
Babysitters.....	\$0.50 to \$0.75.
Service station attendants.....	\$0.75.
Newspaper carriers.....	\$0.75.

If the school system were to begin paying youngsters \$1.25 an hour under this program, it would have a very disturbing effect on employment conditions in the community and surrounding areas. This fact is supported by testimony from small businessmen who are operating competitively on a very small margin of profit and who would have difficulty staying in business if their wage rates were suddenly forced upward.

3. It has been learned that a work-study proposals submitted by Murray State College of Murray, Ky. (located only 40 miles from Paducah), under title 1-C of the Opportunity Act has been approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of an hourly student wage rate of 70 cents. That it is proper for one Federal department to approve a program which pays college students 70 cents per hour and for another Federal department to insist that high school students receive \$1.25 per hour is an example of the most exotic logic that has yet been produced by a Government bureau. The Paducah Board of Education does not believe that, when these facts become generally known, the American people will be able to appreciate such glaring inconsistency.

4. We feel that the Paducah school system has been grossly abused by the Department of Labor in this matter. The Department gave official approval to our proposal, including the wage rates provided in it, and then announced this fact to the public and press. It was only after this had been done that the Department apparently substituted its own wage level directive, the provisions of which appear to be contradictory to the intent of the Economic Opportunity Act as passed by Congress. If our board of education had known originally that the minimum hourly wage rate would be \$1.25 instead of 75 cents, then it could have made a decision as to whether or not to submit a project for approval with that condition in mind. However, this was not the case. The Paducah school system finds itself in the position of having been widely praised for its early and sincere entry into the anti-poverty war and then publicly embarrassed by an after-the-fact policy change which makes it impossible for Paducah to participate. The people of the Paducah area are now asking why this project, which could have provided so much help to so many students, has not been started after having already been approved by the Federal Government. The Paducah Board of Education has no alternative but to answer these people with the facts. Over 100 students already signed up for the project will have to be told that the help promised to them will not be forthcoming. The many projects being planned in Kentucky and elsewhere which used the Paducah proposal as a guide will have to be revised or dropped entirely.

For these and other reasons, the Paducah Board of Education wishes to voice its strongest protests and objections to this wage rate decision by the Secretary of Labor. We realize that this contradictory policy action has been provoked by great pressure from other sources. It seems to us, however, that this anti-poverty program was designed for higher purposes than to be used as a political football. We feel sufficiently strong in our viewpoint that it is our intention to make our views widely known at every opportunity.

In talking with numbers of local school officials and community leaders in this part of the country, we have found unanimous agreement that this portion of the Opportunity Act will never get off the ground unless the Department of Labor has the courage to take a realistic position concerning the student wage rate policy. It seems tragic that large sections of the Nation will be unable to benefit from this part of the anti-poverty program because of the absurd inflexibility of labor leaders and the political acquiescence of the Department of Labor.

The Paducah Board of Education is no enemy of organized labor. However, it does question the wisdom of labor's stand on this issue—a position which seems willing to sacrifice the future work capabilities of thousands of youth who may drop out of high school without the financial assistance that these programs would provide.

It is our hope that the original purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act will not be forgotten by the President and Congress as a result of political fighting between special interest groups. Swift corrective action is needed if the bitterness already developing over this obstructive decision does not spread and nullify the potential good of the program.

The Paducah Board of Education has set forth these facts concerning its experiences with the Economic Opportunity Act for your information. If you believe, as we do, that something should be done to enable all school districts to participate in and benefit from this program, we would appreciate hearing from you and receiving your support in making these views known to appropriate Government officials.

Sincerely,

NEWMAN WALKER,
Superintendent for Paducah Board of
Education, Paducah Independent
School District.

FRANKFORT, Ky.,
February 3, 1965.

Re wage rates to be paid to pupils under Economic Opportunity Act.
HON. THURSTON B. MORTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Department of Labor has ruled that school districts must pay pupils \$1.25 per hour while working on jobs under the work training project (title 1B) of the Economic Opportunity Act. Several schools, with proposals already approved, had had to withdraw their projects. Many other schools, whose projects have been submitted, will have to withdraw them if the ruling requiring \$1.25 an hour wage is enforced.

Many of the job assignments of pupils will be supervised by permanent employees of the school district. The permanent employees receive less than \$1.25 per hour. This would create an impossible situation in our school districts, that of having a pupil worker receiving more pay than his supervisor.

Section 113A, paragraph 5, states: "The rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee."

It is my opinion that the ruling by the Department of Labor is contrary to this section of the law.

The Department of Education has had high hopes for the work training (title 1B) part of the Economic Opportunity Act. We believe, rightly used, it can be a part of the answer to our "dropout" problem.

We strongly urge that you help us get a more favorable ruling on the required wage the pupils must receive.

HARRY M. SPARKS,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal,
Feb. 4, 1965]

**SPARKS URGES LOWER WAGES FOR TRAINEES—
CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TOLD \$1.25-AN-
HOUR RATE RUINS KENTUCKY PROGRAM**

(By Bill Neikirk)

FRANKFORT, Ky.—Superintendent of Public Instruction Harry Sparks called upon Kentucky's congressional delegation yesterday to seek a lower wage rate for students who participate in the Antipoverty Act work-training programs.

Sparks indicated in a letter to the State's U.S. Senators and Representatives that a ruling by the U.S. Labor Department requiring a \$1.25-an-hour wage rate under the program would wreck it in Kentucky.

"Several schools with proposals already approved have had to withdraw their projects," Sparks said.

"Many other schools whose projects have been submitted will have to withdraw them if a ruling requiring \$1.25 an hour is enforced."

GRANTS MADE TO SCHOOLS

Under the Antipoverty Act, grants are made to school districts to pay students participating in work-training programs.

Sparks said many of the pupils' school assignments "will be supervised by permanent employees of the school districts. The permanent employees receive less than \$1.25 an hour in many instances.

"This would create an impossible situation in our school districts—having a pupil worker receiving more pay than his supervisor."

POLICY SPELLED OUT

Sparks said one section of the Antipoverty Act says that "the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as the work performed, geographic regions and the proficiency of the employee."

He said that the Labor Department's ruling for a flat \$1.25-an-hour wage rate "in my opinion * * * is contrary to this section of the law.

"The Kentucky Department of Education has had high hopes for the work-training program under the act," he said.

"We believe rightfully used it can be part of the answer to our dropout problem. We strongly urge that you help us get a more favorable ruling on the required wage."

James Melton, assistant superintendent of public instruction, estimated that 80 school districts in Kentucky have submitted proposals for participation in the work-training phase of the Antipoverty Act.

He said many are contemplating withdrawal unless there is a favorable decision from the Labor Department.

The Jefferson County Board of Education has already withdrawn from the program on the basis of this ruling, he said. [It finds] "itself in the position of having been widely praised for its early and sincere entry into the war on poverty and then publicly embarrassed by an after-the-fact policy change which makes it impossible for Paducah to participate in the school dropout program."

The local minimum wage scale is 75 cents an hour, and school authorities said the Labor Department's new \$1.25 scale for student workers would "have a very disturbing effect on employment conditions in the community and surrounding areas."

Copies of the letter are being distributed to educational and civic leaders throughout Kentucky, and the State's congressional delegation. It criticizes both Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and President Johnson for backing labor's stand on the minimum wage.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times,
Jan. 26, 1965]

**PAY SCALE FOR STUDENTS MAY SCUTTLE SCHOOL
JOB PLAN**

(By Ward Sinclair)

A Federal antipoverty program in Jefferson County schools appears to be scuttled because the Indians would make more than the chiefs.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps project for needy students would pay higher wages than the persons who would supervise them now receive.

School Superintendent Richard van Hoose recommended last night that the Jefferson County Board of Education withdraw from the program on those grounds.

The county had applied for some \$475,000 in Federal antipoverty funds to hire needy students over 16 as part-time employees in the schools. The program is designed primarily to keep them from leaving school because of financial problems.

WAS RAISED ONCE

The city school system, which also has made application to participate in the program, indicated that it, too, might have some second thoughts in light of last night's county action.

Van Hoose said the program, as originally proposed, provided that the students receive 75 cents an hour.

"Then they told us that was too low and so we submitted the project to provide for \$1 an hour," he said.

The Department of Labor said last week that participating students would have to be paid \$1.25 an hour—the Federal minimum wage.

But, said Van Hoose, some of the school system's regular clerical and custodial people who would work with the youths are not now making that much.

"It would cost us \$72,000 to bring those wages up to the minimum," he said.

School employees are exempted from the Federal wage law since they are employed by a governmental agency not involved in interstate commerce.

In the Youth Corps project, the youths' wages would be paid by the Federal Government.

EXPECTED 1,500 JOBS

The county will have to withdraw its application unless the Federal Government revises the \$1.25 requirement downward, Van Hoose said. The board agreed.

James E. Farmer, assistant superintendent for instruction, said that Donald C. Schumacher, a Red Cross worker from Michigan who was hired to administer the program here, will become a teacher in the system instead.

School officials estimated that 1,500 youths would have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the county.

The Louisville school system also has applied for participation for an estimated 500 students.

Charles Patterson, who is coordinating the program in the city schools, said the understanding was that the city students would be paid \$1 per hour.

He said, however, that in light of the country's action last night, the city would have another look at the program. He said there are some regular employees in the city schools who make less than \$1.25 an hour.

[From the Lexington Leader, Feb. 3, 1965]

**MINIMUM WAGE FOR TRAINEES THREAT TO
YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM**

The Department of Labor recently announced that young people enrolled in the National Youth Corps, a part of the Federal antipoverty program, would have to be paid at least \$1.25 an hour. This decision was

made by the Department of Labor at the urging of the AFL-CIO, whose president, George Meany, had argued that the trainees should not receive less than the Federal minimum wage.

By bowing to the union demand, the Department of Labor may very well have signed the death warrant for the Youth Corps, even before it gets into full swing. The Youth Corps, just now starting with centers in 23 States, is expected to enroll thousands of boys and girls between 16 and 21 years of age, providing them with jobs so they can stay in school and with training so they can have better employment opportunities.

The temporary jobs these young people will hold must be found largely in community-service enterprises, such as hospitals, libraries, and playgrounds, and are supposed to include work which otherwise would not be performed. The idea originally was that the boys and girls, largely untrained for any sort of jobs, would receive token wages, since they could not qualify for regular pay rates.

Under the new Labor Department ruling, made at the demand of the AFL-CIO, it is doubtful if jobs can be found for many of the unskilled young people. Employers simply are not going to pay untrained boys and girls that much.

Once more the labor unions have demonstrated that they would rather see people idle than allow them to work for less than a specified wage. And once more the Department of Labor has made plain that it ought to be renamed the Department of Union Labor.

LINCOLN VERSUS LENIN—A CONTRAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, tomorrow our Nation will again observe the birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, a great former President and a great humanitarian.

The magazine "This Week," published by the Washington Sunday Star in its issue of February 7, 1965, contains an excellent article entitled "Lincoln Versus Lenin," written by Robert Kazmayer. Mr. Kazmayer, a publisher, lecturer, and world traveler, recently returned from a trip to Russia, where a visit to Lenin's tomb inspired the following thoughts, which I shall read into the RECORD. These are Mr. Kazmayer's words:

I thought of the contrast between the two. You go down into the darkness in Lenin's tomb. At the Lincoln Memorial you ascend the steps in the light. You look down on Lenin; you raise your eyes to Lincoln. I don't want to be melodramatic about this thing, but there is a contrast between those two leaders, Lenin and Lincoln. Lenin spent his whole life setting class against class. Abraham Lincoln said, "You can't help the poor by attempting to destroy the rich. You can't raise up the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer."

Lenin said, "One would like to caress the masses, but one doesn't dare: like a dog they will turn and bite." Abraham Lincoln said, "God must have loved the common people; he made so many of them."

Lenin said, "This is a fight to the end, to their extinction"—and yours and mine and all who will not bow to the hammer and sickle. Abraham Lincoln said, "With malice toward none; with charity for all."

Lenin said, "There's nothing right or wrong in the world, there's nothing false or true, except as it furthers the revolution." That's dialectical materialism for you. Abraham Lincoln said, "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Mr. President, I thought those words were most appropriate to be read as we begin the observance of Lincoln's birthday anniversary.

THE SHORTAGE OF COPPER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the shortage of copper—a metal basic in peace and war—continues to pose a threat to our Nation.

It has become so acute that, according to quotations on the London market, the price jumped 6½ cents per pound today. This morning's price was 63.66 cents a pound.

The previous record high was 64.64 cents on December 11, 1964. That was prior to introduction by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other Senators, including myself, of legislation to loan 100,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile to domestic producers.

After the introduction and subsequent discussion of that legislation, the price of copper broke, dropping to 40.9 cents on January 19. Since then, it has climbed to 63.66 cents, an increase of 22.8 cents a pound in the past 23 days.

This morning's edition of the Wall Street Journal gives the background for the increase in the following words:

Demand for spot supplies of copper at London has been stimulated by failure of workers at the Mount Isa Mine in Australia to return to their jobs and by the cutting off of shipments from the United States by the dock strike. Dealers said spot supplies of copper in London and in Europe were "very tight."

I have been advised that from 15,000 to 20,000 tons of blister copper from Chile are in Atlantic seaports waiting to be unloaded after the dock strike is settled. This blister copper is converted into electrolytic copper in Perth Amboy, N.J., and Baltimore, Md. Some of it is for domestic consumption, some for shipment abroad.

The situation is so acute that refineries in both these industrial cities have practically exhausted their supplies and soon will be forced to shut down.

I have discussed our loan proposal with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. Senator MANSFIELD and I have been advised that there will be early hearings on proposals to sell or loan copper to our mining industry.

An article in the American Metal Market of Wednesday, February 10, included the following paragraph:

While he did not flatly say so, it was apparent that Senator MANSFIELD was withdrawing his proposal that the Government lend 100,000 tons of copper to industry to be repaid in metal within 1 year.

Mr. President, neither Senator MANSFIELD nor I propose to withdraw that proposal. "As far as I am concerned, my position has not changed one bit since the bill was introduced," the office of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] told the Wall Street Journal yesterday.

He and I are firmly convinced of the importance of stability in this basic industry. Approval of our bill will prevent repetition of the 1955-56 boom and bust cycle.

Price stabilization, resulting from this legislation, will protect copper's place in our economy and also will be in the interest of the consumer. Without this legislation, the price of copper may be expected to continue to rise—to the point where competitive materials will move in and capture a part of the market which will never return to copper. This price increase also will be passed on to the consumer.

The copper, loaned under our legislation, will be returned to the stockpile by domestic producers as a result of a gradual increase in production, which will be maintained to the benefit of producers, the union labor they employ and the mining centers which serve them. In addition, it is our feeling that those who borrow this copper should be charged a reasonable interest rate, which could, perhaps, take the form of the return of 2 or 3 percent more copper to the stockpile than they borrowed.

Mr. President, when hearings have been held on these proposals, I am sure the loan program will be found to be in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 296 be printed at this point in the RECORD together with the names of the cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 296), ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the names of the cosponsors, is as follows:

S. 296

In the Senate of the United States, January 7, 1965; Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

A bill to authorize the temporary release of one hundred thousand short tons of copper from the national stockpile

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to avoid serious economic dislocation and instability in the domestic market for copper, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, notwithstanding any limitation or requirement in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act with respect to the disposition of materials acquired thereunder, or in any other provision of law, to release not to exceed one hundred thousand short tons of copper now held in the national stockpile. The disposition herein authorized shall be made to domestic producers of copper under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. One of the terms and conditions applicable to such disposition shall be that any producer receiving such copper shall agree to restore to the national stockpile an amount and grade of copper at least equivalent to that received (1) not later than one year after the receipt thereof, or (2), in the event of an emergency, as determined by the President, not later than sixty days after notice thereof.

STALEMATE POLICY HAS ITS VALUES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by the distinguished columnist Richard Wilson, entitled "Stalemate Policy Has Its Value," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 10.

I recommend this article to my fellow Senators for I feel it is most informative and perceptive. It logically and briefly explains the values of the policy which this Nation has been following over the past decade and the very sound reason why we have to follow such a policy. It also points out the benefits that have been derived from that policy.

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

STALEMATE POLICY HAS ITS VALUE (By Richard Wilson)

With the passage of a little time, crisis-ridden U.S. officials realized that nothing was changed by the air retaliation in Vietnam. The problem remained the same—to get in deeper or to begin to get out.

All major aspects of the dilemma are very large and long range. One ground attack will not drive Americans out of Vietnam. One or two air attacks will not lessen the Communist Chinese determination to rule all southeast Asia and push the United States back to the Philippines and beyond.

This is the real issue. The difference between those who would pull back and those who would stay put is in the evaluation of whether or not a fallback would have any material effect on the U.S. strategic position in the world.

The local military action in Vietnam has postponed further discussion of a negotiated settlement but the history of events there suggests that it will arise again.

It is the contention of Henry Cabot Lodge, former Ambassador, that a stalemate has in fact been reached in Vietnam. During this stalemate he hopes that a government can be organized and maintained that will have true national aspirations equal to standing against the Chinese Reds.

He, and others, are talking in very long-range terms that imply the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam might last for decades more.

The concept of stalemate is not brushed aside by U.S. officials as something to be shunned. That is, in fact, what happened in Korea and has continued now for 10 years. Stalemate is the condition that exists, and has existed for 20 years, between the Republic of China and the Chinese People's Republic.

Stalemate is certainly regarded as better than defeat. It is very costly to us in Korea, on Formosa and in southeast Asia, but the alternative in the end might be more expensive. As is now being demonstrated in Formosa, the cost can decline and a nation can be built where none existed before.

Stalemate is hard to live with besides being expensive. It is hard to maintain and defend politically in a country where winning ranks so high in the mortality scale. Falling to win is a ready-made political issue for the party out of power. But Dwight Eisenhower survived it in Korea after failing to win caused discontent with the Truman administration.

Responsible officials are not so certain as Lodge, whose responsibility is at an end, that a stalemate does exist. They have noted that in the last year infiltration of South Vietnam from the north has doubled. But the policy being pursued points toward the creation of

a stalemate, whatever President Johnson may call it.

Every military response to Vietcong attack by U.S. forces is limited to fit the situation and we are not driving north nor are the South Vietnamese. The President often reminds his advisers that the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur advised him never to get bogged down in a land war in Asia. A war had yet to be won by air action alone.

By taking the stand we have in Asia since World War II we have prevented the complete domination of East Asia by the Communists and preserved a climate in which Japan and the Philippines could grow and prosper. If we had not stood firm all of Korea would be Communist, Chiang Kai-shek would not exist, southeast Asia would be under Chinese domination and Japan and the Philippines would be in the shadow of a Peiping government stronger than it is today.

There is much to be said, therefore, for the policy of creating and maintaining a stalemate. However unsavory the word, this has been the main line of our policy since the end of World War II, not only in Asia but at the testing point in Berlin. The confrontation and stalemate at the dividing line between Western and Eastern Europe held the line until the Western nations could recover and become more prosperous than ever before.

Also, we created a stalemate in Greece and at Trieste. A neutral if not entirely independent Austria emerged. Stalemate in Asia could have the further advantage of driving a wedge between the Soviet Union and Communist China. We have much to gain from the policy and the Johnson doctrine of limited response helps to promote it.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until February 17, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

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

ENGRAVER IN THE U.S. MINT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Gasparro, of Pennsyl-

vania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

TRIBUTE TO LATE GREAT FEDERAL JURIST, ALBERT LEE STEPHENS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a deep feeling of sadness recently was felt by the legal profession in California and, indeed, throughout the Western States with news of the death, at the age of 90, of retired Federal Judge Albert Lee Stephens.

Over a career of 44 years as a jurist, Judge Stephens evidenced the finest qualities looked for in a person who sits on the bench—honesty, perspicacity, wisdom, courtesy, and understanding. In addition, while steadfastly and uncompromisingly expounding principles of equity and justice in which he believed, Judge Stephens was known as a warm human being motivated by sympathy and tolerance.

The judicial career of this learned judge covered service on both State and Federal courts, following several years in law enforcement as Los Angeles city attorney. After rising to the position of presiding justice of the California District Court of Appeals, he was appointed to the Federal district court by President Franklin Roosevelt and shortly elevated to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, on which he eventually became the presiding judge.

In his capacity as Federal jurist, Judge Stephens was an outstanding exponent of civil rights in the broadest sense. Among his opinions was one restoring citizenship to Japanese-Americans who had been incarcerated in wartime evacuation centers. In another proceeding, while concurring in the constitutionality of the wartime removal orders, Judge Stephens heatedly denounced the treatment of those Americans of Japanese descent who were summarily uprooted and transferred to the relocation camps. In another signal opinion, he delivered the ruling of his court that school segregation for children of Mexican descent was unconstitutional, 7 years before the Supreme Court's landmark decision on this practice.

Judge Stephens was a native of Indiana and a veritable child pioneer, going West at the age of 10 with his parents in a covered-wagon train.

In his role as public official, jurist, and dedicated citizen, Judge Stephens was uniformly respected. His passing is a great loss to his State and to our Nation.

**PURPORTED SAVINGS TO BE MADE
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUDGET**

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the release of the budget for fiscal 1966 confirmed the fact that this administration is doing everything possible to conserve the taxpayer's dollar and yet provide the necessary services that should come from an efficient and compassionate government. The line between efficiency at the expense of extravagance and efficiency at the expense of the future is a hard line to draw in undertakings as large and as complex as those of the Federal Government. By and large, I believe the new budget draws these lines fairly and well. However, Mr. President, I must take exception to some of the purported savings to be made in the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately, in some instances, these savings seem to be a clear example of being "penny wise and pound foolish." We are saving money in this decade at the expense of future decades of farmers and consumers. I certainly hope that the agreement reached here yesterday will permit a reexamination of some of the alleged savings so that the long-term interests of our agriculture economy will not be unduly restricted.

Certainly, the agriculture budget represents a choice target. It is big and it is complex and there are many—farmers and nonfarmers alike—who cry for the end to these programs, perhaps because they do not understand them.

Others of my colleagues have already mentioned the fact that one of the real and most serious consequences of the cutbacks in some of the support programs will be to further restrict the income of the smaller farmers and drive more and more of them off the farm and into our cities. It is obvious that one of the first considerations of any program curtailment should be that it not create unnecessary hardship or contradict Government programs in other areas. It makes little sense to be fighting poverty on one hand and creating it on the other.

The cutbacks on some of these support programs will be felt almost immediately as some of our small farmers and ranchers who have been skirting the edge of insolvency are pushed over the brink. But there will also be long-range detriments as bad, if not worse, than the immediate situation. Included in the reductions planned by the Department of Agriculture are the closing of 20 research stations, the elimination of 100 research projects, and a cut of from \$15 to \$20 million in funds for Soil Conservation Service technicians at the local level. Mr. President, these actions are perilously close to a reckless disregard for the demands of the future to save a few dollars today—in other words, "penny wise and pound foolish." These research stations that are being closed have done substantial and pioneering work to help the

farmers in the area in which they are located to better deal with the problems of climate, soil, and crops that often are unique to the region in which they are located. Such is the case, Mr. President, for the horticultural station at Cheyenne, Wyo., which has been marked for extinction.

Wyoming has some serious agricultural problems that make it difficult for even the most dedicated and the most scientific farmer or rancher to gain a living from the soil. Their difficulties have been lessened in many instances by the work of the horticultural station. The work this station has performed in the search for crops that will grow well in Wyoming's high altitude and mature early to succeed in Wyoming's short growing season is outstanding. And this work brings not only benefits to the individual farmers but is an investment in the agricultural future. No one can say what the discoveries and investigations made at this station or any of the other 19 scheduled for shutdown may produce that could bring about a drastic and beneficial change in our agriculture.

Mr. President, one of the factors that has made this Nation great is our continued striving toward self-improvement. In every object of human endeavor someone has asked, "How does it work?" and "How can it be made to work better?" Many of our national heroes have been men who have questioned the adequacy of their contemporary physical world and set out to make it better or men who were not content to accept the unknown as something that should remain unknown. And at this time—in the face of the space age with its population explosion—we should not turn our backs on any effort to increase man's efficiency and the sum of his knowledge.

Another effort marked for the budget ax is the work—or at least part of it—being done by the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. President, the work of a Soil Conservation Service technician is twofold. He is a trained scientist and technician who assists the farmer to plan his operations and to till his fields in such a manner as to make the best possible use of the potential of his land, while at the same time conserving one of our most priceless heritages—our soil.

Almost every child's geography book contains statistics about how many million carloads of fertile soil washes each year into the Gulf of Mexico. And no discussion of the great depression is complete without an allusion to the Dust Bowl and the havoc worked on a great segment of American agriculture through its failure to properly use the soil. Again, Mr. President, we see a proposed cutback in services which—while seeking immediate gains for the present—are in equal measure seeking to prepare us to meet the future and prevent a recurrence of the dust bowls, floods, and erosion that have occurred too often in our agricultural history.

Mr. President, these suggestions put forward today are for the preservation of agricultural programs that I believe to be in the Nation's best interest. I would also like to suggest a positive action in the reform of an existing agri-

cultural service which would have the effect of greatly strengthening our farm economy and the position of the family farm in our total agricultural economy.

No problem is more acute for our farmers than the problem of credit. For rural people who cannot get credit from private lenders, the Farmers Home Administration is the only available source.

Only credit can open the door to agriculture for the young man who wants to get in. Only credit can help the small farmer enlarge his farm to efficient and economical size. Only credit can help the farmer adjust his operations to take advantage of other farm programs, new techniques, new machinery, and new research.

The supervised credit services of Farmers Home Administration has contributed mightily to farm family agriculture in my State of Wyoming—

Recognizing the expanding needs for credit by farmers and other rural people, FHA made loans totaling \$10.4 million in 1964—a 239-percent increase above the 1960 level.

Late last year, FHA loaned \$520,000 to the Platte County Grazing Association, an organization of 23 farm and ranch families. The loan and private contributions permitted these families to purchase a 36,000 acre ranch and develop it as a grazing area. Now 23 farm families have adequate and efficient operations in an area where previously they had little or no opportunity for expansion.

One large ranch using mostly hired help is now replaced by 23 families, adding to the county tax base, adding to the community income. The loan will be repaid in full and with interest within 40 years.

In January of this year, FHA made five individual farm ownership loans totaling \$273,500 to five Wyoming farmers to purchase 1,646 acres of irrigated land owned by a corporation, and operated by hired labor.

Now five small landowners have been able to expand to economical and profitable size. The stability of that rural community has been enhanced and its economy increased by the additional purchasing power of those five farm families.

These are not unusual or isolated examples of the kind of service FHA is performing. These are typical of what is going on all over rural America.

But there still exists a serious credit gap in agriculture that is closing the door to many young people who want to get in or to enlarge their operations.

The problem is this: The widening gap between the high-market price of farm real estate and the normal value of farm land based on its earning capacity. Current farm credit lending policies are based on earning capacity values—not on market values.

In recent years, the market price of farm real estate has risen steadily under the competitive pressure of land speculators, individual and corporate land investors who enjoy a favorable tax writeoff, and by locally established farmers with good credit resources who are willing to pay a premium for an extra package of land adjacent to their own holdings in order to make use of expen-

sive farm equipment or merely for investment and speculation.

The young farmer with little or no capital resource is therefore unable to buy farm land that comes on the market for the simple reason that he does not have the cash to pay the difference between the normal price and the market price even if Farmers Home Administration or any other lender is able to make a loan for the full normal value of the farm.

As a result, the young and able farmer wanting to get into agriculture is denied the opportunity. Too much of the land put on the market by reiring farmers is bought up by absentee owners, the corporation farmer, or the doctor, lawyer, or other briefcase farmer whose principal crop is a tax writeoff—farms get larger and larger—family farms get fewer and fewer.

This problem will become more acute as time goes on. The 1959 Census showed that some 17 percent of all farmers in this country were 65 years or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 64 years of age. By 1970, nearly half of all our farmers will be over 55 years. This situation is as true in Wyoming as it is elsewhere.

To anyone studying this problem there is one inevitable and logical conclusion: that this credit gap must be closed and closed soon if we are to preserve and maintain farm family agriculture.

One simple and effective way to do this is to adjust the credit policies of Farmers Home Administration to:

Enable FHA to loan the full fair market value to qualified applicants.

Enable terms of such loans to permit repayment first on that portion of the loan representing the true earning capacity value of the farm over a period of years and not to exceed 40 years.

Enable that portion of the loan representing the difference between the true earning capacity value and the market value to be deferred and noninterest bearing until the unpaid principal balance on the entire loan is reduced to a size not exceeding the earning capacity of the property.

I believe this kind of credit policy would be sound and is necessary. Price-support payments, commodity allotments, land retirement payments, and favorable tax writeoffs are substantially subsidizing and encouraging absentee landownership and causing excessive land prices.

If we are to halt the trend in loss of farm families, if we are to reverse the alarming migration of rural people to urban slums, if we are to reopen the door to farm family agriculture to deserving and qualified young farmers, then we need this kind of expanded farm ownership credit policy in the Farmers Home Administration.

This expansion of credit could do much to reverse the trend of the corporation farm. At the beginning of my remarks, I noted that the effects of some of these proposed budget cuts would be to create poverty on one hand while fighting it on the other.

Rather than adopt this completely shortsighted approach, Mr. President, we

would do well to support existing programs which strengthen the family farm and the future of family farming and to initiate new programs which will secure the necessary progress needed to assure continued growth and development in our agricultural economy.

A LOOK AT VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pressure of events in Vietnam in the last few days is prompting prudent Americans to take a penetrating look at the defense posture of the United States in southeast Asia, and more broadly, throughout the Pacific.

We cannot forget that the interests of the United States in the Pacific are such that we cannot remain indifferent to events which might alter the balance of power in that area. This is so because the United States is a Pacific Ocean power. Nor is this simply a boastful statement. It is, instead, an ineluctable fact of history and of geography. Two of our 50 States—Alaska and Hawaii—are thrust out into the Pacific Ocean. Our great Western States look out toward the Pacific. The American flag flies over names immortalized during the Second World War: Guam, Wake, Midway. And the United States administers in the western Pacific the trust territories of the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas. Nor does this exhaust the list, for there is also an American presence in American Samoa, in the Howland-Baker-Jarvis group and on Johnston and still other islands in the Pacific.

A thought-provoking assessment of the situation in Vietnam has been made by Prof. James D. Atkinson, of Georgetown University, in the February 3 issue of the Washington Report of the American Security Council.

Professor Atkinson's remarks were prepared prior to the sudden upsurge of military actions in Vietnam during the past week. Thus, they were given without the benefit of knowledge of the Vietcong attacks against our Pleiku installation and the American billet at Qui Nhon, which resulted in death and injuries to many Americans. They were prepared prior to U.S.S.R. Premier Alexei N. Kosygin's visit to Hanoi, where, following the American retaliatory air raids on Dong Hoi, the question has been dramatically reopened as to whether Russia would back Hanoi against U.S. attacks.

Perhaps, as some predict, the intensified fighting which erupted on February 6 will subside to the level of the cold war in South Vietnam. Perhaps, as others have forecasted, the Communist forces have now embarked on a determined escalation of military efforts.

Regardless, the changed situation is being used by elements both within the United States and abroad as a renewed opportunity to urge that the United States undertake negotiations to withdraw from Vietnam. Should it not be used, more prudently, to determine now, in advance of further tests of our will, or probing actions, whether we shall continue merely to counter or react to thrusts determined to be taken by Com-

munist forces in accordance with their best interests as to time, place, character, and magnitude?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the interesting, incisive, and provocative analysis of the situation in Vietnam by Dr. Atkinson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NONE SO QUICK

There has been a mounting campaign to get the United States out of South Vietnam. Many reasons are given for this position. For example, we are told that the people in South Vietnam are fainthearted in the fight against the Communist Vietcong. Yet these supposedly fainthearted people have been enduring casualties measured in the thousands every year, and for many years, in defending themselves against communism.

In the vast area that is washed by the waters of the Pacific Ocean, the United States is fortunate thus far to have many staunch friends. These friends have indicated their friendship by joining with us in defensive treaties for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific Ocean area. Thus we participated with Australia and New Zealand in the ANZUS treaty. Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand (Britain, France, and Pakistan are participants but are not in the Pacific) joined with us in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, SEATO. South Vietnam came under the protection of SEATO in accordance with article IV of the treaty. We have mutual defense treaties with Japan, Nationalist China, and South Korea. Thus the measures which we take or fail to take in Vietnam will produce a political and psychological fallout extending far beyond that strife-torn country.

OTHER TAKEOVER EFFORTS STARTED

Some of the far-reaching effects which might result if there were an American policy of appeasement in Vietnam have already been foreshadowed. This is because U.S. policy has sometimes appeared to be hesitant and unsure. Thus during the last days of December 1964 a clandestine Communist radio station run by the Thailand independence movement began broadcasting propaganda against the present pro-American Government of Thailand. There has been a fresh outbreak of the Communist Hukbalahap guerrillas in the Philippines. Since the long-drawn-out Huk revolutionary activity in that country which peaked in the early 1950's was supported by the Chinese Communists, it is likely that the current terrorist operations of the Huks are once again being stimulated by the Red Chinese. If this upsurge in revolutionary action by the Communists in southeast Asia is taking place as a result of what the Communists interpret as our lethargy in that part of the world, one may well ask what the effect would be if we were to embark on a policy of appeasement in South Vietnam.

The Chinese Communists are attempting to change the balance of power in the Pacific. Their appetite is insatiable. Earlier it was Korea. Then it was Tibet and later an incursion into India. But now and for the past decade it has also been a drive into southeast Asia. And always accompanying this revolutionary advance in the Pacific has been Chinese Communist mischiefmaking in Africa and in Latin America. Almost daily the press reports details of the Chinese Communist support of the Communist guerrillas in the Congo. And no longer ago than October 26, 1964, our good Latin American neighbor, Colombia, reported that Communist-sponsored guerrillas in that country

were equipped with arms supplied by Communist China and Cuba. In short, Chinese Communist revolutionary activity is in conflict with American interests not only in the Pacific but elsewhere. American withdrawal from South Vietnam will no more appease the Red Chinese ambitions than would our withdrawal across the Pacific to Hawaii. Rather, it would stimulate them to further conquests and so might well trigger an all-out war.

The Soviet Union is giving propaganda and political warfare support to the Chinese Communist efforts in Vietnam. The official Soviet news agency Tass announced December 30, 1964, that a permanent office of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front would be opened in Moscow. On January 5, 1965, the official Communist Party newspaper Pravda printed an aggressive letter to Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to North Vietnam's Foreign Minister. Said Gromyko: "The Soviet Union supports resolutely the just national liberation struggle of the people of South Vietnam against the armed intervention of American imperialism and the antipopular regime of Saigon. The Soviet Government demands that the United States stop all interference in the affairs of South Vietnam, that it withdraw its troops."

There are many public indications that the Soviet Union is in close touch with the Communist Vietcong. For example, on a Moscow radio broadcast of January 14, 1965, Lieutenant Colonel Leontyev of the Soviet armed forces said: "The battle at Bin Ghia made it clear that the South Vietnamese guerrilla forces can now take on big engagements, engagements involving several battalions on either side." It has since been reported that units of battalion size have been brought into the South Vietnamese fighting from North Vietnam. From all of this it would seem not only that the Vietcong is committing large units to the fighting, but also that the Soviet Union is becoming encouraged to take a more belligerent tone by what it believes to be signs of American vacillation in southeast Asia.

THE CHOICES

What options, then, has the United States with reference to our policy in South Vietnam? In blunt terms it would appear that we have two options: To go or to stay.

The policy of going is sometimes called a policy of neutralization. This would mean the formation of a government in South Vietnam in which the Communists or pro-Communists would participate. Sooner or later—and, if past experience with coalition governments is a guide, it would be sooner—the Communists would dominate the government. Reduced to its essentials the policy of neutralization is a policy of scuttle and run, a policy of appeasement. Both on grounds of morality and of self-interest, it should be rejected.

But why should we stay in Vietnam? The answer to this question is really the answer to another question. And that is why we are in Vietnam.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POSITION

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson answered this question. Said the President: "We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us to help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it. Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a larger war."

Both Radio Moscow and Communist North Vietnam Radio Hanoi have commented somewhat impudently on the President's speech. Said Radio Moscow on January 7: "Once again he repeated the worn-out lines

that American Armed Forces are in South Vietnam to give help and safeguard U.S. security in South Vietnam." And Radio Hanoi on January 9 said: "In his state of the Union address to the U.S. Congress on January 4, Johnson once again disclosed U.S. stubbornness in continuing its aggressive plot in South Vietnam. Johnson brazenly stated that the United States would stay in South Vietnam."

But President Johnson's words are not "worn out." His words reflect the verdict of history on the policy of appeasement. A firm policy in Vietnam today is the best guarantee of avoiding a general war tomorrow. How much might not have England—and the world—been spared had the appeasers of the 1930's listened to the advice of Sir Winston Churchill. Militarily, Communist China is still a "paper tiger"—less powerful than Hitler's Nazis in the early 1930's. Today Communist China's challenge in the Pacific can be met without excessive risk. But the peril to freedom in the Pacific will continue to rise with each year if we refuse to face up to this challenge.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

If we stay in South Vietnam what can we do to improve the situation? The following steps would start us in the right direction: (1) Increased interdiction of Communist supply routes into South Vietnam and such related measures as might be required. (2) Recognition that Vietnam is a theater of military operations by the appointment of a military officer rather than a diplomatic officer as chief of the country team of U.S. personnel there. The protection of the people from Vietcong terrorism is a prerequisite before any semblance of stability can be achieved and this is essentially a military operation. Appointment of a military officer as head of the country team would be in accord with the priority of requirements in what is unquestionably an area of combat operations. (3) The establishment of a naval quarantine on North Vietnam as an aggressor against the peace of southeast Asia. The pressures on the present land supply routes by such a naval quarantine on North Vietnam will not be fully effective for several years. Precisely because of this, however, a naval quarantine would signal to our friends throughout the Pacific—and no less importantly to Communist China—the long-range determination of the United States to stop Chinese Communist aggression. The display of such firmness would be a psychological act which would go far toward enlisting support for U.S. policy not in the Pacific alone but throughout the world.

A decision to stay in Vietnam is not the easy way out for the short run. Quite the contrary, it will mean an intensification of the long and hard struggle. It is to be expected in our political system that questions will continue to be raised about the wisdom of continuing to meet, indeed, even of having accepted the challenge in Vietnam. But viewed in a larger context, Vietnam is but a testing ground. Our resolve there is the measure of our will elsewhere. An American withdrawal from Vietnam would inevitably be followed by a withdrawal from other parts of the world in which it is said that we are "overextended." In such a context is Vietnam any more untenable than Berlin?

These words from "The Book of Proverbs" are helpful in evaluating the attitude of many toward our friends in South Vietnam: "None so quick to find pretexts, as he that would break with a friend; he is in fault continually."

Dr. JAMES D. ATKINSON,
International Politics Editor.

WEST VIRGINIAN ON THE ICC

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, the Senate last year confirmed

the appointment of Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, a West Virginian, to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mrs. Brown was 1 of 50 women recommended by President Johnson to serve in various high Federal offices. As one who spoke in support of confirmation of her nomination at that time, I am pleased to note that recognition of her work as a member of the Commission has been made by the Wall Street Journal in a news story on February 1 and in an editorial on just last Monday. I ask unanimous consent to have these items placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Feb. 1, 1965]

MRS. BROWN, ADDING FEMALE TOUCH TO ICC,
TONGUE-LASHES MAJORITY ON SHIELDING
RAILS

WASHINGTON.—Virginia Mae Brown, the attractive brunette President Johnson picked to bring the woman's touch to the Interstate Commerce Commission, gave her male colleagues a tongue lashing.

"The majority's fear of the forces of competition (in transportation) is unwarranted," she said. The prospects "frighten me not." The ICC's all-male majority is so concerned with protecting railroads from themselves that it is ignoring the public, Mrs. Brown maintained. "Are shippers orphans under the Interstate Commerce Act?" asked the trim mother of two.

Then, with language seldom if ever before heard in the staid old ICC, she declared: "It is well known that there are several ways to kill a cat. Drowning appears to be the most favored. The majority * * * waters the facts and drowns the case."

The case at issue wasn't very big. The Monon Railroad wanted to extend its tracks slightly at Michigan City, Ind., and in Jefferson County, Ky., near Louisville, in order to set up a route for moving coal to steel mills in the Chicago area and, by Great Lakes ships, to other mills.

But Mrs. Brown wasn't alone in feeling the case involved important matters of principle. Four other commissioners also dissented from the majority's decision to reject Monon's application.

REFLECTS JOHNSON POLICY

The charges leveled by Mrs. Brown, and reflected in the considerably less vigorous dissents of the other four, are the sort that have been voiced in recent years by some—usually professional types—outside the Commission. ICC insiders on occasion have denied vigorously that the agency has tried harder to protect the railroads from competition than to encourage rival services and innovations that shippers want.

Mrs. Brown's dissent was interesting, too, because, as President Johnson's sole appointee to the ICC thus far, she was reflecting and seemed to be elaborating on the administration's transport policy. The late President Kennedy began a drive to loosen ICC control over rail rates, and Mr. Johnson has endorsed the principle of greater reliance on competition. The ICC opposed the Kennedy approach. It is waiting to see the details of Mr. Johnson's legislative package before taking a stand on it.

To Mrs. Brown, the Monon case seemed classic in terms of what the ICC's role should be. Monon proposed an innovation in coal transport, combining barge movement with an "integral train" that would shuttle between Louisville and Michigan City. Kentucky and West Virginia coal would be moved down the Ohio and other rivers, by bargeline, to a rail transfer facility Monon

planned to build near Louisville, then shut-tled up to a proposed rail-marine terminal at Michigan City. American Commercial Barge Lines supported Monon's application, as did a number of coal shippers, such as Inland Steel Co. It was opposed by a number of coal-hauling railroads, including the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, the Pennsylvania, and the Illinois Central.

JUDGMENT OF THE REGULATORS

To the ICC majority, the Monon proposal offered no "inherent advantage over existing service." Thus, the majority said: "It would necessarily follow that the construction of superfluous lines and facilities not needed to insure adequate service to the public should not be authorized, and existing carriers should not be required to face unnecessary competition." Anyway, the majority added, railroad tracks cost money "and if operations are not successful, only scrap is left." Monon's proposal wasn't "prudent," it concluded.

Mrs. Brown accused the majority of substituting "the judgment of the regulators" for that of "the marketplace." She said: "What the majority really has determined here is that no reliance can be placed on the forces of competition." Monon, she said, isn't worried its investment might wind up as scrap, so "should the commission be afraid?"

"Carried to their logical conclusion, the standards applied here would constitute such a straitjacket that any hope for modern, progressive innovations in surface transportation would disappear," Mrs. Brown said.

ICC Chairman Charles Webb, in his separate dissent, said he shared Mrs. Brown's thoughts on innovation. He also charged that the decision gives all-rail movements of coal "unwarranted protection from the competition of barge-rail and barge-rail-lake routes."

Dissenters Laurence Walrath, Kenneth Tuggle, and Paul Tierney joined in asserting that "an oversupply of coal transportation does not equate an overabundance of service available to shippers."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1965]

NEVER UNDERESTIMATE THE POWER

Though the Interstate Commerce Commission was set up to protect competition in transportation, it sometimes seems more eager to protect competitors from competition. So it's encouraging to read that the ICC's only lady member is trying to push the agency back on the proper regulatory track.

Virginia Mae Brown, named to the panel in 1964, began her shoving in a case involving the Monon Railroad. The Monon wanted to extend its tracks slightly in order to set up a combined rail-water route for moving coal to steel mills in the Chicago area.

The ICC's majority rejected the proposal. Ruling that the rail-water plan offered no "inherent advantage over existing service," it said the step would not be "prudent" for the Monon. Even if it was prudent, the majority decided other railroads should not have to face "unnecessary" competition.

"The majority's fear of the forces of competition," declared Mrs. Brown in her searing dissent, "is unwarranted." The prospects "frighten me not." Whether the majority thought the rail-water service was a prudent idea or not, she went on to say, lots of shippers apparently liked it, since they argued for approval of the plan. "Are shippers orphans under the Interstate Commerce Act?" the lady inquired.

In much the same way, the ICC's fear of change—almost any change—often has delayed introduction of more competitive rate schedules and new types of equipment and

service, such as piggybacking. In the effort to preserve competitors instead of competition, the agency can thus endanger both.

At this late date, Mrs. Brown faces quite a task getting the agency to see the light, but she is certainly giving her male colleagues some powerful competition in the art of commonsense.

JERRY MILAN REGULI

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the Nation there appears to be widespread concern about the ability of today's youth to take the reins of leadership which eventually they will inherit.

I do not share this concern, Mr. President. For one thing, those of us now in positions of authority are considering programs designed to give to all American boys and girls the maximum education they need in order to supplement their God-given capabilities.

For another thing, among the vast majority of our youth there continues the indomitable American spirit to make the most of life—not only for self-interest, but also for the interests of their fellow men.

I wish to tell the Senate the story of an Indiana boy. It is a somber story, but an inspiring one. It should serve to keep bright the flame of confidence in our young people that most of us harbor, and to kindle the flame among those who have doubts.

It is the story of Jerry Milan Reguli, of Franklin, Ind.

Jerry's father died when the boy was 5 years old. The boy grew up in a home in which there was love—love of family and love of God. At one time, he wanted to become a minister. When he was 13, Jerry planted an acre of tomatoes on his grandmother's farm. With the profits he earned from farming, he took out a mortgage on a house. He rented the home, to help pay off the mortgage; but he protected his investment with mortgage insurance.

At 15, Jerry prepared for a church program a brief essay on what education meant to him. I ask unanimous consent that the essay, as it appeared in the November 11, 1964, issue of the Franklin, Ind., Daily Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHAT EDUCATION MEANS TO ME

(By Jerry Milan Reguli)

As we grow in childhood there comes a time for our parents to send us off to school. In the beginning I believe this is why and probably the only reason for us going to school. But there comes a time in our own lives when we ask why? What does this mean to me?

I believe to go to school is to get an education. Through education we get a good view of what life is really like. The purpose of life is to matter, to be productive, to have it make some difference that we lived at all. Through education we see clearly the qualities that make life what it is, and therefore strive to obtain these qualities. School offers a combination of things favorable for the purpose of developing my capabilities. Going to school and learning all I can about different vocations helps me to decide what I would like to do most in life. Then, when I choose my vocation I will take

further schooling to increase my knowledge so I will be more able to serve God and my fellow man.

"I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do, I ought to do; and what I ought to do, by God's grace I will do."

With this knowledge we realize the importance of God to us and through education we realize even more the awe-inspiring wonders of the creation of life.

Education makes us realize our own ignorance, instilling in us a desire to increase our knowledge. It offers faith in the present and the future. Education offers us the opportunity to understand ourselves and our neighbors, enabling us to find our place in society and suggesting a means through which we can contribute to society.

Education offers insight to the path of a rich full life of happiness.

Happiness in the ancient noble sense means self fulfillment and is given to those who use to the fullest whatever talent God bestowed upon them. I believe school trains me to use my talents to their fullest and instills in me a faith in myself that I am capable. Future success and satisfaction often depend upon an education and upon education rests the rich heritage of human life. So as Mark Twain wrote: "Let us endeavor to live, that when we come to die, even the undertaker will be sorry."

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, among other things, Jerry said on that day, in church:

The purpose of life is to matter, to be productive, to have it make some difference that we lived at all. Through education, we see clearly the qualities that make life what it is, and therefore strive to obtain these qualities * * *. Education makes us realize our own ignorance, instilling in us a desire to increase our knowledge. It offers faith in the present and the future. Education offers us the opportunity to understand ourselves and our neighbors, enabling us to find our place in society and suggesting a means through which we can contribute to society.

Such simple eloquence from a 15-year-old boy. Then Jerry concluded on a tragically prophetic note:

Future success and satisfaction often depend upon an education, and upon education rests the rich heritage of human life. So as Mark Twain wrote: "Let us endeavor to live, that when we come to die, even the undertaker will be sorry."

A little more than a year after Jerry Reguli spoke these words, he became a victim of leukemia. A few months ago, at the age of 16, Jerry Reguli died.

I wrote to Jerry's mother, and asked her permission to include her late son's essay in the RECORD, where it can serve as an inspiration to all who read it. She granted permission; and she told me that shortly before his illness and death, Jerry had decided to study agriculture at Purdue University; and he talked of going to underdeveloped nations, to teach farming skills. His own farming skills and his good business sense enabled Jerry to leave an estate of \$7,000 when he died at 16.

Perhaps the greatest legacy any of us can leave, though, is that our lives were meaningful and, as Jerry said, that our existence contributed something to our fellow men. For the answer to whether this goal is achieved, each man must look into his own heart and mind and soul. I pray that each of us is pleased with what he finds.

I know that Jerry Reguli must have been.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable effort in the middle income housing field which has been carried out under New York State's Mitchell-Lama program plan I have previously proposed in housing bills.

I have long believed in and proposed a Federal program parallel to the Mitchell-Lama program which would include a Federal limited profit mortgage corporation, financed by tax-free bonds issued on the money market, to underwrite limited-profit middle-income housing at a cost within the reach of families earning between \$5,000 and \$8,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this successful project in New York, as published in a New York Times article of February 10, 1965, entitled "Big Cooperative To Rise in Bronx," may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1965]
A 15,500-APARTMENT CO-OP TO RISE IN BRONX
(By Thomas W. Ennis)

A cooperative housing development with 15,500 apartments will be built on a 300-acre tract in the Baychester area of the northeast Bronx.

It will be financed with a \$263 million mortgage loan provided by the State under its Mitchell-Lama middle-income housing program.

The development, tentatively named Co-op City, will have a population estimated to total 55,000 to 60,000 persons. Its sponsor is the United Housing Foundation, a non-profit organization that has built a number of large housing cooperatives for middle-income families here.

The buildings will be of reinforced concrete faced with brick and many of the apartments will have terraces.

The site is bounded by the Hutchinson River Parkway, the New England Thruway and the Hutchinson River. The Freedomland amusement park has occupied under lease a 150-acre section of the tract. The operators of Freedomland, which is in bankruptcy, are attempting to stay in business by moving to an adjacent site of 30 acres.

Officials of the United Housing Foundation say Co-op City will be the world's largest apartment development. At present, they believe, the largest is the 12,280-family Parkchester apartment community on East Tremont Avenue in the Bronx, owned by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Details of Co-op City were given yesterday by Governor Rockefeller at a press conference in the Commodore Hotel. The meeting was also attended by Mayor Wagner; Milton Mollen, the city's new coordinator of Housing and Development; James W. Gaynor, commissioner of the State's division of housing and

community renewal, and officials of the United Housing Foundation.

Initial construction of the co-op is expected to get underway this fall and take 5 years to reach completion. There will be 39 apartment structures, 24 to 35 stories high. Land will be provided by the sponsors for four elementary and two junior high schools, a community center, a shopping center, and a recreation area. Herman J. Jessor is the co-op's architect.

The architect's plan envisions the greatest possible amount of open and unencumbered land area, and he hopes to achieve this by putting underground 80 percent of the parking space for 10,550 automobiles. The co-op will have its own central air conditioning plant.

Except for Freedomland's buildings the 300-acre tract is almost vacant, so the family and business relocation problem is negligible.

Buyers of the apartments will make downpayments of about \$450 a room—the apartments will have one to three bedrooms—and pay monthly carrying charges of \$22 to \$23 a room. The downpayments will be the buyers' share of the development's construction cost of about \$285 million.

The one-bedroom apartments will have about 900 square feet of living area, the two-bedroom units 1,180 square feet and the three-bedroom apartments 1,500 square feet.

The low carrying charges compared with rentals in nongovernment aided buildings are possible because of the long-term, low-interest mortgage financing the State will provide through the issue of tax-exempt State bonds. Also helping are a 50 percent realty tax abatement the city will grant the completed co-op development.

The city now gets \$500,000 yearly in property from the 300-acre tract. It anticipates an annual tax revenue of \$5.5 million from the co-op.

The United Housing Foundation has contracted to buy the 300-acre tract from the National Development Corp. for about \$15 million.

The real estate development concern of Webb & Knapp, Inc., is reported to be the major stockholder in National Development, and Webb & Knapp is said to control the Freedomland amusement park through Freedomland, Inc. The latter is a subsidiary of the International Recreation Corp., in which Webb & Knapp is reported to own the controlling interest.

Neither William Zeckendorf Sr., chairman of Webb & Knapp, nor William Zeckendorf Jr., the company's president would comment yesterday on the sale of the Bronx tract.

Freedomland opened in 1960 and has always had financial troubles. Last September its operators filed a bankruptcy petition in Federal court, and said they would like to reduce the amusement park's area to 30 acres to help reduce expenses.

Stanley B. Hendler, a lawyer for the Freedomland interests, said yesterday that it was questionable whether enough financial problems could be settled in time to permit the amusement park to reopen this year.

The tract is about a mile from the Dyre Avenue station of the Seventh Avenue line of the IRT, and about the same distance from the Pelham Bay station of the IRT's Lexington Avenue line. Buses run between the subway stops in the vicinity of the tract.

The United Housing Foundation is headed by Abraham E. Kazan, pioneer in the low- and middle-income cooperative housing movement here. He is recuperating from an illness in California, and was represented at the news conference by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Mr. Potofsky is a member of the United Housing Foundation's board. Amalgamated's pension fund has helped finance

some cooperatives sponsored by the foundation.

The foundation, whose headquarters are at 465 Grand Street, recently completed Rochdale Village, a 5,800-family co-op on the site of the old Jamaica Race Track in the Baisley Park section of Queens. Rochdale Village was also built with mortgage funds provided by the State.

PRESIDENT SHOULD EXPLAIN U.S. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I heard with the greatest interest the statement of the majority leader today on the grave crisis in Vietnam. It is extraordinary how the views of men, separately arrived at, meet in the face of a grave crisis to which they address themselves.

It seems to me the time has come for Senators to state their position when the President of the United States is taking on an awful responsibility in the grave decisions which he is making, and which could very well, as during the Cuban crisis, expose the United States and the whole world to the terrible scourge of a broadscale war.

I believe it is our duty, therefore, as responsible men, having an especial relation to foreign policy through our constitutional powers, to express ourselves on this subject.

I feel I must express support of our country's policy in retaliating against the staging areas and military installations in North Vietnam, which supported and planned the actions which resulted and are resulting in such tragic casualties for United States and Vietnamese personnel. What has been done was necessary to demonstrate that we will not tolerate overt aggression in South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese and their allies without determined reaction.

But this reaction by the United States is no substitute for a policy. The American people are worried; they are wondering whether we have a policy in Vietnam as well as the will to carry it through. Americans are also worried whether or not a majority of the Vietnamese people still have the will to resist Communist aggression, or want our aid in their resistance. Americans want to know why so few of our allies have come to help in South Vietnam, grateful as we are to those who have. Americans want to know what is the real meaning of the Japanese bid to mediate in the South Vietnamese struggle; what can be the role of India, Thailand, and other Asian countries under Communist Chinese threat; and what is the proper role of Great Britain, which is now helping Malaysia, and of President de Gaulle's France. From those who counsel negotiation, Americans want to know: Negotiate with whom and about what?

The statement by the majority leader expressing the hope that Great Britain and the Soviet Union will exercise their prerogatives as cochairman of the commission appointed under the Geneva accord of 1954 is a very sound one. I express my own hope and feeling that they will. But that, too, is not the policy of the United States. Only one man can

make the foreign policy of the United States, and that is the President, subject, at most, to approval in some form by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Accordingly, Mr. President—and this is a parallel to the very fine statement made by the majority leader—I feel the time has come for the President of the United States to address the Nation, and address it promptly, in the most considered way, and state to the people of the United States and the world the U.S. policy and objective in South Vietnam.

For there is nothing in the U.S. position which is inconsistent with every effort to find an honorable solution to the struggle. The assertion of American will to carry on the fight against communism and our determination to maintain our aid to the South Vietnamese, so long as they wish it and show a will to resist, may in time bring an end to this grave conflict from which South Vietnam may emerge in peace and independence. Yet, while we continue to help the South Vietnamese, we should continue to explore every means, whether by conference or direct negotiation or through the United Nations good offices, to resolve the conflict. There is really no profound confrontation between those Senators who feel that the war should be extended—no Senator is foolish or reckless in this matter—and those who feel that we should negotiate. Certainly we are ready to negotiate, or to see that South Vietnam negotiates, under properly controlled conditions, in an attempt to settle the conflict there. But it takes two to negotiate; both sides must be receptive to the idea, and a solution cannot be made at the expense of the people of South Vietnam.

The United States is present in Vietnam in pursuance of a policy we have maintained since the settlement which eliminated the French presence in Indochina in 1954—namely, that we would not allow the South Vietnamese people to be overwhelmed by Communist aggression and subversion so long as they had the will to resist and sought our aid. Unless we are convinced that the majority of the South Vietnamese people no longer wish to continue their struggle against the Communists or to have U.S. assistance for that purpose, we cannot desert them.

The war in Vietnam must be considered also in relation to Communist plans to expand their domination over south and southeast Asia. Vietnam is the active front at the moment, but the struggle is being waged to resist the Communist advance into the whole of Asia and the Pacific. Should the balance tip strongly in favor of the Communists in Vietnam, the rest of this vast region—including not only the smaller countries of Thailand, Malaysia, Ceylon, Burma, South Korea, and Taiwan, but also the larger nations of Japan, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines—would be under dire threat and in serious jeopardy, and Australia and

New Zealand would be in a gravely exposed position. Such towering events could change the whole balance of forces in the world against us and in favor of communism.

The American people must be clearly informed that at the heart of the problem lies a question of proportion. For casualties are a matter of heartbreak to each of us; yet we must match the incidence of these tragic losses to the infinitely greater losses of American lives which could be incurred if the position of the free world was radically altered by the capture of large parts of south and southeast Asia for communism.

In the free world, we do not operate in the dark. A great country states what its policy is in the greatest moment of crisis. I do not doubt that this is no new idea to the President of the United States, and that he is fully prepared to undertake this task. But there is a question of timing, and in my judgment the time should be now. With the situation deteriorating daily in South Vietnam, the President should speak promptly, for only the President can speak with authority.

Our people want to know what the position of the United States is. They want the President to make a firm declaration of policy, to tell us how we propose to continue, so all the world can read and understand. Then he will find, as President Kennedy found in the Cuban crisis, that all of us, without regard to party, will rally to his side, and there will be the unity which has always been forthcoming to Presidents when such crises have faced the country.

UPPER PENINSULA PROGRESS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, again I call attention to the economic needs and aspirations of Michigan's magnificent Upper Peninsula.

The Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress—UPCAP—a most constructive local group representative of the counties in the area, long has been working to develop the potential of the region.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release announcing the latest of these forward steps which offer promise of a better future.

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

UPCAP ANNOUNCES NEW SAWMILL AT L'ANSE

David O. Farrand, industrial development specialist for the Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress (UPCAP), announced the completion of the \$100,000 financing of the new Leo Erickson & Son Sawmill at L'Anse, Mich. This was accomplished by UPCAP with the participation and cooperation of the Commercial Bank of L'Anse, the Superior National Bank of Hancock, and the Small Business Administration.

The new mill is equipped with a modern debarker and loader and the chipper will be installed in February. This will provide two carloads of chips per day. Erickson, who has been in the lumber business for 20 years, also has a sawmill operating in Skanee.

The new mill will employ a total of 27 more men as sawmill workers and loggers which will double the present work force. Erick-

son has contracts with several nationally known wood-product companies and is highly regarded as an experienced sawmill operator.

The Commercial Bank at L'Anse will act as servicing agent in the financing arrangements. Farrand expressed his gratitude for the excellent cooperation of the two banks and the Small Business Administration for their assistance in this project.

PROBLEMS OF LAKE SUPERIOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent, factual account of the problems plaguing the commercial fishermen of Lake Superior. Similar conditions face those of the other Great Lakes.

This material, made available to me by the Lake Superior Commercial Fishermen's Association and the Michigan Fish Producers' Association, documents the reasons why disaster aid is needed by this industry.

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

LAKE SUPERIOR RESOURCE DISASTER

The economic depression in the Lake Superior commercial fishing industry continues to worsen and the resource on which the industry depends, to deteriorate. The current situation constitutes a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster within the meaning of section 4(b) of Public Law 88-309.

The principal contributing factor to the present economic depression of the industry was the near extinction of the Lake Superior lake trout population due to sea lamprey predation. The effect of this debacle on the industry was succinctly pointed out by Dr. Ralph Hile and his associates (Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior), in a paper, "Status of the Lake Trout Fishery in Lake Superior," published in the 1950 transactions of the American Fisheries Society (vol. 80):

"The fisheries of Lake Superior are so constituted that the disappearance of the lake trout would mean an end to the fishing industry as it has existed in the past. In support of this statement, it may be pointed out that during the 5 years 1945-49 the lake trout, although contributing only 14 to 20 percent of the total production in the U.S. waters of Lake Superior, brought such high prices as to account for 51 to 60 percent of the total value of the catch. Not only would the disappearance of the lake trout entail the loss of more than half of the cash income of Lake Superior fishermen; it would force discontinuation of much of the fishing now carried on for the capture of lake herring (*Leucichthys artedii*), the principal species from the standpoint of production (72 to 77 percent of the take in 1945-49, but, because of the low price, only 20 to 32 percent of the value). The great bulk of the lake herring catch is taken within the space of a few weeks in late November and early December. At other times of the season, fishing is directed largely toward the capture of the lake trout. With that species gone, therefore, operations during much of the season would have to be discontinued. It is to be questioned whether many fishermen could afford to maintain their boats, houses, and equipment for the short-term fishery for the cheap lake herring. In all probability most of them would be forced to abandon fishing altogether and turn to other means of livelihood. At best, fishing for lake herring would become small scale and casual,

with most of the present high production lost.

"The continuation of fishing for lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*), the third important fish in Lake Superior (4 to 7 percent of the catch and 12 to 23 percent of the value in 1945-49) might be possible for a time in the local areas in which the species is abundant, but even this fishery would be handicapped by the loss of the lake trout ordinarily captured along with the whitefish. Furthermore, experiences in Lakes Huron and Michigan have demonstrated that the whitefish is in no sense immune to attacks by the sea lamprey and that predation on the whitefish increases as the lake trout becomes less plentiful.

"In Lake Superior, therefore, we face the prospect of losing the greater part of the present production of fish—a production that normally falls between 15 and 20 million pounds. This loss is not inconsiderable at a period when the maintenance of food production bids fair to become a question of national importance. Furthermore,

the effects of the loss on the economies of the many local communities that depend primarily on the fisheries would be disastrous."

The predictions made 15 years ago by Dr. Hille and his associates have come to pass. The value of the Lake Superior catch is now about half of what it was during the period described above. Whereas, lake trout and whitefish made up 24 percent of the catch and 75 percent of the value in 1950-54, by 1955-59 these species were contributing only 15 percent of the catch and 59 percent of the value. In 1960-63, these choice species contributed only 5 percent to the catch, but provided 31 percent of the dollar return to industry. Although the income of the industry has been halved during the past 15 years, the average annual catch has remained close to the 1950-54 level (14.2 million pounds—1950-54; 13.8 million pounds—1955-59; 13.3 million pounds—1960-63), primarily due to a shift of fishing effort to lower value species such as chubs and smelt.

Year	Choice species				Low-value species				All species	
	Pounds (thousands)	Per cent	Dollars (thousands)	Per cent	Pounds (thousands)	Per cent	Dollars (thousands)	Per cent	Pounds (thousands)	Dollars (thousands)
1950-54.....	3,448	24	1,463 (0.42)	75	10,776	76	499 (0.05)	25	14,224	1,962 (0.14)
1955-59.....	2,078	15	1,024 (0.49)	59	11,699	85	720 (0.06)	41	13,777	1,744 (0.13)
1960-63.....	658	5	361 (0.55)	31	12,654	95	805 (0.06)	60	13,312	1,166 (0.09)

A clearer understanding of the present situation in the Lake Superior fisheries is described below.

Lake trout: Lake Superior was closed to commercial fishing for lake trout in June 1962. Whereas the commercial fishing industry landed over 3.2 million pounds of lake trout valued at almost \$1¼ million in 1950, by 1961 the catch had declined to one-third of a million pounds, a 1,000-percent decrease. The economic impact of the near extinction of the lake trout population due to sea lamprey predation requires no further elaboration. The success of United States and Canadian scientists in eradicating the dreaded sea lamprey in Lake Superior, coupled with the success evident in rehabilitating the lake trout, offers a ray of hope to the depressed Lake Superior industry. Prospects look good for early resumption of limited commercial fishing for lake trout. However, the excellent fishing which the industry enjoyed pre-1950 is still a number of years away.

Whitefish: The only other money fish available to the fishermen is the whitefish. During the past 15 years, this species contributed as much as a million pounds per year valued at around one-half million dollars. The catch started to decline as lamprey abundance increased and hovered around 200,000 to 300,000 pounds annually until the last year or two when a small increase in catch was noted. Some further improvement in the whitefish stocks may be expected now that the lamprey is under control.

Lake herring: The principal species from the standpoint of production is the lake herring. This is a highly seasonal late fall and early winter fishery. Over the past 15 years, the lake herring has contributed between 8 to 12 million pounds annually to the U.S. catch. This is roughly 70 percent of the total production and 46 percent of the total dollar return to the Lake Superior fishery. This species has shown some decline in the last 2 years. Few small fish are evident in the catch. The predominance of larger, older fish is indicative of some change that is effecting the ability of this species to reproduce. This could be due to competition from the alewife (a recent invader

to Lake Superior) or to some subtle environmental change. In the last few years, lake herring have not appeared in traditional areas of good production such as Duluth and Bayfield. The amount of fishing effort to catch a given quantity of this species has increased. The industry has been forced to actively search of concentrations of herring. The recent unexplained shortage of herring has everyone worried and the failure of the run to materialize in 1964 has forced the fishermen to take another look at whether they should continue in business.

Chubs: This species has become increasingly important in the Lake Superior catch since the lake trout failure. Whereas only 29,000 pounds of chubs was landed in 1950, the catch in 1963 was almost 1.6 million pounds. Since 1958, the catch of this species has been in excess of 1 million pounds annually. Chubs now contribute about 13 percent of the total poundage and over one-fifth of the total value of the industry. Prospects do not look good for further expansion of the chub fishery using traditional gear. However, some new gear can be developed for exploitation of the abundant chub.

Smelt: This species is extremely plentiful. Smelt was relatively insignificant in the landings until recently. The catch has increased markedly since 1959, with almost 1½ million pounds landed in 1963. Most of the catch is currently used for animal food. Fishermen lack experience and gear for capture of this abundant species.

In summary, the current fishery situation in Lake Superior, along with the present economic plight of the Lake Superior industry, warrants the use of resource disaster funds to provide immediate help to the industry. Without some immediate help, the remnant Lake Superior industry will be hard pressed to survive until the lake trout come back.

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has submitted its sixth an-

nual report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members will recall that this Commission was established by Congress in 1959, for the following basic purposes:

First, to bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments, for consideration of common problems;

Second, to provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs;

Third, to give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

Fourth, to make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, in the review of proposed legislation, to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

Fifth, to encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

Sixth, to recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government; and

Seventh, to recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices, to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

The Advisory Commission is composed of representatives of the public and of each level of government. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I have served on the Commission since its establishment. On the House side, Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, and Representative DWYER, of New Jersey, are also charter members. The other House Member is Representative KEOGH, of New York.

In addition to the six Members from Congress, the Commission has four from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the HEW Secretary, and the HHFA Administrator. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders, and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members, one of whom is the Commission's Chairman.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's fifth annual report; and it is appropriate that the Senate be apprised of the Commission's activities during the past 12 months.

Mr. Frank Bane, of Virginia, Chairman of the Commission, continues to provide his invaluable leadership; while Mr. William G. Colman, its executive director, skillfully supervises the activities of the 23-member professional and clerical staff.

During 1964, general meetings of the Commission were held in January, May, and September; and this year, in January. The following major reports requiring implementation were adopted during the course of these sessions:

First, "The Role of Equalization in Federal Grants." This study explores the present degree of equalization, and considers the extent to which Federal grants should recognize the comparative ability of State and local governments to finance their share of grants from their own resources.

Second, "Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning." This report asks—

To what extent do urban financial aids promote the creation of special districts or otherwise affect the structure of local government, and to what extent do they employ performance standards requiring coordination of federally aided projects with local comprehensive development plans and decision-making?

Third, "Statutory and Administrative Controls Associated With Federal Grants for Public Assistance." The use of public assistance grants is reviewed, and current issues are discussed in this document.

Fourth, "The Problem of Special Districts in American Government." This study explores how special districts affect the organization and functions of general-purpose governments, and makes recommendations designed to strengthen multipurpose units of local government.

Fifth, "The Intergovernmental Aspects of Documentary Taxes." Tax overlapping of documentary taxes is examined in this report.

Sixth, "State-Federal Overlapping in Cigarette Taxes." This study concludes that the goal of maximum tax enforcement with minimum administrative costs can be achieved with increased coordination and simplification of tax laws.

Seventh, "Metropolitan Fiscal and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs." This valuable report is slated for distribution in the near future.

Three informational publications also provide useful data to officials at all levels of government:

First, "Tax Overlapping in the United States, 1964." This report updates an earlier study, and documents the principal taxes levied by more than one level of government.

Second, "State Technical Assistance on Local Debt Management." This study was prepared in 1964, and is due for release this month.

Third, "1965 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." This publication contains the Commission's proposed legislative program for State government consideration.

Senators will be interested in what has occurred as a result of these and earlier reports, as well as of other activities. Since it is a continuing body, the Commission is not satisfied with merely drafting studies and making recommendations. Its members are anxious to see

their recommendations put into effect, and have devoted a significant share of their energies to stimulating and encouraging the adoption of its recommendations at the relevant levels of government. Many Federal-State-local problems treated in ACIR reports were covered by legislation that came before the last Congress. These include:

First, in the report, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," the Commission suggested that the coordination of Federal programs providing financial assistance for physical facilities within metropolitan areas be improved. It recommended that applications for certain Federal grants-in-aid be reviewed and commented upon by an areawide planning agency, prior to final consideration by the Federal agency concerned. Bills implementing this recommendation—S. 3363 and H.R. 11799—were introduced in the 2d session of the 87th Congress; but no action was taken. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I reintroduced a similar measure—S. 855; and Representatives FLORENCE DWYER and Albert Rains introduced companion bills in the House—H.R. 1910 and H.R. 2168, respectively. In the spring of 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held hearings on S. 855. After six executive sessions, the subcommittee reported an amended bill to the Senate Government Operations Committee, which approved the bill for floor action. It passed the Senate last January, but died in the House. On January 15 of this year, I introduced the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965. Title IV of the bill contains an areawide planning provision similar to S. 855.

Second, to implement the Commission's recommendation for increased flexibility at the State level in the handling of certain public-health grants, and to provide for uniform apportionment and matching formulas for such grants, the following bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: H.R. 2487, by Representative DWYER; H.R. 6185, by Representative FOUNTAIN; and S. 1051, by Senator MUSKIE. No action was taken in either House. On February 8 this year, I once again introduced proposed legislation—S. 1023—to implement this recommendation. Cosponsors include Senators BARTLETT, ERVIN, McCARTHY, McGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, PEARSON, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the House, Representative FOUNTAIN introduced a companion measure—H.R. 4610—on February 9.

Third, in 1962 a Commission report on intergovernmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas recommended that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act be amended; first, to increase the ceiling for sewage treatment grants for a single project from \$600,000 to \$1 million; second, to authorize a ceiling of \$4 million, instead of \$2,400,000, for combined sewage treatment projects serving several communities; and third, to authorize a 10-percent Federal financial incentive for those treatment works, consistent with a comprehensive areawide plan for urban

development. In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 649, to carry out these and other objectives; and Representative BLATNIK sponsored a companion measure—H.R. 3166—in the House. My bill included a number of other legislative proposals, dealing with Federal enforcement power, additional grants, and organizational matters, on which the Commission took no position. The bill passed the Senate in October 1963, but did not come to a vote in the House. On January 6 of this year, I introduced S. 4, which resembled S. 649 in most of its provisions. Similar proposed legislation—H.R. 3988—was introduced in the House, again by Representative BLATNIK, on February 1. Hearings were held on S. 4; and on January 28 the Senate passed it by a vote of 68 to 8.

In the same 1962 report, the Commission advised amending the public facility loan program so as to: first, remove population ceilings, and permit joint action by communities in meeting water and sewer needs; second, tighten eligibility requirements for the use of wells and septic tanks under the FHA mortgage insurance program; and third, provide insurance for site preparation and development costs of water and sewer lines and systems. The provisions of this recommendation were considered as amendments to the housing bill of 1964, but were defeated in committee. Similar proposed legislation to implement these Commission proposals will soon be introduced.

Fourth, in 1961 the Commission adopted a report dealing with State and local taxation of privately owned property located in Federal areas. The Commission recommended that Federal agencies be authorized to retrocede to State governments existing Federal legislative jurisdiction with respect to various lands and properties. It also endorsed a similar legislative proposal which had been developed earlier by the Senate Government Operations Committee staff, with the cooperation of the Justice Department. The latter proposal implemented recommendations outlined in the 1956-57 report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States—two volumes, part I, April 1956; part II, June 1957. As a followup, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] introduced S. 815 in February 1963, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. Identical bills were introduced in the House—H.R. 4068, by Representative Schwengel; and H.R. 4433, by Representative DAWSON. Hearings on S. 815 were held by my subcommittee; and the bill was discussed in subsequent executive sessions, but no further action was taken. This year, similar measures have already been introduced—S. 1007, by Senator McCLELLAN, which Senator BENNETT and I are cosponsoring; and H.R. 278, by Representative BENNETT, of Florida.

Fifth, in its report, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments," the Commission recommended the establishment of a systematic procedure for continuing congressional review of all

Federal grant-in-aid programs. Specifically, it proposed the enactment of legislation to subject future grant programs to an automatic termination provision. Such legislation would also require that, prior to program termination, appropriate congressional committees would undertake a comprehensive review of affected programs, and would report to Congress their findings and recommendations. To implement this recommendation, I introduced S. 2114 in the last Congress. Hearings were held, and the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, but failed to come to a vote in the House. Provisions similar to S. 2114 are included in title II of the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965.

Sixth, three identical measures—H.R. 5039, H.R. 6206, and H.R. 6207—to coordinate Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes, were introduced. These bills were based upon a Commission report entitled "Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate and Gift Taxes." The National Government and all but one of the States levy inheritance taxes. To eliminate such overlapping, the Commission recommended that a tax credit be given to individuals paying the State tax. No action was taken on the House bills.

Seventh, H.R. 10412 was introduced; it would implement an Advisory Commission recommendation to deny certain deductions, for Federal income tax purposes, to companies which use facilities constructed with funds from tax-exempt municipal bonds when they also purchase such bonds. No action was taken.

Finally, one ACIR recommendation did become law. In the housing amendments of 1964 is a provision which allows counties, regardless of population, to be eligible for receipt of Federal planning-assistance grants, and removes any restrictions on joint projects undertaken by two or more local governments.

At the State level, Commission recommendations met with greater success. Each year, model laws are drafted for State consideration. The recommendations touch on many areas—some procedural, others substantive in nature. The Commission can justly be proud of its record in our State capitols. The 43 States that have implemented one or more Commission recommendations during the past 2 years are making strides toward improved Federal-State-local relations. Seven States, it should be noted, enacted four or more such proposals.

Much work remains, however. The Commission has not enjoyed many congressional victories. While many of its recommendations have resulted in proposed Federal legislation, only one became law during the 88th Congress. More times than not, the executive branch has halfheartedly supported ACIR proposals; and Congress, in turn, has failed to guide Commission-inspired bills to final enactment. I hope the record will be better this year.

The Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee plans to devote much of its time this year to consideration of Commission recommendations and to an

appraisal of the Commission's functions and operations in its 5 years of existence.

Hearings are planned on the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 (S. 561). This bill is a byproduct of close cooperation by the Senate and House subcommittees and the Commission. It has 37 cosponsors, and commands wide bipartisan support.

In late spring, the Senate and House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittees plan to conduct joint hearings, to bring before Congress the 5-year record of the Commission's achievements, and to explore its strengths and weaknesses. The broader question concerning present trends in intergovernmental relations and possible future developments will also be explored. This phase of the inquiry will provide the basis for a more penetrating assessment of the Advisory Commission's proper role in our overall endeavor to improve Federal-State-local relations.

THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment No. 23 to S. 370; my remarks to the Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and an article describing the Cardozo project in urban teaching, on which my proposal for a National Teacher Corps is based, be printed in the RECORD.

The article is written by Larry Cuban, one of the two experienced teachers who lead the project.

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

On page 63, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"TITLE VI—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 601. The purpose of this title is to establish a National Teacher Corps composed of qualified but inexperienced elementary and secondary school teacher-trainees and experienced elementary and secondary school teachers to be assigned in teams to (1) provide teaching assistance to local educational agencies having in their schools unusually large numbers of children from low-income families and (2) provide teachers training in the field to such teacher-trainees.

"Authorization

"SEC. 602. In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) provide initial periods of not to exceed three months of training to teacher-trainees who can qualify as elementary or secondary school teachers for the purposes of this title but have little or no teaching experience, and thereafter provide to such teacher-trainees not to exceed two academic years of training and experience teaching in the elementary or secondary schools of local educational agencies selected for the purposes of this title;

"(2) provide such training and experience under the guidance and instruction of an experienced teacher employed by the Commissioner for such purpose;

"(3) make arrangements with local educational agencies having in their elementary and secondary schools unusually large numbers of children from low-income families,

under which a team consisting of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-trainees will be furnished to each such agency, without charge to such agency, to teach in the elementary or secondary schools of such agency, but with time available for a training program established by the Commissioner for such trainees to be carried out in addition to teaching duties; and

"(4) contract with institutions of higher education to provide the training authorized in clause (1) and such training as the Commissioner determines necessary for experienced teachers who will guide and instruct teams of teacher-trainees pursuant to this title.

"Experienced teachers

"SEC. 603. The Commissioner shall employ experienced teachers to guide and instruct teacher-trainees pursuant to this title in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, and provide such teachers with necessary training while so employed.

"Teacher-trainees

"SEC. 604. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a teacher-trainee under this title shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b) Such teacher-trainees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as a teacher-trainee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(c) (1) Such teacher-trainees shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a teacher-trainee—

"(A) while on authorized leave; or

"(B) While absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner.

"(d) Such teacher-trainees shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"(e) Such a teacher-trainee shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by the local educational agency for teaching full-time in the same school and grade as such trainee is or will be teaching in as part of his training, and he shall receive such compensation while receiving initial training pursuant to section 602(1). Such teacher-trainee shall also be reimbursed for necessary travel expenses for himself and his dependents.

"Appropriation authorization

"SEC. 605. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

"On page 63, line 6, strike out 'Title VI' and insert in lieu thereof 'Title VII.'

"On page 63, line 8, strike out 'and V' and insert in lieu thereof 'V and VI.'

"Beginning on page 63, redesignate sections 601 through 605 as sections 701 through 705, respectively."

A NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS

(A statement submitted to the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

The committee has before it amendment No. 23 to S. 370, the primary and secondary education bill. The amendment would establish a National Teachers Corps to recruit bright young people to teach in the Nation's most depressed school districts.

The amendment seeks to fill what I think is a serious omission in the bill—the absence of provisions related to recruitment and development of teachers.

This proposal aims at dramatizing the ideal of domestic service, and would offer young men and women an opportunity to begin to teach in difficult and challenging situations at home as the Peace Corps has done abroad.

The proposal is complementary to the basic legislation before us. The Teacher Corps would develop skilled and mature teachers at the same time it begins to meet the educational problems of our most deprived schools.

The Peace Corps is an extraordinary success overseas because of the practical idealism of America's young people. We should use that same idealism on our most pressing domestic crisis—education in our depressed neighborhoods.

The Teacher Corps is not an experimental idea. It has been demonstrated successfully in a 2-year test run at Cardozo High School in a poor area of Washington, D.C.

Like the Cardozo "Project in Urban Teaching" the National Teaching Corps would consist of both volunteers and experienced teachers.

Volunteers would be rigorously screened. They would be trained intensively for 3 months and then sent in small groups, with an experienced teacher, for 2 years of teaching and further training into school districts that requested them.

Under this proposal, volunteers would be paid at the beginning salary level for a full-time teacher in the school system at which they worked. Experienced teachers would be on the staff of the National Teachers Corps.

In the schools both the volunteers and the experienced teachers would teach three-fourths of a normal teaching load. Seminars in teaching method and curriculum development would occupy the rest of the time.

Wherever possible, the Corps would operate in connection with a university that would provide both training and advanced subject matter for the volunteers.

In the Washington, D.C., Cardozo program a group of 10 returned Peace Corps volunteers and 2 experienced teachers began the project in urban education over 1 year ago. It is funded by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The results of the demonstration have been praised by the volunteers, nearly all of whom plan to continue in teaching, by teachers at the school and by the school administration. This year the number of volunteers in the program has been expanded to 16.

The proposed bill would cost approximately \$40 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Judging by the Cardozo experience this would be enough for a Corps of roughly 1,000 experienced teachers and 5,000 volunteers.

The amendment presents a sound, tested, very badly needed program. The volunteers, the schools, all of us stand to gain.

Perhaps the ultimate benefit of this program is that it would hopefully attract bright young people into the teaching profession who might not otherwise go into teaching.

Those who complete the Cardozo program earn a master of arts in teaching degree

from Howard University. It might be wise to include an opportunity for similar professional advancement in the National Teaching Corps. This possibility should be further explored.

[From Social Education, the official journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, December 1964]

THE CARDOZO PEACE CORPS PROJECT: EXPERIMENT IN URBAN EDUCATION

(By Larry Cuban)

Much has been written of late about the urban school. Catch phrases such as "slum schools," "culturally deprived," "middle-class value structure" testify to the growing jargon that dots essays and articles. Urban education is good copy. And it's about time. Today one of every three children in major cities is underprivileged; by 1970 it is estimated that one of every two will be disadvantaged. Consider also the grim list of urban school afflictions: Too few effective teachers, antiquated curricula, insufficient materials, and "stone fortress" schools. Finally, add the explosive issue of de facto segregation, and the awesome complexity of urban education becomes evident.

Recommendations to solve the proliferating problems of the inner-city school run from total overhaul to piecemeal remodeling. To some people complete integration is the solution; unless there is integration, according to one New York boycott leader, the public schools will have had their day. Others urge rehabilitation. Saturate the slum school with more money, more teachers, and more materials. Initiate more experimental programs. Make the school a functioning part of the community. Thus the controversy over solutions seems deceptively simple: Will firming up and experimenting with segregated schools result in quality education, or will colored children sitting next to white children guarantee both an equal education? While rank and file Negroes, according to a recent Newsweek poll, overwhelmingly believe their children will do infinitely better work in integrated schools, James Conant of Harvard, Calvin Gross, superintendent of New York schools, and others stress upgrading the slum school.

But this controversy may become irrelevant. If the present trend in some urban areas continues, then the question of integrated schools will be relegated to moot debate in graduate education courses. Witness Washington, D.C. The Negro school population has risen from 60 percent in 1954 to over 85 percent in 1964. Integration is a meaningless issue here. In New York, Manhattan schools are over 75 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. The New York School Board's integration plan affected only a handful of segregated schools. The hard-core ghetto schools of Harlem were unaffected by Princeton plans, permissive zoning, or other proposals. The pattern of growth in other cities indicates more ghettos, more segregation—not less. The prognosis is indeed dim. Increased demands for integration will result in more whites packing up and leaving the city. How ironical that agitation for integrated schools results in more segregation.

Controversy exists, fundamentally, since education is believed to be one important lever to uplift the impoverished into affluence. If education is inferior, then available jobs are restricted; low-paying jobs mean substandard housing. This cycle of poverty and discrimination, encrusted by tradition and prejudice, has existed for centuries.

To break this cycle attacks have been mounted in all three areas, especially in jobs and housing. Yet it has been precisely residential segregation and discriminatory employment that have proved impervious to

integrationist efforts. Suburbs remain lily-white; slum lords continue to ignore housing complaints. Though some headway has been made in skilled and managerial positions, it is still token employment. Thus, rent strikes and fair employment commissions indicate progress but, in reality, they are only successful skirmishes—not total victories.

Pragmatically, then, the arena of combat against poverty and discrimination must be the urban schoolroom—by default. If this is true, what of an urban school system that is predominately Negro or approaching that condition? Can quality schools in the ghetto break the cycle? There are many who say no. They argue that the community must be changed before the school can effect change. The environment is such, they say, that any reforms initiated within the school will be lost in the morass of ignorance and poverty that exists within a community. How can the school really alter customs and values of a slum? These environmentalists, unfortunately, have ignored what schools have done for millions of immigrants in earlier American slums and also what AID and other U.S. oversea agencies are doing in villages and barrios around the world. To expect an instant middle class is foolish. Family, friends, and neighborhood determine to a great extent values and behavior and circumscribe the effectiveness of the school. This is not to say that urban schools have not changed youngsters. Allison Davis of the University of Chicago has shown that in one generation Negro youth's IQ's have risen. Also in the 1950's more Negro draftees passed Selective Service education tests than whites from 12 Southern States. The Higher Horizon pilot project, criticisms notwithstanding, has lifted aspirations and broadened perspectives. St. Louis' Baneker program demonstrated similar results. Given proper staff and funds, schools can act as regenerative agents for both the individual and the community.

Of course, the school cannot manufacture jobs or decent housing. Pressure must continue in those areas also. But the schools can provide urban youth with the skills necessary for adjustment into American society. To question, as some do, whether urban youth should adjust to middle-class values is irrelevant. The overriding concern of the deprived is to get in—meaning the barbecue pit, the power mower, the dishwasher. To condemn this desire as crass materialism or shoddy conformity is a more pernicious form of paternalism than that practiced by a white southerner speaking about his "Nigras." Once the urban youth has the material prosperity television promises every American as his birthright, then let him debate the esoteric questions of conformity and bourgeois values. Let's equip him with the skills necessary to make choices.

At this point, we face the big question. Can quality schools exist in the ghetto? Much of what James Baldwin has to say about Harlem schools is tragically true for many other urban schools. To be exposed to teachers who don't care, much less teach, and to curriculums that don't matter predictably results in boredom, resentment, and frustration. A recent White House Panel on Educational Research and Development frankly stated, "by all known criteria the majority of urban slum schools are failures." But it is not a lost cause. Good slum schools do exist.

Fundamentally, a school is as strong as its staff is competent and committed. What the urban school needs, then, is more Mark Hopkins and less logs; teachers who can "connect up" with urban youngsters. Yet there are those who say that since only the brave will teach in these schools—and there are not enough brave ones to go around—teacher-proof materials such as films, records,

programed learning units, must be developed and utilized.

Unfortunately, there is no such thing as teacher-proof curriculum materials, materials that a Socrates or a Joe Smith could teach with equally as well. Anyone with classroom experience can testify that printed materials, mechanical devices, or what-have-you come alive or die depending upon the particular teacher. Students can digest reams of facts from programed learning units; but without the interplay of ideas, the use of these facts, can learning be meaningful? These devices are extremely useful aids, but aids only. This is especially true for the inner-city school where cumulative neglect and deprivation require teachers who care, teachers who understand differences in values and motivation, and teachers who like to teach. Enough has been said of the incompetents and hacks who staff urban schools. That scandal continues. Not enough, however, has been said about the core of teachers in every one of these schools who are committed and teach well—year in and year out. Thousands more like them are needed.

Can inner-city schools attract talented individuals? Or will only the martyr and the brave choose to teach deprived youth? One Philadelphia administrator wants teachers who can be "dedicated as a clergyman, selfless as a family doctor, sensitive as an artist, skillful as a master craftsman, ready as a good parent to understand, to sacrifice, to serve, to support, to forgive." If we can recruit such individuals, fine. But urban schools need those who are less than angels too. Can the challenge be broadened to include others? I think so. What gives me hope are the programs in operation at Hunter College, Queens College, Yeshiva University in New York, and a modest experiment being carried on in a Washington, D.C., high school.

Funded by the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, the Cardozo Peace Corps project in urban teaching aims to attract and train teachers for urban schools who can "connect up" with inner-city youth through the development of meaningful curriculum materials. The project operates on two levels of curriculum: creating teaching materials for the student, and constructing a course of study for teacher trainees. But why the Peace Corps? One assumption underlying the whole project was that a sense of commitment, a desire to serve, flexibility, understanding, and energy found within many Peace Corps volunteers, and so necessary for quality teaching, would be effective within the urban school setting. Last year Cardozo High School was the testing ground for that assumption.

Cardozo is a 4-year high school of 2,000 students, of whom less than 10 are white. The faculty ranges from a core of dedicated, competent teachers down to the usual number of timeservers. Though the school serves a population including middle-income professionals—white and blue collar workers—it is primarily a low-income area. Characterized as a "slum" school (a term bitterly resented by faculty and students), Cardozo has had a difficult job fighting this and other characterizations, primarily because the school is located in an area that supports such stereotypes. For example, while 13 percent of the city's population lives in the Cardozo district, 22 percent of the city's juvenile delinquents come from the area. Four out of ten youths in the area are not living with both parents. More than 3 out of every 10 live births in the district are illegitimate. Over 20 percent of the people in the area are on public assistance. Piling on more grim statistics will accomplish little; these few testify to the multiplicity of ills that afflict the community.

For Cardozo High School, the Peace Corps project offers no panaceas, no instant success; it cannot solve the problems in Cardozo and schools like it across the country. It can, however, come to grips with the problem of upgrading urban schools in all-Negro areas, chart directions, and suggest alternatives.

Let me describe the general framework of the program and how it operates.¹ Ten former Peace Corps volunteers, two master teachers, a curriculum coordinator and evaluator comprise the staff. The principal of the school is director of the project. The interns—four in English, four in history, one each in math and biology—teach two classes each under the supervision of the master teachers who also have two classes. In this way, the theoretical is wedded to the practical and, more importantly, the classroom becomes a virtual laboratory. For example, a master teacher may criticize an intern's lesson; the intern disagrees. Either the criticism or the disagreement can be erased when the experienced teacher tries to demonstrate the particular point in his class. The payoff for criticism is immediate. Continuous conferences throughout the day over students, materials, or crises generate an atmosphere that encourages learning. In such a situation there is feedback, a continuing dialogue.

Contrast this with the traditional student-teacher experience. Assigned to an experienced teacher (more often than not a senior faculty member desirous of a few periods off), the first few weeks are spent in observation. Does he know what to observe? After getting his feet wet with a few lessons, the student-teacher is thrown in head first. From there on until the last few weeks of the term, the supervising teacher will occasionally poke his head in the door, smile, and gladly leave. Conferences, if any, rarely rise above the trivia of teaching.

Meanwhile, back at the university, the director of student teaching will hold sessions to explore problems common to the student-teachers. Seldom do these rise above griping. Basically this experience, save for a few enlightened universities, is repeated throughout the Nation's teacher-training institutions. And when the recently graduated teacher is thrust into the urban school, totally unprepared, totally unsupported, the results are predictable. I do not think the picture is overdrawn. Probably the most tragic aspect of traditional student teaching is that this training experience is considered the strongest part of the program.

The master teacher-intern relationship in the Cardozo project tries to avoid the pitfalls of traditional teacher training. According to the interns, this relationship is a main strength of the program. One intern put it this way:

"One area of our work that is particularly exciting is the direct confrontation with our master teachers about teaching. These sessions have been helpful to me as a teacher because they have been helpful to me as a person. The most important contribution my master teacher has made to my teaching is not just her specific ideas of lesson material or classroom techniques, although these are important, but rather her insistence that the most important thing that had to happen was growth in personal areas that dealt with my conception of myself as a teacher and my feelings about my students."

¹This year the Cardozo project has 16 interns. Twelve are at Cardozo; four are at Banneker Junior High School, adjacent to Cardozo. The staff of the project is comprised of two curriculum coordinators who function also as master teachers, and four affiliate teachers from the regular faculties of Cardozo and Banneker who assist in supervision of the interns. The two principals of Cardozo and Banneker share responsibility for direction of the project.

Part of the laboratory setting is experimentation with materials. Cardozo offered ample opportunity to experiment. At the beginning of the 1963-64 school year, more than half the students in the school did not have a book in at least one of their subjects. Library facilities were inadequate; there are less than 75 books for all of American history and about the same number for ancient, medieval, and modern European history combined. Thus, textbooks for all of the intern's students or reliance upon library resources were out of the question. Forced to innovate by circumstances and by example—the master teachers did not use texts in their classes—they relied upon paperbacks and a duplicating machine.

In history, the rationale was to teach a course as relevant and as interesting as possible to urban youth. The four interns began the arduous job of creating lessons day by day. In effect, the interns began to write their own texts. Mistakes, lapses, and failures resulted, but the raw material of creative teaching—experimentation—fostered an approach to teaching among the interns that will last long after they leave Cardozo. These lessons, called "readings"—duplicated for the students on a ditto machine—offered a variety of materials to the students. Primary and secondary sources, poetry, fiction provided a rich vein of material for students. Some examples: a lesson on the six-shooter from Walter Webb's *Great Plains* to illustrate frontier inventiveness; excerpts from *Genesis* and *Babylonian myths* to demonstrate cultural diffusion; *Thucydides'* description of the Plague during the Peloponnesian War to capture the flavor of fifth-century Athens. Or take a lesson on the Boston massacre. The standard text version is known to most schoolboys. One intern took the diary of a Boston merchant, aggressively anti-British, who described the event. Comparing the account with the facts, the class saw how the merchant had employed emotion-laden words ("bloody murder," "massacre," etc.). The reading became a lesson in word evaluation. Another teacher approached the same lesson from the viewpoint of one of the participants, *Crispus Attucks*. Few students realized *Attucks* was a Negro. A discussion developed around the question: How much of a commitment should a Negro have toward a society that degrades him? The use of *Attucks* was not accidental. The study of the Negro in American history, according to the interns, is one meaningful way of "connecting-up" with their students. Meaningful in that the study of the Negro may generate pride and respect for one's self within Negro youth or, better yet, offer insights into the contemporary Negro's position in America. If so, then the effort is worthwhile.

One intern completed a unit on slavery by asking his class to write an essay on the "Hangovers of Slavery"; that is, how did two and a half centuries of oppression mark a people? Though good grammar and spelling were spotty, the essays showed a depth of understanding and insight into the Negro's present-day status that were profound. Thus the past and present become inextricably intertwined in the teaching of history.

The four interns in English did not have to type as much of their materials on ditto masters, for they had available to them the entire world of paperback books. Whether they typed their material or used paperbacks, they, like the history interns, felt traditional texts were inadequate.

Paperbacks have been selected primarily to get youngsters to like reading, on the assumption, which experience seems to support, that many so-called poor readers are simply bored or inexperienced. Most students can read and read well if engaged with what they are reading. In order to involve youngsters the interns chose books that viewed the prob-

lems of adolescents, such as "The Catcher in the Rye," "Separate Peace," "Lonliness of the Long Distance Runner," or that examined the effects of physical and spiritual confinement on humans—"Diary of Anne Frank," "Raisin in the Sun," or that presented Negro literature within the larger framework of American literature—"Black Boy, Native Son," the essays of James Baldwin.

Of course, all students were not reached. It is well to remember that teaching has its limitations too. But enthusiastic response by many students indicates some contact. If fiction didn't, poetry might. The response of one intern's class to Don Marquis' "Archy and Mehitabel" points to the necessity for experimentation with nontraditional materials and nontraditional methods. The combination, then, of sensitivity and understanding with the intelligent use of subject matter comprised the project's approach toward curriculum materials.

If this laboratory setting for curriculum experimentation and teacher-training was one step in the making of a teacher, another took place after school 3 days a week. Three seminars a week, meeting in Cardozo, have been devoted to providing the theoretical and philosophical context for what happens in class. Seminars also constitute the link with Howard University from which the master of arts in teaching degree will be earned by the interns.

One seminar, taught by a professor of sociology from Howard, concentrates on the relationship between the urban condition and the school. What is the city like? How did it get that way? In what ways does the school mirror the community? Inevitably discussions must take into account the anatomy of racial minorities and race relations. Another seminar, entitled "The Humanities," approaches teaching, the adolescent, and the city through the eyes of artists, philosophers, and teachers. What insights about youth can be obtained from John Knowles' "Separate Peace"? Charles Dickens' "Great Expectations"? Richard Wright's "Native Son"? William Golding's "Lord of the Flies"? Would Rousseau's suggestions in "Emile" work at Cardozo? Finally, there is a seminar on psychological disciplines. Led by an experienced psychologist, the behavior of youth in general and urban youngsters in particular are examined through case studies presented by interns.

Three points should be noted about these seminars:

1. All discussion is firmly grounded in the day-to-day experiences of the interns. Examples from the classroom are raised to support or rebut a point. Hard core realism pervades most discussions.

2. Each seminar is enriched through visiting consultants: Psychologist Martin Deutsch' work with preschoolers, David Riesman's opinions of what the urban school should be like, and Martin Mayer's views of the inner city school function. Local resource people have also been tapped.

3. There is no traditional history of education, educational psychology, or philosophy of education course. Instead the principles of each form the fabric of the three seminars and have greater significance since they are filtered through the intern's daily classroom experiences. More importantly, these courses are not studied in isolation; there is continual interplay of their concepts in the seminars. Take Plato as an example. We discussed his philosophical rationale for tracking as found in the "Republic" and compared it to track programs in operation in Washington. Another seminar explored the psychological implications of tracking and the following afternoon the social-class bias of tracking was discussed. Therefore, what appears to be cut-and-dried, when seen from the point of view of other disciplines takes on greater significance.

Very briefly, in fact, too briefly, I have described the implementation of the Cardozo Peace Corps project's two aims. Needless to say, we have had difficulties. A short examination of two problems we have encountered might suggest to projects of a similar nature means of avoiding them.

Faculty-project relations: Knowing full well that change generates conflict, we expected a certain amount of resistance. To some of the faculty we were a welcome addition that would decrease the class load of all teachers. (Class sizes the first 3 months of 1963-64 averaged 40-50, including the interns.) To other teachers, the existence of the project represented either a threat to their security or a direct slap at their competency. After all, some teachers reasoned, we must be doing a poor job if the project is here. This inaccurate rationalizing was not confronted in September and continued to fester through the school year. Orientation of faculty to project was through announcements at meetings. No accomplishment—little knowledge, more resentment. A planned, cooperative orientation session and continuing meeting, we have learned, are crucial in reducing friction to a residual minimum. There were, however, a handful of faculty members who affiliated with the project through seminars and served as bridges to the rest of the teachers. And, of course, our clannishness didn't help matters. The elan, esprit, and cohesiveness of the group, while a decided strength in giving necessary support to one another, was simultaneously criticized by faculty members as excessive. What to do? Sacrifice the abortive nature of the group and atomize the project, and you risk isolation and alienation, twin occupational hazards of urban schoolteachers. Can you compromise on solidarity? I don't know.

Proper school administration: The project has operated with the cooperation of the Washington school system. Our first year we enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. This was a mixed blessing. Not fully of the system, yet not completely separate, relations with central administration were at times strained. There is little doubt that the sympathy and full support of the Superintendent is essential. This year the project will be responsible to the Superintendent. Time will tell if this is an improvement.

Naturally, other problems existed. Some were peculiar to federally financed projects, others were common to any group of individuals gathered together for a single purpose. We believe they have been weathered. If so, can an estimate of the project's success be made?

It would be tempting to agree with Henry Adams and say that the teacher influences eternity, that his effect is everlasting. Thus, it would be impossible to measure whether interns have connected, since the impact of teacher upon student may not be realized for years. But more evidence is necessary.

So far, student response to the interns has been warm and enthusiastic. But this has limited validity as a tool of measurement. If success is measured in terms of attracting and keeping former Peace Corps volunteers in urban teaching, then we have been successful. Eight are teaching at Cardozo and in nearby schools. If success is measured by the support we have generated, then the encouragement and aid we have received from the Peace Corps in recruitment, and the additional grant of money we have received from the President's Commission stand as evidence. Probably, in the last analysis, the success of our project stands or falls on how well each intern teaches. And this is as it should be. With de facto teaching, not mass-produced certificated de jure teachers, schools might begin to deliver on the promise of an education for all youth.

SALUTE TO JOHN LLEWELLYN LEWIS AND THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA ON 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISTINGUISHED PRESIDENT EMERITUS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Americans are cognizant of the important role of John Llewellyn Lewis both to the labor movement and the free enterprise system. His life was a parallel between the advancement of the Nation and the progress of the United Mine Workers of America in particular and organized labor in general. Tomorrow, February 12, is the birthday of the distinguished president emeritus of the UMWA and world renowned spokesman for a hardy element of the free world work force.

John L. Lewis, has devoted most of his life to the coal miners of this country. He was a symbol of strength to them because he fought the tough, difficult battles in proving that labor and management can operate under the free enterprise system realistically in an era of rapid and sweeping change.

The coal miners' hourly wages are the highest in the scale for industrial workers. Pensions, welfare benefits, and improved living conditions for the miners and their families—these were the goals for which John L. Lewis worked with significant success. And even in retirement he is still helping to develop ways to ease the burden of the workingman. On February 1 of this year the retirement age for coal miners was lowered to 55 by the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund. The man most responsible for this innovation was Mr. Lewis, one of the trustees.

Over a 40-year span John L. Lewis served as president of the UMWA. His tireless efforts made the coal industry one of the few in the world capable of exporting its end product in competition with coal of other nations. Mr. Lewis realistically favored mechanization of mines and increasing productivity because they resulted in the cost of coal remaining virtually stable in a highly competitive fuels and energy market.

Mr. President, West Virginia knows the John L. Lewis story as do few other States. More than 30 years ago, he began an era of new hope for the coal miners of the Mountain State. At the start of the New Deal period, he reorganized the mineworkers' union in our State and in so doing made of it a vital force in overcoming depression in the mining communities.

Controversies of the past are forgotten when we assess the statesmanship and the contributions of this dedicated man to our history. In 1959, John L. Lewis received the recognition of the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia when selected as the "Adopted Son of the Year." And in 1957, West Virginia University bestowed an honorary doctor of laws degree upon John L. Lewis. The citation read as follows:

John Llewellyn Lewis, you have worked diligently and successfully to improve the safety conditions and the economic welfare

of the miners of West Virginia and elsewhere. You have maintained that only a healthy industry could provide for its workers those conditions of employment which are compatible with the dignity and welfare of its employees. Under your leadership, the mineworkers have cooperated in the introduction of mining machinery and methods which have improved the conditions of labor, made American mines the most efficient and productive in the world, provided the foundation for the economic welfare of West Virginia among other States, and established a firm base for the industrial development which is a great source of strength to the free world.

An interesting sidelight to this honorary degree is recounted. Mr. Lewis had established a policy of generally refusing offers of colleges and universities to honor him. It was a surprise when he accepted the degree from West Virginia University. But Mr. Lewis had a reason, his friends say. He felt it apropos that the university which had refused to allow him to hold organizational meetings of the UMWA on its campus in the 1930's was honoring him in the 1950's.

John L. Lewis was a humanitarian. Thanks to his philosophy and constant efforts, the United Mine Workers of America are great crusaders in the fight to aid the unemployed.

In his senior years, John L. Lewis has been honored universally for his contributions to the economy of our Nation.

It is a privilege to join in honoring John Llewellyn Lewis on this eve of his 85th birthday.

Mr. President, at this point I request unanimous consent to have inserted with my remarks in the RECORD a tribute to the 75th anniversary of the United Mine Workers of America and its peerless leader for more than half of that period. I refer to, and ask unanimous consent to have printed an article by Rex Lauck, assistant editor of the United Mine Workers Journal, captioned "Four Decades of History."

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

FOUR DECADES OF HISTORY
(By Rex Lauck)

For more than half of its 75 years the United Mine Workers of America were led by one of the giants of the 20th century, John L. Lewis. His leadership of the union covered 40 years—from 1920 to 1960—but his influence on its affairs began before 1920 and still continues.

As a young man he was a legislative representative for district 12. He moved to Indianapolis, then the union's headquarters, in 1917, and before becoming international president acted as business manager for the Journal, international statistician, and vice president.

He has now retired as president but is still chief executive officer and chairman of the board of trustees of the UMWA welfare and retirement fund.

During his early prepresidential years with the union among the things he accomplished was formation of the Journal as we know it today. In an important action after his retirement, only last week, the welfare fund announced that requirements for pension eligibility would be relaxed and benefits raised to \$85 a month.

In 1919 as acting president of the Union he led the coal miners of the United States in

a nationwide strike which resulted in a 27-percent pay increase, the largest in industrial history. After his election as UMWA President in 1920, he led the union through 40 years of turbulence and battles but, most important of all, 40 years of accomplishment.

John L. Lewis and the UMWA had their ups and downs, and in the 1920's the union virtually disappeared in many areas. Large coal mines operated nonunion and good union miners were forced to seek employment in other industries or scab. But John L. Lewis and his associates, after years of legislative effort, were successful in having the Federal Government officially recognize labor's right to organize. This was written into the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, section 7-A of which became widely heralded as labor's magna charta. It was not only that, it was John L. Lewis' brainchild.

Within 90 days of enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act, coal miners of the United States were organized with the exception of steel companies' captive mines. The miners' leader realized that coal miners employed by steel companies could not be organized until the steelworkers themselves were union members. Thus it was Lewis' concern for coal miners that led to the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The story of the CIO and the organization of workers in mass industries was the Nation's most dramatic story of the 1930's. Under Lewis' leadership coal miners traveled all over the Nation teaching the principles of unionism to steelworkers, automobile workers, rubber workers, and farmworkers. Almost overnight the men and women who had slaved at substandard wages in those and other industries were unionized. It was an organizing drive unique in American history. Five million men and women became members of labor unions for the first time in their lives. There is nothing to compare with it before or since.

During the 1940's, John L. Lewis and the coal miners stood alone against the heavy hand of the Federal Government which imposed a wage squeeze on workers but allowed profiteering by industry. He and the miners were vilified, castigated, cursed and damned, but they stood firm and eventually won their battle for higher wages and public recognition of the fact that their occupation was as hazardous as that of the men who were fighting in the Armed Forces.

During the late 1940's, the union again backed Lewis to the hilt when he was fighting the operators over the principle of what is now the welfare fund.

The welfare fund as we know it today became a reality only after 4 years of court battle with the operators, plus several national work stoppages. The international union was fined twice—in 1946 and 1948—and John L. Lewis was also fined personally for contempt of court. The judge in these cases said that the coal miners went on strike with a "wink code or nod" from Lewis. This was untrue simply because the coal miners did not need even a wink to understand what their president was doing and what they needed to do to support him.

NO NATIONAL DISPUTES SINCE 1950

Since 1950 there has not been a national strike in the coal industry. John L. Lewis and his successors—Tom Kennedy and Tony Boyle—have negotiated excellent contracts with the industry without the necessity for public fanfare and scare headlines over strike deadlines.

The decade since 1950 also saw formation of National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., at the suggestion of Mr. Lewis. This organization is made up of representatives of the union, the coal industry, coal-carrying railroads, mine equipment manufacturers, and electric utility companies. It speaks with

what Mr. Lewis called one voice on matters of common policy that will benefit the coal industry and its employees.

If there is one common denominator in the unparalleled career of America's greatest labor leader it was his determination to better the lot of the men who toil in America's coal mines. It was this that led him toward formation of the CIO, establishment of the greatest welfare fund in the world, seemingly endless battles with Presidents of the United States, and the constant and unremitting fight for coal mine safety.

John L. Lewis was the leader of America's coal miners for four decades. He was their strength but he is the first to say that they were his strength and that without the united backing of those brave and hardy men he would have accomplished little or nothing.

The Lewis years will never be forgotten by working men and women of this country. The unparalleled intellect was at their service night and day. The deep resonant voice and eloquent tongue of one of the two or three great orators of this century always spoke in behalf of the poor and downtrodden.

He said it best himself when addressing the 1930 convention of coal miners in Indianapolis. The unmistakable voice echoed through Tomlinson Hall when he roared:

"I have never faltered or failed to present the cause or plead the case of the mineworkers of this country. I have pleaded your case from the pulpit and the public platform; in joint conferences with the operators of this country; before the bar of State legislatures; in the councils of the President's Cabinet; and in the public press of this Nation—not in the quavering tones of a feeble mendicant asking alms, but in the thundering voice of the captain of a mighty host, demanding the rights to which freemen are entitled."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

"YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"—FILM ON LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 282, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) that it is the sense of Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass., to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Do I correctly understand that this is a "one shot" affair for release at these ceremonies?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. It has been cleared with Republican Senators.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, and the accompanying preamble was agreed to as follows:

Whereas the city of Boston will dedicate its new Civic War Memorial Auditorium during the week beginning February 21, 1965; and

Whereas this auditorium will be a living memorial to residents of Boston who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas military, religious, and civic organizations will participate in appropriate memorial exercises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", available for viewing at the dedication ceremonies of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in the city of Boston, Massachusetts, to be held during the week beginning February 21, 1965.

LET US CONTINUE OUR SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the search for peace, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." Since 1954, we have been involved against our will in South Vietnam. Three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, have properly determined that were the Communists to take over southeast Asia then the Philippines and South Korea would probably be next and, in time, the outer western defenses of the free world might well be Australia, New Zealand, and Hawaii.

We sorrow over the deaths of American soldiers on this frontier of freedom in South Vietnam. We should take pride in the vast retaliatory blows which make it crystal clear to the Communist dictators of Red China and the Soviet Union that Americans will never quit under fire, nor retreat from southeast Asia, nor submit to Communist aggression.

The retaliation against North Vietnamese military installations was the best insurance against spreading the war. The Vietcong Communists will go to the limit unless the punishment we inflict makes the price too high. We must not leave the Communists in doubt of the consequences should they persist in trying to widen the war in South Vietnam. Communist dictators understand the language of force and power.

Furthermore, they know that our planes can strike by air and sea from our carriers' floating bases, invulnerable to devastating Communist retaliation. We are superior in power in missiles, on land, sea, and in the air, to all nations of the world combined.

History, over a thousand years, teaches that we must not and we need not send in land forces on the Asiatic mainland into Red China. The huge masses of the Soviet Union and Red China, where life is valued so cheaply, would overwhelm us on land as, over the centuries, they have swallowed up other invaders.

Ours is, and must continue to be in this grim period, a nation superior in missile power, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea.

The elephant cannot fight the eagle nor the whale. Now is the time to invite the Soviet Union, Red China, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and our allies of the free world, to a conference at Geneva.

Austria was neutralized and has remained neutral. This was done by agreement entered into by the nations of the free world and the Soviet Union. Laos was neutralized in a similar manner, and open warfare has been avoided there. The Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was ratified and its provisions have not been violated by the Communists.

Let us try to secure commitments from the Communists of North Vietnam and of Red China to leave their neighbors in South Vietnam alone. Let us secure ratification of the Soviet Union and other nations to this commitment. Then, after that ratification has been consummated—if it is consummated—we then may withdraw our forces and leave to the United Nations the task of maintaining peace in southeast Asia.

ATROCIOUS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, excise taxes are, in reality, sales taxes. These obnoxious taxes burden most those who have least. They violate the sound principle of just taxation, that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay.

Most excise taxes were placed on the American people by Congress in World War II as necessary fundraising measures for the war effort. They were referred to as wartime, or temporary taxes. Experience has shown that there seems to be nothing more permanent in this world than a temporary tax.

I have long been opposed to the continuation of these wartime tax measures and have on numerous occasions urged their repeal. I did so as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the 81st Congress when I served as Congressman at Large from Ohio. My very first speech in the Senate, early in 1959, was in opposition to the continuation of excise taxes, particularly the tax on telephone users for local and long distance telephone calls.

During the last 4 years, some progress has been made toward eliminating some of the more obnoxious of these taxes. However, most of these atrocious taxes remain to harass and burden average citizens.

I was delighted when President Johnson pledged to seek the end of the 10-percent retail tax on jewelry, furs, toilet articles, cosmetics and luggage, handbags and other leather goods, and on other consumer items. I am hopeful that this legislative recommendation will be enacted into law by the time or before imposition of these taxes expires next June 30. Not only will this relieve the tax burden on American taxpayers, but it also should act as a spur to the economy. During the last Congress, we en-

acted the largest income tax cut in the history of the Nation. As a result, our economy has boomed and Americans are better off economically than ever before. American business, industry, and workers on our farms and in our factories are prospering as never before, as a result of the tax cut which gave such impetus to buying on the part of the consumers of the country. Now is the time for us to undertake the next logical phase of tax reform—the removal of discriminatory and burdensome excise taxes.

Many of the goods presently taxed by these sales or excise taxes were originally classified as "luxury" items. Times change. What was yesterday's luxury is today's necessity. Ask any man if his after-shave lotion is a luxury. Ask any businessman if his luggage or briefcase is a luxury. Ask any woman if she can get along without her handbag, or lipstick, or other cosmetics. Is it realistic in this day and age to term household appliances, television sets, light bulbs, fishing poles, and inexpensive cameras luxuries? Will anyone assert that air travel on commercial planes is a luxury? I believe that no one would make that claim. When does jewelry become a luxury? If an alarm clock is not a luxury, is an inexpensive wrist-watch a luxury?

The average working man and woman usually spends all of his or her earnings on the necessities of life. Since many of them are now classified as "luxury" items and taxed, these Americans pay the maximum percentage of their income in excise or sales taxes. Individuals in better circumstances pay a much lesser percentage of their income for such taxes. Inasmuch as some excise taxes are necessary for our good "Uncle" to operate efficiently, I am not opposed to sumptuary taxes on alcohol and cigarettes or on tobacco which have been imposed for many years, and which bring in sizable revenues to our Government. However, I am definitely opposed to the regressive taxes on necessities, which lay the heaviest burden on the poorest people.

Mr. President, in addition to the tax cuts recommended by the President, I fervently hope that the extremely obnoxious excise taxes of 10 percent on telephone calls and 5 percent on air travel will be repealed this year. Admittedly, telephone service is a public utility service. However, other public utilities—water, electricity, and gas—do not suffer by the imposition of such a discriminatory tax. The telephone companies are not the actual sufferers from the imposition of this tax. The burden is passed on to citizens who use telephones—and this means practically every citizen in the land. Telephone service today is certainly a household as well as a business necessity. It cannot be placed in the same category as liquor, wine, beer, cigarettes, and other products on which there is justification for an excise tax. I have not observed that drinking liquor and smoking cigars and cigarettes has been abated by reason of the additional cost caused by excise taxes on smoking and drinking assessed over the years.

There are more than 44 million telephone users in the Nation whose average excise tax last year was more than \$20 a customer. When Congress imposed and increased the communications excise tax to discourage civilian use of an essential service during World War II and to raise funds for the war effort, no one contemplated the continued existence of this tax more than 20 years later. In 1963 the people of Ohio paid the Federal Government over \$43 million for the privilege of using their telephones. In that same year in the entire Nation \$855 million was levied on this so-called luxury. If our citizens had this money to spend as they had wished, it would be a valuable addition to our economy.

Today, 20 years after World War II, this tax is still on the statute books. Year after year the Congress continues it for 1 more year. We go through the motions of extending the tax for 1 year, apparently holding out what has become a false promise to citizens that each year will be the last year of this regressive tax. I hope that this year we shall fulfill this promise. After June 30 these regressive excise or sales taxes should no longer plague us.

The 5-percent tax on air transportation is only half as obnoxious as the telephone excise tax. However, travel by air is no longer a luxury. In most instances it is a necessity. It is just about the only means of public transportation between many of our cities and in many rural areas and in some States, such as Alaska, it is practically the only means of transportation. Twenty or twenty-five years ago air travel might have been considered a luxury in many instances, but today there are few who would question the fact that it is a necessity for millions of Americans. It is unconscionable to continue to levy the tax on this necessity.

Mr. President, I fervently hope that by the beginning of the next fiscal year—by July 1—we shall have enacted into law the recommendations of the President for the repeal of certain excise taxes and shall at the same time repeal the excise taxes on telephone users and on air travel. To collect these taxes is to reach into the pockets of the taxpayers surreptitiously. By abolishing them we shall not only be relieving millions of taxpayers of an unfair tax burden; we shall at the same time be relieving our economy of a heavy tax load and enabling it to continue to grow and expand for the welfare of all citizens. These atrocious excise taxes should be swept out of existence and be buried unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's balance-of-payments message recommendations may temporarily reduce the imbalance, but they are definitely short-term measures which could hurt us materially by restricting the role of the United States as banker to the world. It would have been much better to move immediately into the effort to

revise the international monetary system, utilizing our position as leader in that system—a position which is secure.

I am encouraged that the President recognized the principle of voluntary cooperation in dealing with the outflows caused by bank loans and that he is requesting exemption from the antitrust laws wherever such cooperation is essential in the national interest. This approach was embodied in my substitute for the interest equalization tax which I introduced in the Senate on July 1, 1964, which would have authorized the President to devise a voluntary program to restrict the sale of new foreign securities to U.S. persons, devised by a Committee on Capital Issues appointed from among the financial community and working under guidelines established by the Treasury Department. My proposal also provided exemption from the antitrust laws for any act which taken to put the voluntary program into effect and was found by the President to be in the national interest.

This proposal and the realistic partial exemption of Japan, with which we do such an enormous amount of trade, are the most hopeful parts of an otherwise uninspired approach to one of our greatest international economic opportunities as well as problems.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD AND COMMUTER PROBLEMS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, nearly 5 weeks ago the Senators from the four States through which the New Haven Railroad runs met with representatives of some of the Governors and of the relevant Federal agencies to discuss the New Haven's problems. The consensus of that meeting was that while the Federal Government can be helpful in evolving a longrun overall plan for the operation of the New Haven's passenger services and the operation of other commuter services in the New York City metropolitan area, the initiative for keeping the New Haven's passenger services in operation until such a longrun plan can be effected should come from the States and local governments involved.

Although, in my judgment, the problem is not insurmountable, the States and local governments have not stepped into the breach. Assuming that efforts to reach a longrun solution proceed as quickly as they should, the need is only for a cash input sufficient to keep the New Haven above water for another 18 months to 2 years. Experts estimate that the total financial contribution required would be about \$12 million, a figure which is less than 2 percent of the amount spent annually by the four States for construction and maintenance of their highways.

By the end of the 18-month to 2-year period, if an order for new commuter car equipment has been placed at an early enough date, it should be possible to begin running the passenger operation on a relatively modernized basis. I would hope, therefore, that the Governors of the four States will now sit down to-

gether, possibly joined by the trustees of the railroad, to evolve a cooperative approach to keep the passenger service running during the interim period. Such cooperation is, in fact, essential, for, in my judgment, it is unreasonable to expect any substantial new program of assistance from the Federal Government, which has already poured over \$28 million of its taxpayers' money into the New Haven, while the States have done relatively little by comparison. It should not be difficult for such a meeting to be convened. I trust that the Governor of New York would take the lead in arranging it, since New York has a major involvement in the problem. Once the Governors do reach some agreement, it would certainly make sense for them to call on the Federal Government for its guidance and active help in helping them arrive at the ultimate long-range plan.

It is this effort to meet the immediate and pressing problems of the New Haven that has not been forthcoming. The only immediate aid that has been offered locally is the \$400,000 each from Westchester County and Connecticut for maintenance of equipment. This might have been realistic had new equipment been ordered 2 years ago and put into operation by now, but as it is, it is wholly inadequate. The New Haven commuter and passenger service will go under shortly unless far more aid is forthcoming to help through the difficult period ahead. What is needed is both the cash aid which I have mentioned and an immediate way to get the new commuter cars which the New Haven must have if it is to be ready to be part of a long-range approach in 18 months to 2 years. The plan of Governors Rockefeller and Dempsey recognizes the latter need, but it relies to an unrealistic extent on Federal aid, given the present dimensions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. I hope that more extensive and creative local initiative will emerge to insure that thousands of commuters can continue to get to and from work each day.

By contrast, recent developments concerning the long-range situation show that there is some creative thought going on about the future of the New Haven and the other commuter railroads in the New York City metropolitan area.

For example, Democratic State Senator Berking and Republican Assemblyman Gioffre have introduced bills to create a New York Transportation Agency which would have the task of and the funds for making a comprehensive plan to meet the longrun transportation needs of the New York City area, and would have the power to contract to keep these roads running, should that become necessary. These legislators are also sponsoring a bill for a commuter transportation authority which would have power to issue revenue bonds. This combination of bills gives some hope for a basic State solution to the problem, bringing modernized equipment and the most advanced concepts of commuter service into play to run the commuter lines on the most efficient basis possible. I might add that the Berking-Gioffre

bills also provide for a realistic short-range State cash contribution as well.

A second encouraging development was Senator CASE's call for cooperation between New Jersey and New York to achieve the same goals which are sought for New York in the Berking-Gioffre local approach. The Federal Government can be helpful in this regard through the Pell bill (S. 348) which I and others are cosponsoring, or a modification thereof to include New Jersey. This bill would allow the States to enter into a compact for the purpose of interstate achievement of long-range commuter goals. Informal cooperation among States having agencies such as the one contemplated for New York by the Berking-Gioffre approach is of course possible without the formal signing of an interstate compact, but the Federal aid and recognition envisaged by the Pell bill would be extremely helpful in facilitating such cooperation.

A major virtue of all of these developments is that they recognize the problem as extending far beyond the New Haven—the New York Central, the Jersey Central, the Long Island, and the Erie-Lackawanna all have problems requiring a longrun solution.

I think that what we need now is a public dialog on the form of our long-run approach. Most people who have thought about the matter agree that some form of interstate cooperation is required, but many questions remain. Should there be one super agency to oversee all passenger and commuter service in the New England-New York-New Jersey area, or should the New York metropolitan area commuter problem be dealt with separately, leaving the long-haul New Haven passenger service and the Boston area commuter service to be dealt with as a different entity? Should the agency or agencies involved actually be in the railroad business, or should they have some arrangement with a private carrier or carriers? If the latter, should the arrangement be by way of subsidy or should the governmental entity own the lines and lease out their operation? What should be the nature of the commuter service? Are we really talking about the extension of what is known as rapid transit to what are now commuter railroads? What is the future of the highway as a part of the commuting picture?

All of these questions must be answered if we are to move ahead to develop a modern, efficient, workable system of commuter transportation. Meanwhile, however, the disintegration of the New Haven continues to proceed. The crisis has generated some sensible thinking about the longrun commuter needs, but it has still not generated sufficient State and local interest to keep the commuter service running until a long-range plan can be effectuated.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are all aware of the serious problems facing the United States in regard to its monetary and fiscal relations with other na-

tions, to which the President has directed attention in his message on our international balance-of-payments problem and our gold position.

I wish to speak out today as forcefully as I am able on one of the factors which has caused our difficulty. I want to call attention to the unfair and inequitable attack on our gold reserves and on our dollar, at least verbally, in the recent news conference of the President of France and in the actions of his nation and others with reference to the debts they owe the United States.

As of June 30, 1964, the worldwide total of indebtedness to the United States by other nations stood at \$16,595,088,000, exclusive of indebtedness still carried on our books from World War I. That sum, including both principal and matured interest, is even greater—\$20,363,660,000.

Let us for the moment ignore this World War I figure. The items included in the more than sixteen and a half billion dollars otherwise owed us includes sums for lend-lease, surplus property, export-import loans, mutual security, and foreign aid, the Euratom program, agriculture loans, and food-for-peace debts, United Nations loans and bond purchases—a comprehensive sum.

I have no quarrel with the extending of such loans and aids in most instances. I would like to think, as would all freedom- and peace-loving Americans that they have served the purpose for which they were intended. According to the statements issued by the heads of these countries which we have helped so generously, they point with pride, even with a bit of grievance to their strong financial position as, for example, let us consider the French Republic, which is one of the largest debtor nations among the more than 75 countries owing us sums—according to the latest published annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury—ranging from \$1 million up to the more than \$4 billion chargeable to the United Kingdom.

Twice we have sent our American boys as well as our dollars to fight on French soil. American blood was spilled in the soggy trenches of no man's land nearly 50 years ago, and our boys died on the beaches and in the hedgerows of Normandy, 20 years ago. Nothing could repay us for that priceless expenditure of young lives, which were admittedly lost in a cause larger than that of France alone. But we could, and we should, at least insist that France and those other nations in the same debtor relationship to the United States, should cooperate in helping us to meet our balance-of-payments and gold-reserve problems rather than aggravating them.

In short, I would say, let them pay their debts before drawing down our gold reserves. If our dollar was good enough for them at the time it was loaned, it is still good enough with which they can pay their debt. Let me remind General de Gaulle of some of the facts.

The World War I debt of France to the United States on June 30, 1964, amounted to \$6,455,700,000. But leaving out of account that huge sum, at the end of fiscal 1963 France owed us another \$853

million. Yet in that same year, she was by far the heaviest recipient of gold from the U.S. Treasury, drawing \$518 million.

The New York Times of January 4 said in a UPI dispatch:

France is converting a growing share of her foreign currency reserves into gold in a drive to make the nation's finances independent of the U.S. dollar, financial sources said today * * * (as) part of President de Gaulle's plans to assert France's independence from Washington in all fields.

Mr. President, part of our problem would be solved if the nations who are indebted to us were to use the dollars they have accumulated to help settle that debt. It is true that long-term arrangements are in effect for repayments, except for the disputed World War I situation. It is true that by and large the schedule is being kept by most nations. But nevertheless, in view of all the loans and assistance we have given around the world, it is most disturbing when our debtors aggravate and increase our problems instead of alleviating them by the manner in which they treat the American dollar, which has been their economic salvation in the past and upon which their present prosperity is based. It is time to defend the dollar.

I think at least that is the belief of the people in my own State of Indiana. They have to pay their obligations and debts. It is high time that those in France who are talking as they are today should start doing likewise.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the majority leader asked me to state for the record that it is his expectation that when the Senate reassembles on Wednesday next, it will immediately get down to business. The pending business is the removal of the gold cover on deposit in the Federal Reserve Bank. Consideration of that bill will be the first order of business. A number of amendments will be offered to the bill. The majority leader expects that votes will be taken on those amendments and on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope that all the Members will read the committee report on H.R. 3818, pertaining to gold reserve requirements, before we take that bill up this coming Wednesday.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. If that bill is disposed of on Wednesday, as he believes it will be, he then expects to proceed with the consideration of the constitutional amendment which was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and which, briefly, provides for succession to the offices of President and Vice President in the event that there is an absence, and attendant problems. That constitutional amendment should come before the Senate on Thursday. It is expected that there will be votes on it.

On Friday it is the intention of the majority leader to bring up for consideration the extension of the Inter-American Development Bank. The majority leader expects votes on that measure.

Therefore, the majority leader desired to have it in the RECORD and advise all Senators of his expectations so that they might be present. He hopes that all Senators will be present, because there will be votes.

TIME FOR DECISION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the January 23, 1965, issue of the San Francisco Examiner, the splendid and moving remarks of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, on his receipt of the Sword of Loyola Award in Chicago, are reprinted in full. Mr. Hoover's contribution to America, her freedom, and her security extends over a long lifetime under seven American Presidents. He occupies a unique and respected position among all his fellow citizens. Scientific detection of crime, responsible techniques in the procedures of law enforcement, to which the Federal Bureau of Investigation is dedicated, is well known. Mr. Hoover has a deep concern that if our country is to deal effectively with all elements of terror and lawlessness which have infected some parts of our society, "we badly need a moral reawakening in every home in our Nation."

If every family in this land were to recognize its civic responsibilities and stand up with courage against all forms of illegality, the strength of our country would be immeasurably enhanced. I commend Mr. Hoover's thoughtful comments to Senators and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Jan. 23, 1965]

TIME FOR A DECISION: A PLEA BY FBI CHIEF
(By J. Edgar Hoover)

To every man and every nation there comes a time when decisions must be made about grave problems. Further delay in seeking solutions can bring disaster. That time has come for the United States.

The moment has arrived when we must face realistically the startling fact that since 1958 crime in this country has increased five times faster than our population growth. Serious crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, automobile theft—have mounted steadily since the end of World War II.

In 1951 these crimes for the first time topped the 1 million mark, and more than 2¼ million serious crimes were reported in 1963.

Even more ominous is the fact that this terrifying spiral in crime has come about through a growing wave of youthful criminality across the Nation. Last year for the 15th consecutive year crimes involving our young people increased over the previous year. For all serious crimes committed in the United States in 1963, youthful offenders were responsible for a staggering 72 percent of the total arrests for these crimes.

RETURN TO GOD

What a grim and unhappy commentary on the moral climate of this great Nation.

The moral strength of our Nation has decreased alarmingly. We must return to the teachings of God if we are to cure this sickness.

These shocking statistics together with the public's apparent indifference to them are indicative of the false morality we are tolerating today. It is a false code which is based on the worship of things of man's own creation. It is as imperfect and feeble as man himself.

However captivating to the senses, this type of moral climate cannot give support nor the strength which is so vital to our national survival. This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation.

Law and order are the foundations upon which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

We must never forget that government cannot favor one group or one special interest over its duty to protect the rights of all citizens. We must constantly guard government against the pressure groups which would crush the rights of others under heel in order to achieve their own ends.

LAW OF LAND

The law of the land is above any individual. All must abide by it. If we shortcut the law, we play a dangerous game which can only result in total defeat for all of us because if we destroy our system of government by law, we destroy our only means of achieving a stable society.

It is a great misfortune that the zealots or pressure groups always think with their emotions, seldom with reason. They have no compunction in carping, lying, and exaggerating with the fiercest passion. They cry "liberty" when they really mean "license."

Justice has nothing to do with expediency. It has nothing to do with temporary standards. We cannot, and will not, permit the FBI to be used to superimpose the aims of those who would sacrifice the very foundations on which our Government rests.

I take humble pride in emphatically stating that as long as I am Director of the FBI, it will continue to maintain its high and impartial standards of investigation despite the hostile opinions of its detractors. Furthermore, the FBI will continue to be objective in its investigations and will stay within the bounds of its authorized jurisdiction regardless of pressure groups which seek to use the FBI to attain their own selfish aims to the detriment of our people as a whole.

LEAST RESISTANCE

Unfortunately and too often humanity, if left to itself, moves along the line of least resistance. That is the reason we make such slow progress, and why we are prone to wait for pathfinders to blaze the way for us to follow. Each of us hopes that beyond the despair and darkness of today there is something better in store for tomorrow. It will be tragic if nothing but hope is brought to bear on the problem of crime in the United States today.

We must have men and women with ideals, with faith and hope and determination who will transmute noble purpose into accomplished action. If we are to reverse the crime picture in this country, we must make a sustained effort to stir the complacent ones to awareness.

We mollycoddle young criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew on society. The bleeding hearts, particularly among the judiciary, are so concerned for young criminals that they become indifferent to the rights of law-abiding citizens.

We must have judges with courage and a high sense of their duty to protect the public and to adequately penalize criminals if we are to stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against society.

REALISTIC VIEW

We must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the lenient approach and it has failed.

It is the fashion among many to sneer at ideals, to flout them with derisive jeers as the insubstantial dreams of the naive, and to scornfully prophesy that most men will abandon their ideals as useless encumbrances in the race for wealth and fame. The cynics are too often right, but the fault is not with the ideal—remember that. A worthwhile ideal may be difficult, but it is never impossible of attainment.

I believe in the omnipotence of the human spirit. Man has repeatedly shown that he can both make and master circumstances. It will take this type of determination on the part of the majority of our people if we are to halt increasing numbers of our young people from swelling the crime statistics columns each year. We badly need a moral reawakening in every home in our Nation.

The voices of temperance, logic and decency must speak out. Terrorism cannot be tolerated in a free society. Hate, terror and lawlessness are not the American way.

I trust you will give consideration to my remarks and not dismiss them as typical of the traditional age-old lament about the moral climate of one's native land. We are courting disaster if we do not soon take some positive action against the growing moral deterioration in this land.

GRIEVOUS TREND

It is a grievous trend which is being steadily reflected in the attitude of contempt which many of our people have for the values which made this Nation great.

Today, patriotism seems to be out of style. Those who express their love of country are often looked upon as paranoiac patriots or rightwing extremists.

Let me quote from an article which appeared in a recent issue of a student publication of one of our midwestern colleges. Entitled "Nix Patriotism," this article stated, "Patriotism is an emotion that is marked by ignorance, stupidity, prejudice, autism, fear, and hostility."

We can only pray that this undesirable trend which is evidenced among students in all too many of our colleges and universities can be reversed before it is too late.

This attitude can be seen in the widespread public indifference concerning the real threat of world communism. The philosophy of communism flourishes best in an environment where personal responsibility and self-discipline have been undermined by immorality, materialism and expediency.

Its duplicity is difficult for young Americans to comprehend. If our young citizens turn an objective, analytical searchlight on this ideology and its organizational arms, they will understand communism for what it is—a materialistic, godless dogma dedicated to world domination.

IDEALS DESTROYED

When man places himself above the law and bases his decisions on his own selfish interests, he aids the Communists' relentless efforts to destroy the ideals of our civilization. He contributes heavily to reducing life to the code of the jungle, by making it easier for communism to spread its deadly doctrines, terror and the brutalization of man. What Ignatius Loyola taught, communism seeks to destroy.

The man who has no objective values by which he judges his actions—who allows his passions to run wild, unchecked by a moral standard of what is right—that man is surely risking the loss of his immortal soul.

Faith in man cannot exist without faith in God. Faith in God takes root and grows strong only when it is expressed in service and good works.

It seems we are never converted in mass to any genuine reform in society, science,

religion, morals, or government. There must be a beginning and the time is now.

AT CROSSROADS

America stands at the crossroads of destiny. It is a common destiny in which we shall all finally stand or fall together. Though we contest with utter vigor for the prevalence of whatever attitudes and policies may possess our souls, may we ever remember that we finally must be all for one and one for all against the vicissitudes of fortune—and perhaps against the world.

We are still capable of producing leaders who have the power to move, quicken and transform their environment, and to awaken an answering thrill of appreciation and support in us who read or hear of the struggles and achievements.

I sincerely hope the "Sword of Loyola" will mark the beginning of a new and enlightened era in the United States.

Man is blessed with the liberty to choose between opposing factors, between action and inaction, between good and evil, between God and the devil. Surely our immediate situation requires an endeavor by man to raise himself above ordinary standards to a higher degree of achievement.

As Americans, we should learn to trust God, to know His teachings, and to live in His ways.

This is truly a time for decision.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 15.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 15, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1965:

U.S. MINT

Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Meyer H. Leifer, Congregation Emenath Israel, New York City, offered the following prayer:

אֱלֹהֵינוּ שְׂמַחֵם

Our Heavenly Father, we seek Thy blessing and guidance in these serious and soul-stirring times, when freedom-loving America which is founded upon liberty and justice for all, is being threatened by the onslaught of godless, ruthless, and unprincipled aggressors.

While we must develop superior military might, we must also be filled with Thy Holy Spirit to preserve the superiority of our democratic way of living.

Bless Thou, O Lord, our glorious land of liberty, our leaders, the President of our United States, and the Representatives. Endow them with understanding

to guide America to continue to be a citadel of freedom and ray of light and hope to all those who are now living in darkness.

Hasten the day when universal peace will prevail throughout the world with freedom and justice for all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 60. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 301. An act to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics;

S. 490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 491. An act to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; and

S. 794. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 474, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. FANNIN to be a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

UNITED STATES v. RUSSELL NIXON AND OTHERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair, in his official capacity as Speaker of this House, has been served with a subpoena duces tecum, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, commanding him to appear in the said court to testify in the case of the United States of America against Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen on the 18th day of March 1965.

Under the precedents of the House, the Chair is unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. The Chair therefore submits

the matter for the consideration of this body. The Clerk will read a copy of the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. RUSSELL NIXON, DAGMAR WILSON, DONNA ALLEN—CRIMINAL No. 1170-64, 1171-64, 1172-64

To Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker, House of Representatives, Room H-206, Capitol:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., in the city of Washington, D.C., on the 18th day of March 1965, at 9:30 a.m., to testify in the case of *United States v. Nixon, Wilson, and Allen* and bring with you the documents listed in the attached schedule A.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the defendants, February 9, 1965, David Rein, attorney for defendants, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By GERALD C. DAVIS,
Deputy Clerk.

SCHEDULE A

1. A copy of the opinion submitted to the Speaker by the Parliamentarian with respect to his authority or discretion to certify to the U.S. attorney in accordance with title 2, United States Code, section 194, the statements of fact made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to the three defendants named in the subpoena.

2. A copy of the written certifications of these statements of fact made by the Speaker to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read a copy of a letter which the Chair has sent to the Attorney General in connection with this matter:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
The Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I did on last evening, February 10, accept service in the case of *United States of America v. Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen*, from Deputy U.S. Marshal Morina. I have asked the deputy marshal to present this summons and letter to you so that you may proceed in accordance with the law.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1965: Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Hon. ALFON LENNON, of North Carolina; Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.