PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11525. A bill for the relief of Filomena Quaranta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11526. A bill for the relief of Maria Logoteta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11527. A bill for the relief of Rocco Manfre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 11528. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11529. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hedwig Hauke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11530. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Ekonomides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11531. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

279. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., relative to tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

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

Mr. Richard Langham Riedel, of the Senate staff, a deacon of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Thou Great Spirit of the universe, our Father and our God:

We thank Thee for Thy presence. We thank Thee for the Senate of the United States. We are especially grateful for the rapid recovery of the President of the United States. We ask Thy blessing upon the Chaplain, Dr. Harris, as daily he leads so many hearts and minds toward Thee. We seek Thy blessing and guidance for the Vice President and each Senator, in all their thoughts and actions throughout this day and always.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 9, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 7, 1965:

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1965:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

The message also announced that on October 8, 1965, the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with new reports, and not including nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, sundry nominations in the Coast Guard are on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent be notified immediately of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the 13 minutes preceding 1 o'clock I may have the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in conjunction with the majority leader's request, I ask that the last 15 minutes preceding the allotment requested by him be allotted to the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These will not be considered second speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Is there morning business?

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators as members of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to be held in Rome, November 20, 1965: GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, and JACK MILLER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Patent Office," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. ROBERT WESLEY COLGLAZIER, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to bills proposing to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

First, to express, on behalf and in representation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to the Congress and the President of the United States its solidarity with the purpose of increasing the Federal minimum wage contemplated in the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act at present under consideration by Congress, at the same time that it declares its conviction that if approved, the main amendments to said act, concerning Puerto Rico, will adversely affect the development of Puerto Rico's economy and the living conditions of our laborers.

Second, to express the solidarity of the legislative assembly with the standpoint assumed by the executive branch of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in support of the continuance of the flexible system of fixing wages through the industrial committees and soliciting that Puerto Rico be exempted from any provision contained in the said bills providing for automatic increases in the minimum wage.

Third, to declare that the present coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act should remain unaltered.

Fourth, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington.

I, Carlos Roman Benitez, secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the S. Subs. to House Concurrent Resolution 9, entitled: "Concurrent resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered" has been approved by the Senate of Puerto Rico and the House of Representatives and signed by the speaker and the president of the respective houses on September 23, 1965, as appears from the printed copy attached herewith.

CARLOS ROMAN BENITEZ,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 10779. An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation to construct, maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex. (Rept. No. 859).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 860).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 861).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2619. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2620. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the Northeastern Corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2621. A bill for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2622. A bill to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2623. A bill to amend chapter 33, subtitle II—"Other Commercial Transactions"—of title 28, District of Columbia Code, with respect to charging or deducting in advance interest on loans to be repaid in installments; and

S. 2624. A bill to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2625. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Esparza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Northeast Corridor Transportation Commission.

This bill is designed to fill the need for interim developmental planning in the complicated matter of intercity transportation in the crowded megalopolis of our Northeast States. It follows logically, and will supplement, the high-speed ground transportation act of 1965 which was signed into law by President Johnson on September 30, providing $90 million for research and demonstrations in ground transportation. The bill I introduce today suggests a way for insuring that the findings of the Government research program will be put into action.

Specifically, the bill provides for a framework for interstate cooperation in the form of a commission whose members would represent each of the eight northeast seaboard States, plus the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. The Commission is empowered to formulate a development program which shall include such features as the routing of future facilities, the location of terminals and other facilities, the method of financing such developments, and finally, the organizational plan under which new facilities may be constructed and operated.

It is this last feature—the matter of organizational structure—which is perhaps the most basic element of this bill. The Commission is directed to consider such alternatives as a Federal corporation, an organization established by interstate compact, or continuation and modification of the Commission itself, presumably with added provisions for financial support. To my mind it is very important that the Federal, State, and local governments involved start thinking now about this very important question of how best to operate our future transportation systems with maximum participation by the private sector of the economy.

It is my hope and my belief, for example, that the public-authority concept which I first advanced in 1962 and which is incorporated by Senate Joint Resolution 16 which I introduced in the present Congress, will prove to be the appropriate structure for long-range development of interstate transportation facilities. But the negotiation of such a public authority, involving eight States and dozens of other municipal and county jurisdictions, undoubtedly will require protracted and complex discussions before the agency could evolve. This bill would provide a framework for such discussions and thus begin, none too soon, the protracted job of translating plans into action.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to make special mention of the important role which Congressman CARLTON SICKLES, of Maryland, has played in preparing this legislation, a companion version of which he is introducing in the House today. Congressman SICKLES, in connection with his work with the Commission to create a transportation compact incorporating Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, has experienced, at first, the complex difficulties of multilateral negotiations and has played a primary role in preparing the legislation we introduce today. I am happy to be associated with him particularly now that the Governors of the States involved are holding preliminary discussions on this very problem in Trenton, N.J., October 15.

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

The bill (S. 2620) to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeast corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be added as a cosponsor to S. 2579 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, at its next printing.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 2460 the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the next printing of a bill which I introduced, S. 2180, a bill to improve the safety of rail transportation, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that the names of three Senators be added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 51, to express the sense of Congress that the United Nations provide for the self-determination of the Baltic States—the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 1, 1965, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MUNDT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold and silver produced in the United States, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators) on October 1, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I announce as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill was introduced by me on March 25, cosponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement setting forth the details with respect to these hearings, which will take place on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, announced today that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill, S. 1630, which was introduced by Senator CLARK on March 25 this year is also sponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

"Hearings have been scheduled," Senator CLARK said, "for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, at which time the subcommittee will hear testimony from a number of distinguished economists, including former members of the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as representatives of labor and industry. Additional hearings may be scheduled at a later time.

"The bill would require the President, as part of his Economic Report, to submit to Congress each year a full employment and production budget which would anticipate for the approaching fiscal year and the next 5 years, the projected performance of the national economy and the degree to which this performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment and production with stable prices. Under the bill, the President would also be required to submit a Federal budget and a tax monetary program designed to minimize any full employment surplus or deficit which might be anticipated.

"Thus, these amendments would enable the President to provide Congress and the Nation with rough targets in employment and the investment needed to fully utilize our manpower and production resources so that the levels of unemployment could be reduced below 3 percent within the near future."

Senator CLARK noted that "in spite of the fact that this country has experienced more than 56 consecutive months of the greatest prosperity in its history, we are still plagued with joblessness at a rate of 4½ percent of the Nation's work force.

"Many of the unmet needs which have plagued our Nation and held us back from meeting our full economic potential will be met by the programs enacted by the 89th Congress in the fields of regional economic development, education, and poverty. Nevertheless, allocations of Federal expenditures in the public sector of our economy have never been governed by considerations of how such expeditures might effect our annual employment levels."

Senator CLARK invited comments from all interested persons and stated that his subcommittee would be happy to hear testimony or receive statements from interested Members of Congress.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nominations:

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana; Herman F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; William M. Rountree, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa; and William H. Weathersby, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Sudan.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

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

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Comment on report of the first national conference on the problems of rural youth in a changing environment, edited by Mrs. Ruth Cowan Nash, of West Virginia.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FEDERAL-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to the States and through them to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for additional sponsors until close of business Monday next, October 18, 1965, unless the Senate adjourns sine die before that time, and that it lie on the desk until the Senate does adjourn if sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2619) to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill now implements what has become rather popularly known as the Heller plan developed in June 1964, by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

I introduce this bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. A parallel measure is being introduced today in the House by Congressman REID of New York and other Members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables and a study showing what the States would receive under my bill.

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

State-local government revenues, existing Federal outlays to the States and localities and additional Federal allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal

State	Total general revenues 1963–64	Revenues from Federal Government		Federal revenue sharing allotment			State	Total general revenues 1963–64	Revenues from Federal Government		Federal revenue sharing allotment		
		Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Percent increase of revenues from Federal Government (col. 2)			Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Percent increase of revenues from Federal Government (col. 2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*		*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Alabama	$904	$214	23.7	$84.3	9.3	39.9	Nebraska	$488	$80	16.4	$14.4	2.9	18.0
Alaska	180	91	50.6	2.6	1.4	28.6	Nevada	218	52	23.9	4.4	2.0	8.5
Arizona	592	95	16.0	19.0	3.2	20.0	New Hampshire	197	36	18.3	5.9	3.0	16.4
Arkansas	502	138	27.5	47.4	9.4	34.3	New Jersey	2,179	187	8.6	57.3	2.6	30.6
California	8,929	1,257	14.1	213.6	2.4	17.0	New Mexico	429	103	24.0	28.4	6.6	27.6
Colorado	802	136	17.0	21.8	2.7	16.0	New York	8,096	650	8.0	202.2	2.5	31.1
Connecticut	1,018	134	13.2	23.1	2.3	17.2	North Carolina	1,233	188	15.2	119.0	9.7	63.3
Delaware	199	26	13.1	4.4	2.2	16.9	North Dakota	273	55	20.1	8.7	3.2	15.8
Florida	1,870	251	13.4	62.6	3.3	24.9	Ohio	3,182	440	13.8	88.7	6.4	20.2
Georgia	1,189	234	19.7	105.8	8.9	45.2	Oklahoma	870	213	24.5	26.8	3.1	12.6
Hawaii	314	64	20.4	8.5	2.7	13.3	Oregon	800	172	21.5	20.7	2.6	12.0
Idaho	239	45	18.8	18.1	7.6	40.2	Pennsylvania	3,526	439	12.5	101.8	2.9	23.2
Illinois	3,576	437	12.2	88.8	2.5	20.3	Rhode Island	289	49	17.0	8.2	2.8	16.7
Indiana	1,597	170	10.6	47.4	3.0	27.9	South Carolina	568	93	16.4	62.4	11.0	67.1
Iowa	1,003	134	13.4	30.2	3.0	22.5	South Dakota	267	61	22.8	19.0	7.1	31.1
Kansas	821	114	13.9	25.4	3.1	22 3	Tennessee	1,011	216	21.4	92.8	9.2	43.0
Kentucky	861	205	23.8	76.5	8.9	37.3	Texas	3,144	505	16.1	103.2	3.3	20.4
Louisiana	1,252	278	22.2	96.0	7.7	34.5	Utah	380	95	25.0	11.0	2.9	11.6
Maine	300	52	17.3	10.0	3.3	19.2	Vermont	150	36	24.0	4.5	3.0	12.5
Maryland	1,136	129	11.4	30.5	2.7	23.6	Virginia	1,176	207	17.6	38.4	3.3	18.6
Massachusetts	1,959	244	12.5	49.7	2.5	20.4	Washington	1,285	204	15.9	34.3	2.7	16.8
Michigan	3,125	404	12.9	86.3	2.8	21.4	West Virginia	509	98	19.3	44.3	8.7	45.2
Minnesota	1,426	195	13.7	42.7	3.0	21.9	Wisconsin	1,591	168	10.6	48.9	3.1	29.1
Mississippi	589	128	21.7	61.1	10.4	47.7	Wyoming	191	64	33.5	4.2	2.2	6.6
Missouri	1,355	244	18.0	36.4	2.7	14.9	District of Columbia	355	100	28.2	6.3	1.8	6.3
Montana	302	74	24.5	8.4	2.8	11.4							

State allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal (assuming total distribution of $2,500,000,000, with 80 percent going to all States and 20 percent going to 13 low-income States)[1]

State	State and local revenue from own sources (1963–64) (1)	Personal income (1963) (2)	Revenue effort ratio (col. 1÷ col. 2) (3)	Relative State effort ratio (col. 3÷13.0) (4)	State percentage of total population (1964 estimated) (5)	Unadjusted State allotment (col. 5×$2 billion) (6)	Adjusted State allotment (col. 4× col. 6) (7)	State percentage of 13-State population, total (8)	Extra allotment (col. 8×$.5 billion) (9)	Total allotment (10)
	Millions	*Millions*				*Millions*	*Millions*		*Millions*	*Millions*
Alabama	$690	$5,538	12.5	96	1.8	$35.6	$34.2	10.0	$50.1	$84.3
Alaska	89	704	12.6	98	.1	2.6	2.6			2.6
Arizona	497	3,340	14.9	115	.8	16.5	19.0			19.0
Arkansas	364	2,986	12.2	94	1.0	20.2	19.0	5.7	28.4	47.4
California	7,672	52,317	14.7	113	9.5	189.0	213.6			213.6
Colorado	665	4,831	13.8	106	1.0	20.5	21.8			21.8
Connecticut	889	8,490	10.4	80	1.4	28.9	23.1			23.1
Delaware	174	1,570	11.1	85	.3	5.1	4.4			4.4
Florida	1,619	11,933	13.6	105	3.0	59.6	62.6			62.6
Georgia	954	7,715	12.4	95	2.2	44.9	42.6	12.6	63.1	105.8
Hawaii	250	1,667	15.0	116	.4	7.3	8.5			8.5
Idaho	194	1,366	14.2	110	.4	7.2	8.0	2.0	10.1	18.1
Illinois	3,138	30,020	10.5	81	5.5	109.6	88.8			88.8
Indiana	1,427	11,648	12.3	94	2.5	50.4	47.4			47.4
Iowa	869	6,399	13.6	105	1.4	28.8	30.2			30.2
Kansas	707	5,017	14.1	109	1.2	23.2	25.4			25.4
Kentucky	656	5,545	11.8	91	1.7	33.0	30.0	9.3	46.5	76.5
Louisiana	974	6,072	16.0	124	1.8	36.3	45.0	10.2	51.0	96.0
Maine	248	1,971	12.6	97	.5	10.3	10.0			10.0
Maryland	1,007	9,163	11.0	85	1.8	35.9	30.5			30.5
Massachusetts	1,715	14,889	11.5	89	2.8	55.8	49.7			49.7
Michigan	2,721	20,624	13.2	102	4.2	84.6	86.3			86.3
Minnesota	1,231	8,152	15.1	116	1.8	36.8	42.7			42.7
Mississippi	461	3,183	14.5	112	1.2	24.2	27.1	6.8	34.0	61.1
Missouri	1,111	10,900	10.2	79	2.3	46.1	36.4			36.4
Montana	229	1,553	14.7	114	.4	7.4	8.4			8.4
Nebraska	408	3,376	12.1	93	.8	15.5	14.4			14.4
Nevada	166	1,246	13.3	103	.2	4.3	4.4			4.4
New Hampshire	161	1,450	11.1	86	.3	6.8	5.9			5.9
New Jersey	1,993	18,861	10.6	82	3.5	69.8	57.3			57.3
New Mexico	327	1,953	16.7	129	.5	10.5	13.6	3.0	14.8	28.4
New York	7,445	53,361	14.0	108	9.4	187.3	202.2			202.2
North Carolina	1,046	8,601	12.2	94	2.5	50.7	47.7	14.3	71.4	119.0
North Dakota	218	1,300	16.8	129	.3	6.7	8.7			8.7
Ohio	2,742	25,164	10.9	84	5.3	105.6	88.7			88.7
Oklahoma	656	4,858	13.5	104	1.3	25.7	26.8			26.8
Oregon	628	4,568	13.7	106	1.0	19.5	20.7			20.7
Pennsylvania	3,082	28,017	11.0	85	6.0	119.8	101.8			101.8
Rhode Island	240	2 153	11.1	86	.5	9.6	8.2			8.2
South Carolina	475	3,944	12.0	93	1.3	26.7	24.8	7.5	37.6	62.4
South Dakota	206	1,390	14.8	114	.4	7.5	8.5	2.1	10.5	19.0
Tennessee	795	6,588	12.1	93	2.0	39.7	36.9	11.2	55.9	92.8
Texas	2,640	21,351	12.4	95	5.4	108.7	103.2			103.2
Utah	286	2,083	13.7	106	.5	10.4	11.0			11.0
Vermont	114	827	13.8	106	.2	4.3	4.5			4.5
Virginia	968	8,907	10.9	84	2.3	45.8	38.4			38.4
Washington	1,081	7,575	14.3	110	1.6	31.2	34.3			34.3
West Virginia	411	3,348	12.3	95	.9	18.8	17.8	5.3	26.4	44.3
Wisconsin	1,424	9,617	14.8	114	2.1	42.9	48.9			48.9
Wyoming	127	834	15.2	117	.2	3.8	4.2			4.2
District of Columbia	256	2,645	9.7	75	.4	8.4	6.3			6.3
Total			[2] 13.0							2,456.4

[1] Details may not agree because of rounding.

[2] Average.

TABLE B–64.—*State and local government revenues and expenditures, selected fiscal years, 1927–63*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year [1]	Revenues by source [1]							Expenditures by function [2]				
	Total	Property taxes	Sales and gross receipts taxes	Individual income taxes	Corporation net income taxes	Revenue from Federal Government	All other revenue [3]	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	All other [4]
1927	7,271	4,730	470	70	92	116	1,793	7,210	2,235	1,809	151	3,015
1932	7,267	4,487	752	74	79	232	1,643	7,765	2,311	1,741	444	3,269
1934	7,678	4,076	1,008	80	49	1,016	1,449	7,181	1,831	1,509	889	2,952
1936	8,395	4,093	1,484	153	113	948	1,604	7,644	2,177	1,425	827	3,215
1938	9,228	4,440	1,794	218	165	800	1,811	8,757	2,491	1,650	1,069	3,547
1940	9,609	4,430	1,982	224	156	954	1,872	9,229	2,638	1,573	1,156	3,862
1942	10,418	4,537	2,351	276	272	858	2,123	9,190	2,586	1,490	1,225	3,889
1944	10,908	4,604	2,289	342	451	954	2,269	8,863	2,793	1,200	1,133	3,737
1946	12,356	4,986	2,986	422	447	855	2,661	11,028	3,356	1,672	1,409	4,591
1948	17,250	6,126	4,442	543	592	1,861	3,685	17,684	5,379	3,036	2,099	7,170
1950	20,911	7,349	5,154	788	593	2,486	4,541	22,787	7,177	3,803	2,940	8,867
1952	25,181	8,652	6,357	998	846	2,566	5,763	26,098	8,318	4,650	2,788	10,342
1953	27,307	9,375	6,927	1,065	817	2,870	6,252	27,910	9,390	4,987	2,914	10,619
1954	29,012	9,967	7,276	1,127	778	2,966	6,897	30,701	10,557	5,527	3,060	11,557
1955	31,073	10,735	7,643	1,237	744	3,131	7,584	33,724	11,907	6,452	3,168	12,197
1956	34,667	11,749	8,691	1,538	890	3,335	8,465	36,711	13,220	6,953	3,139	13,399
1957	38,164	12,864	9,467	1,754	984	3,843	9,252	40,375	14,134	7,816	3,485	14,940
1958	41,219	14,047	9,829	1,759	1,018	4,865	9,699	44,851	15,919	8,567	3,818	16,547
1959	45,306	14,983	10,437	1,994	1,001	6,377	10,516	48,887	17,283	9,592	4,136	17,876
1960	50,505	16,405	11,849	2,463	1,180	6,974	11,634	51,876	18,719	9,428	4,404	19,324
1961	54,037	18,002	12,463	2,613	1,266	7,131	12,563	56,201	20,574	9,844	4,720	21,063
1962	58,252	19,054	13,494	3,037	1,308	7,871	13,489	60,206	22,216	10,357	5,084	22,549
1963	62,890	20,089	14,456	3,269	1,505	8,722	14,850	64,816	24,012	11,136	5,481	24,187

[1] Fiscal years not the same for all governments.

[2] Excludes revenues or expenditures of publicly owned utilities and liquor stores, and of insurance-trust activities. Intergovernmental receipts and payments between State and local governments are also excluded.

[3] Includes licenses and other taxes and charges and miscellaneous revenues.

[4] Includes expenditures for health, hospitals, police, local fire protection, natural resources, sanitation, housing and community redevelopment, local parks and recreation, general control, financial administration, interest on general debt, and other and unallocable expenditures.

NOTE.—Data are not available for intervening years.

Data for Alaska and Hawaii included beginning 1959 and 1960, respectively.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

101. State and local total expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures				Revenue				Gross debt [4]		
	Total, direct [1]	State		Local direct	Total, State and local [3]	From own sources		From Federal Government	Total	State	Local
		Total [2]	Direct			State	Local				
1902	$1,095	$188	$136	$959	$1,048	$183	$858	$7	$2,107	$230	$1,877
1913	2,257	388	297	1,960	2,030	360	1,658	12	4,414	379	4,035
1922	5,652	1,397	1,085	4,567	5,169	1,234	3,827	108	10,109	1,131	8,978
1927	7,810	2,047	1,451	6,359	7,838	1,994	5,728	116	14,881	1,971	12,910
1932	8,403	2,829	2,028	6,375	7,887	2,274	5,381	232	19,205	2,832	16,373
1934	7,842	3,461	2,143	5,699	8,430	2,452	4,962	1,016	18,929	3,248	15,681
1936	8,501	3,862	2,445	6,056	9,360	3,265	5,147	948	19,474	3,413	16,061
1938	9,988	4,598	3,082	6,906	11,058	4,612	5,646	800	19,436	3,343	16,093
1940	11,240	5,209	3,555	7,685	11,749	5,012	5,792	945	20,283	3,590	16,693
1942	10,914	5,343	3,563	7,351	13,148	6,012	6,278	858	19,706	3,257	16,449
1944	10,499	5,161	3,319	7,180	14,333	6,714	6,665	954	17,479	2,776	14,703
1946	14,067	7,066	4,974	9,093	15,983	7,712	7,416	855	15,917	2,353	13,564
1948	21,260	11,181	7,897	13,363	21,613	10,086	9,666	1,861	18,656	3,676	14,980
1950	27,905	15,082	10,864	17,041	25,639	11,480	11,673	2,486	24,115	5,285	18,830
1952	30,863	15,834	10,790	20,073	31,013	14,330	14,117	2,566	30,100	6,874	23,226
1954	36,607	18,686	13,008	23,599	35,386	15,951	16,468	2,966	38,931	9,600	29,331
1956	43,152	21,686	15,148	28,004	41,692	18,903	19,453	3,335	48,868	12,890	35,978
1957	47,553	24,235	16,796	30,757	45,929	20,728	21,357	3,843	53,039	13,738	39,301
1958	53,712	28,080	19,991	33,721	49,262	21,427	22,970	4,865	58,187	15,394	42,793
1959	58,572	31,125	22,436	36,136	53,972	22,912	24,684	6,377	64,110	16,930	47,180
1960	60,999	31,596	22,152	38,847	60,277	26,094	27,209	6,974	69,955	18,543	51,412
1961	67,023	34,693	24,578	42,445	64,531	27,821	29,579	7,131	75,023	19,993	55,030
1962	70,547	36,402	25,495	45,053	69,492	30,115	31,506	7,871	80,802	22,023	58,779
1963	75,760	39,583	27,698	48,062	75,317	32,750	33,846	8,722	87,451	23,176	64,276

[1] Direct expenditures are amounts as finally disbursed by units of government for their own functions regardless of source of receipts. Include expenditures for utility, liquor stores, and insurance trust; exclude payments for debt retirement.

[2] State payments to localities are included in State total expenditures and in local direct expenditures. They are excluded from State direct expenditures.

[3] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.

[4] Short- and long-term debt outstanding at end of fiscal year. See table 48 for data on net debt.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

104. Per capita State and local direct expenditures, by function and State, fiscal year 1963

State	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	Health and hospitals	Police and fire	General control	Insurance trust	Other
Total	$408	$129	$60	$29	$25	$19	$13	$27	$105
Alabama	297	88	51	35	17	10	9	10	78
Alaska	760	215	215	25	33	21	29	29	194
Arizona	446	165	66	23	15	17	15	21	125
Arkansas	273	90	58	33	18	8	9	10	47
California	579	184	57	45	30	28	19	56	159
Colorado	466	179	57	52	27	18	18	23	91
Connecticut	412	132	70	28	22	23	14	26	97
Delaware	435	165	84	21	21	15	15	17	96
Florida	375	109	59	20	31	19	16	12	109
Georgia	314	100	56	26	29	11	11	10	70
Hawaii	505	147	40	19	35	22	23	25	195
Idaho	379	126	83	24	20	17	13	19	77
Illinois	387	126	50	35	24	22	12	27	92
Indiana	343	145	51	14	21	15	11	15	70
Iowa	378	140	78	28	23	12	12	8	77
Kansas	384	148	72	26	23	12	14	10	80
Kentucky	331	103	86	27	18	10	9	12	66
Louisiana	392	115	71	56	19	14	10	16	91
Maine	354	110	75	30	15	14	11	17	81
Maryland	384	132	56	17	29	22	12	23	92
Massachusetts	435	105	53	43	34	28	15	40	116
Michigan	429	151	57	24	32	18	12	23	113
Minnesota	437	151	66	36	28	14	13	21	108
Mississippi	276	88	58	26	23	8	8	7	58
Missouri	329	112	56	35	24	18	11	13	61
Montana	453	155	113	23	16	13	17	24	92
Nebraska	429	126	86	17	18	11	11	10	151
Nevada	614	174	114	20	46	31	29	43	157
New Hampshire	397	111	88	24	21	16	11	16	109
New Jersey	367	113	43	17	23	26	15	39	91
New Mexico	408	172	74	30	17	12	15	15	73
New York	528	140	58	33	43	31	18	48	157
North Carolina	268	103	39	19	18	10	9	10	60
North Dakota	417	152	93	27	13	8	13	14	98
Ohio	370	109	59	26	19	15	11	38	92
Oklahoma	382	121	67	62	19	11	11	11	80
Oregon	492	175	81	27	22	17	19	34	117
Pennsylvania	373	113	51	26	19	15	12	34	101
Rhode Island	370	103	52	31	21	23	15	40	87
South Carolina	246	90	38	15	20	9	7	9	58
South Dakota	362	141	98	24	11	10	14	6	58
Tennessee	345	87	64	18	22	12	8	13	121
Texas	323	112	59	23	16	14	10	11	78
Utah	439	184	76	24	16	14	14	17	96
Vermont	444	134	114	34	18	10	16	18	101
Virginia	315	108	68	11	17	12	9	6	85
Washington	559	175	74	36	19	18	14	38	184
West Virginia	296	97	51	37	17	8	9	23	54
Wisconsin	431	148	73	27	26	21	14	20	102
Wyoming	599	184	175	21	36	15	18	33	117
District of Columbia	497	85	75	34	62	43	16	32	150

Source: Computed by Tax Foundation from data in table 105, based on population at the beginning of the fiscal year.

107. State and local revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total [1]	From own sources						From Federal Government	Per capita [5]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Liquor stores [3]	Utility	Insurance trust [4]		Total	Taxes
			Total general	Taxes [2]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$1,048	$1,041	$979	$860	$119	$2	$60	----------	$7	$13.37	$10.97
1913	2,030	2,018	1,900	1,609	291	----------	116	$2	12	21.08	16.71
1922	5,169	5,061	4,673	4,016	657	----------	266	122	108	47.29	36.74
1927	7,838	7,722	7,155	6,087	1,068	----------	403	164	116	66.30	51.49
1932	7,887	7,655	7,035	6,164	871	----------	463	157	232	63.38	49.53
1934	8,430	7,414	6,662	5,912	750	91	499	162	1,016	66.92	46.93
1936	9,360	8,412	7,447	6,701	746	189	558	218	948	73.32	52.49
1938	11,058	10,258	8,428	7,605	823	272	605	953	800	85.51	58.81
1940	11,749	10,804	8,664	7,810	854	294	704	1,142	945	89.40	59.43
1942	13,148	12,290	9,560	8,528	1,031	390	887	1,454	858	98.30	63.76
1944	14,333	13,379	9,954	8,774	1,180	567	1,066	1,792	954	107.06	65.54
1946	15,983	15,128	11,501	10,094	1,407	864	1,169	1,593	855	116.47	73.56
1948	21,613	19,752	15,389	13,342	2,047	946	1,565	1,851	1,861	149.14	92.07
1950	25,639	23,153	18,425	15,914	2,511	904	1,808	2,016	2,486	170.11	105.59
1952	31,013	28,447	22,615	19,323	3,292	1,037	2,071	2,724	2,566	199.75	124.46
1954	35,386	32,420	26,046	22,067	3,979	1,093	2,403	2,877	2,966	220.48	137.50
1956	41,692	38,357	31,332	26,368	4,964	1,136	2,718	3,171	3,335	250.06	158.15
1957	45,929	42,085	34,320	28,817	5,503	1,183	2,944	3,638	3,843	270.46	169.69
1958	49,262	44,397	36,354	30,380	5,974	1,170	3,041	3,832	4,865	285.07	175.80
1959	53,972	47,596	38,929	32,379	6,550	1,216	3,320	4,131	6,377	307.05	184.21
1960	60,277	53,302	43,530	36,117	7,414	1,264	3,613	4,896	6,974	337.25	202.08
1961	64,531	57,400	46,907	38,861	8,045	1,260	3,856	5,378	7,131	355.21	213.91
1962	69,492	61,621	50,381	41,554	8,827	1,282	4,026	5,932	7,871	376.45	225.11
1963	75,317	66,596	54,169	44,281	9,888	1,316	4,474	6,637	8,722	401.86	236.26

[1] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.
[2] Excludes unemployment compensation tax collections included in insurance trust revenue.
[3] Principally receipts from sales in States with alcoholic beverage monopoly systems. Excludes alcoholic beverage taxes.
[4] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.
[5] Based on estimated population, excluding Armed Forces overseas, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

117. State expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal year, 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt	Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to local governments [1]	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]			Total	Direct	Payments to local governments [1]	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$188	$136	$52	$192	$183	$9	$230	1948	$11,181	$7,897	$3,283	$11,826	$10,086	$1,740	$3,676
1913	388	297	91	376	360	16	379	1950	15,082	10,864	4,217	13,903	11,480	2,423	5,285
1922	1,397	1,085	312	1,360	1,234	126	1,131	1952	15,834	10,790	5,044	16,815	14,330	2,485	6,874
1927	2,047	1,451	596	2,152	1,994	158	1,971	1954	18,686	13,008	5,679	18,834	15,951	2,883	9,600
1932	2,829	2,028	801	2,541	2,274	267	2,832	1956	21,686	15,148	6,538	22,199	18,903	3,296	12,890
1934	3,461	2,143	1,318	3,421	2,452	969	3,248	1957	24,235	16,796	7,440	24,656	20,728	3,928	13,738
1936	3,862	2,445	1,417	4,023	3,265	758	3,413	1958	28,080	19,991	8,089	26,191	21,427	4,764	15,394
1938	4,598	3,082	1,516	5,293	4,612	681	3,343	1959	31,125	22,436	8,689	29,164	22,912	6,252	16,930
1940	5,209	3,555	1,654	5,737	5,012	725	3,590	1960	31,596	22,152	9,443	32,838	26,093	6,745	18,543
1942	5,343	3,563	1,780	6,870	6,012	858	3,257	1961	34,693	24,578	10,114	34,603	27,821	6,782	19,993
1944	5,161	3,319	1,842	7,695	6,714	981	2,776	1962	36,402	25,495	10,906	37,597	30,117	7,480	22,023
1946	7,066	4,974	2,092	8,576	7,712	865	2,353	1963	39,583	27,698	11,885	40,993	32,750	8,243	23,176

[1] Principally shared taxes and fiscal aids.
[2] Principally grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. Includes minor amounts from localities for shares of programs administered by the State, payments for services performed by the States, and repayment of advances.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

118. State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare [1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other [2]		
1902	$136	$134	$17	$74	$10	$32	$9	$23	$39	----------	$2
1913	297	297	55	26	16	53	14	38	95	----------	----------
1922	1,085	1,031	164	303	38	125	61	69	271	$54	----------
1927	1,451	1,380	218	514	40	170	94	96	248	71	----------
1932	2,028	1,965	278	843	74	215	119	114	322	63	----------
1934	2,143	2,009	228	738	363	203	85	108	284	64	70
1936	2,445	2,223	297	754	422	221	93	130	306	79	143
1938	3,082	2,576	347	815	453	268	128	146	419	302	240
1940	3,555	2,730	375	793	527	300	144	151	440	601	224
1942	3,563	2,769	391	790	523	299	159	164	443	505	288
1944	3,319	2,666	489	540	577	331	164	162	403	226	426
1946	4,974	3,153	518	613	680	424	207	192	519	1,158	663
1948	7,897	6,186	1,081	1,510	962	663	344	266	1,360	1,020	691
1950	10,864	8,033	1,358	2,058	1,566	947	468	317	1,319	2,177	654
1952	10,790	8,653	1,494	2,556	1,410	1,132	539	361	1,161	1,413	723
1954	13,008	10,109	1,715	3,254	1,548	1,276	563	419	1,334	2,096	803
1956	15,148	12,319	2,138	4,367	1,603	1,470	670	477	1,594	1,984	845
1957	16,796	13,647	2,341	4,875	1,745	1,652	787	531	1,716	2,313	836

See footnotes at end of table.

118. State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63—Continued

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare [1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other [2]		
1958	$19,991	$15,448	$2,727	$5,507	$1,855	$1,848	$875	$569	$2,067	$3,675	$869
1959	22,436	17,319	3,093	6,414	2,007	1,967	976	619	2,243	4,259	860
1960	22,152	17,783	3,396	6,070	2,221	1,896	842	654	2,704	3,461	907
1961	24,578	19,004	3,792	6,230	2,311	2,059	906	725	2,981	4,701	873
1962	25,494	20,373	4,268	6,635	2,509	2,161	973	763	3,064	4,238	882
1963	27,698	22,491	4,954	7,425	2,712	2,330	1,097	830	3,143	4,306	900

[1] Principally categorical public assistance. See table 126.
[2] Principally police, correction, interest, and social insurance administration.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

123. State payments to local governments, by function and State, fiscal year 1963

[In millions]

State	Total	Specified function				General local government support	State	Total	Specified function				General local government support
		Education	Highways	Public welfare	Other [1]				Education	Highways	Public welfare	Other [1]	
Total	$11,855.4	$6,993.0	$1,415.8	$1,918.9	$545.4	$1,012.3	Missouri	$158.1	$131.7	$15.0		$5.0	$6.3
Alabama	171.4	123.8	34.9		6.6	6.1	Montana	23.5	21.0		$0.6	1.9	
Alaska	16.3	14.4			.4	1.6	Nebraska	46.0	7.3	15.7	20.3	1.8	.9
Arizona	105.7	62.3	10.0		2.0	31.5	Nevada	26.8	21.0	3.0		.3	2.5
Arkansas	74.4	49.2	15.1	.1	4.2	5.9	New Hampshire	7.3	4.2	.5	.1	.4	2.2
California	1,804.1	881.5	136.6	587.2	116.7	81.5	New Jersey	209.8	113.9	15.5	62.7	15.4	2.4
Colorado	151.5	51.3	21.1	74.9	4.1	.2	New Mexico	92.9	81.6	4.6		1.4	5.1
Connecticut	88.3	72.7	4.7	3.6	6.3	1.0	New York	1,731.4	1,017.1	85.7	406.9	114.6	107.1
Delaware	50.1	46.6	1.3	1.3	.8		North Carolina	339.2	238.1	7.6	67.6	9.2	16.6
Florida	269.1	233.4	15.2		20.3	.3	North Dakota	26.7	16.5	8.2	.7	.6	.7
Georgia	218.5	174.5	28.5	5.8	9.7		Ohio	538.8	205.4	138.2	121.4	7.2	66.5
Hawaii	22.6				3.2	19.4	Oklahoma	135.0	87.0	38.0		8.0	2.0
Idaho	33.9	21.0	8.9		1.8	2.2	Oregon	110.1	71.6	28.6	1.4	2.5	6.0
Illinois	434.3	244.8	122.5	60.6	6.4		Pennsylvania	492.7	392.0	56.3	7.4	30.8	6.2
Indiana	250.7	134.9	67.2	35.9	4.9	7.8	Rhode Island	29.4	19.2	.4	2.2	.7	6.9
Iowa	138.1	49.3	52.6	.3	2.2	33.8	South Carolina	115.2	89.3	7.9		6.4	11.6
Kansas	121.6	55.2	14.1	40.9	1.5	9.8	South Dakota	12.4	7.8	2.4	.1	.6	1.6
Kentucky	129.6	115.5	2.3		10.2	1.5	Tennessee	180.0	123.6	36.7	.1	4.4	15.2
Louisiana	257.5	182.6	17.6		7.1	50.2	Texas	445.2	435.5	7.9		1.7	.1
Maine	24.0	18.6	3.5	.7	.7	.5	Utah	61.5	54.5	3.9		2.0	1.0
Maryland	267.6	115.9	45.3	43.8	9.7	52.9	Vermont	14.2	7.3	5.7	.5	.7	[2]
Massachusetts	355.4	75.4	14.2	153.5	34.7	77.6	Virginia	179.6	121.1	12.1	26.2	6.9	13.2
Michigan	653.1	360.9	132.4	59.0	20.4	80.4	Washington	288.5	217.0	33.9	7.1	15.7	14.7
Minnesota	278.4	154.1	37.8	62.6	5.8	18.1	West Virginia	73.6	70.4		.4	2.7	
Mississippi	128.7	84.8	25.3		5.6	12.9	Wisconsin	475.8	98.8	74.4	58.0	18.6	226.0
							Wyoming	27.0	17.3	2.6	4.1	.6	2.5

[1] Largely health and hospitals, other, and unallocable.
[2] Less than $50,000.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

130. Total State revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total	From own sources						Intergovernmental		Per capita [4]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Insurance trust [2]	Liquor stores [3]	From Federal	From local	Total	Taxes
			Total	Taxes [1]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$192	$183	$181	$156	$25		2	$3	$6	$2.46	$2.00
1913	376	360	360	301	59			6	10	3.92	3.14
1922	1,360	1,234	1,128	947	181	$106		99	27	12.49	8.70
1927	2,152	1,994	1,857	1,608	249	137		107	51	18.28	13.66
1932	2,541	2,274	2,156	1,890	266	118		222	45	20.50	15.25
1934	3,421	2,452	2,243	1,979	264	119	$90	933	36	27.27	15.78
1936	4,023	3,265	2,914	2,618	296	168	183	719	39	31.67	20.61
1938	5,293	4,612	3,460	3,132	328	890	262	633	48	41.13	24.34
1940	5,737	5,012	3,657	3,313	344	1,074	281	667	58	43.88	25.34
1942	6,870	6,012	4,274	3,903	370	1,366	373	802	56	51.67	29.36
1944	7,695	6,714	4,484	4,071	413	1,702	528	926	55	57.86	30.61
1946	8,576	7,712	5,419	4,937	482	1,494	798	802	63	62.90	36.21
1948	11,826	10,086	7,517	6,743	774	1,711	857	1,643	97	82.09	46.81
1950	13,903	11,480	8,839	7,930	909	1,831	810	2,275	148	92.74	52.90
1952	16,815	14,330	10,944	9,857	1,087	2,462	924	2,329	156	108.87	63.82
1954	18,834	15,951	12,417	11,089	1,328	2,560	974	2,668	215	117.96	69.45
1956	22,199	18,903	15,093	13,375	1,718	2,791	1,019	3,027	269	133.78	80.60
1957	24,656	20,728	16,454	14,531	1,923	3,209	1,065	3,500	427	145.86	85.96
1958	26,190	21,427	17,008	14,919	2,089	3,361	1,058	4,461	302	152.23	86.72
1959	29,164	22,912	18,196	15,848	2,348	3,631	1,085	5,888	364	166.64	90.56
1960	32,839	26,094	20,619	18,036	2,583	4,347	1,128	6,328	363	184.53	101.35
1961	34,603	27,821	21,911	19,057	2,854	4,791	1,119	6,412	370	191.29	105.35
1962	37,597	30,117	23,677	20,561	3,116	5,306	1,134	7,108	373	204.54	111.86
1963	40,993	32,750	25,640	22,117	3,523	5,950	1,161	7,832	411	219.65	118.51

[1] Excludes unemployment compensation taxes included in insurance trust revenue and shown in table 132.
[2] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.
[3] Gross receipts from the sale of liquor and associated products in State alcoholic beverage monopoly systems.
[4] Based on population, excluding Armed Forces overseas and District of Columbia, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

168. Local expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63 [1]

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt	Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to State governments	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]			Total	Direct	Payments to State governments	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$965	$959	$6	$914	$858	$56	$1,877	1948	$13,460	$13,363	$97	13,167	$9,666	$3,501	$14,980
1913	1,970	1,960	10	1,755	1,658	97	4,035	1950	17,189	17,041	148	16,101	11,673	4,428	18,830
1922	4,594	4,567	27	4,148	3,827	321	8,978	1952	20,229	20,073	156	19,398	14,117	5,281	23,226
1927	6,410	6,359	51	6,333	5,728	605	12,910	1954	23,814	23,599	215	22,402	16,468	5,933	29,331
1932	6,420	6,375	45	6,192	5,381	811	16,373	1956	28,273	28,004	269	26,352	19,453	6,899	35,978
1934	5,735	5,699	36	6,363	4,962	1,401	15,681	1957	31,057	30,757	300	29,021	21,357	7,664	39,301
1936	6,095	6,056	39	6,793	5,147	1,646	16,061	1958	34,023	33,721	302	31,348	22,970	8,378	42,793
1938	6,954	6,906	48	7,329	5,646	1,683	16,093	1959	36,341	36,136	205	33,572	24,684	8,888	47,180
1940	7,743	7,685	58	7,724	5,792	1,932	16,693	1960	39,056	38,847	209	37,324	27,209	10,114	51,412
1942	7,407	7,351	56	8,114	6,278	1,836	16,449	1961	42,641	42,445	196	40,483	29,579	10,904	55,030
1944	7,235	7,180	55	8,535	6,665	1,870	14,703	1962	45,279	45,053	226	43,147	31,506	11,642	59,255
1946	9,156	9,093	63	9,561	7,416	2,145	13,564	1963	48,309	48,062	247	46,534	33,846	12,689	64,276

[1] Debt as of end of fiscal year.
[2] Largely shared taxes and fiscal aids from State governments.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TAX SHARING: A BRIEF LIST OF REFERENCES, 1961–65

"A Plan To Divert Part of Federal Tax Take to States Hits Snags," Wall Street Journal, November 17, 1964, page 1.

Abiko, Nabuo, and William H. Stringer, "Federal Funds Debated," Christian Science Monitor, December 30, 1964, pages 1, 10.

"Dollars from District of Columbia," Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Monthly Review, February 1965; pages 26–29.

Ecker-Racz, L. L., and I. M. Labovitz, "Practical Solutions to Financial Problems Created by the Mutilevel Political Structure," Conference of the Universities—National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, Princeton University Press, 1961.

"Governors Look to United States," Washington Post, March 24, 1965, page A20.

Heilbroner, R. L., "The Share-the-Tax Revenue Plan," New York Times magazine, December 27, 1964, pages 8, 30–31, 33.

Lutz, Harley L., "States and Surpluses: Why Federal No-Strings Distributions Would Be Unwise," Wall Street Journal, December 28, 1964, page 6.

Maxwell, James A., "Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, 1962.

"No String Federal Aid Finds Backers at Forum," Business Week, April 3, 1965, pages 28–29.

Otten, Alan L., and Charles B. Seib, "No-Strings Aid for States?" the Reporter, January 28, 1965, pages 33–35.

"President Favors Giving the States Share of Revenue," New York Times, October 28, 1964, page 1.

"Revenue Rebates Sought by States," Christian Science Monitor, January 25, 1965, page 11.

"States Bid Johnson Revive Plan To Give Them Share of Tax," New York Times, March 23, 1965, page 1.

"States Look to Heller Plan," New York Times, May 23, 1965, page 12F.

"Tax Sharing Plan May Get Review," New York Times, March 24, 1965, page 18.

"United States Is Still Considering Revenue-Sharing Plan," Washington Post, February 24, 1965, page 1.

"Western Governors Urge States Share in U.S. Revenues," Washington Post, July 13, 1965, page A7.

Worshop, Richard C., "Federal-State Revenue Sharing," Editorial Research Reports, volume 2, December 23, 1964, pages 943–960.

FINANCING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

(NOTE.—Reprinted August 1965, with permission, from the "Proceedings of a Symposium on Federal Taxation" sponsored by the American Bankers Association (1965).

(This reprint of a paper based on research sponsored by the National Committee on Government Finance is issued for general distribution. The National Committee on Government Finance was established in 1960 by the Trustees of the Brookings Institution to supervise a comprehensive program of studies on taxation and Government expenditures. These Studies of Government Finance are supported with funds provided to the Brookings Institution by the Ford Foundation.

(The interpretations and conclusions in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of members of the Brookings staff, the administrative officers of the institution, or the National Committee on Government Finance.

(The Brookings Institution is an independent organization devoted to nonpartisan research, education, and publication in economics, Government, foreign policy, and the social sciences generally. Its principal purpose is to serve the American people and their representatives by helping to bring knowledge more effectively to bear on major and emerging issues of national importance.)

Expenditures of the States and local governments have grown rapidly in recent years, and will continue to grow rapidly in the foreseeable future. These governments are already spending more than $70 billion per year; they will be spending more than $100 billion in 1970. The rise in State-local spending reflects the demands of an expanding population for more and better public services. These demands have strained the fiscal resources of the States and local governments, and they have responded with an unprecedented tax effort. Nevertheless, the need for State-local services will increase faster than State-local revenues.

In the past, State and local needs have been met in part by Federal grants-in-aid for particular purposes. These specific Federal grants have helped to finance programs in which the national interest was particularly strong. But it is now clear that the States and local governments also need help to meet the needs of their citizens in areas of traditional State-local responsibility.

Until recently, the Federal Government has not been able to provide general assistance to the States and local governments, simply because it has had rapidly growing commitments for defense and defense-related programs. But the pressure for larger expenditures for these Federal activities seems to have abated. Unless the Federal Government takes on new responsibilities, it now seems likely that its potential revenues at present tax rates will increase more rapidly than its expenditures. This prospect provides the opportunity for consideration of methods of helping the States and local governments out of their fiscal plight.

This paper discusses the reasons why the States and local governments need assistance, examines several methods of providing such assistance, and suggests the outlines of a new approach that seems worthy of further exploration.

STATE-LOCAL NEEDS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

The burdens placed on State and local governments in the past two decades have been extraordinarily heavy. They found themselves at the end of World War II with a large backlog of unmet needs; and rapid population growth has added new demands on top of this backlog. Between 1953 and 1963, the school-age population (those 5 to 19) rose 40 percent while the total population increased only 19 percent. In the same period, the number of persons over 65 increased 35 percent. Thus, the age groups which require the costliest Government services and contribute least to the tax base—the old and the young—increased much faster than the rest of the population.

The problems of population growth were aggravated by mobility. People moved freely from State to State and from region to region in the search for new jobs and better living conditions. They migrated from the rural to the urban areas, and left the central cities for the suburbs. New communities were developed while others were being abandoned. New schools, roads and sewers, and more teachers, policemen, firemen, and other personnel were urgently needed in most parts of the country. As a result, the largest growth industry in the United States has been State and local government.

The story of how the States and local governments tried to meet the challenge of growth has been told many times. I shall review it briefly here as background for the discussion of the fiscal problems it has created.

Recent expansion of State-local expenditures

In the 10 years ending in 1963, annual State-local expenditures for general governmental purposes (current operations, capital outlay, and interest on debt) more than doubled, rising from $28 billion to nearly $65 billion. About 53 percent of the increase went for education, health, and welfare (table 1).

TABLE 1.—*General expenditure of State and local government, by major function, fiscal years 1953 and 1963* [1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Function	Amount		Increase, 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution	Percent increase
Total general expenditure	$27,910	$64,816	$36,906	100.0	132.2
Education	9,390	24,012	14,622	39.6	155.7
Highways	4,987	11,136	6,149	16.7	123.3
Public welfare	2,914	5,481	2,567	6.9	88.1
Health and hospitals	2,290	4,681	2,391	6.5	104.4
Police and fire	1,636	3,468	1,832	5.0	112.0
Natural resources	705	1,588	883	2.4	125.2
Sewerage and sanitation	908	2,187	1,279	3.5	140.8
Housing and community redevelopment	631	1,247	616	1.7	97.6
General control and financial administration	1,263	2,474	1,211	3.3	95.9
Interest on debt	614	2,199	1,585	4.3	258.1
Other	2,572	6,343	3,771	10.2	146.6

[1] Excludes insurance trust, liquor stores, and public utility expenditures. Includes Federal grants-in-aid.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Most of the expenditure increase reflected the need to provide services for the large increase in population, but price increases also played an important role. Equipment and construction costs rose rapidly. Salaries of teachers and other Government employees had to be brought into better alinement with salary levels in the private economy. Even moderate adjustments in compensation involved large expenditures, since personal services constitute a large part of State-local budgets.

While State-local outlays increased everywhere, the level of expenditures varies greatly in different States. For example, in fiscal year 1963, the five States with the lowest per capita income spent $262 per capita for State-local services, while the five States with highest per capita income spent $417 per capita, and this despite the fact that the five poorest States made a larger tax effort (as measured by the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income) and received more Federal aid per capita than the five richest States. In fiscal year 1964, expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools were over $550 in four States, but less than $350 in nine States. Average monthly payments to families with dependent children in June 1964 varied from less than $20 per recipient in 6 States to more than $40 in 11 States. These wide variations in expenditure levels indicate that deficiencies are far more serious in some parts of the country than in others.

The available expenditure figures reflect amounts spent and not amounts that would have been spent if adequate resources had been available to finance a level of services consistent with need. Satisfactory measures of the degree to which State-local expenditures fall short of need are not available, but many of the deficiencies are obvious: overcrowded classrooms, inadequate health and hospital facilities, poor housing, blighted areas with high levels of juvenile delinquency, clogged streets, and polluted air and water. These deficiencies are all the more glaring against the background of rapidly rising private consumption standards.

Sources of funds

Federal grants to State and local governments tripled between 1953 and 1963 (from $2.9 to $8.7 billion), but this increase accounted for only 16 percent of the $35 billion increase in State-local general revenues. The remaining 84 percent—close to $30 billion—was raised from their own sources (table 2). State-local tax collections increased by $23 billion, or 111 percent during this period (while Federal collections increased by $24 billion, or only 38 percent). State-local debt rose from $34 to $87 billion (table 3).

TABLE 2.—*General revenues of State and local government, fiscal years 1953–63*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Source of increase	Amount		Increase 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution of total increase	Percent distribution of tax increase
General revenue [1]	$27,307	$62,890	$35,583	100.0	
Revenue from Federal Government [2]	2,870	8,722	5,852	16.4	
General revenue from own sources	24,437	54,169	29,732	83.6	
Taxes	20,908	44,281	23,373	65.7	100.0
Property	9,375	20,089	10,714	30.1	45.8
Sales and gross receipts	6,927	14,456	7,529	21.2	32.3
Individual income	1,065	3,269	2,204	6.2	9.4
Corporation income	810	1,505	695	1.9	2.9
Other	2,731	4,962	2,231	6.3	9.6
Charges and miscellaneous	3,520	9,888	6,359	17.9	

[1] Excludes revenue from publicly operated utilities, liquor stores, and insurance trust systems.

[2] Includes in addition to direct grants-in-aid, shared revenues, amounts received from the Federal Government for contractual services, and payments in lieu of taxes. Excludes grants-in-kind (distribution of commodities, technical assistance, etc.) and net loans and repayable advances.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—*State and local government debt, fiscal years 1953–63*

End of fiscal year	Debt outstanding	
	Amount (in millions)	Index 1953=100
1953	$33,782	100
1954	38,931	115
1955	44,267	131
1956	48,868	145
1957	53,039	157
1958	58,187	172
1959	64,110	190
1960	69,955	207
1961	75,023	222
1962	81,278	241
1963	87,451	259

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Almost the entire increase in local tax collections and 46 percent of the combined State-local increases came from higher property tax revenues. While new construction and higher property values contributed significantly to the property tax base, tax rates were increased substantially. In many cities and towns, property tax rates are already too high and further substantial increases in these rates are undesirable.

Consumer taxes provided 32 percent of the 1953–63 increases in State-local tax collections; income taxes provided only 9 percent. These revenue increases also came in large part from the higher incomes and increased spending made possible by economic growth, but new taxes and increases in the rates of old taxes were important contributors. Since 1952, five States have entered the general sales tax field, and two-thirds of the 33 States with general sales taxes in 1952 have raised their rates (some two or three times during this period). Nineteen States now have 3 percent sales tax rates and eight States have rates in excess of 3 percent. Only two States have enacted new individual income taxes since 1949, but tax rates have been raised in most of the other 31 States with income taxes. Income tax rates have been increased most at the lower income levels, and the degree of progressivity has declined. Local governments in several States have moved into sales and payroll taxes; and many States and localities have introduced new taxes on business activities, many of them of the nuisance variety.

Outlook for the future

The fiscal pressure on the States and local governments shows no sign of easing. Although these governments have made great efforts in the past decade, serious deficiencies remain and new needs will be created by continued population growth, increasing urbanization, and rising expectations. There is little doubt that without substantial assistance from the Federal Government, State-local revenues will fall far short of their expenditure needs. The basic problem is that needed State-local expenditures rise faster than gross national product, while State-local taxes, unlike Federal taxes, are relatively unresponsive to economic growth.

The magnitude of the problem may be roughly illustrated by the following projection. Suppose gross national product grows at 5 percent per annum and State-local receipts (including Federal grants) keep pace with this growth. On these assumptions, State-local receipts would reach about $88 billion by 1970. But if needed State-local expenditures grow at 7 percent per annum—which seems conservative in the light of past experience—they would reach $103 billion by 1970, leaving a gap of about $15 billion.

In the absence of additional Federal aid, the States and local governments would have to raise their tax rates to fill this gap of $15 billion. But this is hardly likely to occur. In every State and municipality, fear of driving commerce and industry to competing jurisdictions or of discouraging the entry of new businesses restrains new and increased taxes. Recent elections in many States demonstrate the political hazards facing elected officials who support tax increases. Furthermore, from the standpoint of tax equity and economic policy, it is undesirable to finance these long-run requirements almost entirely by property and consumer taxes—the revenue sources on which State and local governments largely depend.

In brief, the States and local governments cannot—and should not—meet all of their foreseeable revenue needs from the revenue sources now available to them. Given the present division of functions and of revenue sources, it is a matter of national concern that many essential government services may not be provided because of the inadequacy of State-local financial resources.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLOOK

By contrast with State-local receipts, Federal receipts rise rapidly as the economy expands because they are based largely on personal income and corporate profits. With continued economic growth, Federal budget receipts will grow about $6 billion per year in the next 5 years. At the same time, defense expenditures seem more likely to decline a bit than to increase (unless, of course, international conditions worsen), and expenditures for space exploration will probably level off. This means that a dividend of $6 billion will probably be generated each year for nondefense purposes, or a total of $30 billion for a 5-year period.

The availability of such a dividend is a blessing only if it is used wisely. Recent experience suggests that the rate of private saving will exceed the rate of private investment. For this reason, it will not be good economics to allocate a substantial part of the dividend, if any, to debt retirement. Further tax reduction and/or expenditure increases will be needed to avoid an increase in unemployment. Indeed, unless the dividend were used in this way, it would probably not be available at all. Efforts to hold down expenditures while maintaining tax rates would add to the fiscal drag that has already made the achievement of full employment so difficult.

The remedy is to continue to maintain a fiscal policy that stimulates demand if the private economy is not strong enough. This can be done either by reducing taxes or by increasing expenditures for needed Government services. The difference is that tax cuts favor private spending, while expenditures increase investment or consumption in the public sector. It is important to note that public spending need not be at the Federal level. Even though the revenues are Federal, they may be used in part to finance State-local public services.

In the present circumstances, there are too many pressing public needs to justify reliance on tax reduction as the sole mechanism of eliminating the fiscal drag. Some portion of the growth of $30 billion in Federal receipts over the next 5 years will doubtless be needed to finance growing Federal activities. Since so many of the public needs are within traditional State and local responsibilities, it would also be in the national interest to use part of the $30 billion to help finance the more rapidly growing State-local activities. In fact, unless inflationary pressures develop, there will be room in the Federal budget for increased Federal expenditures and additional assistance to the States and local governments, as well as for some tax reduction.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF ASSISTING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

There are many possible ways to help the States and local governments. In choosing among them, most people will agree that we should be guided at least by the following three criteria: First, the amount of assistance should be large enough to make possible a significant increase in the level of State-local services; second, the funds should help to equalize the services available to citizens of different States; and, third, the plan should not reduce the progressivity of the total Federal, State, and local tax system.

The most frequent proposals for accomplishing these objectives involve reduction of the Federal tax take. They include: (1) Federal tax reduction to enable the States to raise their own taxes; (2) relinquishment of specific Federal taxes; (3) tax credits for State and local taxes against Federal taxes; and (4) sharing of Federal tax collections with the States. In addition, suggestions are made to expand Federal grant programs of the type now existing or adding new ones. As the following discussion will indicate, the four tax alternatives fail, in varying degree, to meet the criteria for an appropriate method of fiscal assistance to the States and local governments.

Federal tax reduction

A reduction of Federal taxes does not, in the first instance, have any effect on the fiscal resources of the States and local governments. State-local receipts would increase indirectly as a result of the effect of the Federal tax cut on the national income, but this would be only a small fraction of the revenue released by the Federal Government. The State legislatures and county and city councils would have to take positive action to pick up the remainder of the lost revenue. Although some of this will occur, there is little likelihood that all of the lost Federal revenues will find their way into the budgets of the States and local governments.

Furthermore, to the extent that State-local taxes increase, they will be largely of the sales or property tax variety. These taxes are already overworked and are regressive besides. From the standpoint of tax equity, there is nothing to commend the replacement of Federal income taxes by State and local sales and property taxes.

Relinquishment of Federal taxes to the States

Relinquishment of one or more Federal taxes in the hope that the States and/or local governments will pick them up is also not a practical alternative. State and local governments find it difficult to move into an area vacated by the Federal Government, because of local opposition to tax increases and fear of interstate competition. Past experience with the admissions tax and the electrical energy tax has indicated that reduction or elimination of a Federal tax is not necessarily followed by State and local adoptions. Local governments had long sought reduction or repeal of these taxes on the ground that they were particularly suitable for local use. Following repeal of the Federal electrical energy tax and drastic reduction of the Federal admissions tax, local governments did not make the anticipated use of these taxes. Similarly, it is doubtful that the States and local governments will pick up more than a small proportion of the reduction of Federal excises which will soon be considered by the Congress.

The response of the States and local governments to the release of any tax by the Federal Government is bound to be spotty, because it depends on action by many separate executive and legislative bodies. Moreover, tax relinquishment, like general tax reduction, would fail to channel larger shares of the released revenues to the poorer States.

Tax credits

A more effective way of increasing the chances that the States and localities would pick up the revenue released by the Federal Government would be to give a credit against Federal income taxes for certain State and local taxes paid. However, a credit would not automatically increase State-local revenues. The States and localities which already impose the taxes eligible for the credit would have to raise their rates. Since this could be done without raising total taxes paid by their citizens they might be encouraged to do so, but there would be strong opposition from the groups that would prefer to enjoy the tax reduction provided by the credit. The 17 States without individual income taxes would benefit from the full amount of the credit, provided they imposed such a tax and the credit applied to income taxes. Encouraging these States to enact income taxes would be desirable, but such a move might be regarded as Federal coercion and, in some States, would run up against constitutional barriers.

Tax credits, like the two previous alternatives, fail to redistribute resources to the neediest States. At best, the credit simply diverts the same revenues from the Federal Government to the States where they originate.

Tax sharing

Proposals have been advanced recently that the Federal Government share with the States all, or a portion of, the collections originating in each State from certain Federal taxes. Sharing of tax collections is a common arrangements at the State-local level, but not at the Federal-State level. All States share one or more taxes with their local governments. The usual basis for sharing, however, is not source of collection, but some measure of local need (such as population).

One tax that has been mentioned as a possibility for Federal-State sharing is the Federal tax on local telephone service. But the volume of telephone business is not distributed in a manner that corresponds with financial need. Other suggestions for tax sharing would also help the richer States more than the poorer ones. By the very nature of the plan, tax sharing cannot meet the criterion of equalizing resources of the State and local governments.

Specific grants-in-aid

Federal financial assistance to State and local governments is now given almost entirely in the form of grants to support specific types of government services. Total Federal grants already exceed $11 billion in this fiscal year. Further substantial increases have been recommended to the Congress and are likely to be enacted in the present session. If the administration's plans go through, Federal grants will amount to $13.6 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year.

The main advantage of the specific grant approach is that the Federal Government regulates the conditions under which the funds are spent. It can choose to support activities in which there is a particularly strong national interest. It can set minimum standards. Through matching provisions and similar devices, it can insure that the federally supported programs receive State support as well. Various formulas can be used to allocate funds to States where the need for the particular program is greatest or where fiscal capacity is least.

The new plan for assistance to primary and secondary school education proposed by the administration is a good example of the specific grant-in-aid approach. The Federal Government considers it essential to increase the educational opportunities of the children of low-income families. To this end, the administration proposes to distribute Federal funds to school districts (through the State government) on the basis

of the number of schoolchildren in families with incomes below a certain specified level. The funds are to be used to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, on the basis of plans formulated by local school boards and approved by State boards of education. Special incentive grants are provided for school districts that increase their current expenditures by 5 percent or more. Public reports are required both from the school districts and from the State boards, so that the Commissioner of Education can evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

The support of particular activities through specific grants-in-aid will, and should, remain the basic method of providing assistance to the States and local governments. Only in this manner can the Federal Government assure itself that programs in which it has an interest are carried out by the States and local governments. At the same time, there are many State-local services of national importance that cannot be appropriately dealt with by specific grants. Unnecessary administrative burdens on the Federal Government would be avoided, and the varying preferences of States and localities could be allowed for more fully, if their ability to render these services were strengthened by the adoption of a more general grant system to supplement the specific grant programs.

A GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THE STATES

The discussion so far suggests that the States and local governments will need assistance from the Federal Government over and above the assistance they will receive in specific grants. If a general assistance program were adopted, it would be desirable to devise some method to assure the States and local governments of a dependable source of funds that will grow with the needs of the growing population. Various methods have been proposed to achieve these objectives. For example, a certain percentage of Federal revenues, or of Federal income tax collections, or of the Federal individual income tax base might be set aside for this purpose. Each grows more rapidly than national income, and each would provide a satisfactory basis for calculating the amount to be allotted for State-local purposes. The difficult questions are (1) How should the funds be allocated among the States? and (2) What constraints should the Federal Government impose on the use of the funds?

Method of allocation

Ideally, the amounts to be distributed to the States should be based on their need for public services and their fiscal capacity. Unfortunately, both need and capacity are very difficult to measure.

A State's need depends on its population and age distribution, population density, distribution of income, local costs, and other factors. A State's fiscal capacity also depends on a variety of factors, including population, per capita income, and the value of taxable property and sales. One formula that reflected all these factors would be difficult to construct and highly complex. However, population is probably the simplest and most appropriate measure of the relationship between need and capacity. On the one hand, population is a reasonably good indicator of general need for public services. On the other hand, a per capita allocation would make some allowances for varying capacity: since residents of high-income States pay more Federal taxes per capita than do residents of low-income States, distribution on a per capita basis would redistribute resources from high- to low-income States.

Per capita distribution may not adequately reflect the more urgent need for fiscal assistance by the poorest States, but this deficiency could be recognized by reserving a part of the funds for distribution among States with the lowest per capita income. It is not necessary to allocate more than a small proportion of the funds for this purpose to achieve a substantial redistributional effect. Even if as little as 10 percent of the total were divided among the poorest third of the States (say, in proportion to population weighted by the reciprocal of per capita personal income), the grant to the poorest State would be almost double the amount it would obtain on a straight per capita basis.

It might also be desirable to include a measure of tax effort among the factors determining the share of a particular State. A simple and effective way of allowing for effort would be to weight the per capita grants by the ratio of State to average tax effort in the country, where tax effort is defined as the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income. Inclusion of such an effort factor would give the States an incentive to maintain and increase their own tax collections and allay the fears that States with lower-than-average tax rates were getting a free ride.

Limitations on State uses of the funds

I have already indicated that the most urgent national need is to allocate more of our resources to public programs which are primarily State and local responsibilities. Experience during the last several years indicates that, without central direction or coercion, State governments have actually used most of their scarce financial resources for those urgent needs. They have also allocated increasing amounts through grants-in-aid to local governments for education. (Between 1953 and 1963, 47 percent of the increased expenditures by States went to education—most of it through grants to local governments.) This evidence suggests that, if the States were to receive unencumbered funds from the Federal Government, they would spend them on urgently needed State-local services whether the particular services were stipulated in the legislation or not.

The Federal Government should satisfy itself that the funds would be shared with the local governments in an equitable manner, but this is also much less of a problem than most people might suppose. The extent to which the States delegate responsibilities to, and share revenues with, local governments varies greatly. All States give aid to local units and most give substantial amounts. (In the aggregate, intergovernmental transfers from State to local governments account for more than a third of State general expenditures and nearly 30 percent of local general revenues.) In view of the differences among States in forms of intergovernmental cooperation, it would be difficult to specify that some uniform percentage of the general grant be reserved for local use in all States. The individual States are in a better position to make the allocation in the manner suited to their particular circumstances. Moreover, legislative reapportionment will help assure that the needs of the communities will be recognized by the State legislatures. Several States are already making plans to use existing or new grant-in-aid programs for distribution to the localities of any unencumbered Federal funds that may become available in the future.

On the other hand, it can be argued that it is bad financial management for the Federal Government to give away its funds without exercising a minimum amount of supervision to see that they are employed productively and in the national interest. One method of achieving this objective, and also of allowing flexibility for each State to meet the needs it considers most urgent, would be to require the Governors to file statements showing the plan for the use of the funds in detail. As guidance for the development of such plans, the Congress might indicate the general areas which it regarded as most urgent, including the need for making funds available for local government services. To be sure that the plan represented a broad spectrum of opinion in the State, the Governor might be directed to consult with local officials and representatives of citizens organizations before incorporating the plan in his budget. A detailed audited report on the actual use of the funds might also be required, as well as a certification by appropriate State and local officials that all applicable Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act, have been complied with in the State and local activities financed by these grants.

CONCLUSION

The States will be unable to meet their growing needs without substantial additional assistance from the Federal Government. Part of this additional assistance will come from specific grant programs which are already enacted or are now being considered by the Congress. But the States will need supplementary assistance in the form of general aid to help finance other State-local programs.

The States have important functions to perform in our system of government. They have been subject to criticism in the past, in part because of their inability to carry out these functions with the resources available to them. If we expect the States to play their role effectively, we should increase their ability to do a good job. The alternative is to shift their functions to the Federal Government, which is a solution that most people in the United States would rightfully oppose.

The type of general assistance program I have discussed would help revitalize State governments in this country. It would provide them with a growing source of revenue from taxes that are much more equitable than those that are now available to them. It would help eliminate the recurrent fiscal crises that have impaired their ability to function effectively. It would help them attract the caliber of people they need in executive, judicial, and legislative capacities. It would provide an additional margin for funds for strengthening their grant programs to local government units. And it would encourage them to solve their own problems rather than to vacate their responsibilities to the Federal Government.

In the light of the inadequacy of their finances, the States have made a remarkably good record in the postwar period. With reapportionment, they will do even better. Improvement of the finances of State governments, and through them the local governments, would strengthen our federal system and, at the same time, increase the welfare of all our citizens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed with my remarks.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Tax-Sharing Act".

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Tax-Sharing Fund". The Tax-Sharing Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in this section.

(b) (1) There is hereby appropriated to the Tax-Sharing Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury equal to one percent of the aggregate taxable income reported on individual income tax returns during the preceding calendar year.

(2) For purposes of this subsection—

(A) The term "taxable income" shall have the same meaning as specified in section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(B) The term "individual income tax returns" means returns of the tax on the income of individuals imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, from time to time, but not less often than quarterly, transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Tax-Sharing Fund the amounts appropriated by subsection (b). Such transfers shall, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the amounts referred to in subsection (b). Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent that prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (d), the Secretary shall, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and during each fiscal year thereafter, pay to each State, from amounts appropriated to the tax-sharing fund for the fiscal year in which payments are to be made, a total amount equal to the allotment or allotments of such State in such fiscal year under this section. Such payments may be made in installments periodically during any fiscal year, but not less often than quarterly.

(b) From 80 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State in such fiscal year an amount equal to the product resulting from multiplying—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to such 80 percent of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, by

(2) a number which is the quotient resulting from dividing the revenue effort ratio of such State by the average national revenue effort ratio.

(c) From 20 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each of the thirteen States with the lowest per capita income of individuals an amount in such fiscal year which bears the same ratio to such 20 per centum of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of such thirteen States.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, (1) the amount of any State's allotment in any fiscal year under either subsection (b) or (c), (2) the total amount of any State's combined allotments in any fiscal year under subsections (b) and (c), or (3) the total amount resulting from combining any State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year and any reallotment to such State under this subsection, shall not exceed 12 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 2 for such fiscal year. In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under the provisions of the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) or (c) for such fiscal year.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "State" means any of the various States and the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "revenue effort ratio", when used in relation to any State, means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total of the revenues derived by such State (including revenues derived by any political subdivision thereof) from its own sources, and (B) the denominator of which is the total income of individuals residing in such State.

(3) The term "average national revenue effort ratio" means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total resulting from adding together all revenue effort ratios of the States, and (B) the denominator of which is 51.

(4) The term "income of individuals", when used in relation to any State, means income subject to the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 4. (a) Each State may use payments from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under section 3 for activities, programs, and services in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

(b) Each State shall apportion in accordance with equitable criteria, from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year, to each local government within such State an amount not less than an amount which bears the same ratio to such allotment or allotments as to such local government from revenues of such State derived from all sources during the five years preceding such fiscal year bears to the total amount of revenues of such State derived from all sources during such five year period.

(c) Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government to which such State has apportioned part of its allotment or allotments—

(1) has used any amount of such allotment or allotments for purposes not within the scope of subsection (a),

(2) has not apportioned any amount of such allotment or allotments in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b), or

(3) has not obligated any amount of such allotment or allotments within five fiscal years immediately following the fiscal year in which such allotment or allotments were made

the Secretary shall subtract, from any subsequent allotment or allotments to such State, a total amount equal to the amount referred to in paragraph (1), (2) or (3). In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment in any fiscal year under this subsection, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such year.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "health, education and welfare", when used in relation to any activity, program, or service, shall not include any activity, program, or service designed to provide—

(A) Administrative expenses for State and local government.

(B) Highway programs.

(C) State payments in lieu of property taxes.

(D) Debt service.

(E) Disaster relief.

(2) The term "local government" means any city, township, village, municipality, county, parish, or similar territorial subdivision of a State, but shall not include any department, agency, commission, or independent instrumentality of a State.

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Any State desiring to receive its allotment in any fiscal year under this Act shall, on behalf of itself and any local government which may receive any apportionment thereof, certify and provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary that such State and local government will—

(A) Use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for any allotment paid to such State, and any apportionment made by such State to local governments, under this Act;

(B) make such reports to the Secretary, the Congress, and the Comptroller General, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act including a statement of intent as to how and for what purpose the fund shall be spent, except that any State may make such reports on behalf of any local government thereof; and

(C) adhere to all applicable Federal laws in connection with any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from such allotment.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be deemed to be applicable to any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from any allotment received by a State under this Act.

(b) Whenever in any fiscal year the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government thereof, is not in substantial compliance with the purposes of subsection (a), the Secretary immediately shall—

(1) in the case of the failure of compliance of any State, cancel any subsequent payments to such State under this Act in such fiscal year and reallot any remainder of such State's allotment in such fiscal year to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such fiscal year, or

(2) in the case of the failure of compliance of any local government, require satisfactory assurance that such State will cancel any subsequent payments to such local government under this Act in such fiscal year and reapportion any remainder of such local government's apportionment to other local governments of such State in proportion to the original apportionments to such local governments under section 4(b) for such fiscal year.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year. Each such report shall include a statement of the appropriations to, and the disbursements made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year; and estimate of the expected appropriation to, and disbursements to be made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the current fiscal year; and any changes recommended by the Secretary concerning the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund.

SEC. 7. The Appropriations Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall conduct a full and complete study at least once during each Congress with respect to the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund and the activities, programs, and services provided by the States from allotments received pursuant to this Act, and report its findings upon such study to each House, respectively, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable at the earliest practicable date. This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill would accomplish a number of objectives in an effort to bring about better equalization between the tax resources upon which State and local governments can draw and those which are preempted by the Federal Government. This is a problem which every State—including my own State of New York, which has the second largest tax revenues in the country—must solve.

The Javits plan would provide as follows:

First. Establishment of a trust fund in which 1 percent of aggregate taxable income would be deposited from the Treasury, beginning July 1, 1967. Under present conditions, this would amount to $2.5 billion a year and would grow as the tax base grows. Transfer from the Treasury to the tax-sharing trust fund would take place at least once every 3 months.

Second. Payments from the trust fund to the States under the following formula: (a) 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population. This amount would be increased or decreased depending on the State's own tax effort, which would be measured by the ratio of the total revenues derived by the State over total personal income of individual State residents, as compared with the national average; (b) 20 percent of the fund would be paid each fiscal year to the 13 States with the lowest per capita income. This would be distributed according to population of the States involved.

Third. No State could receive a total payment for a fiscal year in excess of 12 percent of the trust fund in that year.

Fourth. A State may use its allotment of funds for programs in the fields of "health, education, and welfare," but not to include (a) debt service of the States, (b) general administrative expenses for the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of State and local government, (c) highway programs, (d) State payments in lieu of real property taxes, (e) disaster relief.

Fifth. To benefit from the plan, a State must file reports with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General and the appropriate committees of Congress, including a statement of intent as to how and for what purposes it shall spend the money. States must also comply with all applicable laws including title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Secretary of the Treasury must provide a detailed audit report to the Congress annually on the operation of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year.

Sixth. Failure to comply with prescribed conditions would require cancellation of future payments and permit reallocation of the remainder of a State's allocation to other States in proportion to the original allotment.

Seventh. The State must distribute to its local governments an equitable portion of its allotment. The amount distributed to local governments must be no less than the average of the State's distribution of its own revenues to local governments over the previous 5 years.

Eighth. Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Finance Committee of the Senate and Ways and Means Committee of the House, responsible for appropriations and tax legislation, must, at least once during each Congress, conduct a complete study of the operation of the trust fund and provide such legislative recommendations as appropriate.

The measure I introduce today is designed to provide a workable formula to channel Federal revenues to the States with a minimum of strings attached in order to restore fiscal balance to the Federal-State partnership and to strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens effectively.

The general outlines of a plan to distribute Federal tax revenues to the States was first suggested in June 1964 by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It has since been endorsed by a task force of economists headed by Joseph W. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. It was supported by the Republican Governors Association last July as well as by numerous conferences of local officials. But no concrete plan has yet been formulated as to the precise allocation of Federal funds for a wide range of State activities. Despite its complexity, I believe Congress should have before it now a carefully drawn proposal embodying this plan so that it may be fully considered by congressional committees during the period between sessions and may be the subject for hearings early in the second session.

State and local governments face a severe crisis. While the future with its demands for new services is rushing in on them, they remain victims of a financial revenue base which is years out of date. In the past 18 years, total State and local government expenditures have multiplied six times over. State and local outlays for education alone increased from $3 billion at the end of World War II to $22 billion last year. In the past 10 years, these expenditures, now totaling about $87 billion per year, have risen at 8 percent per year, twice as fast as the gross national product. In contrast to this, the Federal Government made cash expenditures during fiscal year 1965, excluding costs of national defense, of $66 billion.

The sad fact is that the present resources of State and local government are not sufficient to meet the expanding needs caused by exploding population, rapid urbanization, and advanced technology; nor is there any indication that this situation will correct itself. Indeed, almost every imaginable tax resource has already been subjected to increasing and sometimes undesirable pressures. State taxes alone have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964, an average increase of over a billion dollars a year. In 1965, property taxes increased 7.3 percent over the previous year; sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes rose 7.5 and 6.3 percent respectively—all in 1 year.

In 1964, State tax increases siphoned off one-third of the $6.5 billion Federal tax cut. Despite warnings from economists, a bewildering variety of consumption, payroll, and service taxes have appeared at the local level from Detroit to Oakland, Fairbanks to Mobile, Los Angeles to Baltimore. Over 40 cities have recently imposed motel and hotel taxes in an effort to shift some of their tax burdens to nonresidents. In a frantic search for additional revenues, New Hampshire has instituted a State-sponsored sweepstakes on horseracing.

The end is not in sight. Twenty-six Governors have asked for tax increases this past spring and many of those who are relying on larger yields from present taxes have warned their legislatures that increased taxes are a future necessity. Yet there is evidence that traditional taxes have already reached the limits of desirable expansion.

Dramatic proof of the growing disparity between government responsibilities and government resources is found in the increase in State and local debt. From a $15.9 billion level in 1946, public indebtedness at the State and local level almost doubled by 1952. Since that year, State and local debt has tripled, an average increase of more than $4½ billion per year.

State governments, which can tap a wider variety of revenue sources than local authorities can, have been active in using these sources. Between 1946 and 1963, no less than 14 States instituted a tax on cigarettes, while general sales taxes were added as a source of funds by 13 States. At the same time, four States added an individual income tax. Of course, virtually all States have also increased rates on previously tapped tax sources.

The financing of local government expenditures has been a problem of at least similar difficulty. These governments rely almost exclusively upon property tax revenues. While the postwar increase in property valuations has swelled the property tax base, there has still been a steady need to raise the property tax rates themselves.

Interstate competition to attract new industry—and similar competition among localities—has undoubtedly hampered efforts to add to current revenues, particularly in the case of corporate taxes. States and localities generally offer some form of inducement to attract new corporations to their areas, with the long-range objective of creating new job opportunities and increasing the overall tax base, and this competition tends to restrain local governments from increasing tax rates.

In the face of heavy demands placed upon State and local governments, the increase in their taxes and borrowing has been insufficient to prevent them from becoming gradually more dependent upon financial assistance from the Federal Government. The bulk of Federal assistance in the form of grants-in-aid programs has grown from a total of $884 million in 1946 to approximately $11 billion in 1965. In 1964 the Federal expenditure of $9.8 billion represented approximately 16.7 percent of total taxes and other general revenues raised by State and local governments, compared with only 7.3 percent in 1946. Grants to help support public welfare programs and to help build public roads and highways have shown the sharpest

increase over the postwar years, and together they totaled some $7.5 billion in 1964.

Despite their achievements to date, State and local governments will continue to face a wide variety of additional public needs, and they do not want to curtail their responsibilities. They have doubled their employment over the past 13 years and increased their budgets many times. Obviously, problems of water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, and substandard recreation and housing facilities, as well as inadequate health care exist. In our vast and diversified country, these services can often be most effectively provided only through programs run at the State and local level. Thus, the immediate problem is to develop intergovernmental relationships that will enable State and local governments to carry out their vital role. Innovation and experimentation will be needed in future Federal-State cooperation and in planning and budgeting public programs if we want to get maximum benefit out of every dollar spent.

Under the plan I introduce today, New York whose 1963–64 State and local revenues amount to $7,445 million—the second largest in the Nation—would receive $202 million; Alaska, with State and local revenues during this period amounting to $89 million—the smallest in the Nation—would receive $2.6 million. Similarly, California would receive $213 million and Arkansas, $47 million. Through this plan, for example, New York would receive a 31-percent increase in Federal aid; California, 17 percent; Ohio, 20 percent; Alabama, 39 percent; Colorado, 16 percent, and Kentucky, 37 percent.

It may be argued by some that State and local governments will not use these Federal funds wisely or that they will use them to reduce their own taxes and expenditures for necessary programs. Experience of the past, however, indicates that such fears are groundless. A large proportion of total State and local outlays over the past years have been used for educational, health, and welfare purposes—an indication that local governments are cognizant of the needs of their people in these areas and are attempting to meet them.

Grants made to State and local governments under a plan such as this will enable these bodies to operate more independently. Local officials will be free of Federal domination, and the spread of a growing Federal bureaucracy may be halted. State and local governments will be in a stronger financial position, and a better fiscal balance will be achieved between Federal, State, and local governments.

Now, let me direct one word to those who may feel that the sort of tax-sharing plan I propose would mean further incursion on State prerogatives. Of course, there is always a possibility that this can happen, but the choice we face is not between State dollars and Federal dollars, but between Federal dollars bound by strings and conditions and funds which are relatively unconditional and can help buttress the capability of State and local governments to carry their responsibilities and not to abdicate authority to the Federal Government due to financial inability to discharge it.

For, we have to look to the days and years ahead when the demand for more and better local governmental services will increase.

Critics on the one side of the political spectrum are suspicious of the States and seemingly convinced of Federal "infallibility"; critics on the other side are suspicious of Washington. But mutual suspicions should not produce a deadlock, for this country cannot be governed well unless Government is imaginative and active and responsible and works at all levels in a Federal-State system.

I feel that the proposal embodied in the bill I introduced today can help prepare our governmental system to meet needs of the coming decades, and can help us to put cooperative federalism into practice for the benefit of all our people.

HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in yesterday's Star there appeared a story extolling the merits of Harry McPherson, formerly general counsel of the Senate policy staff on the Democratic side.

Harry McPherson is an extraordinary and outstanding individual. He performed his duties in the Senate with intelligence, integrity, and humanity. I am delighted that this recognition is being given to this outstanding American.

Mr. President, when a man reaches the age of retirement and can look back at a fruitful career, he feels that his life has been well spent. But when a man in his middle thirties can look on a single decade of his life and can feel the same broad sense of accomplishment, he has even greater reasons to be proud. Such a man is Harry C. McPherson, who at 36 years of age has already won the admiration and respect of his colleagues for his intellectual and personal qualities, his drive and wide-ranging interests.

An anonymous colleague of his at the Department of State put it well when he said, "he has a brilliant mind, he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings." What greater tribute can a man be paid?

Harry McPherson came to Washington fresh out of law school in 1956 as a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody liked immediately—he is still a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody still likes. But now, only 9 years later, he is also a man who has served with distinction in the Senate, the Departments of State and Defense and now the White House.

The past for Harry has been a fine one—he has already had a rich and varied career—the future, I am certain, holds even greater promise.

It is to President Johnson's great credit that he has selected a man like Harry McPherson to serve as a member of the outstanding White House staff.

I am happy to join all Harry McPherson's friends in commending him for his many achievements which merited this fine article in the Washington Star of yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Sunday Star of October 10, 1965, entitled "New White House Aid, a Man of Versatility," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW WHITE HOUSE AID A MAN OF VERSATILITY

(By Robert Walters)

Harry C. McPherson, Jr., the White House's unofficial resident playwright, peered from behind a pile of papers on his desk to explain one of the problems confronting him.

"I'm just not the kind of guy who can turn off, then turn on and go full blast," he said. "I do an awful lot of scrabbling before I get any ore."

The method may not be orthodox, but ability and creativity have more than compensated for McPherson's "scrabbling" since he came to Washington in 1956.

One of the most recently appointed presidential aids, McPherson moved into his second-floor White House office in late August.

He is one of several Texans working there who disprove the theory—embraced by some cynics—that presidential staff members are so many "old cronies" of Lyndon Johnson, and are hired for that reason.

BRIGHT YOUNG MEN

If he must be stereotyped, McPherson can best be classified as one of Washington's bright young men on the way up. At the age of 36, he is earning $28,500 and quickly gives the impression he is worth every taxpayer dollar.

A bouncy, cheerful, and soft-spoken young man, McPherson describes himself as "something of a utility infielder" at the White House, handling everything from speech writing to legal assistance on such diverse topics as agriculture and international education.

His outside interests range from squash and tennis to drama and archeology. He is an Air Force veteran, a former senior warden of his church, and holds two graduate degrees.

POLITICALLY ASTUTE

McPherson's former associates at the State and Defense Departments have nothing but praise for him. "He sees the political significance of a problem with intellectual penetration," said one.

"Harry's a good and rather quick judge of character. He's got good political instincts. And he's very unlikely to let you know something he doesn't want you to know," said a State Department official, a former coworker. He added:

"He's usually pretty sure his judgment is right—and he lets you know it, but never in any oppressive way. You don't get the impression he's a know-it-all.

"His personal inclination is somewhat in the direction of his cultural interests. He enjoys music and has written and directed plays.

"He has a good feel for personal relationships in a bureaucratic government. He's bright, forward-looking and not doctrinaire. He's obviously dedicated to the President, personally as well as professionally. He's got a long way to go."

McPherson is considerably more modest in describing himself. But one quickly perceives the vast range of his interests when, during a half-hour conversation, he quotes Homer, Mort Sahl, and Albert Camus, then goes on to discuss Bertold Brecht, Joseph McCarthy, and Jelly Roll Morton.

For someone born 9 weeks before the 1929 "Black Friday" stock market collapse, McPherson has come a long way. After 2 years at Southern Methodist University, he transferred to the University of the South and graduated in 1949 with a B.A. degree in English.

He began graduate studies at Columbia University, but left to join the Air Force in 1950, shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war. In 1953, he returned to civilian life, only to find Senator McCarthy terrorizing the country with his "anti-Communist" crusade.

"That was one of the things which made me decide to enter law school," he explained. "At Columbia, I thought what I wanted to do mostly was to write poems and be a teacher, but I later became more interested in politics."

TEXAS LAW GRADUATE

Entering the University of Texas Law School in 1953, he graduated with his law degree in 1956. The Senate Democratic policy committee was seeking an assistant counsel at the time.

The committee chairmanship is held by the Senate's Democratic leader, who at that time was Lyndon Johnson. To fill the slot, Johnson asked the law school faculty to recommend a bright young graduate.

"I guess he was looking in the right month," McPherson explained with a grin. "I took the job and came up here for what I thought was 2 years. I certainly didn't have any plans for moving permanently."

He never made it back to his hometown of Tyler, Tex. In 1958, he was named associate counsel of the policy committee. Three years later, he was elevated to general counsel. All during that period he worked closely with Johnson.

TO EXECUTIVE BRANCH

When Johnson assumed the Vice-Presidency, however, McPherson remained in the Senate employ. In 1963, he moved to the executive branch, serving first as deputy executive branch, serving first as Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for International Affairs.

In April 1964, he received the additional title of Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army for civil functions. Four months later, he moved to the State Department where he served as assistant secretary for educational and cultural affairs.

He remained there until receiving the White House appointment—a post which involves responsibility for agriculture, rural life, urban affairs, international education and tariff and trade matters.

When he can forget about those concerns after a 10- or 12-hour day, McPherson turns to a wide variety of personal interests. Chief among them is drama.

Brecht is probably his favorite playwright, but he acknowledges considerable interest in Eugene Ionesco, Tennessee Williams, George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare as well.

About 10 years ago, McPherson began writing and directing one-act plays for an amateur company of fellow parishioners at St. Marks Episcopal Church. "It developed beyond my expectations, it probably was the most fecund experience I have ever had in the church," he said.

McPherson said he did "only the most modest kind of occasional reading in archeology" but friends described him as something of an authority on the subject.

The family expert in archeology, McPherson insisted, is his wife, Clayton, who watches over a daughter, Courtenay, and a son, Peter, in the McPherson's Capitol Hill home.

"Most of our income since we were married has been spent on records," said McPherson, who described himself as a "Mozart fiend and a Bach lover," before launching into a discussion of Louis Armstrong and Jelly Roll Morton.

CHURCH INTERESTS WIDE

His added governmental responsibilities have forced McPherson to give up his post of senior warden at St. Marks—the highest lay office in the parish—but one church leader recently described him as "a man who always has been a leader in the church." He added that McPherson has lectured at colleges on the relationship of theology and politics.

"Harry is an excellent theologian. In the councils of the church he is very much respected," the man added. "He's very active, but he's more than just a 'good Joe' who helps to run the bazaars."

The church leader went on to describe McPherson as "one of the coming great men—but one who has no yearning for the public spotlight at all."

FELLOW WORKERS

Other former coworkers echoed that opinion. Because they weren't sure McPherson would appreciate anything said about him for publication, they asked to be quoted anonymously.

"There's no question in my mind that this guy will make his mark in life," said a State Department official who once worked closely with McPherson. "He has a brilliant mind; he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings."

He continued:

"Books seem to fascinate Harry. He also likes to swim, but I don't think he gets enough time for it anymore. And he likes a good cigar.

"He does his homework. When we went before Congress with our budget presentation, he had the answers at his fingertips. They appreciate someone who knows what he's doing."

From a former coworker at the Defense Department came this praise:

"He's a terrific guy to work for—a very yeasty kind of man who sees life as a challenge. He's a very effective and agile speaker on his feet. When he talked off the top for his new boss, he described himself well."

McPherson has similar praise for his head. He always handled Johnson as "the most tremendous man to work for I ever encountered in my life." Asked if he regretted having to give up some outside interests because of the heavy White House responsibilities, he said:

"I've got only one life. If I get a chance to become involved in the affairs of state, it's well worth it."

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, every Senator remembers when Harry McPherson used to sit at the front table. He had, indeed, one of the most cordial personalities of anyone I have ever encountered, and along with it there was a real desire to help Members on both sides of the aisle. Coupled with that was a singular capacity not only for legislative but for executive work. I watched Harry McPherson when he went to work on the White House staff. I know he has made a steady advance on that staff. I salute him and join in any encomium that reflects glory and recognition to a former staff member of the U.S. Senate. Harry McPherson richly deserves the compliment paid him in the article in yesterday's Sunday Star.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished minority leader for the kind words he has had to say concerning Harry McPherson.

WISHING THE PRESIDENT WELL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, like most of the people in the United States, we in West Virginia send our best wishes to President Johnson for a complete and speedy recovery from his recent illness.

I believe the sentiments of the country are well expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times of October 8, 1965. I ask that the editorial be printed in the record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed as follows:

TIME FOR A REST?

The prayers of the Nation today will go to Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, for successful surgery and a speedy recovery. As was the case when President Eisenhower suffered three serious illnesses while in the White House, politics will stop at the sickroom door.

Removal of the gall bladder has become an almost commonplace operation, but the procedure still involves the excision of a human organ from the abdominal cavity and a layman cannot look upon the surgery with the same matter-of-factness as a physician. The President, of course, is assured the best in the way of professional care under hospital conditions both for surgery and recuperation that are unparalleled.

Possibly the enforced slowdown which will be the President's lot as he convalesces will be good for him and the country. It will give heated congressional tempers a chance to cool and pave the way for enactment of the rest of his program when the lawmakers return to work next year.

In the Senate, a filibuster led by Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is underway on the repeal of section 14(b). Ol' Ev has worked with President Johnson closely during most of the long session, and it is possible he feels he must assert his prerogatives as the Republican leader in order, so to speak, to keep the franchise.

The House also is chafing under the amount of legislation it has passed in the extraordinarily productive session. Its mood is not unusual after Labor Day when the days begin to drag and thoughts of adjournment fill the air.

Some tired and frustrated Members are getting fed up with being called rubberstamps for writing one of the great achievement records in history. Some want to go home to mend fences—or just to rest.

Republicans recently tied up the House for 12 hours in protest against what they claimed was overuse of the process by which bills can be taken away from the Rules Committee after 21 days of inaction. The lower Chamber whipped through a resolution endorsing unilateral action against communism in the Western Hemisphere—a measure that was in no way part of the administration's foreign policy program—and it passed a wage bill for several employees much higher than recommended by the White House. Home rule for Washington, which the administration decided to push, was beaten, and only by 10 votes was an attack on the foreign aid appropriation bill beaten off.

President Johnson's postoperative convalescence would give him a thoroughly sound excuse for telling Congress it could go home and come back when it was in a better humor. He already has got more at this session than any President in history, and most of his major legislative goals have been attained.

L.B.J. doesn't ordinarily surrender without battling to the last ditch—and he may not this time. But prudence dictates that he take it easy for a while, and he might as well let Congress do the same.

HIGHER RANKS FOR WOMEN IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, great strides have been made in recent months to break down barriers which discriminate against women in various fields of employment. Much of this progress results from recommendations advanced by the Commission on the Status of Women, created by the late President John F. Kennedy. It was my pleasure to serve on that Commission and to consider ways to discard outmoded limitations on the full and effective use of women in our labor force.

On September 23, 1965, the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army met in Washington, D.C., and adopted a resolution petitioning the Secretary of Defense to establish higher ranks for the women who direct the women's branches of our Armed Forces—WACS, WAVES, Women Marines, Nurse Corps and medical services of the three armed services.

Trustees of the association have explained that the women directors of these units are "outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities."

It is my hope that the Secretary of Defense will give favorable consideration to the recommendations of the association's trustees. Such action would be in keeping with policies of our Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the text of the petition presented to the Secretary of Defense by the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRUSTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY PETITIONING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RELATIVE TO HIGHER RANKS FOR DIRECTORS OF THE WOMEN'S BRANCHES OF THE ARMED FORCES

1. The Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army respectfully requests the Secretary of Defense to initiate steps for the creation of field and flag ranks in the several women's branches of the Armed Forces, and for the increase in the number of senior officers thereof.

2. It is the considered opinion of this council that the role of women in the military forces of the United States will be an expanding one. The experience of World War II, and years subsequent thereto, have demonstrated beyond doubt the value of the talents and ability of women in the successful prosecution of the missions of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Recognition of this fact is best evidenced by the permanent status accorded women in these branches of the Armed Forces by Public Law 625, 80th Congress, June 12, 1948.

3. Currently the highest grade or rank which any woman can achieve is that of colonel in the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, or captain in the Navy, and in the law there is provision for only one such officer in each, to wit, the officer charged with the overall direction of the particular branch.

4. It is submitted that the responsibility which is now vested in the directors of the WAC, WAVES, Women Marines, and WAF, and in the chiefs of the Nurse Corps and the medical services in the three armed services, justifies revision in ranks so that each director should be accorded the rank of brigadier general or equivalent. In addition, the commanding officer of the WAC Training Center and Schools at Fort McClellan should be accorded the rank of brigadier general. This is the mobilization base for expansion of the Women's Army Corps in time of war and hence has responsibilities for planning that merit a higher rank. Provision should also be made for the promotion of more lieutenant colonels to the rank of colonel, who would be assigned to positions in which a male colonel is normally assigned. It is firmly believed that there are positions for from 5 to 10 WAC colonels.

5. Under the present organizational structure the ceiling on rank imposes certain inequities which place women at a disadvantage, and we believe them to be inconsistent with the policy of the U.S. Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. For example, the director of the WAC is outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities.

Moreover, the present ceilings on rank are bound to have an adverse effect on morale and the incentive of female officers who are performing their duties in such an outstanding manner that under similar circumstances male officers could expect promotion to higher rank. This is confirmed by the rising trend in the number of those voluntarily retiring from the Women's Army Corps after 20 years' service.

6. In the congressional hearings on legislation designed to give the WAC permanent status in the U.S. Army, General Eisenhower said in part:

"In tasks for which they are particularly suited, WAC's are more valuable than men, and fewer of them are required to perform a given amount of work. * * * In the disciplinary field they were, throughout the war, a model for the Army. * * * More than this, their influence throughout the whole command was good. * * * I assure you that I look upon this measure as a must. * * * You are at perfect liberty to quote me privately or publicly in this matter."

(House Committee on Armed Services subcommittee hearings on S. 1641, February 18, 1948, including letter from Chief of Staff to chairman of House Committee on Armed Services, January 30, 1948.)

Similar laudatory remarks on other women's branches of the Armed Forces during World War II can be cited. Time has confirmed the value of women as an integral part of our military forces.

THE COMING WAR OF HUNGER

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, no proposal made during this session of Congress is as important as the call to a war against worldwide hunger urged by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota and former Food for Peace Director, Mr. MCGOVERN. And no proposal is receiving more deserved attention than his International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965, S. 2157, introduced June 17. I am glad to say that I am a cosponsor of that bill.

My mail almost daily contains articles from newspapers and magazines telling of the coming world food and population crisis and our colleague's proposal to meet it.

My weekend mail includes an interview with Senator MCGOVERN and a subsequent editorial in the October 4 and October 7 issues of the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent for these two items to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Monitor editorial concludes:

Senator MCGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

I believed very strongly when I joined the Senator from South Dakota as a coauthor of S. 2157 that our agricultural production capacity is our greatest asset in the struggle for world peace, and that this would ultimately be widely recognized. It is gratifying that this recognition is coming with great speed.

Typical of press response to our proposal is one I have received from Mr. MCGOVERN's home State—an editorial which filled the editorial column of the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal on Sunday, October 3. It contains endorsement of both the Senator's proposed war against hunger and of his effort to remove restrictions which now prevent our sale of surplus wheat to Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rapid City Journal editorial also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senator MCGOVERN's world food proposal began to receive widespread attention very quickly after it was made last June.

The press saw it both as a foreign policy tool, and as a new domestic farm program—producing to meet human need instead of subsidizing acreage restrictions to control surpluses.

United Press International distributed a background article by Marguerite Davis which was printed in a great many papers across the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article as it appeared in the Springfield, Ill., Statesman, be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, perhaps most significant is the breadth of the ideological spectrum from which endorsements have come.

An article and editorial by Carroll Streetor, editor, which appeared in the very conservative Farm Journal has already appeared in the RECORD.

I shall not ask to include the full text, but I was struck by an advertisement which appeared in Life magazine, September 24, indicating that even the usually very conservative business world is becoming alert to the constructive value in the foreign relations field of our capacity to produce food.

The top two-thirds of the full-page advertisement was a magnificent picture, in color, of a wheat field at harvest time. There were fleecy clouds in an otherwise blue and sunny sky. On the ground, combines were moving through the field.

It was a beautiful, modern-day harvest scene.

The caption on the picture was: "This Is a Battlefield."

Beneath the picture the Republic Steel Corp., the advertiser, told its readers:

Day in, day out, giant weapons of peace are fighting the whole world's common enemy, hunger—right here on your own vast farmlands. And it is many battles later than you think. Creeping hunger is advancing over much of the world's bursting population. The biggest barrier to widespread starvation is grain from the breadbaskets of America.

The text of the advertisement then deals with the merit of Republic Steel Corp. steels used in farm machinery.

A reader could not avoid, Mr. President, observing how much greater satisfaction the men of this corporation appeared to reflect in this ad from the contribution their products make to machinery for the battlefields of peace, than they find when their steel must be shaped into instruments of war, destruction and death.

It was a very forceful advertisement; forceful in the cause of a world food program, forceful in its demonstration that there is economic benefit for all—farmers, urban workers, and industry—in waging the war against want, and forceful in its revelation of the pride that men and corporations will find in making a constructive contribution to the welfare of man.

I am convinced that we have seen the beginning of a movement in the session of the Congress now drawing to an end which will become a reality in the next session and a very powerful instrument of foreign policy, and peace building, in the years just ahead.

I want to congratulate and thank the Senator from South Dakota for the leadership he is providing in this and other fields.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO DECLARE WORLD WAR ON FAMINE

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—"We ought to declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet," says South Dakota's Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, "and do it now."

"The number of people is outracing the amount of food available at an almost unbelievable rate," he says. "In the next 35 years the population of the world will double—from 3 billion to 6 billion. And the food supply is not going up significantly.

"The enormous food gap in prospect is the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century," the Senator contends.

"Hunger and malnutrition are serious enough today. But major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years, unless we start today to tackle it."

The American people are not aware of the facts, Senator MCGOVERN said in an interview. They still think of large American surpluses when in fact these are sharply reduced and approaching dangerously low levels. They see great efforts being made to produce birth-control programs, but these cannot be expected to solve the problem in time.

"Our position of moral leadership will not permit us to turn our backs on this problem. Nor will our national security. Much of the tension and unrest that opens the way for violent upheavals and Communist inroads have their roots in hunger and misery."

Senator MCGOVERN has a bill before Congress to attack this problem. It would turn American farms back from crop controls to deliberately stimulated production.

"If we begin now to divert a portion of the $2 billion annual farm control budget into the purchase, shipment, and distribution of farm commodities abroad, where they are needed, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expense."

The McGovern bill would spend $500 million next year for three purposes:

To purchase needed nutritious foods in the United States for distribution abroad.

To help the receiving countries to store and distribute the food more efficiently, with better facilities.

Greatly to strengthen the food-producing capacity of farm people in the underdeveloped world, by all available technical and educational means.

A similar sum would be added each year for 6 years. The total would then equal the amount spent on foreign aid of all sorts by the United States in the coming year.

FARMERS CORPS SUGGESTED

But the switch from negative cropland restriction to a program of stimulating production in the United States would be a strong stimulus to the American economy, Mr. MCGOVERN said.

One of the Senator's more intriguing suggestions is that of an American farmers corps, not unlike the Peace Corps except that its members would have high professional ability.

It would consist of "retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time."

They would go out like the highly successful agricultural county agents in the United States, as teachers who can show how, as well as tell how, and who know how to combine new technology with old skills.

"When I was Food-for-Peace Director under President Kennedy," he recalled, "I reached the conviction that the most overwhelming paradox of our time was to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"The sciences have broken the space barrier, at a cost heading toward $20 billion, but not the bonds of hunger."

The Senator based many of his facts on the rapidly enlarging hunger gap on a new official study of the situation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It compared for the first time, it is said, comprehensive figures on population growth with similarly careful figures on expectable food production.

OWN RESERVES CHECKED

A typical conclusion: In Asia, merely to maintain present meager diets, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. This would require an annual use of an additional amount of fertilizer that would nearly equal the world's entire output of fertilizer today.

For many Americans, however, the Senator's account of the present state of American farm surpluses will be equally suprising.

"They are not much above the level, now, that is needed for our own national reserves," he said. "For example: Wheat stocks have been worked down from 1.4 billion bushels at the start of this decade to 800 million bushels today. Corn and other feed grain supplies have been sharply reduced.

"The present composite reserve of wheat and feed grains is scarcely equal to 6 months' consumption in the United States."

Senator MCGOVERN recalled that President Johnson recently suggested that Congress build a food reserve. If this were done on a 6-month supply basis, the present food-for-peace program of American aid abroad would have to be eliminated, or American farm production sharply enlarged.

Senator MCGOVERN wants the United States to work with and through the United Nations, as well as on its own, in the big enterprise that he recommends. The effort will have to be cooperative and international, he said.

Senator MCGOVERN, coming from a farm State as he does, is aware of the great complexity of the task of helping other countries with their farm production. The collapse of the high hopes for technical assistance after the last World War, he agrees, are illustration enough.

He mentions, as reasons why these hopes were not justified, the lack of an all-around approach to the problem: lack of rural education, adequate credit, forms of landownership that reward incentive, rural extension services, farm to market roads or cash markets for produce. He blames the shortage of fertilizer, pesticides, good irrigation facilities and methods, hybrid seed and feed mixing equipment—and the knowledge to apply them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 7, 1965]

WAR ON HUNGER

Two of this newspaper's Washington correspondents recently took a long, hard look at the world's rapidly approaching food crisis. Their purpose was not to alarm but to alert.

They report that data produced by demographers, agronomists, economists, and other specialists point to a coming world famine of unbelievable proportions. It can be averted only by a worldwide effort far greater than anything now on the horizon.

One fact alone explains the profound concern expressed by authorities: World populations are soaring way beyond the unimpressive growth in food production. Every single week there are over 1 million more people living on this earth than were here the week before.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, sees the enormous food gap in prospect as the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century. He asks that we declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet and do it now.

To meet the world hunger challenge is not only an imperative moral responsibility but a matter of the utmost practical urgency to every inhabitant of this globe, including those in the most affluent societies. A world half of which is well fed and half of which is starving cannot long endure.

The most radical and violent political and social movements feed on extreme desperation born of the threat of mass starvation. Knowledge of this ought to be sufficient warning to the more affluent North Atlantic community to bend every effort to find solutions while there is yet time.

American efforts to meet the problem, while commendable, are still far from adequate. Nor can the United States solve a problem of this magnitude merely by its own efforts, however great.

The export of food, fertilizers, insecticides, credits, agricultural know-how, and so on, together with the recent tentative steps taken toward encouraging effective birth control programs, when all put together, still fall far short.

Only greatly increased food production coupled with much wider use of effective birth control methods will solve the world's hunger problem. And only then will conditions be conducive to world peace. In view of this, we question Pope Paul VI's

statement before the United Nations, apparently advocating reliance on the one but not the other.

Senator McGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Rapid City Sunday Journal, Oct. 3, 1965]

SURPLUS FOODS SHOULD BE USED

What to plant and how much is the problem plaguing legislators and farmers. The 4-year proposal now approved in Washington is a temporary, patched job which seems to have appeased very few.

It is known the United States can produce more food, whatever the crop or animals might be, on fewer acres than ever before. For those in the cities, it is difficult to understand why millions of dollars are paid each year to store more grain, bury more lard, give away butter, fail to process cotton for fabric or oil.

It is equally difficult for millions of Americans to understand why other people on this globe go hungry.

South Dakota's Senator GEORGE McGOVERN offers a solution which could head off world famine and aid the cause of world peace. On September 20, Senator McGOVERN told a regional Methodist conference in Sioux Falls:

"Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world." He suggested hunger is a focal point where the United States can earn good will, rather than ill will.

Carl A. Quarnberg, Rapid City businessman with wide interests as operator of a flour mill and feed, seed, and grain buyer, processor, and distributor wrote the following letter to Senator McGOVERN:

"Press reports on your address greatly intrigue me.

"You are right. 'Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world.' In that statement, you may have uncovered a really great idea that can be of real service to wheat farmers as well as starving people of the world.

"Wheat programs of the past have not been fully acceptable to farmers of South Dakota. And wheat farmers of western South Dakota are even more independent than those living on the east side of the river. Western ranchers and farmers are definitely individualistic. They like standing on their own feet. They definitely resent the idea that a government employee sitting at a mahogany desk in Washington, D.C., must tell them what to plant and how much. They want their independence back. They want to use their own judgment as to what and how much.

"Again you are right. 'It is time to tell the world that we have a great unused farm capacity and that America is going to use it to help end hunger in the world.'

"Over the past many years, the United States has continually reduced wheat production while at the same time and under the same world conditions, Canada, Australia, and Argentina (even Germany and France) has encouraged increased wheat production, much to the benefit of their farmers as well as consumers.

"Again you are right when you say, 'If we spend as much money purchasing and distributing our farm surplus production as we now spend paying farmers not to produce, we would lay a foundation for a greater farm prosperity at home and much less hunger abroad.' You have expressed a perfect two-point idea: Food for starving millions of the world; and in the very same breath, a possible answer to the ever-present but still unsolved farm problem.

"Your experience as director of food for peace points to you as better informed on world food problems than any man in public life today. I urge you to pursue your idea to final conclusion. Laying all politics aside, I pledge my personal support to this end."

The capacity to produce seemingly unlimited supplies of commodities for citizens of the United States has been challenged by the farm bills. More production results on fewer acres Subsidies for unplanted acres merely add to the total cost for taxpayers.

McGOVERN served as director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy. Subsequently he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

McGOVERN and Senator KARL MUNDT do not see eye to eye on the farm bills, nor on how best the surpluses might be utilized. Senator MUNDT does not believe in giving aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in any manner. Yet it seems there should be a way to win good will.

What better way to win than with our surplus food?

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Springfield (Ill.) Statesman]

SENATOR URGES CROP USE TO FEED A HUNGRY WORLD

(By Marguerite Davis)

WASHINGTON.—For years, a bountiful America has struggled—and spent millions—to control its farm surpluses.

Now a farm-State Senator wants an about-face which would let farmers grow more food on more land and would distribute more of it to the world's hungry millions.

Led by Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a group of midwestern Democrats in Congress contend it is neither sensible nor moral for the United States to follow a program of sharply curtailed food production when every day half a billion people go to bed hungry.

And they warn that strict Federal controls have reduced the Nation's food stockpiles to such a low point, that there are not enough of some of basic commodities to maintain a 6-month reserve for home consumption.

They admit that the problems in their plan could be many and complicated. But they argue that the results would be good for American farmers as well as for international relations. They believe President Johnson agrees.

The roots of the food-for-peace (FFP) program lie in a 1954 law which provides for the distribution of surplus U.S. crops to have-not nations. The food may be given, bartered, sold for the currency of the receiving nation, or bought through a 40-year American loan plan.

In 1961 the program was designated food for peace, with McGOVERN as its first Director. But he found his office carried little authority. He resigned in 1962 to run for the Senate. But his 18-month exposure to food for peace left its mark.

On one side of the world he had seen mass graves of those who had starved to death; children whose gaunt limbs and distended stomachs testified to their hunger, and some blind from lack of proper nourishment.

At home were millions of acres taken out of production in a continuing battle against too much food, even while farmers declared that their private economic depression could eventually engulf the cities.

President Johnson suggested in his farm message to Congress establishment of strategic reserves of food but he submitted no bill to accomplish this.

Representative CLAIR A. CALLAN, Democrat, of Nebraska, did so June 3 with a measure which called for reserves of food equal to half a year's requirements. According to his calculations, this would wreck the food-for-peace program.

Under his proposal, for example, 600 million bushels of wheat would be kept on hand. That would leave only 41 million for distribution abroad.

Two weeks later McGOVERN submitted to the Senate an "International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965." It would authorize an additional $500 million of foods of all kinds, not merely those now surplus, for distribution to hungry nations.

The program would be increased at the rate of $500 million a year until it reached $3.5 billion in 10 years.

His bill went to the Foreign Relations Committee whose chairman, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has indicated he believes food-for-peace program should be stepped up from the mere dumping of surplus foods to providing the vitamins and proteins which hungry children require.

Support for his plan was forthcoming.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY promised whatever help he could give. Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, claimed that McGOVERN'S plan would work for this country's own interests.

"For every 10 percent the less-developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent," he said. "Italy, Japan, and Nationalist China have moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports."

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the RECORD.

It expresses the wishes of us all for the successful and speedy recovery of our President.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 7, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S OPERATION

The prayers of all Americans will be with President Johnson as he enters the hospital on Thursday for a gall bladder operation the following day.

Happily, medical science has reached the stage where this type of surgery is regarded as fairly routine. The President is expected to spend no more than 10 to 14 days in the hospital following the operation; then will probably have a period of reduced activity for several weeks. But when he gets back on the job, there is no reason why he should not be as vigorous as ever—and vigor is one of Mr. Johnson's prime characteristics.

When the President is ailing, every American is deeply concerned. That is why it is so important that the public be kept fully informed. In taking it upon himself personally to announce his impending operation, and in making it possible for newsmen to obtain all the information they desired from his physicians, President Johnson is pursuing the intelligent course instituted by President Eisenhower, during his several illnesses.

Mr. Johnson has been careful also to make sure that, if the need should arise for any Presidential decision when he is under sedation, Vice President HUMPHREY would act in his place. He has pointed out that "the doctors expect there will be a minimal time during which I will not be conducting business as usual," but every contingency, obviously, must be covered.

The strains upon the President, and the burdens of responsibility placed upon him,

are very great. The hope has been expressed many times that Mr. Johnson would slow down his amazing pace, and take more time out for rest and relaxation. Considering the demands of the office, and the President's devotion to duty, that has been something easier to hope for than to achieve.

The country, extending its best wishes to Mr. Johnson, will look forward to his emergence from the hospital, a few days hence, completely recovered.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY FORMER NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL GOLDSTEIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein was installed as president of the American Friends of the Hebrew University last Sunday. Mr. Goldstein is one of New York's most distinguished citizens. He served the State as attorney general from 1942 to 1954 and was my immediate predecessor in that post. During his terms of office under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York moved forward and led the Nation, in many areas of government concern, including civil rights, education, and health. Also during that time, Mr. Goldstein was a leading figure in the National Association of Attorneys General. In addition to the bar, he has also distinguished himself in philanthropy and community service.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the acceptance speech of Attorney General Goldstein on the occasion of his installation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN OF NEW YORK, UPON HIS INDUCTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1965

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind introduction. May I also express my deep appreciation to the Minister of Commerce of the State of Israel, His Excellency, the Honorable Haim Zadok, for his most gracious remarks. Were I, in turn, to present him to you, I should characterize him succinctly as a brilliant lawyer, a superb public servant and, above all, a gentleman of the highest order.

I accept the indicia of office today with due humility, realizing the duty which goes with it and the accompanying obligation to that great citadel of learning, standing at the crossroads of the Middle East, in all of its majestic glory, beaming its rays of knowledge throughout the civilized world.

The Hebrew University performs a dual function. It supplies the professions to administer to the needs of the people of Israel, the scientists, the doctors, and the lawyers. It produces the teachers so essential to man the primary and secondary schools, for brick and mortar without teachers can be of no avail. I know I need not stress its importance, for it is self-evident and axiomatic.

For the next few minutes, I should, therefore, like to tell you what impelled me, with all of my manifold duties and obligations, to accept the presidency of the American Friends. It is inherent in the second great historic mission of the Hebrew University.

We are the people of the Book, and learning has sustained us throughout the ages, in all of our travail and suffering—and it is learning which can bring peace and tranquillity to the world.

Nuclear weaponry is not the answer, for in a span of 50 years we have fought and won two world wars, steeped in blood, sweat, and tears. Checkerboard diplomacy will not do it, for with all our statesmanship and diplomatic maneuvering, we find ourselves on the brink of world war III.

Knowledge, learning, education, and understanding must supply the tools, by which the human race can survive, in a world of plenty and splendor.

Unfortunately, America, the most powerful nation on earth, which has done so much good for so many people, has been unable to reach the underdeveloped and newly developed countries of Asia and Africa. Unless there is a rapport with them, I fear that mistrust and misunderstanding will continue. Unless we can infuse them with our democratic way of life, we shall be groping in the dark and in the abyss of dismal failure. We, who are living under the best form of government conceived by man, cannot transmit our good and our blessings to these people.

But there is one ray of hope. In an era when the use of force as a weapon in diplomacy has become an anachronism, the example of Israel stands forth as a guiding light. The diplomacy of economic and technical assistance waged so ably by Israel is doing much to win the hearts and the minds of the people of these developing countries. Dedicated young people trained by the Hebrew University are now practicing the diplomatic art and setting an example which the free countries of the world can follow and learn from.

Let me name a few specifics where the Hebrew University is now playing its important role, helping their Asian and African neighbors. There is, at the university, a unique program for training Africans in modern medicine, under the auspices of the World Health Organization, an arm of the United Nations. The program, now in its third year, will soon graduate the first group of physicians, who will return to their native lands in Africa and head hospitals, research centers, and, before long, be training physicians and technicians essential to the health of their people.

Similarly, there are African and Asian students in economics, social work, the law school, as well as in the multifaceted fields of modern science.

There is presently underway a newly created Institute for American Studies. Although less than a month old, this institute is teaching American history and an appreciation of the guiding principles of American democracy. I can think of no more direct channel to the consciousness of the people of the emerging nations than through the tutelage of another new democracy which has benefited so dramatically from the American experience.

This little State of Israel has been able, in a short time, to reach the eyes and the ears of these Asians and Africans. It has been able to gain their confidence and trust. And this little State, through the Hebrew University must be the catalyst by which these people can be reached.

To eradicate poverty of the body is all important, but to feed the poverty of the mind is also important, if we are to live in a world of rule by law.

We, in America, must provide the wherewithal, for the Hebrew University can supply the manpower and the brains. All that we are being asked for is dollars, and dollars, unless put to good use, lie fallow and helpless. This, believe me, my friends, is the cheapest insurance premium we can pay for the survival of civilization.

THE CIGARETTE ADVERTISING DOLLAR AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this year the Congress passed the Cigarette Labeling Act, requiring a hazardous warning statement on each cigarette package. The Congress declined to act favorably on the companion proposal to include a similar warning in all cigarette advertising. One of the reasons for this reluctance to act was the claim that the effects on consumption of the cigarette advertising were not known. As a useful contribution to this discussion, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Julian L. Simon, which appeared in the May 1964 issue of the Illinois Business Review, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING AND THE NATION'S WELFARE

(By Julian L. Simon, assistant professor of advertising)

The Federal Trade Commission is now holding hearings about whether cigarette companies should be required to post a "danger to health" warning on packs of cigarettes and in advertisements. These hearings are an outgrowth of the recent report by the Surgeon General on the health hazards of cigarette smoking.

Some individuals and groups, including Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and Consumers Union, favor the proposed regulation. Some want cigarette advertising prohibited completely. However, no responsible person has suggesting outlawing the manufacture or sale of cigarettes themselves.

People who oppose the warning proposal and the ban on advertising base their opposition on grounds of legality as well as of economics. This article will consider only the economics of a warning requirement or a ban. It will not consider other economic alternatives such as an increase in cigarette taxes.

I shall discuss the possible effects on cigarette use, and the consequent economic impacts of these two proposals on the groups that have a stake in what happens. Mostly, I shall talk about the ban on advertising, because its effect is better understood. The effect of a warning requirement would probably be much less than an advertising ban, but of the same general nature.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE CONSUMPTION RATE

Opponents of a warning or ban will say that forbidding cigarette advertising, or requiring a danger warning, will have "practically no effect" on consumption. Supporters of the warning, however, argue that advertising has a "substantial" effect in influencing people to start smoking, and in keeping them smoking. Where is the truth?

It is perfectly clear that advertising has the power to influence the purchase of particular brands of cigarettes. The $220 million spent annually for cigarette advertising is proof-positive of that. But we are not interested in the power of advertising to shift smokers from one brand to another. We want to know how cigarette advertising as a whole starts people smoking or keeps them smoking.

Neil Borden examined the role of cigarette advertising in the astounding growth of cigarette smoking starting about 1900, when the annual per capita consumption of cigarettes was 49. By 1962 the rate had risen to 3,958 cigarettes per capita. Borden did not say that advertising caused the rise in cigarette consumption. He argued that if

the public had not been ready to take up cigarette smoking, advertising could never have caused such a large increase in consumption. Nevertheless, Borden concluded that advertising was an important factor in the size and speed of increase in cigarette smoking.

But we want to know the effect of advertising now, when cigarette smoking is a very prevalent habit. We want to know what would happen if advertising were banned, or if a warning were required.

Robert Basmann carried out an intricate statistical study of the rise and fall in cigarette advertising from year to year in the United States, and its apparent effect on cigarette consumption. He found that for each 1 percent change in total cigarette advertising, the number of cigarettes smoked changed one-twentieth of 1 percent. In other words, the consumption of cigarettes is affected by the amount of advertising, but it takes a big change in the amount of advertising to make much of a difference in consumption. This is typical of an industry once it has become well established, but it may also result from the degree to which the smoking habit takes hold of people and the fact that nothing else is a good substitute for smoking.

What would happen if all cigarette advertising were cut off? An extension of Basmann's finding would suggest that if there had been no cigarette advertising last year, consumption would have been about 5 percent less than it was. If the ban on advertising continued, we might expect further decreases in the amount of consumption each year, but the absolute decrease would be less each year. These predictions are subject to many technical reservations, and they go far beyond the data. But they are the best that we can do at this time.

A required danger-warning in the ads would be a type of negative advertising. We cannot estimate how much the warning would cut smoking, but certainly the effect would not be as drastic as a ban on advertising, or no firm would continue to advertise. Our inability to come up with any better prediction is testimony to how little scientific knowledge we have about the effect of different forms of advertising copy. But it should certainly be possible to pretest ads that contain warnings, just as other ads are pretested, in order to obtain an estimate of the effect of a warning.

Now let us estimate the health effect of an advertising ban and the resulting reduction in cigarette consumption:

1. For each cigarette smoked, someone's life is shortened by 5 to 9 minutes. We shall figure 7 minutes per cigarette.

2. About 523 billion cigarettes were smoked last year. A decrease of 5 percent in consumption for just 1 year would mean an increase of human life in the United States of about 183 billion minutes, 349,000 years of life. Remember, this is the amount of lifetime increased by a decrease of 5 percent in smoking for just 1 year.

3. People who are kept from starting smoking will live, on the average, 5 years longer than if they had started smoking.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT AND LOCAL ECONOMIES

An estimated 225,000 people make a substantial part of their living in tobacco agriculture, earning approximately $600 million last year, of which about $450 million came from cigarettes. Some 31,000 factory workers earned $150 million last year from cigarette manufacture. In total, then, cigarette purchases put about $600 million into the pockets of workers and farmers. How will a ban or a warning affect them?

Notwithstanding the frantic reactions of Southern State officials, however, a drop in consumption would have no immediate effect on farm earnings, because of the Government subsidy program. Unless the Government removed the subsidy, the taxpayers at large, rather than the farm population, would take the loss. But let's assume that the subsidy would be cut.

If the subsidy were cut, the effect of a loss in earnings would probably be worse than the figures show, because the effect would be concentrated in a few States that are already economically backward. Many tobacco farmers are already poor and would find it hard to find new jobs. For example, North Carolina is an agricultural State and almost half of its farm income comes from tobacco.

Using our estimates above, employment and earnings would be cut by 5 percent at most during the first year of an advertising ban. In subsequent years, the further cut in jobs and/or dollars would be less. I say "5 percent at most" because there is good reason to believe that an important proportion of smokers who quit smoking cigarettes, or young people who never start, would use other forms of tobacco instead. The accompanying table shows that cigarettes largely replaced other forms of tobacco and did not create much new demand for tobacco. To the extent that smokers switch to pipe tobacco, cigars, chewing tobacco, and snuff, the damage to tobacco farming would be reduced, even though cigarette tobacco is a more expensive product than other types of tobacco.

Furthermore, some or many tobacco workers who are thrown out of work would get other jobs, so we are overestimating greatly when we assume that the equivalent of lost cigarette industry wages would be lost to the economy as a whole. But we assume the worst, or close to it, for the sake of argument. Later we shall look at the potential effects on employment again, when we consider the overall picture.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE COMPANIES

To understand the effect of a ban or a warning requirement on the cigarette companies, we must first understand the nature of advertising as a business investment.

When a firm spends a dollar in advertising a brand of cigarettes this year, the advertising bought with that dollar increases cigarette sales this year. But it also increases cigarette sales next year, and the year after, and in subesquent years. Customers get into the habit of buying a given brand, a habit that may continue for many years. To say it another way, a dollar of advertising may create some goodwill or brand loyalty that persists long into the future, though each year the effect of that single dollar of advertising is less than the year before. Cigarette advertising is really an investment, just like an investment in a new machine that will produce for many years after it is bought.

Lester Telser studied the pre-World War II cigarette market in considerable detail. He found that only 15 to 20 percent of the advertising investment is used up in the year in which the advertisements appear. This means that for each dollar of sales created in the advertising year, much more than $3 of sales will be created in subsequent years. (However, because of the chaos in the post-war cigarette market, investment is probably used up faster than Telser's estimate.)

Therefore, even if all cigarette advertising were stopped tomorrow, the established cigarette brands would continue to sell well for many years, though at continually diminishing rates. During that time the cigarette companies would be recouping the investments they have already made. Furthermore, since all the firms would have to stop advertising, the investments already made would not be used up as fast, which would give the cigarette companies a better return on their invested dollars than they expected to earn when they made the investments.

The total effect, then, would be that in future years the sales of any brand would gradually decrease. But the gross profits on a brand would be at a very high rate for a while, because the firm would not be making any further investment in advertising. The cigarette companies would have a fine opportunity to milk their brands for profit.

The cigarette companies already know how to milk a brand after they cease advertising it. For example, substantial quantities of nonfilter Old Golds have been sold in the last couple of years despite the fact that Lorillard practically quit advertising them.

If advertising were stopped, the cigarette companies would generate large amounts of cash each year, which they could either liquidate to stockholders or use to diversify. The former is not likely because of our tax structure and because no executive likes to liquidate himself out of a job. In the latter case, much of the capital would go to create new jobs in other industries.

Either way, I would guess that a cigarette stock would have a very solid value if advertising were banned. The same type of predictions would apply if a warning were required, but the effects would not be as sweeping.

EFFECT OF ADVERTISING MEDIA

The advertising media have already been hit by the Surgeon General's report. Some radio and television stations have voluntarily restricted cigarette advertising to certain hours of the day, while others have cut it off completely. Some magazines and papers have always refused to accept tobacco advertising, notably the Reader's Digest. And now the cigarette advertisers have set up an authority to regulate copy and media.

A warning requirement would not hit the media as hard as a ban, of course. But a warning that really affected consumption would make advertising less profitable for the firms, and they would therefore advertise less.

Television would lose more than $120 million in advertising revenue, about 7 percent of its total revenue last year. But that would not represent a dead loss to television stations and networks. Television time is limited, especially on networks, and the time is therefore rationed among potential advertisers. If cigarette advertising were banned, the television time could be sold to other advertisers, though at a somewhat lower price.

Television stations are charged with the public interest to a greater extent than are other communication media, because they are given a free franchise for a channel. This franchise gives them some monopoly power. Therefore, the television people should be particularly slow to complain about the loss of cigarette advertising revenue if it is in the public interest.

Radio would lose an estimated $20 million in cigarette advertising revenue, less than 3 percent of its total revenue. Other advertisers would not replace this revenue. But radio stations also have a free franchise granted by the public.

The $34 million loss to general and farm magazines would be a complete loss, about 7 percent of their total revenue. The magazines would not find other advertisers to replace cigarettes, and some magazines would feel a considerable strain. But since it would hit them all, they could all be expected to reduce their editorial cost somewhat, without fear of losing advertisers or circulation to competition. This might cushion the impact somewhat.

The $18 million lost to newspapers would be only one-half of 1 percent of their advertising revenue.

EFFECT ON ADVERTISING AGENCIES

The advertising agency business would take a beating if cigarette advertising were banned. Agencies would also be hurt if a warning were required, because in that case total cigarette advertising would decrease. Madison Avenue-type agencies would lose approximately $200 million billing of their total of perhaps $4 billion, about 5 percent

of their total. (Actually, only 15 percent of the $200 million—$30 million—stays with the agencies. The rest goes to the media.) Perhaps a thousand copywriters, account executives, and other agencies would be scurrying about looking for jobs, and the job market would be glutted for a while.

It is interesting to note that some major advertising agencies have said, after the Surgeon General's report came out, that they would refuse to handle cigarette advertising, because they now consider it immoral. Expectedly, none of those agencies now has a cigarette account. But their statements do mean something, nevertheless.

EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE

The total cigarette market is about $6.8 billion. Excluding taxes, the industry accounts for $3.6 billion, much less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

We have some evidence that Americans tend to spend a fairly constant percentage of their total yearly income, year after year. This suggests that a decrease in cigarette sales would lead to a compensating increase in other spending. If so, the effect on the economy as a whole would be lessened. Exactly how much the first impact would be, we cannot say. It would be somewhere between no effect and $180 million (5 percent of $3.6 billion).

On the other side of the ledger, the "multiplier effect" would magnify the ill effects of whatever decrease in spending does take place, by a factor of two or three. This effect is due to the spending of money again and again by people in the business chain. In other words, if people saved half of the $180 million drop in cigarette sales, the drop in national income would then be between $180 million and $270 million.

In any case, a small yearly decrease in cigarette sales and cigarette advertising, made even smaller by a shift to other forms of tobacco, would not be even a drop in the bucket for the economy as a whole.

Cigarette smoking does affect the Federal economy and the economies of the States and some cities, too, by way of taxes paid on cigarettes. Federal excise taxes amount to $2 billion, State taxes are above $1 billion, and municipal taxes are $40 million. These taxes are important to the tax-collecting bodies. But at first the loss would only be 5 percent of taxes that represent 2 percent of total government revenues. Furthermore, if taxes are not collected one way, they can be collected another way, at the same total cost to the public.

On the other hand, cigarettes may cost the economy far more than they contribute. Louis Lublin, a retired vice president of Metropolitan Life Insurance, estimates that cigarettes cost the Nation $10 billion annually in the lost services and earnings of men killed prematurely by cigarettes. My own estimate is a loss of more than $4 billion, based on 1.1 years of life lost by the average smoker before the age of 65, half of the men in the United States being smokers, and an annual payroll of $322 million.

In sum, then, we must balance the expected effects on health against the expected effects on employment and earnings.

Putting together our previous estimates, we can say that it takes a reduction of 880 cigarettes to produce a drop of $1 in tobacco-worker's earnings. And a drop of that many cigarettes means that someone's life expectancy goes up by 880 times; 7 minutes equals 104 hours. The drop in both consumption and earnings would be less in subsequent years. But they would stay in step with each other, so the same type of dollars-for-hours-of-life relationship would hold.

When we consider the $4 to $10 billion in earnings lost each year by men killed prematurely by cigarettes, it is clear that the country will gain more in live-men's earning power than it will lose in revenue. And, in fact, the gain in earning power for people kept alive by not smoking would be 10 to 20 times the loss in earning power of tobacco-industry workers.

Then, too, deaths caused by smoking decrease consumption spending. In the 104 hours lost by each dollar of cigarette-industry earnings, a live person would spend more than $20. This consumption spending is important to the economy.

This, then, is the decision that will eventually be made, if our assumptions are correct. Should the Nation decrease employment temporarily to gain 104 hours of life per dollar of earnings lost? Should the Nation reduce the tobacco industry revenue, gaining $2 in earnings from live men for each dollar decrease in tobacco industry revenue, and a gain of $10 to $20 in earnings of men kept alive for each dollar of tobacco workers' earnings lost?

CONCLUSION

There is much to gain, little to lose, by stopping the advertising of cigarettes. My chain of reasoning goes like this:

1. Advertising could be banned without prohibiting smoking;

2. A ban on advertising would bring about no boomerang noneconomic ill effects and the economy's overall vitality would hardly be affected;

3. A prohibition on cigarette production could have harsh repercussions, as with the prohibition of alcohol in the twenties;

4. There are other commodities (e.g., contraceptives, medical services, liquor on radio and television, and many others) that are sold but cannot be advertised, so this would be no new precedent; and

5. Therefore, let's ban cigarette advertising.

POSTSCRIPT

If the Nation wishes to decrease cigarette consumption, raising the tax on cigarettes is an obvious alternative or additional measure that might be taken. There is no doubt that fewer cigarettes will be bought if the price is higher. However, the tax would take a larger proportion of some people's income than of others. And if the price of cigarettes goes up, people will smoke the butts closer to the end. The more of a cigarette that is smoked, the more dangerous it rapidly becomes. So an increase in taxation may not be a good alternative solution.

DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN: ELWOOD HAYNES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in my home State, I had the pleasure to visit the Howard County Historical Society and witness the excellent work being done in Kokomo, Ind., to preserve a vital portion of our heritage.

During my trip I was reintroduced to the noted American—Elwood Haynes—whose place in the history of the automobile is well established and well known. His laurels, however, rest not alone with his gasoline automobile of 1894; Elwood Haynes is widely recognized for his activities ranging from industrialist, metallurgist, and inventor to educator and philanthropist. His accomplishments are numerous, and his contributions to these many fields are significant yet today.

Mr. President, it is fitting that the Howard County Historical Society should nominate Mr. Haynes for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans. He certainly merits consideration for such an honor. It is my hope, however, that the distinguished electors for this honor will not be alone in reviewing Mr. Haynes' record. It is important for all American citizens to come in contact with the achievements and qualities of greatness that inhere in men such as Elwood Haynes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of his life, prepared by the Howard County Historical Society, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ELWOOD HAYNES NOMINATED TO THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS

Elwood Haynes (1857–1925) was nominated by the Howard County Historical Society, Kokomo, Ind., for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, as inventor, scientist, metallurgist, industrialist, educator, and philanthropist. In nominating Mr. Haynes our thought was that he rightly belonged among the most notable men and women of the country. The nomination has been accepted by the Hall of Fame.

A brochure has been published to substantiate the claim, all facts being taken from Haynes papers now in possession of the historical society and other recognized authorities.

Judging from the bibliography mailed with the brochure to the 100 electors (two from each State) and the directors, we must conclude that the original Haynes car is his best known invention. This Haynes car is in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., labeled as follows:

"Gasoline automobile, built by Elwood Haynes in Kokomo, Ind., 1893–94. Successful trial trip made at a speed of 6 or 7 miles per hour, July 4, 1894. Gift of Elwood Haynes, 1910 (262–135)."

Mr. Haynes was the first to introduce aluminum in the automobile, a standard for automobile motors today, and first to use nickel steel in the automobile. He is credited as being the first to depart from the horseless carriage idea, since every part was made specifically for the car except the buggy seat and the horsepower Sintz marine upright 2-cycle gasoline engine. He also invented and built in 1903 a rotary gas valve engine. His place as a founder of the automobile industry is deserved.

However, "of the many industrial and social contributions of Elwood Haynes, perhaps the most significant may be his invention of the basic cobalt-base alloys. As a perpetual living memorial, his alloys are in use today. The need was so urgent and his provision was so complete that in many applications, no improvements have been necessary in his alloys after 60 years of effective and valuable use.

"The alloys known as Stellite alloy No. 4, Stellite alloy No. 6 (also 6B and 6K), Star J Metal and 98M2 are produced today throughout the world, exactly as invented by Elwood Haynes as early as 1899 and described in his patents granted in 1907 and 1913. These alloys continue to be valuable for use as cutting tools, well and mine drilling bits, bearing materials, and hand-facing for articles that must endure severe wear conditions: tractor plowshares, discs, machinery parts and the like. Several original Haynes alloys are in use in many modern severe-service applications: jet aircraft, nuclear energy installations, rocket motors and the like."

(Examples of the above are nuclear steamship, *Savannah*, alloy No. 6; nuclear submarine, alloy No. 1; Jet plane, No. 12; modern cars; manufactured diamonds No. 12; Snap 8, a compact experimental nuclear reactor using the more adaptable materials

commercially available, No. 6B. All these are late developments using Elwood Haynes' original formula—E.P.R.)

"In 1911 Elwood Haynes discovered some valuable properties in stainless steels and made significant improvements and advances in the art. His patent granted in 1915 based on his stainless steel improvements, was a foundation of the American Stainless Steel Corp. (about 1920) in Pittsburgh, Pa.

"In keeping with his characteristics as a benefactor and teacher, Mr. Haynes shared his knowledge and discoveries by publishing many technical papers disclosing his contributions to metallurgy." (Joe J. Phillips patents engineer, Steelite division, Union Carbide Corp., Kokomo, Ind.)

Of his lesser known contributions that should be mentioned are natural gas industry, education, philanthropy.

Natural gas industry: Elwood Haynes was manager of the Portland Natural Gas Co., Portland, Ind., 1886–90, at which time he became field superintendent of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., Chicago, Ill., with headquarters at Greentown, Ind. In 1886 Mr. Haynes invented a small vapor thermostat used on natural gas.

During Mr. Haynes' superintendency of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., "He found that the pipeline carrying gas to Chicago would freeze up in winter, and he decided to dry the gas to prevent the trouble. After considering chemical absorbents he made the proper choice of drying by refrigeration and designed a workable unit. At the time this was pioneer engineering. * * * considerable ingenuity was required. He found that this process not only removed the water vapor from the gas, but also condensed some of the lower boiling constituents and he was one of the first or perhaps the first to produce casing head gasoline. There was no market for this gasoline and it was dumped in an open space and allowed to evaporate." William A. Wissler, former director development and research, Haynes Stellite Co., served in research and development, Union Carbide Corp., Niagara Falls, N.Y. Presently retired.

In education Elwood Haynes was principal of the Portland High School 1883–84 and taught science in the Eastern Indiana Normal School in 1885–86, both in Portland, Ind., his birthplace. At the time of his death April 13, 1925, at his home, Elwood Haynes had been a member of Indiana Board of Education and a member of the Indiana Library Board since 1921. His special interest was vocational education. Some of his ideas are just now being initiated.

(NOTE.—Between his time as principal of the Portland High School and science professor at the Indiana Normal School he did postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins University in chemistry, biology, and German.)

The main areas of philanthrophy were the Presbyterian Church; the Worcester (Mass.) Polytechnic Institute; the Prohibition Party and movement. He was especially generous to struggling young churches of all denominations; small colleges and students needing assistance.

Other lesser known facts about Kokomo's famous inventor were his candidacy for the U.S. Senate in 1916 on the Prohibition ticket; the honorary LL.D. by Indiana University in 1922; the Liberty Ship No. 269 named for him January 26, 1944, from the Permanente Metals Corp., launched at Richmond, Calif. Mr. Haynes' alloys had significant use in World War I, II, and the Korean episode.

Many seem interested that his work in metallurgy started, when at 15 years of age, he succeeded in melting brass, cast iron, and high carbon steel, using furnace and blower of his own construction; also invented an apparatus for making hydrogen and another for oxygen.

His thesis at Worcester Polytechnic Institute was "The Effect of Tungsten on Iron and Steel." There, he also wrote both the words and music for the class ode, 1881.

Perhaps his greatest honor was the John Scott Medal given by the University of Pennsylvania, the American Philosophical Society, and the National Academy of Science, one of the highest awards given to a scientist of the United States.

The monument erected at the site of the trial run of the original Haynes car by the Indiana Historical Commission and the Hoosier State Automobile Association, dedicated in an elaborate ceremony July 4, 1922; the bronze plaque on the site where he invented and designed the first Haynes car and started work on the alloys; and the boulder marking the site of his birth, attest his contribution to the American way of life.

The Bernice Haynes Hillis family has purchased the Haynes House, now being renovated to receive the Haynes papers and collection, and "The Kokomo Firsts," a monument to Kokomo industry. The house is expected to be dedicated later this year. Come, visit Kokomo, Ind.

EOS PETTY RICHARDSON,
Curator, Howard County Museum.

A PLANNING MEETING FOR SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to speak Saturday, October 9, 1965, at the first planning meeting for the newly created Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. The meeting was held on Spruce Knob, near Elkins, W. Va., and was arranged by several national and State conservation clubs as a preliminary work session for the development of what will eventually become a 100,000-acre recreation center for the entire country.

The Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, was also present and spoke of the great contribution that can be made by conservation clubs to the recreation needs of the country.

I was happy to have the opportunity to trace some of the natural and legislative history of this new recreation area. I have long had a deep appreciation for the natural and scenic wonders of Spruce Knob and introduced legislation in the Senate in 1963 to reserve the area for public use. The Congress did not have an opportunity to act upon the measure in the 88th Congress, but I was pleased to reintroduce it during the opening days of the 89th Congress in January on behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH. It was later included by President Johnson in his message on natural beauty and was signed into law by the President on September 28, 1965.

I have also been active in securing appropriations for the purchase of lands within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, and, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I shall continue in my efforts to secure the necessary funds to implement the authorizing legislation and make the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area the No. 1 recreation spot for the tens of millions of Americans who live within a day's automobile travel.

I hope that each Member of Congress will some day visit Spruce Knob and I ask unanimous consent that my address to the members of the conservation clubs be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOOKING ON FROM SPRUCE KNOB

We gather here tonight because of our common interest in this area, which has now become the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. We will spend but a relatively short time talking about this area on this occasion. By contrast, it took nature millions of years to create it.

But we take these moments because we value this wonderful world of mountains, valleys, streams, and forests—a wonderful world that is far too rare in our crowded, mechanized society. We know how much we need such places. And, sadly, we know how easy it is for us to destroy them. Here in this magnificent region, we have a heritage of natural beauty that is ours to protect and use providently; or it is ours to destroy, if we ignore the lessons of the past.

But, wisely, we are not going to destroy our heritage. This meeting is evidence of a public determination that this portion of the Monongahela National Forest will remain, unspoiled, always to enrich the lives of those who come here. That determination, expressed through the active support of people such as you, is the force that has encouraged the Congress of the United States to designate these 100,000 acres in the highest, and a most beautiful, part of this State for public enjoyment. The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is now established by an act of Congress, and, I firmly believe, welcomed by all who seek to preserve a little more breathing space.

You are witness to the capacity of this region to fulfill its purpose for healthful outdoor recreation. Each year thousands of others share the same pleasures that you enjoy as you come to visit this region. People will continue to come—next weekend, next year, and the year after—in growing numbers.

Most of the visitors will come from among the 30 million people who live within 250 miles from here, chiefly from cities and towns, for this area is right next door to the most populous, most crowded part of the entire country. This is an area of great open spaces easily accessible to those who need open space the most.

But this is a national recreation area, not a regional one; and I want very definitely to emphasize the word "National." These mountains are a national asset. Thomas Jefferson wrote that the view at Harpers Ferry was worth a voyage across the Atlantic. Well, then, I will say that it is worth traveling a little farther to see the top of West Virginia, the Smoke Holes, and the great rocks standing above narrow valleys. Who here tonight would not recommend this region to any visitor searching for America's scenic grandeur?

With such a fine area as this now in public ownership, and managed in the public interest, I wonder if many people realize how close we came to losing it. The harsh details of the past have faded. The beautiful countryside shows little of a different kind of scene that was once all too apparent. It was a scene of waste and destruction. We might well remember that the spirit of conservation did not come easily to the mountains of West Virginia.

In the early part of this century, the ancient forests of these mountains were cut—without thought of new forests to replace the old—without thought of the needs of another generation. Timber was stripped to feed hungry mills; and, as part of this boom

period, the great sod areas were plowed up to grow food for loggers and millhands.

Then fire swept through cutover lands and destroyed healthy forests as well. Floods were spawned on denuded slopes and rolled down into the valleys with tragic regularity. Moreover, the location of many farms on steep slopes, on poor soil, only added to the ruin of the land.

At that time, no authority existed to protect or manage these lands in the public interest. There was no system of forest fire protection, no game management, no organized erosion control, none of the conservation measures so widely recognized today.

Fortunately, the abuse did not go unchallenged. Public protest found voice in a growing conservation movement, inspired by public-spirited Americans of national stature. People cared about the land then, as they do now. They wanted the land managed for all time, not just for a quick profit. And their concern was expressed in new laws and in government action.

One of the early conservation laws was the Weeks law of 1911. It provided authority by which 20 million acres of wornout, abused lands were brought under national forest production, mostly in the East where no public domain lands remained. It authorized the Federal Government to work with the States for forest fire control. Because of that law, the Federal Government—during the last 50 years—has purchased and restored more than 800,000 acres in West Virginia. We are standing on some of that land. These are among the acres we are now proud to call the Monongahela National Forest.

I think you will agree that the Monongahela National Forest is an effective monument to the conservation movement. It is particularly impressive when one considers the raw area with which the Forest Service started working. They used to call this the Monongahela National Burn—it looked that bad. But foresters went to work—and they were content to work for long-range goals, knowing that they might never live to see the end result of their labors. So here, on the Monongahela, they have gradually brought the land back. They planted trees, checked erosion, fought fires, and improved the fish and wildlife habitat. Bit by bit, they acquired land that needed better management. Today the crystal waters of Seneca Creek flow from the national forest, showing us what our Potomac River might again become. And, encouragingly, the work still goes on.

However, I need not dwell on the continuing struggle for conservation. Most of us are made aware of this by the abundance of manmade ugliness, by silt-choked streams, by endless urban sprawl, and by many signs of neglect or outright destruction of our greatest resources.

I shall dwell, rather, on what we have accomplished here in the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region. A law has been passed which I think we can call a milestone in West Virginia's quest for the golden fleece of tourism. Not only you and I, and the people of West Virginia, but also the people of the United States have recognized that we have something special here.

We can be grateful for that recognition, and proud, too, for it did not come automatically. Some years back, I looked for a means of drawing attention to Spruce Knob, the Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks. I found, happily, that many others shared my interest; therefore, in March of 1963, I introduced a bill in the Senate, in behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH, to establish this country as a national recreation area. The bill did not pass in the 88th Congress, so I introduced it again in the 89th. Subcommittees of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees held hearings. Support began to build up. President Johnson added his endorsement, specifically, mentioning this area as a "must" item in his message on natural beauty. The bill, S. 7, was finally passed by Congress on September 14 of this year, and, on September 28, President Johnson signed it into law.

Now that this law has been enacted, the question might well be asked, "What will we do with this area?" Quite appropriately, that is the question that appears to be on everyone's mind. With the national spotlight on Spruce Knob, it is very much on my mind as well.

In response, let me say that I believe this region to be in good hands—responsible hands. After all, the evidence is all around us.

First, let us consider that this region has been made a national recreation area because of what it is—not because of what we propose to do to it or with it. People come here, and will continue to come, because this is a magnificent realm of natural wonders.

Nevertheless, there will have to be some developments to accommodate the many visitors to the area. And that is what causes most of the concern at this moment. What sort of developments?

I would prefer to meet the question by looking at the provisions of the act that is now on the law books. Let us see just what the law has done.

First, it has placed the congressional stamp of approval on the management of this area for outdoor recreation. It has provided the spotlight for the area which it has so deserved—for a long time.

Second, it has provided a means of assuring that all of the conservation programs in this area will move ahead more rapidly—under the force of congressional sanction. This includes programs in all resource activities, with particular emphasis on scenic protection and outdoor recreation.

The act provides that the Forest Service will continue to manage the land, which is a vote of confidence for the way it has been handled so far. The Forest Service will continue to work closely with the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, and other groups interested in developing the full potential of this area for outdoor recreation.

There is a provision that deserves special mention: the overall size and boundaries. The area will total about 100,000 acres, which will include 4,000 acres not heretofore within the national forest boundaries. Since land acquisition will depend heavily on the land and water conservation fund, the act specifically makes these additional 4,000 acres eligible for acquisition by using these funds.

But the question of development remains. On the basis of congressional hearings and conferences with Forest Service officials, I believe I can look ahead and give you some idea of what I foresee.

One of the first jobs is going to be the acquisition of key tracts of land, either through full Government title or in the form of easements. Already 40,000 of the 100,000 acres are federally owned. Full development will require acquisition of title or easements on another 45,000 acres—privately owned land within the national forest. The Forest Service has indicated that approximately 60 percent of this remaining acreage will eventually be owned by the Government. Scenic or conservation easements will be used as much as possible to protect the appearances of the landscape and to continue many of the present compatible uses, such as certain types of farming, grazing, and timber management.

The physical developments of this area will move ahead concurrently with land acquisition. It will provide basic facilities to accommodate 1 million visitors by 1970 and will eventually have a capacity to serve 5 million visitors a year.

What sort of facilities? More of the same, properly located, giving each of the many types of users the kind of recreation he seeks. There will be scenic roads and overlooks for those traveling by car. There will be campgrounds, picnic areas, and related facilities. There will also be rugged back country for those who want less of civilization's trimmings. Rock climbers and cave explorers will continue to enjoy this country. The clear headwaters of the South Branch will continue to provide pleasure for whitewater canoeists and fishermen alike.

I consider the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area as one of the best investments that this Nation can make in its public lands. We will be making needed capital improvements in an outstanding area adjacent to the populous northeastern and midwestern regions.

In West Virginia, the development of this area will have definite benefits for the surrounding communities—and I think such an area as this should contribute something tangible to the lives of its people. The building of roads, trails, campgrounds, and picnic areas will provide jobs in an area that for too long has had too few jobs. The continued development of other resources, such as timber and wildlife, will require willing workers.

But beyond the benefits of direct Federal employment, this area will attract a growing number of visitors who will stimulate local trade through their purchase of goods and services. Many visitors will want the comforts of home, so they will look for motels, restaurants, and resort facilities which will be provided by private enterprise in the surrounding area. Even those who choose the more rugged outdoor life will need gas, food, ammunition, fishing tackle, and many other such items that can be provided locally.

Economic benefits are not, of course, the only ones that West Virginia will receive. The greatest benefit will be the enjoyment of the national recreation area—a benefit available to everyone regardless of where he lives. People will come here, not so much because of new motels or clean campgrounds, but because the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region is one of the most magnificent examples of mountain scenery in the Appalachian region. They will come—and come again—everyone finding something to enjoy according to individual interests. They will hunt. They will camp. They will fish. Or perhaps they may just sit and listen to the wind in the trees.

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area will be the place to come to absorb the majesty of West Virginia—the place to see and feel the world as it ought to be. This is the essence of what West Virginia will soon offer to the citizens of our Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of October 7, 1965.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S OPERATION

It's inevitable that the illness of a President will be cause for not only some sincere public concern but for a good deal of political flap. But taken on the whole, it strikes us that Mr. Johnson has sensibly acted to minimize the one and avoid the worst of the other.

Faced with a gall bladder operation, he had two choices. He could have slipped quietly into the hospital, had his operation and said nothing about it until it was all over. Secrecy about the President's health has not

been unknown in the past. President Cleveland underwent surgery while in office and the public learned of it only long afterwards; President Roosevelt ran for reelection when all but the public knew he was seriously ill.

President Johnson chose instead to follow the example of President Eisenhower, who saw that the public was fully informed after his heart attack and his abdominal surgery. Everybody knows about Mr. Johnson's illness, its cause and the planned remedy, even the day of the operation.

For one practical thing, this puts a check on the rumor mill and avoids the surely unsettling effects from a dramatic and unexpected announcement after the event that the President of the United States had been operated upon. Beyond that, it has the virtue of treating people as adults, not as children to be shielded from the fact that a President can suffer the ills all of us are heir to.

The candor will not remove the concern with which everyone will await word from the hospital tomorrow. It should, if people react in adult fashion, keep that concern in perspective and dampen the political disturbance. A small point, perhaps; but in contrast with the past, one not without its importance.

SALUTE TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. JOHNSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the passage of the highway beautification bill seems to me to be a most fitting conclusion for this great Congress. I think it is one of the brightest stars in the crown of achievement of the Johnson administration. It is a tribute not only to the vision of a great President and a hard-working, constructive Congress, but it is especially a tribute to the First Lady of our land, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. President, the United States is fortunate that we have in Mrs. Johnson a woman of rare intelligence and dedication to the public interest. Her dream of a more beautiful America may very well be one of the most enduring monuments of the 1960's. Through her tireless efforts, her travels, her public statements and her numerous related activities, she has added a dynamic new dimension to "America, the Beautiful."

I think it is regrettable that a few Members of the other legislative body, instead of discussing the merits of highway beautification, utilized their allotted discussion time for some scoffing comments about the First Lady's concern for the quality and beauty of our countryside. These gentlemen not only delayed action with irrelevant attacks on the highway beautification bill, but they also created a needless delay which made Members of the House of Representatives miss one of the most stirring and dramatic evenings I have ever experienced—the President's salute to Congress.

I would like to take this occasion to salute both President Johnson and his gallant lady for the inspiring vision of America that they have held up to us all. We are about to complete the most constructive and impressive legislative session in American history. Much of the credit for that accomplishment belongs properly to the President. All of this has been accomplished at a time when the administration was grievously burdened with dangerous and difficult foreign policy crises, including the war in Vietnam. While I have not always agreed with every aspect of our foreign policy in recent years, I have developed a growing appreciation for President Johnson's long-rang commitment to peace.

My prayers are with him in that commitment and for his speedy recovery and return to the White House.

PROPOSED MEDICAL TRAINING FOR ARCTIC DOCTORS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a story appeared in the Anchorage Times for September 15 announcing that a committee of the American Academy of General Practice was recommending a special training program for doctors who will be practicing in the Arctic regions of Alaska. The practice of medicine in the Arctic is complicated by many factors. Dr. Carroll L. Witten, of Louisville, Ky., president of the academy, chose a particularly apt phrase to describe one of the complications. He said that Alaska has many peculiar problems as to the size and availability of villages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Anchorage Times be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that Congress will better understand the recommendations soon to be made to the Surgeon General.

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

MEDIC TEAM TO ASK BUSH AREA TRAINING

The recommendation which would provide a 2-year training program to qualify physicians to practice in remote regions of Alaska is being advanced by a committee from the American Academy of General Practice.

The committee which will present its recommendations to the Division of Indian Health in Washington is composed of Dr. Edward J. Kowalewski, Akron, Pa., chairman; Dr. Carroll L. Witten, Louisville, Ky., president of the academy and consultant to the Surgeon General; Dr. Paul S. Read, Omaha, Nebr., and Dr. Herman E. Drill, Hoskins, Minn.

Dr. Kowalewski said the new program would provide new or additional services to interior Alaska, and also would relieve the Alaska Native Hospital of an overflowing number of patients.

Twelve to sixteen volunteer physicians would be trained at the hospital and in the bush, then would remain at an assigned area. Many times the physician would be the only doctor in a wide area of Alaska.

Another recommendation by the committee would provide volunteer help to replace doctors who presently are practicing in remote areas but cannot leave because no other physician's services would be available.

The volunteer help would allow the regular physician to take 3 or 4 weeks to brush up on new advances in medicine and to take a vacation from his duties.

In a third recommendation, the committee would increase the number of Health Aid program volunteers who are operating in remote Alaska. The volunteers, which have been serving Alaska nearly 28 years, are young people trained to recognize symptoms of patients and to radio the information to a central station.

A physician then prescribes medicines which the volunteer has available. The system is under the direction of the Public Health Service.

"We were very impressed with the proficiency of medical care in Alaska," said Dr. Witten, "even though Alaska has many peculiar problems as to size and availability of villages.

"The Health Aid service is especially well developed, and we are recommending that these volunteers be commended both publicly and officially."

SUPPORT FOR UNDERGROUND TRANSMISSION LINES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I recently introduced two measures, S. 2507 and S. 2508, to promote research and development into an economic and practical program of burying underground transmission lines. An article in the September 27 issue of the trade magazine Electrical World reviews the interest generated by my proposals within the utility industry and the appropriate departments and agencies of the Johnson administration. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HOW MUCH R. & D. FOR BURIED TRANSMISSION?—EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE CREATES TASK FORCE TO CONSIDER STEPPING UP EXTRA HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE PROGRAM—FEDERAL AGENCIES WEIGH RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT'S PLEA

The investor-owned utility industry is seriously considering stepping up its R. & D. program in underground transmission. At the same time, Federal agencies are pondering their next step in response to President Johnson's call for accelerated research in this area. But there are questions all around as to just what the President is after and what direction industry and Government efforts will take.

At a meeting September 9, the Edison Electric Institute Board approved creation of a task force that would suggest ways for accelerating the extra high voltage cable research and development program now being conducted by the Edison Electric Institute Transmission and Distribution Committee. The new task force is also directed to consider the feasibility of an expanded research activity relating to both a.c. and d.c. cable in the extra high voltage range. The Edison Electric Institute Board is asking the new group to come up with cost data on an expanded program by December.

Announcement of Edison Electric Institute's action carried no reference to President Johnson's statement of August 24 in which he reported that he had instructed his science adviser, Dr. Donald Horning, "to work with the appropriate Federal Departments and agencies to speed our research into the technology of placing high voltage lines underground." The statement was issued at the time the President signed the bill permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to build overhead transmission lines to serve its Standard Linear Accelerator Center.

Also in the statement, Johnson said, "I have instructed the AEC to give great weight to the natural environment in constructing the line, including not only the design of the poles but to their location and to the clearing operations." A vertical configuration on metal poles has been proposed for the 220-kilovolt Stanford line.

Acting on the President's instructions, Horning has talked with the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department on spurring underground transmission research. But neither Hornig nor the agencies has seen fit to disclose the nature or content of these conversations.

Yet, there is talk among Government power men of the possibility that the administration may begin a drive this year for legis-

lation to authorize research, development, and demonstration projects on underground transmission. Measures along these lines have previously been introduced in the House by Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. The Ottinger bill (H.R. 10514) calls for a $30 million program; the Neuberger bill (S. 2508) calls for a $150 million research program.

There is some feeling at Interior that no big push on underground transmission R. & D. can be mounted without a new appropriation such as would be authorized under terms of the Ottinger or Neuberger bills. While relatively little attention has been paid to these bills up to now, they would assume significance if chosen as an administration vehicle for expanding Federal effort in the underground transmission field.

Meanwhile, at FPC, the industry task force on underground transmission continues its work. A report is expected from this group early next year. It is looking into research only in a general way—being concerned specifically with such matters as: (1) Finding ways to express underground transmission terminology in layman's language so utilities can discuss the situation with Government leaders at local and other levels; (2) determining the state of the art; (3) determining the economics of overhead versus underground lines; (4) defining the relation of underground costs to overall utility costs as these apply to individual power bills.

The FPC effort at this time appears more concerned with determining costs and evaluating applications. Interior seems more concerned with initiating some type of research and development program.

Earlier this year, a three-man Interior team (Special Research Assistant Morgan Dubrow, Reclamation Engineer Ted Mermel, and Bonneville Power Administration Engineer Eugene Starr) reviewed underground, but this was aimed directly at what should be done about the controversial 345-kilovolt lines from the Cornwall pumped-storage plant in New York. That group decided it would be uneconomic to mount a campaign to urge that the lines be buried. The recommendation went directly to the White House for the President's consideration.

Informed observers in Washington think there is a likelihood that hearings may begin before the end of the year on underground transmission. But just what form such hearings take, and in what forum they will be conducted depends on what President Johnson and his administration are after. If hearings are not conducted this year due to the impending adjournment of Congress, then these observers look for a real push early next year.

Comment on the industry role in the larger natural beauty campaign came from still another administration source in recent weeks. Speaking before a gathering of conservationists groups in Wyoming, the President's wife made passing reference to several contributions made toward improving the appearance of utility installations.

BIG BROTHER IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE: EDITORIALS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently I have received a large number of editorials dealing with the curbing of Big Brother in the Internal Revenue Service. All of the articles, with the exception of one, are critical of the IRS practices exposed by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in recent hearings.

In the interest of fairness, I wish to bring some of the more outstanding editorials to public attention—both favorable and unfavorable.

I ask unanimous consent to have the one critical and seven favorable articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Recorder, Aug. 2, 1965]

WIRETAP EVIDENCE

The Internal Revenue Service admits it has resorted to the use of wiretaps, hidden microphones, and two-way mirrors while investigating suspected tax frauds. But it insists such tactics have been limited to the campaign against organized crime and never in probes of ordinary taxpayers.

Neither the IRS nor the average American citizen condones trickery. But the fact remains that income tax violations constitute about the only charges against racketeers that result in conviction.

The record proves that it is difficult to obtain evidence against organized racketeering. Informers must be able to identify criminals without being seen, and the devices being used by the IRS appear to be the only way of accomplishing that.

So either the Government employs available techniques to break up crime rings or permits them to operate unmolested. Of the two choices this allows, we think the IRS has made the right one.

[From the Progressive, Sept. 1965]

Due process still has its champions in the Congress of the United States, wiretapping is frowned upon, and illegal searches and seizures are condemned. This is our hopeful conclusion after observing Senator EDWARD V. LONG's investigation of illicit surveillance techniques employed by the intelligence division of the Internal Revenue Service. We would be more encouraged still if LONG's Senate Judiciary Subcommittee were to go on to scrutinize the practices of the sacrosanct FBI and the score or so of other Federal agencies that maintain their own police and intelligence forces. Incursions into the rights of alleged tax evaders seem to strike a more responsive chord than assaults on the liberties of other citizens.

This is not to suggest that IRS was unworthy of the subcommittee's attention. On the basis of testimony taken by LONG and his colleagues, the Treasury's electronics devices school is clearly one of the more advanced educational institutions of its type. IRS apparently operates its blacklight scopes, concealed recorders, two-way mirrors, and wiretapping gear with a deftness worthy of 007 or the Man from U.N.C.L.E.

The philosophy of the Service's operatives, on the other hand, seem to be more reminiscent of Dick Tracy or Little Orphan Annie. When Senator LONG asked O. Burke Yung, who teaches at the electronics devices school, whether questions of guilt and innocence should not be decided by juries rather than agents, Yung protested that he had taken an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, and that he believed he had done so.

We were not present when Yung and his fellow agents took their oath of office, but if it followed the usual Federal form, it called on them to uphold the Constitution as well as to defend it.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, July 31, 1965]

MORE IRS SNOOPING

A Senate subcommittee investigating Government invasions of privacy goes on piling up evidence that the Internal Revenue Service is one of the worst offenders. Some might argue that the IRS, after all, does its snooping in a good cause and thus should be leniently judged. What this argument boils down to is a contention that collecting money for Uncle Sam's coffers justifies violating the safeguards written into the Constitution. We do not think so.

The argument is even thinner than that. For snooping devices, electronic and otherwise, do not necessarily make the difference between catching or not catching an income tax evader; often they are simply an easier way of doing the job.

At one recent hearing, an IRS agent testified that on orders he broke into the home of a Boston tavern owner to sneak a look at what was believed to be a vault in the basement. The vault turned out to be a cedar clothes closet, but that makes no difference so far as the IRS method is concerned. The agent broke the law; both in spirit and letter, he violated one of our most honored traditions—that a man's home is his castle, not to be entered without a warrant. The agent's testimony that he also observed the tavern owner's wife through a long-range snooperscope while she was sunning herself merely adds to the distastefulness of the whole proceeding.

Yet this was a comparatively mild and simple invasion of privacy. Hearings have brought to light instances of eavesdropping with various electronic devices. Such gadgets, and the even more sophisticated ones likely to be developed, pose a serious threat to individual privacy. The Government simply has no business using them, in violation of the law, no matter how laudable its purpose.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Aug. 10, 1965]

CONTROLLING TAX SNOOPS

When it comes to collecting taxes, it seems clear that some agents and officials of the Internal Revenue Service do not consider themselves bound by such trivialities as fairness or citizens' rights to privacy. A Senate judiciary committee under Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat of Missouri, is continuing to turn up evidence of an "anything goes" philosophy in the IRS, including its use of hidden microphones and two-way mirrors in supposedly private conference rooms.

LONG said Sheldon S. Cohen, Internal Revenue Commissioner, had given him a list of 22 cities across the Nation—Chicago was one—in which the IRS had bugged conference rooms, and 10 cities in which the trick mirrors had been used. (These gimmicks look like normal mirrors from the front, but allow an observer behind to watch everything going on in a room.)

LONG has denounced such snooping practices by Federal agencies as unnecessary invasions of privacy—which of course they are. But there is a further consideration that makes it particularly important to stop them.

It is that Federal agencies seem to adopt these practices without a qualm as long as they are not specifically forbidden by law. Such abstract ideas as "right to privacy" plainly have no power to keep such an agency from using any method it can to get information, as long as the method has not been forbidden by name.

In short, we'd better not expect the IRS or any similar Government body to police its own methods. The tax men are out to do a job, and will not deny themselves any useful tool in doing it. The policing will be up to Congress and the courts—and we hope Senator LONG's findings will prompt them to tighten controls on Government snooping.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram & Sun, Aug. 11, 1965]

BUGS IN THE PHONE BOOTH

Of all the disclosures emerging from a Senate subcommittee inquiry into Governmental wiretapping, perhaps the damnedest

yet is the admission by the Miami Chief of Intelligence for the Internal Revenue Service that agents had bugged a public telephone booth and recorded all conversations.

The reason? The booth had been used often by a suspected bookmaker.

So, in the process, all other dialogs rippling across the wires were also eavesdropped by big brother.

A Senator asked the Miami sleuth if it wasn't a moral, if not legal, violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion. The witness paused, then said yes, he guessed it was.

Obviously this bugging business has gone beyond all bounds of necessity, sense, or taste. Out of the Senate hearings had better come some stern restraints on electronic snooping, Government style.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Aug. 11, 1965]

U.S. AGENCIES NEED RULES ON SNOOPING

Although confession may be good for the soul, it is hardly sufficient for the Internal Revenue Service and other Government agencies that have engaged in a surprising amount of wiretapping, use of two-way mirrors, and other secret techniques in overzealous efforts to keep the public honest.

The latest disclosure is that the IRS since 1958 had installed and sometimes used two-way mirrors and hidden microphones in 26 cities. Yet, by what authority were these widespread installations made, and what real steps have been taken to prevent their use again? The answers thus far have been few.

Apparently the former IRS Commissioner, Mortimer M. Caplin, had developed an eager group of antiracketeer specialists who reported directly to Washington and who were not closely supervised by district and regional directors. Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating these things, said some agents abused this freedom by engaging in illegal wiretapping. Then the present Commissioner, Sheldon Cohen, ordered his local directors to assume close supervision of the racket investigations.

But simply closer supervision at a lesser level is not a satisfactory deterrent, for it is rather unlikely that some local IRS officials were not aware of this organized spying. Explicit legislative or administrative controls, with procedures that will back check on their enforcement and leave no doubt about their meaning, are what is lacking.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Aug. 16, 1965]

"BUGS" IN THE REVENUE SERVICE

Under the prodding of a Senate subcommittee, the Internal Revenue Service now acknowledges that it has made a widespread practice of spying and snooping on citizens. In at least 22 cities, IRS offices had bugged conference rooms, and at least 10 instances of two-way mirrors were uncovered.

It is small comfort to be told that the hidden microphones in Chicago and other cities "were not used on the average taxpayer," but only in investigating organized crime. The mikes were there, and the chance remarks of any unsuspecting visitor to the conference rooms could have been recorded.

The practice of eavesdropping spread in spite of instructions to the contrary from the top levels of Government. It came to light only because of the persistent digging of Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri. Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, head of the IRS, "was not aware of the extent to which these devices were used," said a spokesman.

The insidious growth of such practices in a supposedly free society is shocking and degrading. We expect this sort of spying on citizens in a police state, but not in America. And the lengthening list of bugged rooms eloquently supports the proposition that wiretapping is an evil that, once begun, all too easily gets out of hand.

If the IRS needs broader powers to investigate tax evasion and assist in the war on organized crime, let it seek and use such powers openly, if it can justify them to the public. But until or unless it gets such powers, the agents who have been playing "big brother" should have their knuckles rapped.

[From the Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C., Sept. 8, 1965]

IT'S TIME TO UNBUG

The Internal Revenue Service has informed Senator EDWARD V. LONG that it's going to stop doing what it should never have been doing in the first place.

In a letter to the Missouri Democrat, who is in charge of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigating the ofttimes illegal spying by Federal agents, especially revenuers, into the lives of private citizens, IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen has revealed the names of cities in which the agency had installed various surveilliance gadgets in its conference rooms.

In 10 cities, including Greenville, S.C., and Montgomery, Ala., agents had been using two-way mirrors with which they could watch taxpayers without themselves being watched.

In 21 cities, also including Montgomery, concealed microphones had been placed so that the agents could hear without being overheard. Not a very pretty picture. And not very legal, either. The privacy of communications between a lawyer and his client is supposed to be respected, even by investigators looking for evidence of illegal activities.

Now the IRS says it will unbug its conference rooms. This is, we suppose, progress, and perhaps we should be grateful, but we can't help wondering what other malpractices Senator LONG's subcommittee is going to uncover.

The IRS seems to be "hooked" on wiretapping, even though the agency knows and the agents know that wiretapping evidence can't be used in Federal courts and can even ruin a case that's based on it. The IRS is under Presidential orders to kick the habit, but the attitude of some of its agents suggests that won't be easy. In Miami, Fla., the other day, the longtime head of the agency's intelligence division there confessed to Senator LONG that his agents had bugged a public telephone and recorded all conversations from the booth.

"Was this not a moral, if not a legal violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion?" the Missouri Democrat asked. "Yes," replied the division chief after a long pause, "I guess it was."

And a Pittsburgh, Pa., special agent asked if he hadn't felt embarrassed about his illegal entrance into a private citizen's office to plant an illegal bug, replied: "I never gave it a thought."

No one ought to be allowed to get away with evading his taxes. But no one either should be allowed to get away with evading the letter or spirit of the laws, and that includes in particular those sworn to uphold them. "Criminal prosecution," said the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, "should not be deemed a dirty game in which 'the dirty business' of criminals is outwitted by 'the dirty business' of law officers."

If IRS agents or any other governmental officers at any level flout the law they breed contempt for the law, and if anything may truly be called subversive this is it.

PRESIDENT RENEWS THE FLAME

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the torch of freedom must eternally be rekindled with acts of justice.

The recent signing of the immigration bill was such an act, and it was fitting that this should be done by the colossal statue, designed by Bartholdi, and presented by the people of France on the 100th anniversary of American independence.

Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty is well known:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

In the beginning, of course, there was unlimited immigration to this country.

Then, shortly after World War I, immigration was definitely restricted.

Immigrants numbered over 1 million in 1910. Very few came during the war. By 1920, over 400,000 were admitted.

Then a national policy of strict limitation was adopted.

Immigrants, except those from the Western Hemisphere, were admitted only in definite quotas from each country.

When signing the new bill, President Johnson said the old system represented a "harsh injustice," that the system violated the basic principle of our democracy, the principle that values and rewards each man on the basis of his merit as a man.

Now, "Those who come will come because of what they are—not because of the land from which they sprung."

PULASKI DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 10, I was privileged to attend the parade and banquet honoring Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski in Wilmington, Del.

This celebration annually highlights the contribution that General Pulaski made to this country and the continuing contributions that have been made by Americans of Polish descent.

At this year's celebration the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish-American Congress adopted a resolution. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be included as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas in a rapidly changing and increasingly chaotic world, we must cling to the fundamental principles among nations, those of freedom and justice, and we should feel it our duty to restore them where they are missing, and

Whereas inspired by the thought of Casimir Pulaski's life who came to this land to help other people in their struggle for freedom and finally sacrificed his life for their cause and common ideals: we, Americans of Polish descent, assembled in the afternoon

of October 10, 1965, at the Pulaski Triangle in Wilmington, Del., at a meeting held on the occasion of celebrations in memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress; and mindful that, because of our origin, our opinion on the chaotic world affairs can be of service to our country, the United States of America, and to our leaders,

Resolved, That in any policy adopted toward Eastern Europe in general and toward Poland in particular, a distinction should be made between the countries and their rulers who may have been imposed by force on the peoples concerned, and that the policy of "building bridges" should be referred to the people and not to their governments;

That, while endorsing the above policy, it cannot accomplish a great deal without a resolute diplomatic action at an opportune moment;

That, any agreements with Soviet Russia, who may be pressured by circumstances to come to terms with us, should be preceded by restoration of freedom to the people of Poland deprived of it by Russia after World War II;

That the recognition of the present border between Germany and Poland on the Oder and Neisse Rivers will not change the "de facto" status of the questionable territories as they are populated by Poles, integrated with Poland and regarded as a return of previous national possessions of Poland; and that such recognition will become a factor in helping the Poles release themselves from the Communist yoke, and of arresting the encouragement of German revisionism, a reaction increasingly strong in Germany;

That the celebrations of Poland's millennium of christianity during the next year will be an occasion for our country to emphasize our links with Poland and to demonstrate our common cultural heritage, and that such celebrations will give the people of Poland hope and courage toward attaining so greatly desired and so greatly deserved freedom from oppression; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Delaware Senators and Representative to Congress, the Governor of the State of Delaware, and the U.S. Ambassador to Poland, to whom we extend our wishes of success on his new appointment.

For the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress.

ADAM J. ROSIAK, *President*
ANGELA C. TUROCHY,
Corresponding Secretary.

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN AMERICAN BOTTOMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Friday, October 8, 11 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], wrote a letter to the President of the United States, which was subsequently released to the press, advocating that the 50-percent requirement of shipments of wheat in American bottoms to certain Communist countries, including the Soviet Union, should be revoked administratively.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 7, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodies in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do no know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, FRANK CARLSON.

AN AWARD FOR DR. WEAVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, swiftly moving events in the realms of science and math are among the most spectacular and noteworthy achievements of our age.

We all experience a thrill when we hear of great discoveries in the laboratory or major explorations in the world of numbers. Yet, the new vocabulary, the unusual terms have little meaning for too many people. In fact, they are denied any real understanding of the most exciting ideas of our time—that stimulate the scientific community to produce even more of the same.

Dr. Warren Weaver is a rare human being. A mathematician and benefactor of the sciences, he not only understands and contributes to these ideas, but he also eases the plight of the interested public that wants to reach for comprehension but needs the services of an understanding interpreter.

Last week the Pacific Science Center Foundation awarded Dr. Weaver the Arches of Science Award "for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man." This prize acknowledges the fact that so many people are indebted to Dr. Weaver. Those of us who are interested—but uninitiated—are at least a little wiser for his efforts to make the achievements of science and mathematics more comprehensible.

Naturally, I am proud that Dr. Weaver is a resident of New Milford, Conn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Science World Honors Weaver," which appeared on October 6 in the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SCIENCE WORLD HONORS WEAVER

(By Earl Ubell)

For more than 30 years, Dr. Warren Weaver has played Alice to the crazy wonderland. As the public has viewed the mysterious goings on, he has tried to make sense out of it and helped others to make sense out of it, too. He had more luck than Alice did.

Yesterday the public and the scientists rewarded the sharp-witted shaper of science who is at once a mathematician, a science benefactor, a writer, an orginator, a needler, and an expert devotee to the lore and writings of Lewis Carroll: They gave him the $25,000 Arches of Science Award for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man.

STUNNED

Dr. Weaver took the whole proceedings at the Overseas Press Club with cheerful astonishment. All he had been doing for the last three decades was giving away a few million dollars to scientists through the Rockefeller and Sloane Foundations, starting science television programs, writing science books for bright children, cajoling newspaper editors to cover science, increasing the number of science writers, and saving a little time to start a new field of mathematics—information theory.

"I was so stunned when I could not say one single word," he said at a press conference.

There he was, playing Alice again. In Carroll's masterpiece, Alice had just presented all the animals with prizes as equal winners in a caucus race. The dodo bird, however, insisted that Alice get a prize herself—a thimble.

"The dodo solemnly presented the thimble, saying, 'We beg your acceptance of this elegant thimble,' and when it had finished this short speech, they all cheered. Alice thought the whole thing very absurd but they all looked so grave that she did not dare laugh,

and as she could think of nothing to say, she simply bowed, and took the thimble looking as solemn as she could."

ESSENTIAL

Dr. Weaver was not entirely dumb. He reserved to his wife the right of disposal of his prize, which he gets in Seattle on October 25. It was put up by the Pacific Northwest Telephone Co., and awarded by the Pacific Science Center Foundation. He also said he was leaving for Paris to pick up an international award: the Kalinga Prize, given for the popularization of science.

He also pointed out that he hardly thought the Arches of Science prize was absurd:

"It is essential that we today have individuals who are willing to live their lives partly within science and also partly within the world of affairs. These persons, working at the interface of science and society are more than useful—they have become essential."

He said he hoped the Arches of Science prize would be a stimulation to such people.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, representatives of various States recently met in Kansas City, Mo., to discuss the role of the Federal Government in education. An incisive editorial from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard points out graduate education particularly as being in need of a comprehensive Federal program.

It also warns that "50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as 1 Federal program."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Register-Guard editorial.

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

TOO MUCH FOR THE STATES TO COPE WITH

Thursday and Friday, representatives of most States will meet in Kansas City, Mo., to talk about a compact for education. It is the brainchild of Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina. The Governor shares with others concern over the increasing role of the Federal Government in education. Governor Sanford and friends have taken note of the warning of James Bryant Conant, former president of Harvard and America's education elder statesman, who has warned of a "tangled mess that no one can straighten out" in Federal education programs. The State representatives will try to get control back into their own hands.

Good luck. Unfortunately, however, they are likely to find that 50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as one Federal program. And one increasingly troublesome area of higher education must eventually become the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. That is graduate education, the cause of major problems in Oregon this year.

Sooner or later State legislatures must decide to what extent individual States are willing and able to provide the highly expensive kind of education that leads to Ph. D. degrees. Sooner or later, legislatures will discover that there is little relationhsip between what a State contributes to the national Ph. D. force and what it gets from it. For the American graduate student is one of the most mobile persons on earth. Only rarely does he stay in the State where he earned his graduate degree.

Many State schools discourage their graduates from taking advanced degrees on the campuses where they earned their B.A.'s. Also, many refuse to hire their own Ph. D.'s. There is a reason for this. The schools want to prevent inbreeding, believing that it is as beneficial to get a teacher into a new environment as it is to get a student away from home. That's one of the ways we become a nation instead of a bunch of regions. Therefore, it is not unusual for a native of Utah to get his bachelor's degree in Utah, his Ph. D. in Oregon and then to teach in California or Arizona.

The tendency of the educated to move away from home begins with high school. The more education a person has the more likely he is to forsake his hometown for the big city and a big job, or the more likely he is to flee his home in the city for less populous regions where he can grow with the country. Among Ph. D.'s only 1 out of 5 lives in the State where he got his degree.

Oregon is still a debtor State in this regard. We import two Ph. D.'s, mostly professors, for every one we train and send away. Washington imports 1½ for every one it sends out. California, with its vast educational plant to train and consume Ph. D.'s, breaks even, as do North Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Iowa, however, train five for every one they import. Importing five for every one they train are Maine, Pennsylvania, and some Southern States.

Plainly, legislatures will someday look at the benefit-to-cost ratio. Oregon's will not be the first to do so. For Oregon is still benefiting. But even in Oregon, the national problem can be seen. At the University of Oregon from 1961 to 1964, undergraduate enrollment increased by 1,774 students, or 20.2 percent. But in the same period, graduate enrollment increased by 974 students, or 64.7 percent. And this graduate enrollment was costly—in money, in teaching time, and in critically short space.

Not only are more students attending college, but more are deciding that commencement is just that, only the beginning. State representatives in Kansas City may find they can make some arrangements among themselves to help out. But in the long run, they're going to have to grant that graduate education, as we now know it, should be as much a Federal as a State responsibility.

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM: THE PACE BETWEEN FOOD AND PEOPLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cover of the October 4, 1965 issue of U.S. News & World Report, is headlined "The World's Biggest Problem." This heading is explained in an excellent article pointing up the challenge to mankind posed by the acceleration of population and the strain on future world food supplies. The editors of U.S. News & World Report have been on top of this problem for some time. Their first issue of 1964—January 6—carried a cover story headlined "Why Hunger Is To Be The World's No. 1 Problem." This well-informed earlier report which was based in considerable part on the findings of the Department of Agriculture's brilliant Dr. Lester Brown was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at my request following an address to the Senate on this theme, September 23, 1965.

Believing that the editors of U.S. News are performing an invaluable service to the Nation and to the world in giving attention to the vital problems of food supplies and world population, I ask unanimous consent that the article of October 4, 1965, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM—HOW EXPERTS SEE IT

How can the world feed all its people, at the rate the population is growing?

That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

A look at what's happening shows why experts are worried. The human race is doubling in numbers every 35 years. That means the food supply must be doubled, too—in just 35 years.

Can that be done? Or is famine ahead?

For United States, it means a new challenge. And officials already are moving to meet it.

Startling facts that dramatize the world's biggest problem are brought to light by an international industrial conference sponsored by Stanford Research Institute and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The problem is this:

In the next 35 years, the world's population, now about 3.3 billion, will skyrocket to about 6 billion—almost doubling by the year 2000.

Biggest population increases—more than 100 percent—will come in the less developed nations, where population already is pressing severely against food supply.

Smallest increases—about 40 percent—will come in the well-fed, industrial nations best able to handle growth.

These United Nations estimates of future population are conservative. Actual increases may prove to be much higher.

The story of what these figures mean was reported by experts at the conference, held in San Francisco in September.

NEEDED: TWICE AS MUCH FOOD

The drama of the population story is this:

The world, even now, is facing a food problem. Diets are inadequate in the huge underdeveloped areas of the world, which include almost all of Asia and Africa and most of Latin America.

Just to maintain the present inadequate level of diet will require a virtual doubling of the world's output of food in the next 35 years.

This vast increase in food production must be achieved at a time when nearly all of the virgin lands of the world already have been brought into production.

There is no assurance that the job can be done in time.

Great famine, as a result, could be the outlook.

This warning is voiced by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University and onetime chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportion as to threaten the peace and stability of the western world."

SPEEDUP IN POPULATION GROWTH

But, it is asked: Hasn't the world always found a way to feed its ever-growing population?

The answer, according to the exports, is that the problem today is far more complex than at any time in the past.

For one thing, population growth is faster now—and getting faster all the time. Dr. Butz paints this picture:

"At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million.

"In the next 16 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600.

"Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion.

"In the less than two-thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again.

"Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again.

"The astonishing fact is that the human race is currently doubling in numbers every 35 years.

"Obviously, this rate of growth cannot persist indefinitely, because of the sheer limitation of space and food."

Complicating the problem is the fact that food production is not increasing as fast as the population. Dr. Butz reports this:

"The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years.

"Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in a serious decline."

WHERE FOOD CRISES LOOM

The drama of the food problem that lies ahead will center in the following areas: Latin America, Asia, Africa.

Latin America's population in the next 35 years will zoom 157 percent—from 245 million people now to 630 million people by the year 2000.

Even now, Latin America as a whole is compelled to import food to feed its own people. The only Latin American countries classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having adequate diets are Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ahead, for Latin America, is the problem of finding food for 385 million more people within 35 years.

Asia, which already holds 55 percent of the world's population, is expected to show a rise of 89 percent in population in the next 35 years, up from 1.8 billion now to about 3.4 billion in the year 2000.

Here, too, is an area that must import food to live. Today Red China is forced to buy grain in large quantities. The millions of India are heavily dependent on food supplies from the United States. Few Asian nations are able to provide their people an adequate diet.

Asia's problem, loaded with potential for future tragedy, is where to find food for the 1.6 billion additional people that it must feed 35 years hence.

Or take the case of Africa, heading for a population growth of 151 percent in the remainder of this century. Only South Africa, in this whole vast continent, is classified as having an adequate diet today. Africa, already importing food, faces the problem of feeding 466 added millions by 2000.

Taken all together, the hungry countries of the world—those considered by experts to have deficient diets—now contain about two-thirds of the world's population but produce only about one-third of the world's food. And it is almost exactly these hungry areas that face the biggest population growth in the years ahead.

A TURN IN THE FOOD FLOW

What makes the food problem even worse is the decline of underdeveloped areas as food producers. Only a generation ago, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the more advanced countries, especially to Europe.

Now the food flow is reversed. The underdeveloped areas that once grew more food than they ate now must import food from the developed nations.

The reason is that food production in those hungry, underdeveloped areas is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with the increase in population. From 1953 to 1963, there was an actual drop in the amount of food produced locally per person in the underdeveloped regions.

DILEMMA OF THE WEST

Here's a problem for the free world: Communist countries, including Red China, face a smaller population explosion than non-Communist countries.

The outlook, as analyzed by the experts, is that the population in the Communist world will grow about 49 percent while the population in the free world will grow about 98 percent between now and the year 2000.

What this means is that growing food problems could fan agitation for revolution in areas not now Communist.

OVERCROWDING

Not only food but living space will become a serious problem in the population explosion ahead. Even now, many parts of the world are overcrowded. The following figures show the density of population in 1965 and the density expected by 2000:

Population per square mile

	1965	*2000*
Asia	108	202
Africa	26	65
Europe	167	192
Latin America	31	78
North America	26	41
Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, etc.)	5	10

As these figures show, North America will continue to be a part of the world that offers its inhabitants the most elbowroom. But even Americans will begin to feel crowded.

NOTE OF HOPE, TOO

One hopeful note is sounded by the experts: The world is not likely to run out of essential fuels or industrial materials in this century.

Sir John Cockcroft, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1951 and now master of Churchill College at Cambridge, England, told the conference:

Reserves of coal, oil, gas, and uranium will be adequate to provide increasing amounts of power for many years.

By the time uranium supplies run out—if they ever do—man will know how to extract energy from water.

Industry will have to turn to lower grade sources of raw materials. But the ocean floor may yield large quantities of manganese, copper, nickel and cobalt. And plastics will be improved to replace metals in many uses.

A WATER SHORTAGE?

Water, in the crowded world of the future, looms as a problem almost as serious as that of food. Sir John Cockcroft discusses the water situation in these words:

"Water supplies could be a limitation on the development of the economy, especially water supplies for industrial and agricultural use, since requirements are likely to double in the next 20 years. The future of Asia, Africa, and Australia could be vitally affected by water shortage, and even in some parts of the United States this is becoming a problem.

"Desalination of brackish and sea water may help in some areas of the world, especially if combined with less wasteful methods of using water for agriculture and the development of plant varieties which require less water."

WHAT EXPERTS BELIEVE

Is there an answer to the worlds biggest problem? Two things must be done, say the experts:

1. Increase food production greatly.
2. Reduce the world's birth rate.

"In the long run," says Dr. Butz, "say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution."

But Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, of Toyko University, warns:

"The control of population growth, although it might become a kind of necessity in the future, cannot be depended upon too much now as the major means of adjusting the unbalanced food and population relationship.

"As the adoption of birth control among the developing nations will presuppose a raised standard of living, a wider diffusion of general education, as well as a changed mental outlook, it will certainly take many years to come. During this time, the predicted crisis will not stop approaching.

"It will be a race between the two, and our prospect of winning the race is not too bright at present.

"So we have to turn our attention toward the increase of food production."

U.S. ROLE IN FOOD BATTLE

The United States, it is clear, will play a leading role in the coming battle to feed the world.

This country produces so much surplus food that the official policy has been to limit grain production.

Now official thinking is beginning to change.

On September 23, a new policy was proposed by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former Director of the food-for-peace program. He told the U.S. Senate:

"The most overwhelming paradox of our time is to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production. * * *

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger. * * * We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food-producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential."

A bill has been introduced by Senator MCGOVERN which would authorize the Federal Government to buy American-produced food to give to hungry nations or to sell to them at bargain prices. Other countries also would be given help in improving their own food production.

President Johnson is known to be thinking about the world food problem. He has expressed his conviction that the United States cannot remain secure as an island of abundance in a world full of starving people.

The time is seen approaching when U.S. farmers will be asked to spur food production—instead of curb it.

THE CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

Can the United States really feed the world of the future?

"The opportunity for increased food production on the North American Continent is tremendous," says Dr Butz, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

However, he points out: "We can add only a limited supply of additional arable land. We can get some additional food from the sea—but here again we face practical limits.

"The only practical alternative available to us is the accelerated application of capital and technology to our own agricultural system in an effort substantially to increase output per acre and per man."

This also is pointed out by the experts: United States and Canada themselves face a population growth of about 64 percent in the next 35 years. Those additional people will take a large part of any increase in production.

Feeding a population the size of that foreseen by 2000 is going to be a job too big for any one country. Yet, for the United States, says Dr. Butz: "There is no realistic alternative for us except to gear up to meet this challenge."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM—BREAKTHROUGH IN BIRTH CONTROL: ANSWER TO POPULATION EXPLOSION?

As birth rates soar—governments, in the United States and elsewhere, are moving into "family planning" as never before.

It's a big break with the past. And the story is just beginning to unfold.

Birth control is breaking more and more into the open as governments begin to look for ways to curb the world's population explosion.

Japan, in the years after World War II, was the first nation to go in for birth control on a massive scale. There it was considered a success in causing population to level off.

Now other countries are moving rapidly in the same direction.

India has opened a factory to produce an intrauterine device—itself a revolution in birth-control technique. Goal is a supply for 20 million users by 1970.

In Latin America, predominantly Roman Catholic, Chile has started making birth-control services available to the poor, and private clinics are flourishing in Brazil.

Korea, Tunisia, and other countries are in the midst of birth-control campaigns, or are planning them.

In the United States the Government is taking a greatly changed attitude toward the idea of supporting birth-control programs at home and abroad.

As recently as 1959, President Eisenhower rejected the idea of Government support for birth-control programs abroad.

Laws in most States prohibiting distribution of birth-control information or devices were seldom enforced—but efforts to get them repealed met with repeated failure.

Today, by contrast—

The Child Health and Human Development Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service is spending about $6 million for research on human reproduction, much of it related to the search for universally effective and acceptable methods of "family planning."

The Department of the Interior is offering birth-control services on Indian reservations, in Pacific Trust Territories, and to Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in Alaska.

Birth control is becoming part of the "war on poverty," too.

St. Louis and Buffalo, for example, are getting Federal money for birth-control clinics, publicly or privately operated, as part of their overall grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity, subject to meeting specific conditions aimed at minimizing controversy.

Expansion of Federal activity in this field already is being mapped.

A "RIGHT" FOR PARENTS

On September 9, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, head of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that family planning services should be available as a "right" to all parents. She added:

"The conviction has grown that education and instruction in effective family planning should be an essential component of both the health and welfare agencies * * * for dependent families."

State and local governments, meanwhile, have started moving in the same direction.

In the last 2 years, 12 States have removed, in whole or in part, legal barriers to the distribution of birth control information and devices.

Twenty-seven States and the District of Columbia are offering family planning advice as part of their maternal-care programs for the poor. In a dozen other States, local tax money is going into birth control programs.

In addition, birth control services are being offered free of charge, or at nominal cost to more and more people by the 275 privately run clinics of the Planned Parenthood Federation.

Last year this organization reported a 44 percent increase in its caseload over the previous year.

BIG PROBLEM: THE POOR

The family planning campaign is being centered on America's poor—who are found, on the average, to have larger families than others, with less ability to support them or raise them properly.

Public officials, worried by soaring welfare costs of more than $1 billion a year for dependent children alone, are attracted to the idea of making birth control aid available to the poor.

This availability, it is stressed, would leave individual parents free to accept or reject family planning—and, if they accept, to decide which method to use.

In Illinois, where 65,000 illegitimate children are on welfare, the legislature this year extended birth control aid to any mother, married or unmarried, who is 15 years of age or older and on public welfare.

Chicago's Board of Health, since March, has been prescribing oral contraceptives for women applying at 7 of its 34 clinics.

New York City operates eight clinics in slums. Detroit and San Francisco recently launched municipally run clinics for indigent women seeking birth control help. In Washington, D.C., where 1 in every 5 births is illegitimate, about 8,000 women over the past 12 months have received birth control services at public hospitals from funds that were provided by Congress.

Just what impact such programs are having is being debated widely.

It is the claim of Planned Parenthood that an intensive campaign in one slum area of Chicago brought a 25-percent decline in the birth rate between 1960 and 1965. In North Carolina's Mecklenburg County, a birth control project involving 180 women, each getting relief money for 5 or more children, reduced pregnancies to zero after a few years.

On the other hand, Detroit's health commissioner, Dr. John J. Hanlon, reported that response so far to the municipal birth control program was "not as great as we expected." He explained:

"Basically, we are dealing with the most indigent, who suffer from a lack of education. There is a cultural lag. They have to become aware of the advantages of limiting the number of dependents."

WATCHING AN EXPERIMENT

Population experts are closely watching the outcome of studies in Corpus Christi, Tex., where Planned Parenthood has been running a central clinic for 6 years and now is setting up "satellite" clinics in neighborhoods with the help of $8,500 in Federal funds.

To date, studies show this:

The number of live births to indigent parents at the charity clinic in Corpus Christi declined 24 percent between 1961 and 1964.

Postabortion treatments at this hospital declined from 374 to 224 during that period.

At present, obstetrical cases of all kinds at the charity hospital are running at about 60 percent of the rate of 1963, the year before the birth control center began distributing oral contraceptives on a large scale.

HELP FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Federal funds to support birth control programs soon are to start flowing abroad, too.

President Johnson last January promised that "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population * * *." In August, he urged United Nations delegates to "act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth."

Word has gone out to foreign governments that the United States will consider all requests for aid except for the providing of contraceptives themselves. Assistance could be given, for instance, to a nation in the training of family planning workers, in research, or in the purchase of mobile clinics and other equipment to be used in birth control programs.

Foreign governments, at the present time, are drawing up applications for U.S. aid on birth control programs—and advance signs are that the number of such requests will not be small.

Korea, which hopes to reduce its rate of population growth from 2.9 percent to 2 percent by 1971, has already made a big start in plans to distribute a million intrauterine devices.

Formosa, where a birth control drive already is well under way in the cities, expects to extend it to the countryside.

India, despair of the world's population experts, is just beginning a mass campaign to reduce the number of births from 40 per 1,000 to about 25 by the early 1970's. That would make a sizable dent in the present baby crop, estimated at 14 million births a year.

Before the war between India and Pakistan, the latter also had plans for a birth control drive that was to require substantial U.S. aid.

Tunisia is mapping a large-scale campaign to reduce births—the first Arab nation to do so. Turkey, which recently repealed a ban on contraceptives, is to apply for large amounts of American help.

Even Latin America, where the subject is highly controversial, is getting into birth-control programs.

Chile, already offering contraceptive devices to the poor in cities, soon expects to extend that service to peasants in the countryside.

In Peru, the Ministry of Public Health and Social Assistance has set up a population-study center that is seen as leading, almost inevitably, into a campaign to promote birth control.

In Brazil, privately operated clinics offering help on birth control are functioning in cities—some with the support of Catholic priests behind the scenes. Numerous churchmen are privately encouraging family-planning promoters to go ahead with any type of contraceptive that seems effective.

Communist nations, too, are joining in the worldwide rush to curb explosive population growth.

East Germany is quietly liberalizing restrictions on abortion, and plans to manufacture oral contraceptives. In Red China, oral contraceptives are beginning to make an appearance, amid signs that the Communist leadership intends to intensify its drive against early marriages and childbearing.

BRINGING PRICES DOWN

Technical developments are accelerating the worldwide movement toward birth control.

Until a few years ago, the contraceptives then available seemed impractical for mass campaigns. Even the oral contraceptive, which must be taken for 20 consecutive days

at a cost of $25 or more a year, was not popular among slum dwellers and peasants of low income, literacy, and responsibility.

Legalized abortion, largely responsible for bringing Japan's population growth almost to a standstill, is being used in Red China and Eastern Europe—but elsewhere is making little headway. Sterilization, in India and some other nations, is found to require more physicians than usually are available in such countries.

In that situation, the appearance of intrauterine devices is considered of major importance to mass programs of birth control.

One type of device, made of plastic and shaped like a double S, can be manufactured in Asia to sell for about 2 cents—and, once inserted by a physician, can remain indefinitely in about 75 percent of the cases. Satisfactorily in place, it is found to prevent conception in 98 or 99 percent of its users.

What is also giving a push to Government programs to curb birth rates is growing worry about the population crisis.

Former President Eisenhower, once opposed to Government action in this field, is publicly urging that the Government assume a more active role. Congressmen who once considered the birth-control issue "political dynamite" are considering a bill that would establish "population offices" in two departments of the President's Cabinet.

Early this year, a Gallup poll reported that 78 percent of Catholics questioned believed that birth control should be made available to anyone wanting it. This was a substantial increase over the 53 percent noted in a June 1963 poll.

In Chicago, it was Catholic politicians who led the way for approval of that city's birth-control program. In Massachusetts, Richard Cardinal Cushing urged repeal of that State's law against birth control, although the legislature voted against repeal.

A RELIGIOUS VIEWPOINT

For Catholics themselves, church teaching is that "artificial contraception" is immoral. The "rhythm method"—abstinence from marital relations during a woman's fertile period—is cited as the only permissible method of regulating family size.

Some Catholic scholars are calling for a reexamination of this stand. Pope Paul VI, after getting the report of a papal commission, is expected to make a pronouncement on the subject soon.

In the meantime, much debate is building up among Catholics on the growing role of governments.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing U.S. Catholic bishops, approved a statement to Congressmen asserting: "If the power and prestige of government is placed behind programs aimed at providing birth-control services to the poor, coercion necessarily results and violations of human privacy become inevitable. * * *"

On the other hand, some prelates are endorsing this view, given last year by the Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of Boston College's law school:

"The exploding population of the world * * * and the tragedy of more than 1 billion human beings living on a substandard diet can hardly be said to be a problem on which the modern state can be neutral by being inactive."

This much is becoming clear:

Technically and politically, governments are finding that many obstacles to the launching of mass programs of birth control are being removed.

Programs already underway are far from solving the world's population worries. In America itself, for instance, best estimates are that birth control for the poor is reaching 10 percent of 5 million impoverished women.

Even so, population experts say that the situation today is far different from what it was 2 or 3 years ago—and that even bigger changes are likely to come in years just ahead.

SBA REGIONAL COUNSEL FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, earlier this year Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, established Alaska as a region in itself, and Robert E. Butler, an outstanding Alaskan, was named regional director. This was one more step Mr. Foley took to aid in Alaska's economic development. Few public servants have brought as much vigor and imagination to their jobs as Mr. Foley did for SBA and now will in his new position as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

Today I can announce that a final step in making Alaska a full region has been taken. The positions of regional counsel and assistant regional counsel have been established in the Anchorage office.

This is an important, indeed, a vital step in permitting the Small Business Administration to operate as it should. Until now all loans had to be closed in Seattle. By road, Seattle is over 2,500 miles away from Anchorage, the city where most of the business activity takes place. The establishment of Alaska as a region in permitting the Anchorage regional office to operate as a region should be a demonstration of the fact that Alaska is growing and growing at a rapid pace. The Small Business Administration is playing an essential role in the growth of the State and I want to take this opportunity to commend all of those in SBA who have contributed so much.

THE HUNGER OF CHILDREN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, despite efforts to fight hunger around the world, Latin America faces the severe crisis of population growth racing ahead of food production. The extent of the problem is often difficult to envision. An article in Today's Health poignantly sketches the urgency of coming to grips with the widespread hunger in parts of the lands to the south. It places in perspective the efforts now being made to overcome hunger and how far behind the problem these efforts are. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a portion of this excellent article by Gwen Schultz.

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

A new baby can bring into a home bright hope of happiness ahead. But in a rueful number of Latin American families hope shrivels all too soon to sorrow—sorrow caused by malnutrition. That insidious "hidden hunger," whose easiest victims are children and whose confederates are poverty, illiteracy, and out-of-control birth rates, is rampant in large parts of Central and South America. A defense as simple as a balanced diet could rout it, but still its menace grows.

In those lands there are far too many tiny coffins carried to cemeteries, too many little bodies dwarfed and distorted, too many baby smiles that fade into irritable frowns, sparkling eyes that dull with disinterest or stop seeing altogether, and energies that flag into limp apathy.

Why have Americans, renowned as militant hunger-fighters around the world, tolerated this mass misery in their own backyard? Their earnings go generously to governmental agencies, the United Nations, universities, churches, and various other organizations which assiduously attack hunger in underdeveloped areas. Every day an average of five 10,000-ton ships leaves the United States carrying food-for-peace around the world. Then why isn't hunger in our hemisphere whipped into retreat? It is, but not everywhere and not fast enough.

Of all the world's major regions, Latin America has the highest rate of population growth. It has had the highest rate in every decade since 1920. Between 1920 and 1960, while the United States and Canada increased 72 percent and south Asia 85 percent, Latin America zoomed up 136 percent. By the year 2000, its present population, if unchecked, will triple and in some areas it will quadruple while the world as a whole only doubles.

Latin America's food production must increase faster than population if hunger is to diminish, but it is not even keeping pace. There, where population growth is the fastest in the world, agricultural production per capita has paradoxically been decreasing. Children are produced faster than food to feed them.

The food shortage may seem unrealistic in view of the large grain and meat exports from South America. But these come from the pampas of Argentina and Uruguay, a region much like the North American Corn Belt but smaller in area. In all of Latin America this is the only first-class agricultural region of any important size, and these are the only two countries that have an ample food supply.

The Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP) recently investigated the deaths of children aged 1 to 4 in several Guatemalan villages. Civil registers indicated malnutrition was the cause of only 1 of 109 deaths in a given period. INCAP investigators, reexamining the cases, clearly determined that not 1 but 40 were due to malnutrition.

This surreptitious killer has escaped detection, too, because its method of operation has not been fully understood, even in medical circles. For decades the need for minerals and vitamins has been explored, and we know that severe deficiencies of certain of them still cause numerous cases of anemia, blindness, scurvy, rickets, pellagra, and other illnesses in underdeveloped areas like Latin America. Now medical science is advancing into another nutritional realm. It has put the finger on the world's most critical childhood deficiency—protein, particularly high-quality protein found in animal foods such as meat, milk, fish, eggs, cheese, and butter. These vital foods do not keep well in farm climate; they are high priced, and besides, taboos and superstitions prohibiting their consumption by children are widespread.

Marasmus and kwashiorkor—still unfamiliar words probably; but these are the two most destructive childhood diseases of underdeveloped tropical and subtropical areas. Protein shortage is a factor in both. Marasmus afflicts children under 1 year of age; kwashiorkor afflicts those somewhat older. These two diseases, somewhat allied, often merge with one another. The infant with marasmus has a wasted, "skin-and-bones" look. Eating little but watery gruels, he is literally starving. If he survives he will in time be fed more calories but still not enough protein. Then, usually following an infectious disease, kwashiorkor will be superimposed upon the marasmus condition.

Protein deficiency diseases are curable if treated in time. Skimmed milk, mixed from

dry milk powder, has proved highly successful in recovery and preventive diets. Mothers are being encouraged to use an inexpensive milk substitute, Incaparina (named for its developer INCAP), where it is available. A formula mixture of corn, sorghum, cottonseed flour, yeast, calcium carbonate, and vitamin A, it contains protein of good quality although no animal protein.

The basic use for Incaparina is as a gruel for infants and for older children. Presently, considerable thought is being given to special ways of incorporating it into the diet of children beyond the age when they will eat whatever is placed before them.

Fish flour can be a boon to low-protein diets. Said to be the world's cheapest, richest potential source of high-quality protein when properly prepared, it keeps and ships well and can be made tasteless and odorless. Waters off the coasts of Peru and Chile are excellent for fishing. The annual catch of Peru alone is about 7 million tons, most of which is now exported as fertilizer and food for animals.

Fish flour has been produced for experimental studies in both these countries. They could become manufacturers of this product for human consumption.

Many Latin American governments have, since 1956, taken advantage of the offer of the U.S. Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Development (earlier called the Committee for National Defense) to collaborate in assessing the nutritional state of their countries. Health teams from the United States work with local personnel, examining individuals, sampling food from home kitchens, analyzing food distribution, and determining ways to improve the country's nutrition.

The white hospital ship *Hope* (health opportunity for people everywhere) has docked at Peru and Ecuador during her worldwide mercy voyages, and next year will drop anchor at Nicaragua. Her staffs on ship and on shore conduct health education programs. Her milk plant, said to be equal to 2,500 cows, reconstitutes dry milk. To obtain it, mothers must attend nutrition classes. Edith S. Clark, *Hope*'s director of nursing, says that one mother was so grateful for the improvement in her baby that she tried to give it to a *Hope* worker.

Many devoted hands and minds are at work. But their effect in this enormous, craving land is a light sprinkle of raindrops, vitalizing spots here and there, when what is needed really is a saturating flood.

Education could be that flood. About 45 percent of Latin America is illiterate. School enrollments are far below what they should be.

Operation Ninos (ninos means children), the food-for-peace child-feeding program, is luring children to school with snacks and lunches. Begun in 1954, the project uses food from the United States. Through volunteer agencies, local governments, and teachers, it now helps feed one-third of Latin America's schoolchildren, serving them as little as a cup of milk or as much as a full hot meal. Some school kitchens are no more than an oven formed by three stones. The workers' instruction manual indicates the rudimentary level on which the program operates:

"A sturdy aluminum cup is an all-purpose utensil that will stand up under hard treatment. A spoon can later be provided to eat food from the cup if this seems desirable and funds permit."

Although recipes are not exactly the gourmet type, they are planned with good nutrition in mind: bulgar wheat pilaf, peanut soup, cornmeal fruit pudding, cereal pie with meat, molasses milk.

By serving milk and food in schools, malnutrition and illiteracy are attacked simultaneously. Hungry students are inattentive and learn slowly.

Parents who never sent their children to school before now want them to go. School lunches are credited with doubling rural school attendance in Peru, cutting absenteeism in Bolivia from 38 to 2 percent, and adding 8 pounds in 4 months to third-graders in Chile. Many youngsters get their only wholesome meals, their only milk, at school.

A questioning of Brazilian students revealed that for breakfast 2 out of 10 had nothing, 3 had just coffee, 4 had bread and coffee, and only 1 had more than that. Now a basic meal is enjoyed by 3 million schoolchildren in that country and by 12 million in Latin America as a whole. Gardens kept by students demonstrate home gardening methods and provide vegetables for the meals.

Health centers, mobile units, and river boats reach children who are not in school and—just as important—they reach their parents, who may need education too. Some mothers, tied to tradition, lose two or three children before daring to try new lifesaving foods. Some tell their sons that only sissies drink milk. Some paint their breasts with vile-tasting substance to repel their infants.

A farmer may sell his eggs, chickens, or milk (protein desperately needed by his children) to buy larger caloric quantities of food. Corn, rice, wheat, potatoes, cassava, beans—these satisfy hunger for a low price. If he slaughters one of his few precious animals it is likely to be prime one, leaving the scrawnier ones for breeding. Andean farmers are repeatedly told, "Eat the small potatoes and use the big ones for seed," but they do just the opposite. Can farmers at starvation's brink gamble with alien methods which some tall stranger assures them will pay off in the future?

There may still be skeptics who think, "Things can't really be as dismal as all that." Surely, a farmer with initiative, who cannot make a go of it in one place can move elsewhere, for Latin America is still in the pioneer stage—a big, beautiful, thinly settled land. However, the best land is already under production, much in large ranches and plantations. Ninety percent of the agricultural land is owned by 10 percent of the landowners. About a third of Latin America is dry. Mountains rumple Central America and western South America, and much more land is dissected badly. The luxuriant rain forests? Deceptively infertile. Soils are leached and eroded by year-round rains, and clearings are overrun with insects and weeds. What marginal land remains is far from market and requires energy—as well as capital—to develop.

Yes, the destitute farmer can leave his wornout plot of ground—even though several children are buried there; even though he cannot read; even though he has no money and his wife is pregnant; even though his creativeness is dulled by the drugging coca leaf used since childhood to deaden hunger pangs, or by alcohol, or the greater depressant, failure.

Why not go to the big city? Latin America has 10 cities over a million, several over 3 million. With their modern architecture, bustling thoroughfares, and handsome, healthy people they beckon promisingly. Work must be there.

But throngs of other farmers are migrating to cities too. Unskilled, illiterate, and poor, they cannot easily find jobs or even a place to live. In magnificent Caracas, a metropolis of more than a million and a half, 65 percent of the inhabitants are squatters. On the farm a family might have had access to some vegetables, fruits, and animals, but here with little money they are restricted even more to starchy staples. And poverty does not prevent children from being born.

Urbanization is accelerating. Fewer hands are left on the farms. If farmers do increase their yields their own families can in most cases consume the increase. Incomes of unskilled city workers are pitifully low. There is less food to be bought and little to buy it with. Should a family's income rise, many things beside proteins and vitamins must be paid for—clothes, a home, furnishings, a few luxuries—and so the diet remains meager.

The skeptic still has reason to doubt the extent of the children's suffering when he looks at the vital statistics. It is true that death rates of Latin American children are dropping dramatically. For instance, from about 1948 to 1962 the infant montality rate (deaths of infants under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births) dropped from 102 to 70 in Mexico, from 78 to 42 in Puerto Rico, from 147 to 117 in Chile, from 105 to 70 in British Honduras. But these are still high compared with United States' 25, Canada's 28, and the United Kingdom's 22. Goals are set to bring these rates lower still.

To conduct a health program in a hungry land without increasing food supplies proportionately is to invite disaster. And disaster is at the door. Each saved life is an added drain on the available food. Yet who would even think of retarding medical and technical progress? Plans are to step it up.

We see the ironic truth: The more we help, the worse the hunger situation becomes.

Death rates fall fast. Birth rates remain frighteningly high in a fertile, youthful population. No wonder there is panic at the prospect. Ultimately, we trust, all countries will find a way to feed themselves properly, but what of the meantime? It is the children who will suffer most.

Some look to industrialization as the quick solution because it can increase a nation's buying power while it lowers birth rates. Japan and Great Britain are often cited as classic examples of countries where industrialization solved the overpopulation problem. But no nation has successfully industrialized without first having had a sound agricultural base. The British and Japanese are some of the world's most expert agriculturalists. Except for certain limited regions and large commercial enterprises, Latin America's agricultural base is poor, even primitive.

Land reform, which will eventually give more land to the small farmer, progresses slowly, and while it takes place agricultural production will be disrupted as new patterns and techniques are put into operation.

Change will take time. Meanwhile malnutrition slithers along—killing, crippling, stunting, weakening, and mentally numbing, through one generation after the other. A country's outlook is a composite of the outlook of its people individually. How much more vigorous, progressive, and satisfied a country would be if the bulk of its citizens grew to full stature with strong bodies, healthy ambitions, and normally happy dispositions.

Food is not all youngsters need for the good life. If they do manage to keep alive and healthy, can their other requirements be met? Will their environments be uplifting ones where characters can develop in healthful channels too? Will rescued lives find opportunity, stimulus, and fulfillment?

PULASKI DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today is Pulaski Day, a day during which we express our gratitude to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life on October 11, 1779, to help us achieve our independence.

In a proclamation that today, October 11, 1965, be set aside as Pulaski Day in Connecticut, Gov. John Dempsey pointed out:

The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I heartily concur with Governor Dempsey's thoughts on why we should observe Pulaski Day and I ask unanimous consent to have the Governor's proclamation printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN DEMPSEY, GOVERNOR, STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Our Nation will ever be grateful to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life for the cause of American independence in the historic siege of Savannah on October 11, 1777.

A fearless champion of liberty in his native land before he generously offered his services to the struggling Colonies, General Pulaski, a brilliant strategist, brought strength and inspiration to the Colonial troops in their long battle to establish an independent nation.

The General Assembly of Connecticut, mindful of the esteem in which the name of General Pulaski is held, has directed that a day be set aside annually to honor the memory of this gallant officer. Accordingly, I hereby proclaim Monday, October 11, 1965, to be Pulaski Day.

The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I urge that national and State flags be displayed on public and private buildings in Connecticut on Pulaski Day and that schools and civic organizations conduct appropriate memorial exercises.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 25th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States the 190th.

JOHN DEMPSEY,
State of Connecticut.

By His Excellency's command:

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR REPORTS ON WORLD FOOD CHALLENGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor, which I have long regarded as one of the world's greatest newspapers, has given careful attention in recent weeks to the world food and population crisis. I have especially appreciated a report by the distinguished journalist, Saville R. Davis, on my efforts in this field which appeared in the October 4, 1965, issue of the Monitor, and a supporting editorial in the October 7 issue. A third article, entitled "Experts Warn of Global Hunger Challenges," appeared in the October 4, 1965, Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that this piece be printed in the RECORD:

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

EXPERTS WARN OF GLOBAL HUNGER CHALLENGES

WASHINGTON.—What happens when soaring world population crosses the line of food production? Some experts here think it has already happened.

Maduri is a 7-year-old girl in Rajpur, India. The village had 400 people a generation ago; today 700. Maduri is small for her age, has big hungry eyes. She has never had a square meal. Foreign experts look and sigh.

Carlos Busto tries to support five ragged children in a shack in northeast Brazil. His situation is abject—desperate even.

The country imported 3 million tons of wheat last year. Yet the soil is rich. It is a classical example of unused potential.

In Egypt the great Aswan Dam is rising. When completed it will add 2 million arable acres on either side of the Nile. Engineers hail it "to feed the hungry." But by the time the dam is built, the new acreage will not be able to feed the new population.

IRONY SEEN

So it is around the world—Turkey, China, Africa. A terrible irony is that almost without exception Communist countries which rebelled against deprivation now import food more and more. It is true of China and the Soviet Union.

The forthcoming world hunger may be the single most important fact in the latter part of the 20th century, demographers here say. It will be, they argue, unless something is done quickly.

A world famine, experts say, doesn't "start"; it has no fixed time of beginning. There was no "start" of the New York water shortage, for example. What happened was that New Yorkers suddenly discovered a condition that was there already.

World hunger is present today. One international food agency (Food and Agricultural Organization) estimates 10,000 fatalities a day due to malnutrition.

CRISIS SIGHTED

By 1980, Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, says that 1 billion more people will have to be fed. Primarily they will be in underdeveloped, hungry countries.

Swedish Economist Gunnar Myrdal puts the acute stage closer. "Five or Ten years," he told a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. "I am frightened," he added.

Thomas M. Ware, head of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation testified here in June before a Senate subcommittee:

"Very few grasp the magnitude of the danger that confronts us * * *. The catastrophe is not something that may happen; on the contrary, it is a mathematical certainty that it will happen."

VIEW SHARED

This view is commonplace among anxious agronomists and economists.

The U.S. Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, testified that approaching world famine threatens "the most colossal catastrophe in history."

When world famine is discussed experts are talking about an area that embraces one-half the earth's population. It is too big for most people to grasp. They tend to survey country by country—Algeria, for example. Algeria is going through characteristic post-independence adjustment difficulties. Result: Food production per person is down one-sixth in the early sixties over the early fifties.

It is not fashionable to say famine is inevitable or to admit that it is already here. Most experts simply call the situation explosive. They think they can hear a ticking. Will somebody defuse the bomb?

TIME FACTOR ACCENTED

"Famine is not inevitable," Lester Brown says, "but it's going to take a real step-up to prevent it. The critical thing is time."

Take India, for example.

India and the United States have about the same acreage under cultivation—350 millions. But India's grain yield per acre is a fourth of the American. The United States has only 4 million farmers, India 60 million. Over 60 years India's grain yield rose by only 3 percent. Officials hope to add 6 million acres in the next 15 years. That's 0.2 percent a year. But India's population is growing 2 percent a year—10 times as fast.

The U.S. reaction to this problem has gone through four phases:

First came straight compassionate food exports. Millions of tons have been sent. Public Law 480 ("food for peace") passed in 1954. Ten years later it was almost universally recognized that just exporting food wouldn't do the trick. Population grows faster.

KNOW-HOW EXPORTED

Second came exports of fertilizer, insecticides, and know-how. The hungry countries often have good soil. Let them grow their own food, not import it. But population grew faster.

The third stage came 2 weeks ago. Instead of sending fertilizer in bulk, send money and credits to build local plants. This is still going on. Population is growing faster.

Now is the fourth stage. President Johnson both in his State of the Union message, and at the 20th-anniversary meeting of the U.N. cited the need to cope with population. Now, increasing efforts by the United States to help hungry lands are adding the element of family planning—birth control.

Nobody knows the ending of the story. Nobody can turn to the back of the book of world hunger and see how it turns out. But the plot line is plain; accelerating births bring hunger; hunger brings turmoil; turmoil brings war.

The affluent United States can draw no iron wall around itself. As Barbara Ward, the British economist put it, the economic gap is steadily growing; a gap, she said, "between a white, complacent, highly bourgeois, very wealthy, very small North Atlantic elite, and everybody else."

AMERICA: LAND OF THE FREE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, once again our President has established that this land where our forefathers sought their freedom from oppression and tyranny will remain the land of the free.

Fidel Castro, of Cuba, made a statement the other day saying those Cubans who wished to leave the way of life he has imposed on them will be able to leave the island.

President Johnson answered affirmatively, and in the best tradition of this country.

He said, in ceremonies at Liberty Island, with Ellis Island and the magnificent symbol of the Statue of Liberty in the background, that the people of Cuba who seek refuge here will find it.

The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed will be upheld.

Those in Cuba who seek freedom may now "make an orderly entry into the United States."

The U.S. emphasis will be on orderly movement, and the President is asking the Department of State to seek through the Swiss Government the agreement of the Cuban Government in a request to the President of the International Red Cross Committee.

The request is for the assistance of the Committee in processing the movement of refugees from Cuba to Miami.

Miami will serve as a port of entry—the temporary place for refugees as they move on to settle in other parts of the country.

The President has asked all States in the Union to join with Florida "in extending the hand of helpfulness and humanity to our Cuban brothers."

Here again is an example of how America can grow stronger—by extending a hand of fellowship to men and women who declare their devotion to freedom by their action, not just by speech.

We grow not by being selfish and content with the status quo—but by initiative and positive actions of faith.

Now, America opens its arms and its hearts to those Cubans who have been separated from their loved ones, and to those who want to live and work in this atmosphere of freedom. Here, it is what the man can do that matters.

As Americans we know that it is not just enough to be strong. We want to be strong, and also to be able to say to the oppressed: Welcome, come in to the land of the free.

It was my privilege over a period of several years to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary. During that period a number of hearings were held across the country to analyze the effectiveness with which Cuban refugees were resettled, and resettled, indeed, at points which one would think, by virtue of language, local conditions, and even climate, were not conducive to success. Actually, the reverse was the case. Our efforts were dramatically successful.

In Michigan, the Cuban refugees have settled in the region of Grand Rapids in the number of more than 300. There are more than 1,000 Cuban refugees in the entire State of Michigan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram sent to me by Jose Tagle, a leader in the resettlement in the Grand Rapids Cuban community, reacting to the President's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 3, 1965.

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Cuban families in Grand Rapids will support their relatives coming from Cuba please be our leader in getting them out of there according to the President's speech. Your presence here will be helpful.

JOSE TAGLE.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Senate is in the process of deciding one of the most basic issues ever to face our form of government and our economic system.

It is an issue which needs the very careful consideration of every citizen of the United States because it involves the rights of every citizen of the United States who works for a living or who is dependent upon our economy for his livelihood.

I am strongly opposed to limiting debate in any form on this question because I am confident that when the people of this country have considered all of the facts involved they will strongly oppose Congress taking any action that would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have always felt that the Federal Government should refrain as much as possible from intervening in the relationships between organized labor and management in this country.

To me, it is completely contrary to the free enterprise system when any person, whether he be on the side of labor or management, is required to join any organization in order to pursue his work or his profession.

Because of the basic principles involved, I am perfectly willing for the Senate to remain in session on an around-the-clock basis for the rest of this year and next year, if necessary, to prevent the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Because of my deep feelings regarding this matter, I will vote against limiting debate on the question.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Senate will be in order. Personnel around the wall will take seats and cease their conversations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to consider and nothing more. It has been properly signed. There has been an intervening day under the rule. That motion, therefore, is properly before the Senate for a vote at 1 o'clock, after the Vice President or the Presiding Officer ascertains that a quorum is present.

The purpose, of course, of the cloture is to end debate on the motion to consider 14(b). There is nothing unusual about this continuing discussion on the motion to take up. It has been done many times. I believe the Senate anticipates that when that motion is made on a highly controversial bill that is the very point at which the issue will be joined.

The motion to proceed to consider is debatable, but when adopted, the bill then would be subject to amendment. I would anticipate that there might be as many as 50 or more amendments offered to the Taft-Hartley Act of various shades and descriptions.

The rather interesting fact under the rule must be remembered that when an amendment has been offered and has been discussed, it is then subject to a tabling motion, and that shuts off all debate.

Under the motion to consider, we are free to debate and to get this story out to the country.

There is a better reason for opposing cloture, and that is that up to this time we have had about 18 hours of discussion, and no more. That goes back to Monday of last week, when I opened the discussion on the motion to take up.

But I recite this for the RECORD because, unless my figures are incorrect—and I do not believe they are—we had 37 days on the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1960. There were actually 74 days after House passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was before the Senate for a period of 57 days. The satellite bill was before the Senate for a period of 18 days. I did not check the voting rights bill, but there was quite an intervening time before it came on for action.

It would be singular, indeed, if the Senate imposed upon itself a gag under which, if adopted, each Senator would have 1 hour and no more; he could not transfer his hour; he must either take it, or the hour is lost. If every Senator took his hour there would be only 100 hours and no more. That is a short period because there are speeches prepared and ready that would take 5 hours, 6 hours, and 7 hours.

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who was Governor of his State when the Right-To-Work Act was signed in that State, is prepared to speak at length.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who has been waiting, has a 6- or 7-hour speech. He is waiting patiently for his opportunity to be heard. There is a long list, because Senators are beginning to hear from the country.

The job we are trying to do for the right of all to work, to live, to survive, and perhaps to start on some of the union abuses would be rather cavalierly

shut off if the cloture petition were adopted.

When I mention the distinguished Senator from Texas, I call attention to the fact that on the 24th of September the distinguished Governor of Texas appeared before the Executives' Club in Chicago. Knowing about that club, I presume that at that luncheon 1,500 persons were present.

In the question period this question was asked:

I know you have stated your position on Taft-Hartley and the poverty program. Could you state your position specifically?

Governor Connally, in his second term as Governor, elected last November by 73 percent of the vote in Texas, responded:

Yes, I have taken the position specifically, as I did when I ran for Governor in 1962, as I did on our State program in 1962. I am for retention of 14(b) in the Taft-Hartley Act. I see no justification whatsoever for its repeal. I am as concerned and interested in the working people of Texas as any union leader in that State. But, I can assure you that the fact that we have—that we are one of the 19 right-to-work States in this Nation, that it has not in the least hampered the activities of the unionman, his wages, his standard of living, or his welfare. I think if the leaders themselves will get out and do the job without asking the Government to do it for them, they can make progress. I am not against the unions; I am for them. But I think they are going to have to hoe their own row just like a lot of the rest of us do.

That is the Governor of Texas speaking, the Governor of the great State which gave us the great President of the United States who occupies the White House, except for an interim period while he is in the hospital.

I say now what I said to his staff this morning and yesterday, and when I talked with him before he went to the hospital: that our prayers are with him.

What a colossal mistake it would be because when a vast segment of freedom is at stake, when the right to work is at stake, and when the principle is at stake, we have a duty, Mr. President, to cite our case.

Under the rules of the House, the bill was gagged, and it could not be amended. What a crying shame it would be if the Senate did not take abundant time to educate the people on the bill. Education takes time.

The Governor of Texas, when he stood before that group in Chicago, said he looked at the Gallup poll recently, and that 8 out of 10 who responded to that poll thought that Texas was a desert; that it was flat; that it was barren; and that it had no water.

That is great talk, but Texas has more water than any State in the Union, except Alaska, and up there I suppose it is frozen half of the time.

That indicates what has to be done in an educational effort in order to present an abstruce problem to the attention of the people. We are beginning to make some real progress in that field. We seek only to present the facts; to present the truth to the people.

This is the country of the people. It does not belong to the unions. It does not belong to the Congress. It belongs to the people and they are not only entitled to be heard, but they have got to be heard because much is at stake.

Mr. President, when the first national headquarters of the American Federation of Labor was dedicated in this city many years ago, inscribed on the cornerstone was the following:

This edifice erected for service in the cause of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity.

What is at stake before us is the whole question of freedom, and it cannot be lightly disposed of or swept under the rug. So I reaffirm that when we make our fight on the motion to consider the bill, that is the proper place for those who believe a great stake is involved to make the fight, so that they will not be jeopardized at a later time by amendments, by motions, and by the employment of the tabling process, because I have seen how that procedure works in committee and on the Senate floor, and I prefer uninhibited debate now, at this point, on the motion to consider.

I fervently hope and trust, for the sake of the country and for the sake of the people, that the cloture motion will be rejected and that untrammeled debate can go forward in the interest of truth and in the interest of light.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, of the time remaining before 1 o'clock, 3 minutes be allotted to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Oregon for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall support the cloture motion. Since 1947, this issue of so-called right-to-work laws has been debated in the Senate of the United States. Every Senator knows the pros and cons of the issue.

The Senator from Illinois talked about the country belonging to the people. The Constitution also belongs to the people—and to all the people. In 1947, I led the fight in this body against segmentizing the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. That is exactly what the Congress did when it passed the Taft-Hartley law including a delegating to the States of certain powers reserved to the Federal Government under the interstate commerce clause. What is involved in this issue is whether there shall be a uniform application of the interstate commerce clause among the 50 States, or whether 19 States shall be permitted to take advantage of an unfortunate delegation of power to the State by Congress under that clause. Such a delegation of interstate commerce authority to the States permits them to maintain the shocking low labor conditions that they maintain under right-to-work laws to the competitive disadvantage of employers in high-labor-standard States.

The Senator from Illinois cites the Governor of Texas as being in support of right-to-work laws. I shall cite Texas as an outstanding reason why the right-to-work laws should be repealed. Texas maintains some of the most shocking low labor standards in this country. For years, Texas has been taking competitive advantage of high-wage-paying employers in the Northern States. I shall give a sordid example of what the Governor of Texas is maintaining in his State.

In Texas, every morning trucks leave to cross the river into Mexico. Mexicans are loaded onto those trucks and are brought across the river and through the gate of low-labor-standard textile factories in Texas. These migrants have daily immigration permits which allow them to work in Texas and live in Mexico. They are hauled to work each morning and back home each night. Those factories have been moved into Texas from the New England and other high-wage-paying States. That is an example of what can be accomplished in States which have the so-called right-to-work laws. These Mexican workers are exploited by Texas employers with the full knowledge of the Governor of Texas. This truck transportation system is so devised as to prevent these workers from being approached by union organizers. This is part of the right-to-work law union-busting system. The Governor of Texas is notorious for his advocacy of low labor standards in Texas in order to pirate away from high-labor-standard States industries and plants such as are involved in the Mexican worker textile sweatshops in Texas. Some other industries are involved too.

As a Senator from Oregon, I can testify that my State is confronted with the same unfair competition from Southern right-to-work States in the lumber industry.

To the senior Senator from Oregon, the issue is very clear. It is whether we shall apply the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution uniformly across the country by having Congress take back the unfortunate power it delegated—mistakenly, in my judgment—in 1947. The time for us to do so is now. By our vote we should make perfectly clear that we intend to reestablish the uniform application of the interstate-commerce clause among the 50 States and stop the so-called right-to-work law States from taking advantage of workers by maintaining low labor standards, such as are so prevalent in Texas. Texas is a good example of what I mean.

The time has come for the Senate to apply cloture today. In spite of everything the Senator from Illinois has said, what he really designs is to kill the bill by dilatory tactics known as a filibuster, irrespective of the adjectives he applies to describe his tactics.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana until 1 o'clock.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me a minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since last Friday, I have been a little gun shy. I must admit that I have no rabbits to pull out of my hat. The only thing I am interested in is votes; and the only factor which will decide the issue before us, and the substance, as well, if we ever get to it, will be votes—nothing more, nothing less.

In my opinion, every Senator has his mind made up as to how he will vote on the question of cloture; and if by chance cloture is invoked today, how he will vote on the question of the passage of the bill to repeal section 14(b). So we must face up to the realities of the situation and recognize them.

I hope we shall move away from the emotionalism involved in this issue and will recognize the facts for what they are and treat this subject accordingly.

Mr. President, it is possible, as some persons have contended, that Friday's vote was rendered meaningless by its unanimity. So far as the majority leader is concerned, he prefers to believe that the Senate does not deliberately engage in meaningless gestures. On Friday the Senate was provided with an opportunity to get off the issue of section 14(b) by a simple tabling motion. The Senate chose not to put the motion aside. It chose not to do so by a unanimous vote.

The majority leader takes Friday's vote at face value. Insofar as the majority leader is concerned, therefore, that vote was, in no sense, without meaning. On the contrary, it has been immensely helpful and the leadership is most appreciative.

In all frankness, if the motion to table had carried on last Friday, the majority leader was prepared to recommend immediately that the Senate pass over this issue for the session. On the other hand if the motion to table had been defeated by a slim majority, the Senate would have remained in a difficult predicament. The majority leader would have been hard-pressed to decide whether the margin against tabling warranted an effort to invoke cloture on a simple procedural question of whether the Senate would take up H.R. 77.

But the vote on Friday was such as to resolve all doubts on the matter insofar as the majority leader was concerned. Indeed, when unanimity against tabling was indicated in the early stages of the tally the majority leader drew from his pocket a cloture motion. The motion had been prepared in advance but was unsigned because, I confess, that until that moment I did not quite know what to do with it. Once the vote began to be recorded, however, it was clear what had to be done with it. The motion was circulated among the Members while the vote was in process and, before the tally was complete, the requisite signatures had been obtained.

It was possible, therefore, for the majority leader to move without waste of time at the conclusion of the tally to give substance to the overwhelming, indeed, unanimously indicated inclination of the Senate, as expressed in the vote against the motion to table.

The Senate, in effect, had said—indeed the minority leader did say it—that it did not want to leave this issue. So, in accommodation, the majority leader offered the motion for cloture. He offered it, in the first place, to make sure that he had heard correctly and, second, to act on the Senate's indicated wish in the only procedural way which is believed practical at this time.

The nature of the predicament and the need for a cloture motion becomes clear in the light of the proceedings on the floor during the last 2 weeks. Ten days is a lavish and wasteful expenditure of the Senate's limited floor time of any simple procedural question, which usually takes 10 seconds or less. Indeed, during this session of Congress many complex pieces of legislation have been completely disposed of in a fraction of that time. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, was both novel and controversial; yet the motion to proceed to its consideration was passed by the Senate in less than a minute. Similar swift treatment was given to the procedural question of taking up the proposed constitutional amendments on reapportionment and on Presidential inability. The same is true for Appalachia, poverty, and aid to education, to name but a few. That is part of the background for the vote which is about to be taken. Here is the rest.

On October 1, 10 days ago, the majority leader moved that the Senate turn to consideration of H.R. 77. It was an entirely orderly and routine procedural motion. The bill, itself, had passed the House. It had been considered at length by the appropriate Senate committee and reported favorably. It had been on the Legislative Calendar for a month. What was there to debate on the question of taking up this measure? Whether it was too late in the session for a major and controversial issue of this kind? Whether the Senate should take up some other bill first? Whether the Senate should adjourn? These, indeed, would have been legitimate matters to discuss in an orderly fashion prior to a vote on the motion to take up H.R. 77; an hour or so might have reasonably been consumed in the process. But these matters were not discussed at all, except as they were mentioned by the majority leader on Monday. On the contrary, a long and continuing tirade on the evils which would attend the repeal of 14(b) was launched even though the Senate had not yet decided to consider H.R. 77.

I submit that that is not useful and pointed debate. That is an unconscionable delay on a procedural question for the purpose of obfuscating the issue of substance. If it is not a filibuster, it is, to say the least, a prefilibuster.

And so, on October 5, 5 days ago, the leadership indicated its concern to the Senate over the delay in reaching a decision on the simple procedural question of taking up 14(b). At that time, the Senate was asked, via the tabling motion, to give the leadership some guidance as to its wish on the sole question of taking up 14(b). The majority leader was at great pains to point out that what was involved was in no way a test of sentiment on the issue of 14(b) itself.

Therefore, on Friday, the distinguished minority leader whose own position against repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the tabling motion, so that the matter would not be put aside. And the majority leader, whose own position in favor of repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the motion to table so that the matter could be moved forward in an orderly fashion. The Senate responded magnificently to the appeal of the joint leadership.

In the vote which is about to be taken, the Senate will be able to make clear that it does not toy, as some have suggested, with the hopes of millions of Americans who are members of the great labor unions of the Nation. The Senate can make clear that, regardless of how it may feel on the issue of 14(b) itself, it does not make light of their sincere petition by dabbling in parliamentary parlor games. The Senate can make clear that labor is entitled to a fair and decent consideration of an issue of great importance in labor-management relations duly and properly brought before the Senate, even as corporations are, even as the aged and the poverty stricken are, even as immigrants are and even as racial minorities are.

The Senate can make this clear, in the only way that it can be made clear at the present time, in the judgment of the majority leader, by voting to invoke cloture on the simple procedural motion of taking up H.R. 77.

I stress again that this vote will not, any more than the motion to table on Friday, bind anyone for or against repeal of 14(b). What it will do—and let there be no doubt—is to determine whether or not the Senate means to get down to business on the issue of 14(b) itself or to pass over it. On the basis of the performance of the past days, the majority leader, in all frankness, sees no other rational way at this time in which this point can be nailed down except via the path of cloture on the single issue of whether or not to proceed to consider H.R. 77.

So, Mr. President, at 1 o'clock, thanks to rule 22, and the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader on Friday, a significant moment of truth will have arrived for the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Under rule XXII the Chair lays before the Senate the pending motion to bring

to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77. A two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting, a quorum being present, is required for this motion to carry.

Under the rule, the clerk will now call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 286 Leg.]

Aiken	Hayden	Moss
Allott	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bartlett	Hill	Murphy
Bass	Holland	Muskie
Bayh	Hruska	Nelson
Bennett	Inouye	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Boggs	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Case	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Cotton	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Curtis	Mansfield	Simpson
Dirksen	McCarthy	Smathers
Dodd	McClellan	Smith
Dominick	McGee	Sparkman
Douglas	McGovern	Stennis
Eastland	McIntyre	Symington
Ellender	McNamara	Talmadge
Ervin	Metcalf	Thurmond
Fannin	Miller	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Under the rule, a yea-and-nay vote is required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A "yea" vote would be in favor of cloture, and a "nay" vote would be against cloture. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has properly stated the present situation. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If they were present and voting, they would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 287 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Bartlett	Javits	Morse
Bass	Kennedy, Mass.	Moss
Bayh	Kennedy, N.Y.	Muskie
Burdick	Kuchel	Nelson
Case	Long, Mo.	Neuberger
Church	Long, La.	Pastore
Clark	Magnuson	Pell
Cooper	Mansfield	Proxmire
Dodd	McCarthy	Randolph
Douglas	McGee	Ribicoff
Harris	McIntyre	Smith
Hart	McNamara	Symington
Hartke	Metcalf	Tydings
Inouye	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Jackson	Montoya	Yarborough

NAYS—47

Aiken	Fong	Pearson
Allott	Hayden	Prouty
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bible	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Boggs	Holland	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Cotton	Lausche	Sparkman
Curtis	McClellan	Stennis
Dirksen	McGovern	Talmadge
Dominick	Miller	Thurmond
Eastland	Monroney	Tower
Ellender	Morton	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	Fulbright	Scott
Brewster	Gore	Young, Ohio
Cannon	Gruening	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, there are 45 yeas and 47 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to consider H.R. 77.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Vice President has just stated the question. We shall continue with the debate.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 5, strike out "five", and insert "three".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services, to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed three years, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what the business before the Senate is?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the bill about?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to state the purpose of the bill. Its purpose is to permit the Administrator of the General Services Administration to enter into contracts with private concerns over the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings, for periods not to exceed 5 years.

The House amended the bill and changed it from 5 to 3 years. I have suggested that the Senate accept the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments of the House are concurred in.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PELLY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee appointed by the Committee on the Judiciary to take the testimony on the Morrissey nomination to a Federal judgeship be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am firmly opposed to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I take this position as a member of the Senate Labor Subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill, as a resident of the State of Arizona with an elective responsibility to the people of that State, and as an individual American citizen who is firmly convinced that the vast majority of my fellow citizens object strenuously to being forced to join any kind of an organization in order to secure or retain a job.

We have come down a long and controversial road to the point where we can now conduct what I trust will be a thorough discussion of this issue.

In traveling down that road I have been repeatedly impressed by public reaction—by the hundreds of polls, thousands of newspaper editorials, and by private letters from concerned citizens who urge this body to reject the repeal amendment.

I regret that not all of my colleagues have had an opportunity or the time to read these pleas to the Senate for our help in retaining this fragment of our vanishing individual freedom.

We have a war against poverty—a war on waste—a war on ignorance—and a war on ugliness and pollution. All of us have heard about these widely publicized wars.

What we are discussing here, however, is a war against freedom.

This is a war we should avoid at all costs—a war that is totally uncalled for—a war generated by minority greed and a lust for power over many thousands of our people.

It is a war most Americans do not understand—and will not support if they do.

I propose to begin speaking about it in some detail, but not merely as a perfunctory task to comply with the obligations of my office. My approach is that of a deeply concerned citizen who has gone through previous campaigns in similar wars against freedom of choice in this great land of ours.

At the beginning, I want to give Senators a brief capsule summary of the origin and history of the right-to-work law in my State of Arizona.

It was adopted as an amendment to our State constitution in November 1946, as a result of a citizen initiative campaign to put the question on the ballot. The people approved it by a margin of approximately 62,000 to 49,000.

Again in 1948, after pressure from organized labor, the question was put before the people on a one-man, one-vote basis in a statewide referendum. This time the voters expressed themselves even more emphatically by a margin of nearly 87,000 to 60,000 in favor of voluntary unionism.

Four years later, in 1952, a related initiative measure to prohibit secondary boycotts and regulate picketing was placed on the ballot. This time the electorate was even more decisive. They adopted the measure by a count of 115,000 to 67,000.

This brief period of Arizona's history coincided with the beginning of our State's tremendous postwar expansion.

Yet is is significant to note that despite substantial increases in the numbers of registered voters from 1946 through 1952, the relative strength of compulsory unionism supporters declined in all three elections, while the majority percentage increased each time.

My discussion of this period is based on my own personal experience and observations. These events occurred while I was in private business and active in the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, where I had the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Industrial Development Committee.

Later on, it was my privilege to serve three terms as Governor of my State, and this permitted me to gain more firsthand knowledge of labor-management relations in Arizona and the progress of our economy.

I am proud of what Arizona has accomplished in those years. With all due respect to other States, the record demonstrates that Arizona's economic growth rate since the end of World War II has been one of the highest in the Nation.

It is difficult to appreciate or understand what has happened in Arizona without some facts and figures to illustrate the development. Let me cite just a few of the outstanding statistics to put the situation in proper perspective for the Senate.

For many years prior to World War II, Arizona was known as the 3-C State—for copper, cotton, and cattle. Tourism gradually developed into a fourth major element in our economy.

Dollar income from manufacturing climbed 178 percent since 1946. Manufacturing forged into first place in 1958 and has been the No. 1 element in our economy in Arizona ever since. Manufacturing employment has increased by 329 percent.

The last 5 years also have witnessed a strong comeback of our mining industry, principally copper, to the point where last year it accounted for more than a half-billion dollars.

Nearly 3,000 more persons are working today in Arizona mining jobs than were employed 10 years ago. This enabled Arizona to maintain its position as the producer of more than half of our domestic copper supply—more than all other States in the United States combined.

The copper figures are important because the mining operations are heavily unionized. The mine, mill, and smelter workers have strong representations, as do the AFL–CIO unions, the independent machinists, and others.

I could go on citing figures until the listener went to sleep and I ran out of breath. They would boil down to the simple fact that in this postwar era Arizona has been among the national

leaders in just about every major economic index of growth.

To put it another way—we now have more people working at more jobs producing more goods and earning more income than at any previous time in Arizona's history.

No doubt everyone is familiar with most of the standard arguments in the organized campaign to belittle right-to-work laws. Some are plain distortions of the truth. Others simply have no basis in fact.

I will cite an example.

In a recent radio broadcast, the president of the Communications Workers of America charged that right-to-work laws attracted only "cheap" industries to a State.

I will answer that. So far as Arizona is concerned, I would mention names: RCA, Motorola, General Electric, Reynolds Metals, Sperry Phoenix, Hughes, Goodyear, Aerospace, Unidynamics, Spreckels Sugar, Emerson Electric, Airesearch, and many others.

It is common knowledge that these are among the leading industrial names in the world.

It would require another 10 minutes just to read off the names of new companies that have located in Arizona in the last 5 years, because there are 280 of them.

We know these companies have located in Arizona because of the many advantages our State had to offer. We also know that many of them have long histories of effective partnership with union workers.

In short, the record is quite clear that Arizona's right-to-work law has not hampered the legitimate and useful function of collective bargaining in our State.

The right-to-work law has not acted to unfairly restrict normal growth in union membership in proportion to the gain in population and total work force.

I cite AFL–CIO membership for example.

The Labor Department began keeping figures on AFL–CIO membership in 1958. I have been informed by the Department that AFL–CIO locals in Arizona claimed approximately 40,000 members in 1958.

By 1962—the last year for which the figures are available—the total had increased to about 76,000. I read from an article appearing in the Arizona Republic of June 11, 1965.

UNIONS CLAIM GAIN OF 4,200 IN VALLEY

AFL–CIO unions in the valley now represent about 4,200 more workers than they did 6 months ago at the outset of a drive to "organize the unorganized."

This was announced last night by Robert Hutto, president of the Phoenix-Maricopa County Federation of Labor, during a training conference for union leaders in the laborers union hall.

The campaign, slow in getting off the ground in its initial state, is gaining momentum, Hutto indicated.

Cited as one of the brightest spots of the movement were efforts of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, directed by National Representative Nick Pinto.

Since last November 1, Hutto said, about 220 Phoenix city employees have joined local No. 317 of the federation. Beginning June 1, when an intensive drive to organize city hall employees was started, a daily average of 10 persons joined the union, Hutto reported.

About 66 new members have been signed up among various State agencies. In one case, in which no previous membership existed, a new local charter will be issued, said Hutto, a Democratic member of the Arizona House of Representatives.

The federation drive will climax with a mass meeting of city, county, and State employees at 8 p.m. next Tuesday in the laborers union hall. Speakers will include James McCormack, federation area director, and Daniel V. Flanagan, of San Francisco, AFL–CIO regional director.

Among victories enumerated by Hutto in elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board was that of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers at the Westinghouse Electric Corp. maintenance and repair plant.

Another gain for the AFL–CIO, Hutto stated, was a unanimous vote for the United Packinghouse Workers at the Phoenix plant of the Lewis Food Co., which he said is noted nationally for its opposition to unions.

The Communications Workers of America, whose present membership in Arizona is dominated by employees of Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., is working on a "large target," which Hutto declined to name.

The actual number of workers who have signed union cards since the campaign began, the labor council president concluded, "doesn't tell the whole story." Since last January, he said, unions have made significant inroads which are expected to pay big dividends in the future.

President Johnson promised in his state of the Union message to submit proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b). But the President was very careful to use the word "changes" and not the word "repeal."

Regardless of the semantics, however, organized labor has interpreted this as a promise. They have made repeal of 14(b) their No. 1 objective in this Congress.

Furthermore, they now believe they have enough political muscle to get the job done.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to make my position very clear.

To me, the issue at stake here is a fundamental human right—not just special interest legislation. It involves the right of any individual to join—or not to join—a labor union.

I should emphasize that right-to-work laws in 19 of our States are laws for individual worker freedom. Other States have statutes that would be revoked if section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed.

They are not laws against unions, no matter how much propaganda is put out to the contrary.

To classify these right-to-work laws as antiunion is a complete misrepresentation of the laws and the facts.

Yet the union leaders have been beating the drums loudly for repeal of 14(b) this year—louder and stronger than ever before.

Notwithstanding this there appears to be a growing opposition throughout the country to these demands of labor leaders.

Many Senators and Representatives already have expressed themselves strongly in favor of retaining section 14(b).

Some spokesmen for organized labor would have the country believe that right-to-work laws are a relatively recent development—just one of the many things they do not like about the Taft-Hartley Act.

What they do not talk about is the fact that voluntary unionism laws—in one form or another—have been around long before the Taft-Hartley Act.

Labor leaders have always referred to the Wagner Act of 1935, for example, as the "magna carta" of organized labor in the United States. They acknowledge it as one of the historic milestones in the progress of unions—and indeed it was.

But I believe the people of this country should be reminded that under the Wagner Act itself the States had the right to adopt laws prohibiting the compulsory union shop.

Furthermore, 11 States adopted such laws before Taft-Hartley was even considered.

Not only that, but the right of the States to adopt such laws under the Wagner Act was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Algoma Plywood case. The late Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote the opinion.

Now, after all these years, we hear complaints about the alleged unfairness of section 14(b).

There is evidence recently of growing citizen opinion against any effort by Congress to further infringe upon the right of States to legislate in this field.

The results of several surveys recently support this and I know others are going to discuss this in depth.

In my judgment, unions have no inherent right to expand by forcing new members to join.

They can and should grow, but only if they can convince, not coerce, the worker that his best interests will be served by joining the union.

This takes performance—not persuasion by the force of an unfair law. Senators know that in their home towns and States an individual businessman or firm cannot be forced to join an organization. It is necessary to convince prospective members that it will be worth their while to join and participate.

The situation is no different with unions. They must earn their way.

To me, this is the fair way, the American way.

Mr. President, the bill should be defeated because it is wrong in principle and cannot be justified by the facts. It would not meet any demonstrated national need; on the contrary, it is the product of a long, expensive propaganda campaign by organized labor officials to gain dictatorial economic and political power through the force of Federal law. Even the proponents of this bill concede it would give virtual monopolistic power to unions. This proposed legislation would, if enacted—

First, compel American working men and women to join unions, or to pay money to unions against their will and beliefs;

Second, compel workers to join even in many instances where a majority involved do not desire "union security" clauses in their contract or in fact do not even desire union representation;

Third, lessen the initiative of union leaders to work for the benefit of employees in all the States;

Fourth, make national policy a principle contrary to that of other leading democratic countries including Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany, in each of which compulsory unionism is prohibited by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions;

Fifth, provide organized labor with the additional economic and political power to secure its real objective—abolition of the ban on the "closed shop";

Sixth, result in a tremendous increase in strikes, picketing, and violence in the 19 States which now have right-to-work laws;

Seventh, deprive 50 States of their traditional and historic American right to prohibit all forms of compulsory unionism; and

Eighth, adversely affect the interests of small business.

There are many other compelling arguments against the bill. Considered together, they present an overwhelming case for retention of section 14(b) in the National Labor Relations Act.

The fundamental issue posed by the bill is the freedom of an individual to join—or not to join—a labor union. It involves the freedom of association guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. In effect, it translates into the question of whether Congress should compel millions of Americans to pay tribute to a labor organization in order to earn a living for themselves and their families.

This is a basic civil rights question and not merely a matter of labor legislation. Proponents may argue that a union shop contract does not force any individual to actually join the union to retain his job; the requirement is merely that he must pay dues. In practical terms, the distinction is absurd.

A direct illustration of this point is afforded by longstanding and documented practices of the American Federation of Musicians. No member of a local musician's union may exercise his freedom of choice to work with any nonunion musician without forfeiting his own union membership, and in turn, his opportunity of earning a living. Nor may a nonunion musician work with union members merely by tendering dues; he must, in fact, belong to the union before he can work with a union group.

This is true throughout the entertainment industry, irrespective of the usual 30-day decision period granted new employees under union shop contracts in other fields of employment. In virtually every field, many pressures, both direct and subtle, are brought to bear on the new worker in a union shop to join the union regardless of any personal reasons he may have for not wanting to join.

The attention of the Nation has been focused for an extended period on the subject of civil rights—and rightly so. A historic and comprehensive law on this subject was passed last year. Congress has followed that with a law to guarantee the constitutional right of every qualified citizen to register and vote.

Yet the passage of the bill would take away an equally important, if not paramount, right of all Americans. All other individual liberties and civil rights long cherished by the people of this Nation have little value if a person can be forced to pay money to a union to keep a job.

Many times in our history we have sent American people to die in defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. Americans are being killed today in the jungles of Vietnam to defend this principle. What a tragic paradox it would be if Congress were to withdraw individual liberty at home while we are defending it abroad.

The repeal of section 14(b) would further erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field. Not only would repeal nullify "right-to-work" laws which are now part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States; it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this vital aspect of labor-management agreements.

The passage of the bill would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or labor codes of their States. This vital area of local and State concern would be preempted by the Federal Government and could be relinquished only by a subsequent act of Congress.

I repeat—it should not be forgotten that voluntary unionism laws preceded the Taft-Hartley Act. Even the Wagner Act, justly regarded as their Magna Carta by organized labor, clearly did not prevent States from adopting right-to-work laws, and, indeed, some of them did. The courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of such laws.

Furthermore, the people of the several States now have the power, as they should have, to modify or repeal any existing State law or constitutional provision at any time. One of the former right-to-work States, Indiana, did just that earlier this year, and the opponents of H.R. 77 have no quarrel with the people of Indiana on that score. We respect their right to make that decision for themselves.

The fact that repeal of right-to-work laws carried in Indiana and five other States over the years and failed in Iowa and Wyoming, for example, reflects honest differences of opinion among the States which should be respected. To repeat: The people of any State with a voluntary unionism law can readily bring about its repeal at any time they may desire. This remedy is always available to the people.

There is much to be said for diversity rather than conformity with respect to State laws on union security agreements. This land remains a collection of striking State and regional distinctions which, far from weakening the Nation, contribute much to its strength and progress.

Repeal of section 14(b) would trample on the remaining sovereignty of the 50 States. It would further accentuate the already alarming trend toward an oligarchy of big business, big labor, and Big Government in which the larger public interest and the interest of the individual worker are subordinate to the special privilege of a minority.

Congress has a solemn obligation to consider the views of the citizens who elect its Members. "Representative government" means what it says, or at least it should. And in the case of this particular bill, there can be no doubt that a substantial majority of the American people oppose it.

Recent national polls by Samuel Lubell, Louis Harris, and Opinion Research Corp.—three of the most reputable organizations in the field—show that upward of two-thirds of the voters oppose compulsory unionism. The Gallup poll of June 15, 1965, supported this conclusion and also disclosed that a majority of the public believes unions already have too much power.

Mr. President, I shall cover what happened in my own State of Arizona. After the right-to-work law had been overwhelmingly passed, the union officials decided that they would seek to do away with the right-to-work law. So they, by a referendum, secured by an appeal to the legislature, had this matter placed on the ballot. They naturally worded it in wording that would be extremely beneficial to the union position.

The people turned this referendum down by an even greater vote than had been obtained when the bill was originally passed, even though that referendum was so worded as to put the right-to-work law in the worst possible perspective.

It had been said, when the right-to-work law was originally passed, that it was passed by means of wording which, it was claimed, portrayed the measure as giving the people a right to work which was different from that which actually existed in the law. Even though that referendum was placed in the perspective most favorable to the union, it was even more overwhelmingly defeated than it had been prior to that time.

Mr. President, from my own experience I feel it is quite evident that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is not antilabor or antiunion. It affords a great protection to American workingmen.

In my experience as a State official, I had the privilege of working with both union and management officials. There was a statewide strike in the State of Arizona in 1959. It was my privilege to consult union and management officials to determine whether I could bring them together after the strike had continued for an undue length of time.

I brought the union and management officials to my offices at 7:30 one morning and asked them if they would start negotiating. At that particular time, they had not met for 11 days. I did not find it disadvantageous because of the right-to-work law to get them together to start negotiations. In fact, I felt that they were ready and willing to negotiate and needed only encouragement.

I emphasize this because I believe that it illustrates that we can negotiate, we can have adverse opinions, and we can still get together, in a right-to-work State as well as in a non-right-to-work State.

I do not believe that the statement that the existence of this section hinders labor negotiations has any significance.

It is significant to note that 42 percent of union members themselves agreed that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, providing for the establishment of right-to-work laws, should be retained. This fact was very much in evidence in my State from the experience I had as Governor.

Augmenting these widely known national polls are many selective State polls which reflect similar public sentiment. Editorial opinion in the Nation's press also is heavily arrayed against repeal of 14(b). Even such usually divergent publications as the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune agree that 14(b) should remain the law of the land.

By all accepted techniques of measuring public opinion, including a heavy volume of constituent correspondence, there is a distinct national consensus against repeal of this provision of law. At no point in the hearings before the subcommittee was any evidence put forth to justify overriding the clearly expressed will of a majority of Americans on the issue. Repeal of 14(b) would be an obvious and flagrant disregard of the will of the people.

Congress, by law, and the courts, by upholding many questionable decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, have already granted many special privileges to organized labor during the last three decades. Many of these advantages conferred upon trade unionism by law are not enjoyed by any other private institutions or economic interests in our society. For example:

Unions are largely exempt from application of the antitrust laws.

They are immune, in many instances, from the issuance of Federal court injunctions.

They can compel employees in 31 States to pay dues to the union in order to hold their jobs.

They can—and certainly do—use funds which their members have been compelled to contribute as a condition of employment, to finance political campaigns opposed by some of their membership.

Some unions for many years have practiced racial discrimination in determining who shall be allowed to join.

They have the exclusive right to act as collective bargaining agents even for those employees who do not want to be represented by the union.

Added to this list are a growing number of NLRB decisions which have vastly increased the scope and power of union authority. For example:

In the Wisconsin Motors case—145 NLRB No. 109, 55 LRRM 1085—the Board specifically upheld the right of a union to fine members for exceeding union-imposed production quotas.

In the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. case recently—149 NLRB No. 10, 57 LRRM 1242 affirmed by the court of appeals—the Board held that a union member could be fined and threatened with legal action to collect the fine if he exercised his right not to respect a picket line.

Earlier this year, the Board held that an employer who moved his apparel manufacturing company from New York to Florida must bargain with the union in Florida, even though the union cannot prove it represents a majority of the workers in the new location.

Aside from this tendency of the NLRB to regard itself as an advocate of the unions instead of as an impartial administrator of the law, many large unions over the years have not demonstrated the responsibility that should accompany the extraordinary privilege they have.

Consider the staggering loss to the economy from industrywide strikes in which the public interest was not represented at the bargaining table. Consider the unreasoning opposition of many union officials to the technological change which is necessary for survival in a competitive market. And finally, consider the violence and corruption disclosed by work of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in recent years.

Given this record, it is difficult to understand how the granting of additional coercive power would result in more responsible statesmanship by unions.

Unions represent only about 17 million workers in the United States. By contrast, more than 53 million workers do not belong to any union.

Many of these nonunion workers are employed by the millions of small business enterprises which are such an integral part of the Nation's economic and commercial structure. They are the ones who would be hit hardest by repeal of 14(b).

Giant corporations in basic industries can meet monopolistic union power at the bargaining table with at least some degree of equality. This is not true for the independent small employer, who may be starting a new enterprise or struggling to survive on a thin profit margin in a fiercely competitive field.

It is this small employer—and there are approximately 4 million of them—who can be put out of business or ruined financially by powerful union officials. There are many small contractors in the right-to-work States, for example, who operate an open shop and thus afford an opportunity both for apprentices to learn a trade and for skilled workmen to work. They would soon be eliminated if 14(b) is repealed.

Adoption of H.R. 77 would directly contradict long-established Federal policy to encourage and support small business in this country.

The Secretary of Labor has based his arguments for repeal of 14(b) on philosophical rather than economic grounds. This is understandable in view of the fact that proponents of repeal have no solid economic ground to stand on. The same statistics used for years by union spokesmen in their campaign to discredit right-to-work laws can be turned around and exploited with even more weight to support retention of such laws.

For example, it is true that some Southern States, only recently embarked upon industrialization programs, have wage scales ranging below the national average because of the relatively large proportion of rural and farm labor in their population. But it is also true that in the seven right-to-work States outside of the South earnings of production and manufacturing workers surpass the national average.

Furthermore, there is hardly any accepted index of economic growth in which the rate of gain in the 19 right-to-work States does not exceed that of the remaining States. The union contention that voluntary unionism laws tend to depress wages simply ignores the facts.

Take the State of Arizona, which has a right-to-work law, and compare it with our neighbor New Mexico, which permits compulsory unionism. They are neighbors of approximately equal size and similar in resources. They are approximately the same age, having been admitted to the Union in the same year. Both have approximately the same support so far as Federal programs are concerned. The State of Arizona, with a great mining industry, produces, as I have stated, more copper than all the other States in the United States. But New Mexico has even a greater dollar-volume industry, the oil and gas industry. So we have two States that economically and in many other respects are very similar.

Ten years ago, the average wage rate of a production worker in New Mexico was $85, and in Arizona it was only $82. Now, in 1965, 10 years later, the average production worker in New Mexico receives an average weekly earning of $90, but in Arizona the figure is up to $111. As I stated, New Mexico has compulsory unionism, Arizona has voluntary unionism.

The economic progress, or lack of it, of any State or region is compounded of many complex factors. It is quite clear that State laws relating to union security agreements are at best only a minor one of these factors.

I am not stating that progress in Arizona has been so much more rapid than in New Mexico because we have voluntary unionism, but I am saying that the attitude of the people, as indicated by their desire to have voluntary unionism, has contributed in that regard In other words, there has been greater encouragement for industry in Arizona than there has been in the wonderful State of New Mexico.

I could illustrate what has happened in many of the other States. Senators have heard remarks to the effect that our right-to-work States pay starvation wages. I have stated the average weekly earnings of production workers in Arizona—$111. In some of the non-right-to-work law States, the wages are far below $111. Let us pick out some of the New England States. We have Connecticut, $109. We have Maine, $83—I am cutting off the fractions; it is $83.84, but if I said $84, the difference would still be manifest. Rhode Island, $85, or almost $86. Vermont, practically $90. Massachusetts, $96. Compare this to $111 in Arizona.

So, Mr. President, it is not factual when people say that in the right-to-work-law States starvation wages are paid.

In the highest three States in the Nation, so far as the wages of production

workers are concerned, we find the right to work in our State to be in second place with a wage rate of which we are very proud; namely, $121.52 a week.

Returning to the Southern States, we are proud of what has been happening there. We know that over the years they have not been industrialized, that they have been agricultural States in most instances; but since they have begun industrializing, they have made more rapid progress than other States of the Union. I am pleased that that has come about, because it is extremely important to realize that the Southern States are making progress and that most of them have right-to-work laws.

Union leaders and the labor press generally have characterized section 14(b) as a major obstacle to their continued progress. Yet, there are no facts anywhere in the record to support this contention.

The combined population of all 19 right-to-work States represents only a small portion of the total population of the country. An even larger proportion of the Nation's industrial plant is located in the 31 States which now permit union-shop agreements. It can even be demonstrated in some right-to-work States—Arizona, for example—that unions have gained members in recent years. I quoted those figures a short time ago.

The available studies and information on union membership present an understandably mixed growth pattern. Rapid technological change typified by automation, new patterns within old industries and competitive market conditions are by common agreement the major impediments to continued union-membership growth in most fields.

Some unions have maintained or improved their relative position since 14(b) was enacted, while others have not. It would appear that the absence or presence of right-to-work laws in the States has been of little consequence.

The truth is that neither unions nor companies they bargain with have any inherent right to grow or any guarantee of success in our economic system. Both must earn their way.

This Nation was founded by men and women who wanted to escape compulsion and seek opportunity. The maximum amount of individual liberty consistent with the public interest is guaranteed in our Constitution and exemplified in the diversity of American life and the multitude of voluntary associations in our society. Repeal of 14(b) would arbitrarily restrict individual freedom in the most basic way; namely, by prescribing conditions of employment for millions of Americans.

Compulsion in the trade union movement has been opposed on principle by some of the greatest leaders of organized labor, such as Samuel Gompers, as well as by the foremost jurists of this century. One of the most ardent supporters of trade unionism, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, argued forcefully against compulsion. Summing up his views on the subject, he once wrote:

> It is not true that the success of a labor union necessarily means a perfect monopoly. The union, in order to attain or preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness: neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists.[1] Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

The case against compulsion also was put persuasively in recent times by another Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg, who spoke from a background of experience as union attorney and also as Secretary of Labor. He was quoted at a 1962 meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees by the Washington Daily News as follows:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility, and your own achievements.

Mr. President, that is the way most organizations function. Civic organizations earn the right to expect members to join, pay dues, and participate in the activities of such organizations, by rendering a service. I feel that unions should earn that same right. They should render a service to their members, to justify their becoming dues-paying members of the organization.

There is another aspect of compulsory unionism which deserves mention. In 1950, the CIO expelled several unions because they were either led or controlled by Communists.

Some of these unions survive today with hundreds of thousands of members for whom they are the legal bargaining agents. They have not been readmitted to the AFL–CIO. The result is that thousands of loyal Americans are being compelled to contribute their dues money toward the support and propagation of causes they detest.

It is extraordinary that exponents of what is today called the liberal philosophy should wish to diminish individual freedom of association by Federal statute instead of to preserve it.

In this connection, the following article was published on August 11, 1965, in the Valley Monitor newspaper in McAllen, Tex. I will read it in its entirety:

> A month or so ago, before the House passed a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, a special subcommittee on labor held hearings on the proposal. Among those who appeared to speak out against repeal was LaRue Berfield, a man who had been fired from his job for refusing to join an organization the Attorney General had charged was subversive. Here's what he had to say:
>
> "My name is LaRue Berfield of Driftwood, Pa. I faced the hard choice of joining a union I believed to be Communist-dominated, or being fired from my job at a plant where I had worked for 19 years, with time out for combat duty in the Air Force in World War II.
>
> "The choice was forced upon me when the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, known as the U.E., entered into a so-called union shop contract with my employer, the Sylvania Electric Co. plant at Emporium, Pa., in 1958.
>
> "I had been a member of the U.E. when it was expelled by the CIO on grounds that it was Communist dominated. The U.E. had been classified as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General.
>
> "I took an active part in an unsuccessful fight to have the U.E. replaced by the newly chartered International Electrical Workers (I.U.E.) in a national labor board election. As a result of this, I wound up being expelled from the union, but still was able to hold my job because there was no union shop agreement at the plant at that time.
>
> "Eight years later, the U.E. and Sylvania signed an agreement with a compulsory union membership clause and I was subsequently notified by the company that I must join the U.E. or at least pay dues. I refused to do either and was fired from the job I had held so long.
>
> "I did not pay dues to this union because I felt that in so doing I would be supporting a Communist-dominated organization under the guise of a labor union.
>
> "I am sure that any American citizen would agree that it is wrong to force any citizen of our Nation to, in any way, pay tribute to the Communist conspiracy that exists in our Nation, no matter under what guise it may lift its ugly head.
>
> "I was a member of my local school board and the civil defense organization. I would have had to resign from these positions because I took loyalty oaths in both cases, swearing that I have never been and would not be a member of an organization advocating the overthrow of the Government. It was a choice between keeping a job and betraying those oaths. I chose not to violate these oaths, even though it cost me my job.
>
> "I can't understand why our laws do not protect an American citizen from being forced, at the expense of his job, to join and support an organization dedicated to the destruction of our American Government.
>
> "Unable to obtain redress under Federal labor laws, I took my case before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose members expressed sympathy and promised to do what they could by way of seeking remedial legislation. Press reports quoted members of the committee saying I was a martyr of a legal system which protects those who associate with Communists, but not those who oppose such association.
>
> "I have no desire to be classified as a martyr. I only want my constitutional rights as an American citizen to be protected, but more importantly, I want to preserve those rights for my children.
>
> "Things were not easy in that period after I lost my job and 19 years of seniority with one company. Today, my wife and I own and operate a service station and grocery store in the small town of Driftwood, Pa. We put up with a lot of hard work and long hours, but we are getting along all right now.
>
> "I submit to you that if the State of Pennsylvania had a right-to-work law that I would not have had to suffer this injustice. I feel that the repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act would be a grave blow to my hopes for the protection of my constitutional rights and those of my children."

When this company did not have a union shop, this gentleman had the privilege of working there without paying tribute to any organization. This is true of any of the right-to-work States. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is

[1] Quoted by the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his concurring opinion in American Sash & Door Co., 335 U.S. 538–559, which upheld the constitutionality of Arizona's right-to-work law.

repealed, this freedom will be taken away from them.

The people of the States which have right-to-work laws in some respects are in the same position as the people in States which do not have right-to-work laws so far as section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is concerned. If it is repealed, they will be precluded from taking any direct action in regard to labor legislation.

Regardless of the activities of union organizations, or business organizations, many people take it for granted that all unions are good unions. This is a false premise, as I have illustrated, because a Communist-dominated union cannot be considered a good union. Not every business organization can be assumed to be a good organization, either. We have laws and rules and regulations concerning their operations, and the States have the privilege of passing additional legislation regarding business operations. The people should retain that same privilege so far as unions are concerned.

As it now stands, an individual can go to his legislator in my State—he may go to his Senator or his House Member—and give his views as to actions of a union, or of a business organization, and his voice will be heard. If he had a just cause—if necessary, he could have others join him—the people could have an initiative that would provide for the changes that would be necessary to give protection to the residents and workers in that State.

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

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, his good State, the State of Arizona, has a constitutional provision including the right-to-work principle. Is that correct?

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, it was perhaps the second State to adopt such a constitutional provision.

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State which I happen to represent in part having been the only State to precede it in that course.

Mr. FANNIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that citizens in the Senator's State who wanted to repeal the constitutional provision have on one or more occasions requested that the question be submitted to the people, and upon the submission, the people, after reexamination, could have changed their verdict if they cared to do so?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator from Florida is correct. It has been before the people three different times. The second time it was before the people it was initiated or referred to the people as a result of the union officials deciding that they wanted to repeal that law. It was overwhelmingly approved again, by an even greater vote than at its initial passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. If that is true, those who feel that they are aggrieved by the right-to-work law and its presence in their constitution or, for that matter, in their statutes, will have ample opportunity to have their grievance heard and to have a resubmission, with the election of their legislatures, if it is a statute matter, and by a referendum back to the people in the event it is a constitutional matter; and they have not hesitated to do that on three occasions in the fine State which the Senator represents.

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one more question to ask. As his State of Arizona has grown so rapidly and improved, and increased in stature and national importance, has the Senator felt that in the wages paid to workers, in relation to population, and in every other way, any handicap was visited upon his State by the existence of the right-to-work provision in the constitution of the State?

Mr. FANNIN. I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Florida asked me that question because it gives me the opportunity to say that in the first 6 months of this year the AFL–CIO has been boasting about having a greater increase in union membership in Arizona, percentagewise, than any other State in the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I am not surprised. That indicates, does it not, that union members of good standing, loyal to their organizations, have not felt any unwillingness to come into his good State, but to the contrary have gone there in large numbers, have joined unions, and are prospering at the present time under the right-to-work provision in his State constitution?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct. I would add to the words of the distinguished Senator from Florida that the unions have performed a service for the members and earned the loyalty of those members, instead of being compelled to do so.

I feel that we shall have far better unions so long as the unions must perform a service to justify a member joining. If there is compulsion, members will not have interest, will not care, and though they will be good members, they will not get the service which they deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that comment.

Is it not true that the officers of unions know that in order to enlarge their membership, they have to show service, they have to show fine values rendered to their membership, and they are put on notice to do that?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that with regard to unions, they have been performing in many instances better than others. Many have good management, and those which do not have good management improve. Right-to-work laws have not been a deterrent; they have been of assistance to the working people of our State.

I feel confident that our growth has been greater because of the right-to-work law, because of the attitude of the people. It has not been that firms did not go there because we had a right-to-work law. They went there because, as I explained, the right-to-work law indicates the political attitude and the business attitude of the people of that State.

Rather than twist it around, as many have done, the right-to-work laws bring industries into the State. They bring industry to the State because of good management, good political atmosphere, and good business atmosphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the good wages paid.

Mr. FANNIN. And the good wages paid.

I would say to the Senator from Florida that his State is one of the best examples. They have some of the finest industry in this Nation because they have not catered to low-wage industry.

There are electronic industries, industries that do research and development, and some of our finest services such as technical development, and aerospace development. Because of the attitude of the public, and because they have had good laws, and business concerns that are practical, additional concerns have been brought to the State.

I commend the Senator for that service which has been rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for these gracious remarks.

I cannot help but say, before I take my seat, that I think the great progress and the great and permanent prosperity which have been accomplished in his State with the right-to-work provision in its constitution, and also in the State of Florida, with a similar provision in our constitution, clearly disprove the contention of those who say that right-to-work provisions are found hand in hand with poor wages and slack industry, and with little appeal to either businesses or people to come in and settle there. I believe that fact is about as clearly disproved by the record in his own fine State and in the State of Florida.

Unless I incorrectly remember the census data of the past few years, Arizona and the State which I represent, in part, have, first one and then the other, been No. 1 in the States of the Nation in gain of population and other means that have to do with their prosperity and their attractiveness to good people.

While I am sure he would not give full credit for that to the right-to-work provision in his constitution—just as I would not in Florida—I wish to say that not only has it not been a handicap, but I believe it has been an added industrial attraction. I believe the fine records made by these two States clearly show that in the right-to-work provision there is a fine value in any good State interested in progress, and development, and freedom of its citizens.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator for the information.

I wish to answer the question which the Senator posed in regard to the fine economic position of his State with some figures as to what is happening in Florida. I would like to boast about it especially, for although we are not neighboring States, we are in a similar situation and our climates are similar. We like to boast that our climate is like that of the State of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will never yield the floor while the Senator is talking in such kindly fashion about my State. Proceed at will and at great length.

Mr. FANNIN. The following information discloses what happened in the State of Florida:

From 1953 to 1963 nonagricultural employees increased 69.5 percent. What does that mean? In non-right-to-work States it increased 9 percent. In new manufacturing jobs it increased 78.2 percent. In non-right-to-work States there was a minus 7.6 percent. In production workers there was a 51-percent increase in Florida and a minus 14 percent in non-right-to-work States. People have sought to have industry come into a State which pays good wages and has good working conditions. There was an increase of 86.4 percent against 27.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Per capita personal income increased more than the national average: 35.7 percent to 35.4 percent. Personal income is more than double what it is in non-right-to-work States—136.7 percent against 60.2 percent.

Hourly earnings by manufacturing workers increased 57.3 percent, against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. Value added by manufacturing increased 202.7 percent, as against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. That is the highest in the Nation.

Population increased 105.9 percent. That is another illustration of the point brought out by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We are proud that our State is going along with his State. That was against 26.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Bank deposits, of course, are very important to all of us. That was 137.3 percent, more than double the 63.5 percent in non-right-to-work States.

Motor vehicle registrations, which indicate the prosperity of the people, were 109.8 percent, as against 44.3 percent.

All the way through the list I could continue to illustrate what is happening. I know that the Senator is proud of what has taken place. The attitude of the people has been expressed by a willingness to have the right-to-work law to protect the people and to give them the privilege of making decisions one way or the other. They can do away with the right-to-work law or take care of it under present conditions. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed they will not have that privilege.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for putting those facts in the RECORD relative to my own State. Similar facts could be placed in the RECORD with reference to the State of Arizona.

I wish to add one additional fact which I think illustrates the great growth that my State has had.

I had the honor of being inaugurated as Governor in 1941. The census of 1940 showed a little less than 2 million people in the State of Florida.

That population has been trebled since that time, and the annual estimate as of July 1, 1965, is 5,805,000. Florida has risen from 27th State among the States in population at that time to 9th State now.

Again, I hurry to say that the right-to-work provision is not the sole reason for this growth, but it has helped to create the fine atmosphere and environment under which great growth and prosperity have been possible, just as the same values have been created in Arizona by the same right-to-work principle.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator from Florida. I commend him for assisting in bringing forth the benefits that have accrued to his State by the attitude of the people. This is expressed in their retention of the right-to-work law.

With respect to the contention that workers are unable to obtain redress under right-to-work laws, what has happened to the gentleman whom I mentioned, who has carried the fight through, is indicative of what has occurred in many other cases throughout the Nation. When people make the argument that right-to-work laws do not give protection to workers, we should refer them to what happened in this individual's case. It is significant.

Mr. President, several nationwide polls have shown that between 65 and 70 percent of the people favor retention of the right-to-work clause, but Washington observers predict its passage. If the provision is stricken from the lawbooks, Congress will be responding to pressure from President Johnson who promised big labor it would be repealed in return for support of his candidacy for the Presidency. Repeal will not reflect the will of the majority.

The only reason stated by the President in his message of May 17 recomending repeal of 14(b) was that repeal would eliminate conflicts between varying State laws. This feeble argument has no merit. No evidence was put forth to suggest that any such alleged conflicts have in any way damaged the public welfare. Moreover, the same argument could be used with better logic to demand a Federal right-to-work law banning compulsory unionism in all 50 States.

It is illuminating to recall what the President was quoted by the Dallas Morning News as saying in a Senate campaign speech on August 10, 1948:

> I have never sought, nor do I seek now, the support of any labor bosses dictating to freemen anywhere.

So although we have heard much about what was said by Governor Connally, of Texas, in support of the right-to-work law in his State, and about his appeal to Members of Congress to support the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, we also have a statement by one of Governor Connally's close associates, our President, in this regard.

Yet in their public statements many union officials have repeatedly declared they believe the administration is obligated to support repeal of 14(b) in return for the material contributions made by organized labor in the 1964 election campaigns. They are entitled to this opinion, but the administration obviously is under no such real obligation, since the President's popular and electoral vote majority was among the largest in our national history.

The President is elected to serve as the Chief Executive for all Americans. Neither he nor the Secretary of Labor should be under any obligation to serve as a pleader for special interests. Neither should organized labor expect further privileged status under law.

Mr. President, none of the various arguments advanced for compulsory unionism bear up under analysis. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, for example, has contended that right-to-work law unfairly restricts freedom of contract between employers and unions. This overlooks the fact that Federal laws already have severely restricted employers' freedom of contract in dealing with unions.

"Yellow dog" and "sweetheart" contracts have long been prohibited. No employer may bargain for wages or working conditions below minimums established by Federal law. And there are substantial restrictions on employer freedom in communicating management's views to employees during representation or bargaining procedures.

The freedom-of-contract argument and its companion majority rule contention both ignore the fact that minorities in our system of government have rights which cannot be bargained away by majorities. Moreover, the record discloses many instances where unions have acquired exclusive bargaining status without any election whatsoever. Nor for that matter is the question of a union shop demand always put to the union membership for a vote.

As for the oft-repeated "free rider" argument by organized labor officials, it should be remembered that labor actively sought the privilege of exclusive bargaining agent for all employees of a unit, union member and nonmember alike. Labor willingly assumed the responsibility for representing nonmembers.

The fallacy of the free rider argument was well stated by Donald Richberg in his book "Labor Union Monopoly." Mr. Richberg wrote:

> The unions took away by law the right and freedom of individual employees to contract for themselves, and now the unions demand that nonmembers be compelled to pay for having their freedom of contract taken away and exercised against their will. The nonmember is not a free rider; he is a captive passenger.

It has also been suggested that repeal of section 14(b) would contribute to increased stability and peace in labor-management relations. That kind of peace and stability can be found in a prison.

The truth is that the repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land as individual employers and employees struggled to resist coercion by powerful unions. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

Organized labor, representing approximately one-fifth of our work force, has expended millions of dollars in a propa-

ganda campaign to create a simulated demand for repeal of section 14(b). Yet the evidence unquestionably shows a strong majority of the American people want section 14(b) retained.

Mr. President, amid all the arguments involved in the pending issue, the one which assumes prime importance is individual freedom. Section 14(b) makes it possible for the people of the States to act to preserve the vital ingredient of personal liberty in labor-management relations, repeal would destroy this freedom of choice.

A national policy of compulsory unionism would place the United States in a position contrary to that of virtually all Western European democratic nations. Compulsory unionism is prohibited either by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany. By adopting this bill the United States would aline itself with the Soviet Union and other totalitarian regimes where labor freedom does not exist.

Finally, a word about organized labor's real objective, the closed shop. This form of union security, made illegal by section 8(a)(3) of the Taft-Hartley Act, requires a prospective employee to be a member of the union before he may be hired. When this arrangement is accompanied by the "closed union" (a union which does not admit new members) the power of the unions becomes overwhelming.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO said:

> A closed shop—and an open union—is from our point of view a more desirable situation. The union shop permitted by the Taft-Hartley Act is not ideal from our standpoint, but rather, as was well understood, at the time, is itself a compromise.

That is in the record.

However, the legitimizing of union hiring halls, preferential union hiring and practices followed in the building trades, printing trades, shipping and the entertainment industries amount to a "closed shop."

The union campaign for repeal of section 14(b) started with the passage of Taft-Hartley, grew upon failure to repeal this law in 1949, and blossomed to full fruit after the last national elections when union leaders claimed that they then controlled a sufficient number of Members of Congress in both Houses to obtain repeal. If successful in the Senate as they were in the House it is predicted that the campaign for the "closed shop" will immediately commence.

Compulsion is alien to our heritage and does violence to one of the American citizen's most basic and cherished human rights. Congress cannot preserve freedom by extending it to a few while denying it to many. This is the reason why the Senate should reject H.R. 77.

For the convenience of the Senators and to assist them in understanding the issues involved I will list some of the arguments for repeal advanced by the administration and spokesmen for organized labor. Following this listing there is presented a refutation of each argument. References are to the record of hearings on this legislation before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor.

First. All other provisions of the National Labor Relations Act apply uniformly in the States and that accordingly a uniform national policy should be adopted in the area of union security.

Second. The "free rider" argument.

Third. Section 14(b) prevents freedom of contract as between employers and unions.

Fourth. Union security provisions make a very real contribution to industrial peace and union responsibility.

Fifth. The Railway Labor Act permits union security agreements.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951 when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organizations, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry.

(1) ALL OTHER PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAW APPLY UNIFORMLY IN THE STATES AND, ACCORDINGLY, A UNIFORM POLICY SHOULD BE ADOPTED IN THE AREA OF "UNION SECURITY"

Even assuming, for purposes of debate, that there is virtue in uniformity, this argument does not stand up under investigation. The Supreme Court has held that State boards may enjoin "quickie" or intermittent strikes, can regulate the conduct of strikers on picket lines, and that State courts may entertain suits for breach of collective agreements (336 U.S. 245; 346 U.S. 485; 368 U.S. 502).

Section 14(c) of the present law permits the States to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes even in industries affecting commerce if the board has relinquished jurisdiction.

Section 18 of the Fair Labor Standards Act allows the States to impose higher wages or shorter workweeks than are prescribed by that act.

Section 603(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act preserves State laws regulating the actions of union officials and the remedies available thereunder to individual members.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 gives wide latitude to the States to legislate in the area of racial or religious discrimination in the field of employment.

In the National Labor Relations Act, "union security" is not applied alike to all employees. A special rule applicable only to the construction industry is written into section 8(f) of the act. The act similarly abandons uniformity in section 8(e) which writes in special rules regarding "hot cargo" arguments applicable to both the construction and garment industries. Since the garment industry centers largely in New York it follows that here is an exception which is principally applicable in just one State.

Workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation benefits vary from State to State. The States also have varied laws about injunctions in labor disputes, about payment of wages, about employment of minors and females, and many other matters that affect the employer-employee relationship.

The Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act recognizes authority of the State when it provides in section 16(a) that States shall not be prevented from obtaining information regarding a plan in addition to that required by the Federal act.

Without further examination of the exceptions to uniform national policy, we go to the heart of the matter and say we believe that the States still have some rights. If there is to be legislation limiting or guaranteeing freedom of association, let it be by State action as the Founding Fathers intended. As the Founding Fathers drafted it, the Constitution guaranteed to the States and to the people the unused reservoirs of power and authority. As a nation we suffer from too much centralism already. Let us keep a little power in the States, and thus give a small nod of respect to the Constitution as written and intended.

We have examined in vain the record of testimony before the subcommittee to find any citation of problems created by the lack of uniformity on "union security." There are none. Proponents of repeal of 14(b) rest on the mere statement that there is someting good about uniformity.

(2) THE "FREE RIDER" ARGUMENT

Almost every proponent witness appearing before the subcommittee stressed the argument that every employee's wages and working conditions are fixed by union contract and that, therefore, as a beneficiary of this contract, he should contribute his share of the cost of union representation.

The argument ignores the fact that employees in a competing nonunion plant are frequently better paid. It assumes that the wages and fringe benefits of the worker in the union plant would be less if it were not for union negotiations. Obviously, this applies only to the less skilled, less dexterous, or less diligent members of any working force, for an employer could afford to pay more to the more competent workers, were it not for the union goal of uniformity in job rates. Moreover, almost all union contracts have seniority provisions which require the newly hired to be laid off first and the older to be rehired first. Young workers or new workers in industries where there are frequent layoffs simply do not benefit by union representation.

Consider also the fact that many nonunion employees have serious doubts whether excessive union demands are in their ultimate best interests, particularly when they are involved in costly long strikes over issues where they do not stand to gain. For example, where the

issues—union shop, checkoff, maintenance of membership, and so forth—result in a strike, the employees have much to lose and little to gain. Employees may choose not to join for many reasons apart from the dues requirement. To list a few: Confidence in the leadership of management, objections to the union leadership; or objections to the union policies.

In fact, 39 million of 56 million workers in nonagricultural establishments have not joined unions, and this has not been due to a lack of opportunity to do so.

The American Farm Bureau Federation in its testimony on this legislation asks some very pertinent questions:

First. Does the member benefit when the union supports political causes he abhors?

Second. Does the member benefit when the union helps elect political candidates to whom he is opposed?

Third. Does the member benefit if the union prices him out of a job?

Fourth. Does the member benefit if the union destroys his employer?

Fifth. Does the member benefit if the union falls into the hands of criminal elements, racketeers, or subversive elements?

Sixth. Who is to decide whether or not the individual benefits—the union or the individual? The McClellan committee hearings document these reasons for concern.

The free-rider argument is basically unsound because throughout America many voluntary organizations carry on meritorious work which benefits many persons who contribute neither financial or other support. Fraternal organization, churches, civic and political organizations are examples. Any organization so lacking in the confidence of its members that it can exist only through the protective cloak of compulsion rests on such insecure foundations that it needs a reappraisal by its membership.

Proponents of the bill also use a secondary argument, that the law requires a union to represent all employees in a bargaining unit—members or not. This is hypocritical. Unions have steadfastly insisted that the union be the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees. They have resisted all suggestions that the law of exclusive representation be modified.

If a union serves the persons in the bargaining unit it represents wisely and unselfishly, it will have no difficulty in maintaining a strong and nearly universal membership.

(3) SECTION 14(b) PREVENTS FREEDOM OF CONTRACT AS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND UNIONS

This argument could be dismissed with the simple observation that we are concerned here with the protection of the rights of employees. They and they alone are affected by union shop agreements. Freedom of contract between employers and unions has no relevance here.

However, it is interesting to look at the record to see what freedom of contract has meant in non-right-to-work States.

The testimony of small retailers establishes that the word "freely" is a grim joke. There is bargaining on wages, working conditions, and fringe benefits. There is no bargaining on the union shop. The employer is reduced to the position of saying yes or no. If he says no and sticks to it, he must expect a strike or picketing. A retailer is vulnerable to strikes and picketing. When his store is shut down or his customers do not cross a picket line, he loses customers which he may never regain. Thus, he is easily forced to agree to compulsory membership and the dues checkoff.

Too often employers quickly agree to compulsory membership contracts in exchange for a better break on wage and fringe benefits. Thus the employees lose.

Consider this testimony of a small businessman:

The bargaining which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to just does not exist at the small business level. Experience has shown that a union demand for a compulsory membership contract is invariably accompanied with threats of the most drastic economic reprisals upon the employer if he does not accede to the demand. This bargaining, which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to, is comparable to a situation where a highwayman puts a pistol at your head and says I want to bargain with you for the contents of your wallet. The small businessman yields on the union shop just about as willingly as the highwayman's victim gives up his money.

The American Farm Bureau Federation testified during the hearings that:

It is bad enough in principle to force a person to join a good union. But what shall we say to a law which forces a worker to belong to some of the racket-ridden unions investigated by the McClellan committee? Yet, monstrous though it may be, this could be required everywhere if section 14(b) should be repealed.

The printing industry went on record as follows:

Very few small companies can afford an extended strike on a union shop issue, as the bulk of orders which come to a printing plant—legal briefs, periodicals, timetables, have a deadline. A suspension of operations means that these customers will go to a nonunion plant, and possibly will never return. But if these employers yield to the union shop demands, it means that every one of their workers forced into membership will also be trapped by the union rules on jurisdiction and other practices which drive up costs and prices in this highly competitive industry.

The Associated General Contractors made this observation:

The act allows construction contractors and the construction unions to make prehire agreements; that is, before there are any employees on the job. The prehire agreements can, of course, contain union shop provisions, unless banned by the States. Construction workers coming on the project will be required to join the union at the end of 7 days. This means it is a "closed shop" in our industry which is also known for its closed unions.

The manufacturers made this point:

The major impact of this legislation would fall on medium and small sized companies which could not possibly withstand the assault of such organized power in a demand for a union shop and compulsory membership. Thus you come to the "agreement" between a union and an employer entered into under the coercion of a potentially ruinous strike and without regard to the ultimate desires or wishes of the employees who will be compelled to sign up or look elsewhere for a job.

(4) "UNION SECURITY" PROVISIONS MAKE A VERY REAL CONTRIBUTION TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE AND UNION RESPONSIBILITY—LET US EXAMINE THIS FALLACY

In support of this statement Secretary of Labor Wirtz said:

The resultant assured continuation of the union's status removes one of the most serious sources of bitter labor-management suspicion and conflict. Without such a clause, union energies better devoted to making a cooperative bargaining relationship work for the mutual benefit of the employer and employees are likely to be drained off in abrasive defensive efforts—guarding against willful attrition, continuous organization of newcomers, watchfulness against antiunion solicitation.

Thus, the Secretary of Labor departs from the role of a neutral Government official to that of the all-out advocate of the union shop.

It cannot be denied that the employer who agrees to the union shop has made his job of employee relations easier. But that is not the point of this dissent. I believe the welfare of the employees is the paramount consideration. The abuses which flow from compulsory unionism are felt principally by the individual worker at the local level, and for this reason it is felt that they create essentially local problems which should be dealt with by the States on the basis of their special knowledge and judgment as to what is necessary in the best interests of their people.

My colleagues in the Senate are urged to read the statements of 22 individuals relating their personal experience with union shop conditions in the hearings. Their stories illustrate the frustration and helplessness of union members who are unable to do anything about the corruption, mismanagement, and abuses of power which exist under union shop conditions.

Many unions in many plants have 100-percent membership without the compulsion of union shop contracts. They have sold themselves to their members. I agree with the statement:

Good unions don't need compulsory unionism, and bad unions don't deserve it.

Proponents of repeal argue that this legislation would not require anyone to join a union—all an employee has to do is tender the dues and initiation fees. This argument ignores the practicalities of the matter. For example, the American Federation of Musicians do not permit their members to work with nonmembers and the nonmember can tender dues as often as he pleases, but he will not work because he cannot work alone.

Moreover, it is not true that all an employee has to do is tender initiation fees and dues. His job also depends upon his payment of special assessments. In 1948 as a result of a ruling of the Department of Justice, unions were given authority to classify whatever special assessments they wished to levy as dues by the simple subterfuge of amending their

constitution. Union hiring halls and agreements giving preferential employment to union members have been legalized by the Supreme Court.

Secretary Wirtz's statement might well have read that existing law permitting union security has produced long and costly strikes. I refer my colleagues to the hearings, pages 118–119 and 195, for illustrations of long strikes on this one issue.

(1) THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT PERMITS "UNION SECURITY" AGREEMENTS

Prohibitions against all forms of "union security" agreements and the checkoff were made part of the Railway Labor Act in 1934. The 81st Congress repealed this prohibition. The report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommended this action because the committee believed that railway unions should have the same freedom to negotiate union shop conditions as unions representing employees in industry generally—page 3, report 2262, 81st Congress, 2d session. The report is silent on section 14(b). The report states:

> It is the view of our committee that the terms of the bill are substantially the same as those of the Labor Management Relations Act as they have been administered and that such differences as exist are warranted either by experience or by special conditions existing among employees of our railroads and airlines.

While the committee did not develop the point, the "special conditions" could only have reference to the fact that railroads are instruments of interstate commerce and many of the employees move daily between States.

It is interesting to note that at least one railway union president opposed the amendment. The president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers said that his union for 25 years had held to the position that it was such an outstanding organization that men should seek its membership. He "did not want any compulsion; he did not want any closed shop; he did not want any union shop"—May 1, 1950. Hearing To Amend Railroad Labor Act, page 86.

The statement that the Railway Labor Act permits union shop contracts in all States has little relevance to the issue now before us.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951, when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement, workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified that:

> Over 97 percent of the 46,146 elections which were conducted went in favor of the union shop, and 91 percent of the almost 6 million employee votes cast in these elections were in favor of the union shop.

To the Secretary, these figures demonstrate that the American workingmen overwhelmingly favor the union shop.

The figures, like most statistics, do not tell the whole story. Only a small percentage of the establishments in this country which now have compulsory membership provisions in contracts were ever the subject of these popular referendums. It must be remembered that because such polls were taken only upon the petitions of labor organizations, the union officials rarely picked any establishment where they were not sure to win. In cases where the Board has entertained deauthorization petitions from dissident employees—and it takes a 30-percent showing to file—the results of such balloting indicate a disillusionment with compulsory unionism. Of the 34 such referendums conducted in 1964, 67 percent resulted in a majority vote for revocation of the union shop. In 1963 unions lost 71 percent of such elections.

It should be noted that these deauthorization proceedings have every force working against them. Employees cannot campaign for deauthorization in the shop or plant. They can hardly campaign at the union hall. The employer cannot assist or even suggest such without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. Advocates of deauthorization can expect threats and abuse and future retaliatory action from the union. Their employers, fearing union pressures, may be expected to make every effort to discourage deauthorization campaigns. It is surprising that such elections ever occur.

The Secretary's statistics are also debatable when one considers the timing of those union shop authorization elections. They were held after the union had already become the bargaining agent by certification or recognition. They were held before bargaining began. The issue in those 1947–51 votes was bargaining power. They were sought by the union to demonstrate a show of strength to the employer. Employees were propagandized to insure a belief that a strong vote for union shop was the way to win wage and benefit demands at the bargaining table.

The report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations dated December 31, 1948, discussed the problems involved in the union shop authorization (section 9(e)(1)). While this was only a little over 1 year after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, that committee recommended the amendment which became law in 1951. The reasons for its recommendations were: First, many elections were being held where there was already a contract with union security provisions; second, unions were requesting authorization elections in situations where they have reason to believe they have the best chance of success; third, the practical difficulties of conducting such elections where employment is intermittent, most often in the building trades; and fourth, the cost of such elections was average 40 cents per vote.

In any event, the results could have been expected. The Smith-Connally Antistrike Act, which during World War II required an employee vote to authorize a strike, resulted in a similar statistical record. Although the ballot was worded to the effect, "Do you want to interfere with the war effort by going on strike?" in almost every case the employees nevertheless voted overwhelmingly to authorize the strike. The reason then, as in 1947–51, was that the real issue was bargaining power with the employer.

I believe that forcefully brings out the manner in which union members accepted this prerogative. They felt it gave them the opportunity to express themselves so far as bargaining power over the employer was concerned.

The Smith-Connally votes do not prove that employees wanted to go on strike during the war and the 1947–51 votes do not prove the employees wanted a "union shop."

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

The only conflict which proponents were able to cite was in the political arena when States pass or attempt to pass right-to-work laws, Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> It is time to put an end to fruitless and acrimonious political controversy by adopting the rule of uniformity.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO, said:

> There have been innumerable legislative contests and in 13 instances referendum votes—all accompanied by highly emotional charges and countercharges, which, quite apart from the merits of the case, did not contribute to labor-management peace or stability in the States involved.

This type of "conflict" can hardly be persuasive to any Senator. To abolish it would be to demolish democracy itself.

If "conflict" means that the States do not have uniform laws, the field of "conflict" covers innumerable subjects as broad as the body of laws of any given State.

I could cite eight definite reasons for the differences in the laws of the various States. I could refer to my State of Arizona, which has more Indians than any other State in the United States. In one county of our State there are approximately 26,000 Indians and 6,000 non-Indians. I would not like to have the same rules and regulations apply to the organization or the hiring of Indian people, to dictate to them the conditions under which they can work, as would apply in an industrial area of our land. Those people are not in a position to meet those conditions. If we based all of our laws on a basic uniformity it would be a definite injustice to these people. They have not had an opportunity to go forward as many people in our great Nation. I would oppose any attempt at uniformity to bring them to apply to any metropolitan center of a highly industrialized area.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> There is no violation of freedom in a minority's having to accept a majority's fair judgment fairly arrived at. There is no "right" of minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The view of a few who oppose belonging to a union or to any other organization as a matter of conscience or religious principle must be accommodated to the obligations of living together, and is respected to the fullest practical extent in section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The Secretary's argument on "majority rule" is quoted in full text because it is believed that he is wrong both in the principle he states and in his assertion that in the majority of cases there is an expression of desire by a majority.

In the first place in talking about majority rule the Secretary and union spokesmen erroneously assume there is no difference between public government and private labor organizations, so far as power over the individual is concerned. Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

I wish to emphasize that statement: Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

If a minority of employees does not want to be unionized, no democratic principle will support action which compels that minority to join the union of a majority. Second, although a properly constituted government may take some rights from an individual under the principle of majority rule, even in this case there are certain basic rights which cannot be taken from him. It takes a compelling national purpose to deprive an individual of a basic right.

Mr. Justice Jackson eloquently expressed this when he stated:

> The very purpose of a bill of rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship, and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to votes; they depend on the outcome of no elections (speaking for the majority in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette,* 319 U.S. 1187).

I cannot agree with Secretary Wirtz that a great national purpose would be served by requiring American workingmen to join unions even if the majority will it. In the case of the Government a majority decision may decide issues. It should never decide who shall join what private association.

This country has been moving rapidly forward in the area of civil rights and civil liberties, the motivation being the result of personal convictions, legislative action, and court decisions. Repeal of section 14(b) would be a long step in the other direction.

While the United States regards itself as and hopes to convey the impression abroad that it is the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, the passage of H.R. 77 can only be regarded as a rejection of voluntarism. We would become the only major power outside of the Iron Curtain to permit compulsory unionism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany.

The majority-rule argument can also be shown to be fallacious on other grounds. Unions and employers customarily enter into union shop contracts without ever having obtained an expression of the desires of the majority of employees in the bargaining unit. Even in the best run unions, the business agent presents proposed demands in a package at a meeting of employees—in almost all cases just those who are already members attend—prior to bargaining. Then in bargaining, everything is bargainable except the union shop. That is a "must". The employer agrees or a strike is called. An attorney-witness before the subcommittee described a 427-day strike in Kansas City, Mo., where the sole issue was "union shop." After the strike the employee union leader admitted on the witness stand that he did not even know what the term "union security" meant.

As a matter of fact, it is even possible for a worker to be forced into a union by so-called "majority rule" where there has never been a majority of employees even wanting union representation. During the hearings witnesses pointed out that the National Labor Relations Board has circumvented the elections provisions of the act to require bargaining on the basis of union membership cards by what it calls the Joy Silk and Bernel Foam doctrine. It is submitted that the use of card checks to determine a majority can be justified only in the most extreme cases—cases where the employer is guilty of gross misconduct. This is so because cards can never be a reliable indicator of employee intent. Employees sign cards believing the purpose is only to obtain an election at which time they will have an opportunity to express their real intent. Cards may be signed today by a group of employees who next week may change their minds on union representation. Cards are signed because of various pressures—some, just to please a friend. Many cards are forgeries. It is no answer to say that motivation may be inquired into on the witness stand because few people wish to admit that they did not know what they were doing or yielded to pressure in signing a card.

The whole practice is detrimental to employee rights. He is prevented from hearing both sides of the question of representation which occurs if an election is held. He becomes a victim of the union shop in many cases where there has never been a majority of employees desiring union representation. Card checks are the handmaiden of "sweetheart" contracts where the employee loses wage increases and benefits and the opportunity to choose a different union to represent him.

Thus, the arguments of majority rule fail in every respect.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organization, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry:

There was an attempt to show that right-to-work laws cause migration of industry from non-right-to-work States with resulting loss of jobs. This was an argument without supporting proof.

This subject is much misunderstood, and many people who have discussed it in recent weeks have been under illusions. They have considered that in the right-to-work States starvation wages have been paid. They have not taken the time to determine how their particular States stand in relation to the right-to-work States. I gave statistics, and I shall submit more, covering that particular item. But in making the determination, it was found that of the top 15 States, in relation to wages paid, 6 are right-to-work States. One of the right-to-work States is the second in the Nation so far as wage payments are concerned. But such statistics are not valid in proving arguments one way or another. Even if statistics were available in all categories, they would be meaningless, because an employer may move his business for myriads of reasons.

There have been movements both to and from right-to-work States, between right-to-work States and between non-right-to-work States. The National Labor Relations Board has extremely few "runaway shop" cases—it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to move his business to get rid of a union.

The subcommittee was presented with many tables of statistics on wage rates and on union membership in the various States by both proponents and opponents of repeal of section 14(b). From these, one may logically argue that there is or is not motivation for an employer to move to a right-to-work State. Statistics were also offered on man-days lost by strike in the various States from which one might argue that there is motivation to move to States where there are fewer strikes.

When one makes comparison between two States, the statistics lose their persuasiveness.

Compare Arizona with the neighboring State of New Mexico, which does not have a right-to-work law. Similar in size, climate, and resources, 10 years ago the average weekly earnings of a worker in New Mexico was $85 compared to $82 in Arizona. Today the average wage in Arizona is $111 a week compared to $90 in New Mexico.

I do not feel, as I stated before, that this is occasioned merely because one State is a compulsory-union State and the other is a voluntary-union State.

The AFL–CIO gained 36,000 members in Arizona between 1958 and 1962, and gained 5,000 members in New Mexico during the same period. Later I give statistics showing that gains in the year 1965 have been highly significant in my State of Arizona.

In 1964, Arizona ranked 13th and New Mexico ranked 36th in average hourly earnings in manufacturing. I do not say that this is due merely to the right-to-work law. However, I emphasize over and over that the States which have right-to-work laws have been seeking industries. They have had a good political climate, and a good business climate. I believe that this is important.

I believe this indicates that a State is a right-to-work State not because it wants to take advantage of the working man, but because, in most cases, the people involved look favorably upon industry and want industry to come to that State.

That is proved by the statistics, if we want to accept the statistics as proof. The per capita personal income in Arizona was $2,218 for 1964, and it was $2,010 in New Mexico for the same year. Incidentally, both those States have a

large Indian population with a very low per capita income. I believe that we are on about the same percentage basis in this relationship.

Arizona has more Indians than has any other State in the United States. The State of New Mexico is second in that regard. That does affect our per capita personal income. In New Mexico—as an example, to show that compulsory unionism has not been beneficial, strikes accounted for 69,300 man-days idle in Arizona and 93,500 man-days idle in New Mexico.

If we look back over the years, we see that we have had a better relationship between mangement and labor and a far better situation with reference to union activities in the State of Arizona, which is a right-to-work State.

The value of these statistics is diminished by the fact that they do not show the number of employees belonging to affiliated unions, such as the Mine Workers, the Teamsters, and a large body of independent unions. Statistics reflecting such total membership are not available.

Another factor should be noted when examining tables of union membership. Under the act a union is certified to represent all employees in the bargaining unit. Since union shop is forbidden in the 19 right-to-work States, there are more nonmember employees represented in such States. As pointed out by Mr. Biemiller, it should also be remembered that total union membership declined between 1958 and 1962. Total membership fell from 17.1 million in 1958 to 16.6 million in 1962. However, this is not true today. The union membership has increased and the statistics show now that it is at a high point.

While Mr. Biemiller is able to make the overall statement that percentage drop was greater for the right-to-work States than for States without right-to-work laws, reference to some individual States demonstrates that there must have been factors other than right-to-work laws operating to create losses and gains. Among the non-right-to-work States, for example, Michigan lost 50,000 members, Ohio lost 250,000, California lost 200,000, Vermont lost 500, Illinois gained 50,000, Massachusetts gained 125,000, and Washington gained 150,000, Tennessee lost 25,000, Iowa lost 30,000, and there were no changes in Alabama, Arkansas, and North Carolina.

Senators are urged to examine the tables of strikes and man-days lost for the 4 years, 1960–63, for the various States. It is interesting to note that when the States listed above were considered, gains and losses in union membership bear a close relationship to the number of strikes and man-days lost.

Statistics from the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce for the decade ending in 1963 indicate that determinative factors of an expanding economy such as wage improvements, increased number of production workers, greater capital investment, larger bank deposits, accelerated personal income, and other similar indexes of increased prosperity showed a greater percentage rate of increases in right-to-work States than in either non-right-to-work States or the national average.

Mr. President, I shall read a few statements from individuals whose testimony was given before our committee.

This is a statement of John Seeley, of California. It reads as follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN SEELEY, SEPULVEDA, CALIF.

It was almost exactly 2 years ago that I walked for the last time out of the gates of the Douglas Aircraft Co. plant where I had worked for 27 years. An old union man, I had taken my stand on the principle that no man should be forced to join or pay fees to a union except by free choice. I knew it meant the loss of my job and I was fired.

I had helped organize one of the first unions in the Douglas plant at Santa Monica, Calif., years ago—the Aircraft Workers Union. Later, during World War II, I was a member of a CIO union at the plant and served as an assistant shop steward. Those were voluntary unions, which employees were free to join as they chose. I believe in that type of union.

But when the International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO) demanded of Douglas an "agency shop" contract, under which every employee of the plant had to either join or pay fees to the union, I was one of hundreds of other Douglas employees who fought against it because they believed it was wrong. We organized the Douglas Employees Right-To-Work Committee and did all we could to prevent imposition of the "agency shop," but were defeated.

After the signing of the "agency shop" contract at Douglas, I was 1 of 25 or 30 employees who stuck by their guns and refused to pay forced tribute to the union—even though they knew it meant their jobs.

Speaking of those who accepted the "agency shop" against their beliefs, I found that most people can't afford the luxury of integrity.

When I received official notice that I had to pay a fee to the union or be fired, I went to call on the president of the company, Donald W. Douglas, Jr. Told that Mr. Douglas was not in, I left my 25-year pin with the secretary. Later Mr. Douglas called me to make sure he understood the company's position and my rights under the contract. I assured him that I did. Asked why I had returned my 25-year pin, I replied: "I don't want the pin any longer because I can't wear it with pride."

During my 27 years in the Santa Monica Douglas plant, I worked in almost every phase of tool and diemaking. My last assignment was in a department where highly skilled men were building special machinery. My supervisor gave me the highest rating in the plant.

I hold no resentment against my employer, or even the union—only against the compulsion which I feel is robbing rank-and-file workers of their freedom and is hurting the union movement.

Today I am employed as an instructor at the North American Aviation Co. My duties include use of a special skill I possess in teaching classes for the deaf.

I continue to fight against compulsory unionism. I serve as a director of the organization, California Employees for Right To Work, which is working toward adoption of a law to make compulsory union membership illegal in that State.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before doing that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a quorum call?

Mr. FANNIN. I withhold my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to ask a question or two of the Senator from Arizona.

Before doing so, however, I wish to state that he has made an excellent analysis of the situation. The Senate is favored with his statement, because the Senator from Arizona speaks with authority, having served as Governor of his State for a long enough period of time to have had the benefit of an opportunity to observe precisely what has happened on the industrial scene, the labor scene, and the economic scene, as affected by the law in effect in his State, and is in a good position to predict what the impact and effect would be should repeal occur.

The question which I should like to put to the Senator from Arizona has to do with work stoppages. There was a comment by him as to the greater number of work stoppages in non-right-to-work States than in right-to-work States such as his own. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether, in his State, there has been the same experience that we have in this Senator's State of Nebraska, where, for the 11-year period from 1952 to 1962, the percentage of estimated total working time lost due to stoppages was 0.118, while during that same period of time nationally, the percentage of estimated total working time lost was 0.303, a figure not quite but nearly three times as great.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, therefore, whether there was a similar experience in his State.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his question, as well as for the information regarding his State. I am proud of what has happened in Nebraska, just as I am proud of what has happened in Arizona, both being right-to-work States. I have carefully checked the figures over the past 5 years, and the record is highly encouraging. We find that Arizona has been fortunate in having fewer work stoppages than most of the States of our Nation. I cannot say that we have the fine record that Nebraska has, but we do have an outstanding record as compared with the other States of our Nation; and I am pleased that in our area, we have proved that in comparison with New Mexico, our neighboring State, we have had far fewer work stoppages and fewer man-days lost by strikes than has that State.

So although we have not maintained such a fine record as have the people of Nebraska, whom the distinguished Senator represents, I am proud of the record of our State.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for another question.

Mr. HRUSKA. It has been called to my attention that in States which permit what we call enforced unionism, that is, where they do not have right-to-work laws, the work stoppage record is nearly twice as great, through time lost as a result of strikes and other labor

stoppages, than in States where right-to-work laws exist. I know that the Senator, being a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, has come across figures of that kind. The percentages which I have are 0.09 in all States which ban compulsory unionism, compared with 0.14 in the remaining 31 States—not quite twice as much, but nearly so.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether that is his recollection, and whether that is the information which was developed during the course of hearings on the bill.

Mr. FANNIN. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct. I have here the record on the economic progress in the various States of our Nation. The Senator's information is correct. We are proud that that is the record and has been the experience in the right-to-work States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not true that often in work stoppages and strikes, strikes not necessarily caused by it but nevertheless prolonged by it, the issue of enforced unionism was the issue which caused the work stoppage, and that that is one of the prime reasons for the more adverse record on work stoppages in States where that can be done?

Mr. FANNIN. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. He has brought out some very valuable information, which discloses that a better working relationship exists between unions and management in States which have voluntary unionism.

The record of time thus lost through strikes, as shown by the statistics the distinguished Senator has mentioned, is very impressive, and it is encouraging to see that the record in right-to-work States is still improving. That is highly commendable.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the attitude of the people is reflected, in States which have voluntary unionism, in the better relationship which has accrued to them as a result of their working together, because the union management of a voluntary union is, by necessity, compelled to provide service to members to a much greater degree than in the case of a compulsory union.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator very much for his responses to my questions, and congratulate him on the clarity of his statement, made, as it is, from his vantage point of authority.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 77, a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In all my years in public life, Mr. President, I have never seen an issue upon which there was a more confused public debate, upon which misunderstanding was so rampant, upon which there was so much heat and so little light as there is on the so-called right-to-work issue.

Perhaps one reason for this is the fact that the right-to-work dispute has absolutely nothing to do with anyone's right to work.

What it does have to do with is labor's and management's right to negotiate a union security agreement. That right it gives a State the power to deny.

I come from a State that has never enacted a right-to-work law. The proposed repeal would not affect Alaska, or 30 of the other States, in any way. In these States labor and management in a given plant have an unfettered right to determine whether they want a union-shop or open-shop arrangement. They are free to decide either way.

It is only in the 19 right-to-work States that labor and management are forbidden this choice. There they are compelled to operate under the open shop.

The repeal of 14(b) would simply remove the State's power to impose this sort of arrangement.

It would not end the open shop or establish the union shop. It would merely guarantee that in all States labor and management are free to determine which arrangement they prefer.

I find it difficult to understand why advocates of the right-to-work clause argue in the name of freedom. It seems to me that they are instead arguing for a compulsory situation which restricts the free bargaining process.

Now if we wanted to talk about the freedom of the working man, about the right to work, we might talk about a number of things.

We might talk about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and certain NLRB or court decisions which provide that no person shall be denied employment or union membership because of race, creed, or sex.

We might mention the numerous statutes which provide that a union shall preserve the liberties and serve the best interests of its members. The law completely bans any arrangement whereby a man may not be hired if he is not a union member. It provides that a union shall not bargain on behalf of a body of workers unless it represents a majority of them, as determined by free elections. It provides that union members shall not be compelled to participate in union activities nor to pay excessive dues and fees. It prohibits unions from denying membership to workers for reasons other than their failure to pay uniformly required dues and fees. All this effectively precludes unions from denying or burdening a laborer's right to work.

We might look at the restraints placed upon employers to guarantee that they shall not discriminate against union members in their hiring and firing practices, that they shall not impede legitimate labor activity nor refuse to engage in bargaining. We might indeed look at the wage and hour guarantees, the fair-labor standards, and the job security agreements to which management has agreed, largely because of the growth and strength and activity of the labor movement.

We might talk about all these things if we were interested in the right to work.

But we would not talk about right-to-work laws.

The only person to whom a right-to-work law conceivably gives a right to work is the person who would choose to work in a unionized plant, who would reap the benefits of past and continuing union activity, and yet who would choose not to pay the dues that maintain the union. The argument in favor of a compulsory open shop sometimes makes little more sense than suggesting that the person who participates in a company's health or retirement program should be "free" not to pay the requisite fees. The union shop does not compel active unionism. It merely provides that each shall share in the financial maintenance of union benefits.

But the point is not to defend the union shop—though I think it undeniable that such arrangements have contributed immensely to the welfare of the working man. The point is not that union shops are good and open shops are bad. The point is that labor and management should be free to negotiate whichever kind of arrangement seems best for a given situation. That freedom 19 States have seen fit to deny through the powers granted them under 14(b).

14(b) represents an unwarranted exception to the national labor policy outlined in the Taft-Hartley Act. It provides for the irregular and arbitrary intrusion of State law into a delicate field otherwise preempted by Federal statute. It disturbs the balance of interests represented by the otherwise uniform regulation of labor and management policy and practice.

The progress of the working man and the operation of the free bargaining process have been inhibited in 19 States by misnamed and misguided right-to-work laws. The repeal of the clause which made such restrictions possible is long overdue.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 288 Leg.]

Aiken	Hayden	Moss
Allott	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bartlett	Hill	Murphy
Bass	Holland	Muskie
Bayh	Hruska	Nelson
Bennett	Inouye	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Boggs	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Case	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Curtis	Mansfield	Simpson
Dirksen	McCarthy	Smathers
Dodd	McClellan	Smith
Dominick	McGee	Sparkman
Douglas	McGovern	Stennis
Eastland	McIntyre	Symington
Ellender	McNamara	Talmadge
Ervin	Metcalf	Thurmond
Fannin	Miller	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the 47-to-45 majority vote today was to me a clear demonstration that the Senate prefers to postpone until next year the issue raised by the proposal to repeal section 14(b). I am fairly certain that, before the end of this week, the Senate will go on to other matters and that the present attenuated discussion will come to an end. However, until the signal is given, it remains the responsibility of those who oppose the repeal of section 14(b) to continue to discuss the measure.

I rise tonight for the first time in my Senate career to participate actively in such an extended debate. I do so, fully convinced that the cause which I defend is supported by a large majority of the American people.

In my own State, which has a right-to-work law, made possible by section 14(b), the available figures are quite dramatic.

The mail which I have received from Utah shows that 83 percent of the people who write me oppose the repeal of section 14(b) and only 17 percent favor it. This is a 5-to-1 margin.

The mail that I am beginning to receive from outside my State is running more than 98 percent in opposition to the repeal of section 14(b).

When we take all this mail and average it out, the average is 87.5 percent against, and 12.5 percent for, or a ratio of 7-to-1.

Two great Americans, both from Illinois, have brought the issue into sharp focus. Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the greatest defender of freedom this Nation has known, described the American political system as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." His definition left little room for private forms of government, special interest groups, and compulsion. The other man of whom I speak is the distinguished minority leader from Illinois, whose leadership and courage in this battle will go down in history as a classic defense of freedom, and under whose leadership I am proud to serve.

The issue of 14(b) is, of course, a power grab by certain labor bosses who have called at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and at the offices of certain Congressmen and Senators to collect their political I O U's for the 1964 elections. This fact has not escaped the attention of the American people and the American press. It was placed clearly in focus by the distinguished minority leader when, upon being asked if he had enough support to mount a successful drive against the repeal of 14(b), replied that he did, but even more importantly, he knew that those Congressmen and Senators who opposed compulsory unionism also had the country in their corner.

Mr. President, what a comfort it is to know that out in the States, the cities, the towns, villages, farms, factories, and offices of America, at least two-thirds of the people believe that this cause is just and that section 14(b) should be preserved. At a time when consensus has come to mean so much to some Americans and to one in particular, I find it difficult to understand how this classic case can be ignored, but ignored it is. But not for long, for our people are becoming aroused and are beginning to speak. I feel that if the discussion of this proposal is to be dropped for the remainder of this session, that by the time we come back in January, that voice will have made itself so clear that the proposal to repeal section 14(b) cannot be passed.

Let me point out for the sake of those who, for obvious reasons, choose not to listen to what the citizen of my State have said regarding compulsory unionism. Every Utah newspaper of which I have a record has spoken in favor of retaining section 14(b). The largest broadcasting firm in Utah has spoken against compulsory unionism. Other people, business leaders, farmers, teachers, housewives, young people and more workers than some would care to admit, have spoken.

I received a very interesting postcard today. Its writer said that he had been urged to send to me a postcard asking me to vote for the repeal of section 14(b). He said:

> I have followed your political career and I have known how you stood from the beginning. And I am sure you are not prepared now to desert the principles for which you have stood so long. And even though I don't agree with those principles, I hope you have courage to stay with them.

Utah is the one State in the Union the majority of whose citizens have always belonged to the same church. Therefore, the leaders of that church, when they speak, are entitled to special attention.

Our church leaders, whose right to present their point of view to Congress has been attacked by some of their own members who serve in this body, have joined hundreds of other churches in opposing this form of compulsion over the individual.

It has interested me to know that 28 different religious organizations have taken a position on the repeal of section 14(b). Most of these organizations have opposed its repeal during the hearings held on the measure in the House and in the Senate.

Yet when the Mormon Church leaders made their views known, certain Members of Congress refused them a decent hearing. In my office, Mr. President, the voice of the people of Utah is being heard. The people of my State, by the latest count of telegrams, letters, and postcards to which I have referred, oppose repeal of section 14(b) by a margin of nearly 5 to 1. How can I ignore the people I was elected to represent? They know that the central issue in this debate is individual freedom. They have not chosen to ignore this glaring fact.

Mr. President, let us examine the issue in its historical perspective. Let us look back into the history of American political development. Let us examine the writings of the men who attended the birth of this Nation and those who wrote its Constitution. Let us examine the great issues of the Civil War and issues of our own industrial and political development to see whether or not the forces of freedom or compulsion were the victors.

A candid examination will, of course, show that throughout our history as a Nation there have been forces which would reduce freedom for self interest, but I think that our general approach, as a people and as a Government, has been to favor freedom over compulsion.

It should never be forgotten that one of the first acts of defiance in recorded American history was the refusal by certain members of the established churches in England to be subject to the dictates and will of a private organization. Rather than submit, they left for the New World with all its uncertainties to forge a new land of religious and political freedom. For 170 years these people underwent the long and agonizing process of developing and cultivating the forces of freedom. It was a time when further contests over religious freedom and between private power centers were fought. It was also the time when this Nation saw the establishment of human slavery, where one man's life came to be the property and subject of another man. We are, Mr. President, still attempting to eradicate the problems caused by this tragic institution.

After 170 years as British colonies, our people made the historic decision to declare their independence. It was an event dedicated to the proposition that:

> All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure their rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Then as now, Mr. President, the central issue was life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These were God-given and unalienable. They remain so today. I submit that to force a man to join a private organization and to force him to pay money to it against his will is a violation of these great principles.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson and those great men who signed the Declaration clearly, emphatically, and correctly declared that government was instituted to preserve these rights. It follows then that its task is not to destroy them. Yet this administration and those elected officials, who would force compulsory unionism upon the American people would do just that. Is it liberty if a free man must become a member of a private organization to earn his livelihood? Is this administration now about to place certain shackles on the "pursuit of happiness"? Can a man obtain this worthwhile objective in life if he must pay tribute to a private organization and to private individuals? Mr. President, we outlawed this principle of individual servitude a century ago. Let us not reinstitute it under the guise of "labor peace" and the erroneous claim of the "free rider."

From Independence Hall our people, cast upon their own resources, stumbled through 11 years of independence without a constitution or a strong central government. This was rectified at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 after which the finished Constitution was sent to the various States for ratification. Here it met resistence of the American

people because it did not contain what most Americans considered the necessary safeguards to individual freedom. Consequently, the first 10 amendments were submitted to the States in 1789 and finally became law in December 1791. This Bill of Rights was no outline of government powers or government responsibilities. It was a limitation or prohibition against Government interference with the rights which are enumerated therein. Let us examine two of those articles as they bear upon the issue of compulsory unionism.

Article I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Mr. President, I believe, and reason supports me in this argument, that if a man is guaranteed the right to exercise religion, it follows, as night follows day, that an American is also free not to practice a religion.

Because he is free to speak, he is also free to remain silent. Because he has the right to express freely his views in the press, he also has the right to refrain from using the press. Now the classic as far as this debate is concerned is the right of the American people to assemble peaceably. Has anyone ever stopped to think that most of our assemblies and associations are of a private nature? The authors of this amendment were concerned over the right of Americans to assemble in their churches, in their clubs, in their public squares, and in their private homes.

Is it not obvious, Mr. President, that an American who has the right to join a church also has the right not to join a church? If he chooses to join a club, he may also choose not to join. If there is a public rally in the city square and he chooses to attend, he may also choose not to attend. If his friends gather in a private home, he may attend, or he may stay away. Is a labor union any different? I believe it too is a private organization. It too can assemble. The first amendment is one of its guarantees. But is it not quite obvious that an American who chooses freely and independently not to join a church, a club, a PTA or attend a public meeting, should also be free to choose not to join a private labor organization? Have we come to the point, for the sake of political debt, that we are about to qualify the first amendment at the cost of personal freedom? This administration would do it. The labor bosses would force it. But, Mr. President, the American people would not. The people of Utah would not. For the last 10 years the legislatures in the State of Utah would not. They knew that they represented the people of Utah and not just the labor bosses.

Let us turn to the fifth amendment, Mr. President. Here the Congress is prohibited from depriving any American of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. Money is property. If Congress is forbidden from taking an individual's property without due process, how can anyone justify the taking of a man's property, against his wishes, by a private organization and by private officials to be used for purposes which he opposes? How far have we come in the loss of individual freedom?

Those who advocate the repeal of section 14(b) base their arguments mainly upon the need for a uniform and national labor policy. This, they argue, is possible because Federal law is supreme and State laws should not be permitted to override the Federal laws. Of course, this position is based largely upon the commerce clause in section 8 of article I and the supremacy clause of article VI. This power, no one denies, belongs to the Congress. But I emphatically deny that this power to regulate commerce gives Congress the right to override and set aside the rights guaranteed under the first and fifth amendments. These are individual rights which Congress shall not bridge. Have we forgotten about the ninth amendment? Let us put it in the RECORD:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

These take precedence over the power of Congress to regulate commerce. Congress, in violation of these rights, may not give private labor organizations the power to force membership in private organizations and allow labor bosses to take a man's private property and deny him the right to earn a livelihood under the guise of the commerce clause. Mr. President, this poor clause has been stretched, abused, and maligned in the past, but this is taking the matter much too far. The commerce clause was never intended to nullify the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Someone may question my use of the term "involuntary servitude," but in order that this may not be misunderstood, let us examine its meaning and compare it with "compulsory unionism."

On the 13th amendment, one the leading law journals, the Journal of Public Law, volume 6, 1957, had this to say about compulsory unionism and involuntary servitude:

[From the Journal of Public Law 6, 1957]

(By Jack P. Ashmore, Jr.)

The amendment is directed not only toward slavery but also against serfage, vassalage, villeinage, peonage, and every other form of compulsory labor. In striking down an Alabama statute making it a crime not to carry out the labor condition of a contract, the Supreme Court held that the statute violated the 13th amendment since all mandatory servitude is prohibited except as punishment for a crime. Of course, the Hanson situation is not "mandatory" in that the individual does have the choice of working elsewhere. But realistically is this a choice? "Necessitous men," it has been said, "are not free men." Can a personal right, a right which Justice Douglas called "the most precious liberty that man possesses," be denied on the ground of such a weak alternative? In large measure, forcing a person to join a union is a form of latter-day bondage.

The first item to examine is the basic and all-important requirement in the lives of all men, that of earning a livelihood and sustaining life itself. Without the compensation which one derives from holding a job, it is, Mr. President, impossible for a man and his family to pursue happiness, enjoy liberty, and even to sustain life. How then can a man who does not work enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

In this light, let us then examine the sad and deplorable similarities between involuntary servitude and the un-American and morally wrong principle of compulsory membership or service in private organizations, such as unions, businesses, or any other group of private individuals who would compel membership and dues payment against the free will of an individual and against his God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and to assemble or not assemble peaceably.

May I, for the sake of accuracy, give the Webster definition of these two words:

Involuntary: (1) done contrary to or without choice. (2) Compulsory: not subject to control of the will.

Servitude implies in general lack of liberty to do as one pleases, specifically lack of freedom to determine one's course of actions and conditions of living.

Let us measure the two—involuntary servitude and compulsory unionism. Under the terms of compulsory unionism, a man is allegedly required to join a union in order that he may share the economic costs of collective bargaining. First, therefore, we must measure the few dollars involved against the fact that a man is forced against his will to join a group which he may oppose and which often acts contrary to his self-interest by conducting strikes, and so forth. How in the name of liberty can anyone make a choice for the few dollars involved? Mr. President, the free exercise of thought, independent judgment, the free will, each separately and all collectively are worth much more to each American than the few dollars which the union bosses are trying to demand from the nonunion employee.

Unions claim that a nonunion man should help pay the cost of collective bargaining. Are the unions claiming that they cannot afford to carry on this function as a private organization? Are they asking the American people to forget about the huge sums of money that unions have available to them for operations completely unrelated to collective bargaining?

Mr. President, the American people are not blind. They know that the unions are extremely wealthy and have no cause to gripe about the lack of funds available to bargain collectively for nonunion members, a right which the unions themselves demanded under the Wagner Act and left intact by the Taft-Hartley law. This is not a matter of simple economics. It is a case of pure power grab based on coercion which would destroy some of the most basic of American freedoms.

During the past week we have read about Federal Government employees' unions who feel that if section 14(b) is repealed, they will then move to have the right to collect dues from all Federal em-

ployees, just as is done by unions representing employees in private collective bargaining.

If this happens, of course, the unions will have taken over a part of the fundamental sovereignty of the American Government.

Let us measure the paltry few dollars the unions would gain against the evil consequences a man must face if he chooses not to knuckle under to demands of the private union organization. Under the terms of union shop, he can be fired from his job if after 30 days he refuses, by exercising his free will, to join this private organization. Consequently, his ability to earn a livelihood can be cut off. This the unions would do for a paltry few dollars. Has a man's right to earn a livelihood become less important than the demands for a few measly dollars? Let us measure those few dollars again against the fact that by forcing a man to join a private organization we would be depriving him of his right under the first amendment to join or not to join a private organization. Mr. President, have we as a Nation come to the point where we will sell our rights under the first amendment for a few dollars in union dues?

Again, let us weigh the circumstances of forced union membership and how it requires a free man involuntarily to serve masters and causes which he opposes. The American people know that a unionman's dues are used for many purposes other than collective bargaining. He is not only paying a union leader's salary, he is also, in a few cases, paying for a union leader's vacation, for his mansion, for his liquor, for his limousine, and in a few cases, for his corruption. But beyond this, an unwilling union member is also paying for the election of some public officials whom he may oppose in principle, or for other reasons. He is helping to pay for the printing of propaganda sheets, the contents of which he may oppose. He is forced to help pay for lobbying agents and lobbying projects which are often contrary to his convictions. His very involuntary membership in this private organization requires him to serve, with his own dollars, to pay the debts and costs of people, projects, and policies which he in his own mind opposes.

Mr. President, in the past, we have permitted only the duly elected representatives of our republican form of government to exercise this power. Are we now foolishly about to give a blank check to a private organization to do it, also? The whole concept of compulsory unionism, therefore, is closely related to the involuntary servitude expressly outlawed by the 13th amendment, in that certain free men are forced to support with their property private causes of private individuals against their own free will.

Mr. President, involuntary servitude can take many forms, and it was not long after the 13th amendment went into effect that it was violated, if not in letter, in the spirit. All American history students know that the industrial power of the North was one of the major reasons why the Civil War was won by the northern armies. After the war was concluded, this industry, new and largely unregulated, began to expand and give to the American people an improved standard of living which has gradually come to be the standard of the world. This long process of development, however, was not without its black pages. The growth of American industry carried with it the employment of children, which was very often a matter of abuse, the creation of large trusts and monopolies, and the emergence of something akin to private economic governments. The evils, Mr. President, were there and our Government and people were eventually moved to the point of eradicating most of the evils.

In 1890 the Sherman antitrust law was passed which reduced some of the power of the large corporations. In 1938 the child labor laws were finally accepted by the Supreme Court. This must be considered one of America's most humane pieces of legislation. In 1932 the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed which outlawed the "yellow dog" contracts. What did these laws do and how do they affect the current debate? No one can deny that the circumstances under which children worked in the 50 years preceding the child labor laws were deplorable. To a certain extent they were in a condition of involuntary servitude. They were paid a very small wage, worked extremely long hours, and often forced to perform the most dangerous and unpleasant tasks. They could do little to improve their conditions and economic requirements quite often precluded their quitting the job. Technically, of course, there was no involuntary servitude, but in many ways they were slaves to the industry they served. The child labor laws, both State and Federal, went far to correct this great injustice.

About this same time, Mr. President, the American labor movement, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, was beginning to organize itself in order better to deal with the problems the individual workingman faced vis-a-vis industry and management. One of the big problems which they had to combat was the yellow dog contract, an agreement which abridged the right of an employee to join a union. This was a major issue. I fully believe that the right to organize and to join a private organization, such as a labor union, is guaranteed by the first amendment which, as noted above, provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people to assemble peaceably." This, the Federal Government found necessary to guarantee in 1932. This simple fact I do not dispute. On the other hand, I say, and the American people back us in this demand, that if a person has the right to join a union, he also has the right not to join a union. Mr. President, why in the name of human freedom must the yellow dog contract be reinstated, in reverse, this time against the man who chooses not to join a union. Somehow in the course of time the men who now claim to be leaders in the American labor movement have repudiated the advice of their most distinguished predecessor, Samuel Gompers. Have they forgotten the sound advice he gave regarding union membership when he said:

> I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principle of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible. * * * No man shall be deprived of livelihood for his family because of employment conditional upon membership in any union.
>
> There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons unexplainable to us does not join a union of labor. This is his right no matter how morally wrong he may be. It is his legal right and no one can or dare question his exercise of that legal right.

James F. Byrnes, a famous man of our own times, said:

> A workingman must have the right to join a labor union. It is equally important that a worker have the right to refuse to join a union, and no government or union should have the right to force him to join in order to get a job.

The Charter of the United Nations, section 2 of article XX, provides:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Gompers was speaking in the great tradition of America, a tradition based upon the time honored and wise premise that private organizations under no circumstances can compel membership, collect dues, or demand financial support for private causes which a private citizen may oppose. Mr. President, how wise he was. How foolish are those who would destroy this tradition and sell the American workingman into a situation akin to involuntary servitude, subject to the dictates of private and ofttimes corrupt labor bosses for the very essence of life, the right to earn a living. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We have fought this war in the past and have won. We are fighting it now, and because all America backs our cause we shall win again.

From the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Congress moved to the Railway Labor Act, originally passed in 1926 and amended in 1931. The basic premise of this statute was that compulsory membership in railroad unions was undesirable. Wisdom and constitutional rights prevailed. Then in 1935, Congress acted again on the subject of compulsion and passed the Wagner Act. This time, however, the forces of freedom, constitutional rights, and commonsense, gave way to the forces of compulsion, forced memberships, and those who would ignore the first and fifth amendments. Unions were permitted under Federal law, unless a State acted otherwise, openly to compel a man to join a union in order to get and hold a job. This mistaken concept was not permitted to remain unchallenged, however. In 1944, Americans in several States began to challenge this violation of freedom, and eventually in that same year two States adopted right-to-work laws, which the Wagner Act sanctioned.

These laws, Mr. President, were fair and reasonable. All right-to-work laws now existing in 19 States are also fair and reasonable. Did these new laws say

to the unions "You cannot organize yourself nor can you bargain collectively"? Absolutely not. Rather, in keeping with the traditional fairness of the American people, these laws encouraged, as have most labor laws, the right of private individuals to join together in a private association designed to improve themselves. They did not trample on the rights of labor. They did not attempt to destroy what was acknowledged then and now as a great American institution and contribution, the organized labor movement. What these laws said, and rightfully so, was that the labor unions could not coerce a man into joining what is admittedly and legally a private organization. What these right-to-work laws said to organized labor was that "Your drive for members is just, but under no circumstances will you as private individuals be permitted to abridge the God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of free Americans."

What these laws were saying to the labor unions is that "If you have got a service to sell to the great Americans who man the machines, build the buildings, operate the transportation system and industries, and perform the honorable tasks of labor, you had better get out and sell it to these men and women on its merits. You had better convince them in the marketplace, as free men traditionally have done in America, that your service is worthy of their consideration, acceptance, and financial support. What you had better do is get out and serve the public and the union member in such a way that he will see the worth and benefits of union membership. You had better get out there and sell your product voluntarily, because as Americans we neither believe, nor will we condone, the claim that a man can be compelled to join your private organization or pay you his money against his will. You had better do this on a voluntary basis because this is the American way, and the Constitution protects a man against the coercive practices now being pursued under the Wagner Act."

What these laws were saying to the unions was that we do not allow our churches to force a man into membership or donate to the cause, even though it would be nice to save all men's souls and enjoy the increased donations for new buildings and to assist the poor. What is more, our churches have not even asked for this power. How could they? The Master whose Gospel they teach set them an example of freedom. In his finest hour, the Humble Carpenter of Nazareth never went beyond the practice of persuasion in trying to convince His fellow men that His teachings would bring a better life now and in the hereafter. Mr. President, is it not quite evident that if all men could be forced to adhere to a church that the world might be a better place or might seem to be a better place? Yet in the wisdom of our Maker this has not been done.

What these laws are saying about the unions is that we do not permit the Elks or the Eagles or the Kiwanis or the Rotary or anyone else to compel membership because it would be morally wrong. They, too, are private organizations and people daily benefit from their activities, but these organizations are not crying for the right to compel membership. What these laws are saying is, "You have no reason to compare your cause with the integrated bar associations simply because in most cases they are an arm of the State governments designed mainly to regulate a profession."

What these laws are saying to the unions is that Americans have always judged a man by his service and on his merits. If we do not like a certain company or its products, we buy those of another one. This makes the business and the salesman whose product and service we have rejected work a little harder to regain our allegiance and our sale. No coercion here, Mr. President.

What these laws are saying to the unions is, "We will defend to the end your right to organize and bargain collectively, but we deny your demands that it be based upon coercive membership, upon destruction of our freedom of choice."

What these laws are saying, Mr. President is, "We believe that a union has every right under the Constitution to organize and deal with the management collectively, but you had better do it standing on your own two feet without the assistance of a Federal crutch. You had better realize that you are no longer a struggling, young labor movement fighting for your very existence. You are now a fullgrown labor organization, and it is time that you came to respect the freedoms and rights of all men as espoused by Samuel Gompers."

It was under these circumstances, concern for individual freedom, that the Congress wisely considered a national law which would permit the States to protect the rights so aptly described by Gompers and guaranteed by the Constitution, particularly, the first and fifth amendments. It had been a long contest, Mr. President, between the forces of freedom and those of compulsion. To preserve freedom is never easy and the watch must be eternal. Under the Wagner Act the forces of compulsion had scored a sad, but temporary victory. For 9 long years the American workingman, without choice of the exercise of his free will, was forced to join a union in all States in order to get a job. The American people, who had taken time out to fight a long and difficult war for the preservation of freedom around the world, after the war were turning to the task of building the peace, and as they looked around it became apparent that some changes had to be made for the cause of individual freedom right here at home. The result was the Taft-Hartley law, which was a great blow to the forces of compulsion and a great victory for the cause of individual freedom and the Bill of Rights.

Now, Mr. President, what does Taft-Hartley really do? First it permits, as did earlier legislation, labor unions to represent all employees, union and nonunion in the collective bargaining process. Do the American people know why this right was placed in the law? It was placed in the law because the labor people insisted that it be there. Dead, gone forever, soundly beaten, and refuted, therefore, should be the labor cry of "free rider." The nonunion man is really a "captive passenger." He has no right to bargain himself with his employer. I suggest, therefore, that the next time a union leader cries "free rider" to the American people he be asked to explain in the same breath the meaning and legislative history of this practice.

Mr. President, what does 14(b) itself say? It says:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such executive or application is prohibited by State law or territorial law.

I quote, Mr. President, from the conference report on the Taft-Hartley law:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in those States illegal. It was never the intention of the National Labor Relations Act, as is disclosed by the legislative history of that act, to preempt the field in this regard so as to deprive the States of their powers to prevent compulsory unionism. Neither the so-called closed shop proviso in section 8(3) of the existing act nor the union shop and maintenance of membership proviso in section 8(a)(3) of the conference agreement could be said to authorize arrangements of this sort in States where such arrangements were contrary to the State policy. To make certain that there should be no question about this, section 13 was included in the House bill. The conference agreement, in section 14(b), contains a provision having the same effect. (H. Rept. No. 150, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 60.)

Let us also examine what Senator Taft said about 14(b) during the Senate discussion on the conference report:

> I merely wish to make it clear that in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the Senate, we stated that in our opinion there was nothing in the bill as originally reported by the committee which in anyway would invalidate the provisions of a State law prohibiting the closed shop. That statement appears in the committee report to the Senate, on page 6. In it we pointed out that when the National Labor Relations Act was enacted, it was made clear in the report at that time that the proviso in section 8(3) was not intended to override State laws regulating the closed shops.
>
> In other words, the whole spirit of the Wagner Act and its provisions would prohibit a closed shop, because it prohibits discrimination against people who are not members of labor unions. In order to preserve that right and to keep the Wagner Act itself from abolishing the closed shop everywhere, it was necessary to write in this provision (in sec. 8(c) permitting the closed shop). But that did not in any way prohibit the enforcement of State laws which already prohibited closed shops.
>
> That has been the law ever since that time. It was the law of the Senate bill; and in putting in this express provision from the House bill (sec. 14(b)), we in no way change the bill as passed by the Senate of the United States. (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6679.)

Mr. President, by tacit admission the Federal Government was saying to the States that in the field of union membership, Federal law was not supreme. How could it? How can the laws regulating commerce overrun the Bill of

Rights? The Wagner Act recognized this and the Taft-Hartley Act simply restated it in clearer and broader terms. By its own admission the Federal Government was saying that it would be wrong for a union to be able to compel membership. In terms not open to doubt, the Congress was saying that the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce was subordinate to the power of the States to guarantee the individual rights of the first and fifth amendments. What was really needed then and now was a Federal right-to-work statute which would guarantee organized labor the right to sell its services freely to the American workingman, who would be left free to accept or reject the services on their merits. The Taft-Hartley law, however, left this open to the States alone and 19 States currently are protecting those basic rights of the individual.

The Taft-Hartley law was simply restating the essence of the State laws banning compulsory unionism. It took no right away from labor. Rather it took away, in part at least, an unnecessary and in my opinion an illegal Federal crutch. Did it, Mr. President, deny labor the right to organize or bargain collectively? Did 14(b) take away the ultimate weapon of labor, the strike? Did 14(b) really hamper the growth of the labor movement. No, Mr. President, it did not. We know it did not, labor knows it did not, and the American people know it did not. What Taft-Hartley was saying to labor was a good old American standard: "Freedom had better be the foundation of our labor policy whether you like it or not and you had better get out there and sell your service and your program on its merits. You had better leave a man free at least in those States which will guarantee his freedom, to make a voluntary choice, to exercise some free will in this matter of union membership."

What Congress was saying, Mr. President, was that the pendulum of compulsion had upset the forces of freedom and that the time had now come as it had in 1607, 1776, 1791, 1865, 1890, and 1938—child labor laws finally upheld—to redress the balance in favor of freedom. What the Taft-Hartley law was saying was that we had better start guaranteeing in part at least the freedoms of the first and fifth amendments. Mr. President, is there anything wrong with that? I do not think so. The American people do not think so.

Now, Mr. President, may I give you the views of two Americans, who in their lives as public servants have been very close to the American Labor movement. The first is an American who is currently very much in the national spotlight and one who has just recently helped to achieve a great victory for world peace. Speaking to a group of government labor leaders in 1962 in his capacity as Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg said:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements * * * from my experience representing the trade union movement this is not a handicap, * * * This is a great advantage * * * you have an opportunity to bring into your organization people who come in because they want to come.

If voluntary membership is desirable in government unions why is it not desirable in private unions? Perhaps this debate before the America people will answer that question.

There has been much said by the unions leaders regarding the principle of majority rights. Perhaps it would be well if this subject were openly and honestly discussed. Then maybe the confusion which has surrounded it would no longer be so great. From the beginning our own modern political system, the principle of majority rights has played an important role. James Madison in the 10th Federalist paper examined this problem in great depth. Acknowledging that majorities and factions were necessary and operative in our body politic, he examined the dilemma which the country faced:

> By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amount to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community.
>
> There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other by controlling its effects.
>
> There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction; the one by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions and the same interests.
>
> It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire and ailment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty which is essential to political life because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

It is truly amazing, Mr. President, how accurately James Madison described the present controversy of union membership in the United States.

To Madison the problem was factions, which experience shows can be a minority or a majority, each of which can be motivated by a common passion or interest. Now the labor union leaders are indeed a faction. They are also a minority and even the total union membership in the United States is a small minority of the total population. Now these union leaders have in fact attempted to secure passage of legislation; namely, the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which is adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community. Below we shall examine a little more closely what and how these interests and rights will be affected. But first let us examine the basic claims of this minority faction. First they argue that union membership is based upon the time-honored principle of majority rule itself. This is basically true. However, what is never admitted is that this is a situation where majority rule operates in a private environment. Can anyone honestly say that under the circumstance of private majority rule, the majority should continue to bind the minority, to the point of denying a man his job? This, Mr. President, is a vote on membership in a private association. We cannot, therefore, in good conscience and honor permit the majority of workers in a plant to force the minority to join their private association. The Congress can, of course, guarantee the majority the right to associate and organize, but this is the ultimate of its authority. A second question arises of equal importance. Can the Senate, bound to uphold the Constitution, permit a majority of private citizens to deny someone, or the minority, certain public and inalienable rights which, according to article 9 of the Constitution, are not to be abridged even by Congress? Are we as a body of duly elected public servants about to give this liberty destroying power to a private group? Are we about to succumb to a tyranny of the private labor union majority over the minority whose rights are publicly guaranteed? Not if I can help it.

Mr. President, this minority faction, the labor bosses, has through various means, but particularly through the use of union dues as political contributions, extracted from a majority of the Members of Congress, a commitment to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law thereby giving their private majorities a liberty destroying power. For the sake of the people, perhaps this relationship between the minority faction of labor bosses and the majority of Congress should be explained. It is like the old mule. Labor is now demanding a repayment for past election contributions and is also reminding the representatives elected by all the people that future campaign funds would disappear if labor demands are not met. Thus the labor bosses not only carry a carrot, they also carry a whip. Senators have no doubt heard it cracked over the heads of two great Senators already. Now they have no doubt heard some of the proponents of repeal say that the majority of the Members of Congress favor repeal, so why not let the majority vote on the issue and settle the matter? The sad truth is that the majority which voted to repeal in the House did not represent the majority of the people in the United States. The purported majority in the Senate also fails to represent the entire American people. Has this body failed to recognize the wishes of the people? Have we come to the point where we are about to inaugurate "Government of the factions, by the factions, and for the factions?" I want to say in the Senate Chamber today that in this case the only majority will that has any efficacy in this debate is the majority will of the American people. They have wisely and loudly made their views known, and it is ironic that their cause, constitutionally supported and founded on liberty, is being defended by a minority. But right is on our side. The large majority of the American people know that their position on section 14(b) will preserve liberty

rather than destroy it. Therefore, we can justly and legally dismiss the demands of a minority of labor bosses and base our position upon the will of the American people, which has been spoken to all who would hear. Loudly and clearly they have told us through letters, telegrams, editorials, columns, and in person that they stand for freedom. Freedom of all Americans to join a union or not to join a union as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. President, the subject of voluntary unionism is closely tied to several constitutional amendments. Liberty is a major issue in each one, according to Mr. Ashmore:

Other possible constitutional objections include the 9th, 10th, and 13th amendments. The content of the ninth amendment and its historical background definitely seem to indicate that it was intended to be a protection of individual personal rights as distinguished from public or collective rights. As a recent commentator on that amendment says, "Whenever we lost the distinction between individual liberty and the necessities of the general welfare the virtue of our form of government is lost * * *." But as that same commentator says, this amendment has been largely forgotten and has received no significant interpretation. Based, thus, on present doctrine it could not be used in the context of the Hanson case.

Much has been said by the unions of the power of Congress to regulate national labor policy. In fact many of those in Congress have based their support of repeal of 14(b) on this premise. I have argued that the freedoms of the first amendment take precedence over the commerce power. Mr. Ashmore takes a similar position:

Although the clear and present danger test may have been watered down somewhat in recent years, nevertheless it does indicate that invasions of first amendment freedoms must be justified on the basis of grave dangers to interests which the state may lawfully protect. Whether those freedoms are given a preferred position or not, it takes a strong case of public necessity in order to uphold an interference. As Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in *Whitney* v. *California*, these freedoms are subject to restriction only "if the particular restriction proposed is required in order to protect the state from destruction or from serious injury, political, economic or moral."

Mr. President, I turn to another distinguished American who is currently serving this Nation in high office. Writing as a university law professor, W. Willard Wirtz, our incumbent Secretary of Labor, eloquently defended individual freedom against the inroads of private power centers in an article in the Louisiana Law Review in 1952:

Here is no invitation to even the slightest heresy. Powerful private organizations must be recognized, under present circumstances, as having some of the same essentiality to capitalism and democracy as do the agencies of government. But no institution has any significance except as a means to the end of individual satisfactions, and of these we count freedom the greatest, both for itself and for what it, in turn, produces. It is devotion to the basic democratic ideal which demands emphasis today upon the increasing evidence that individual freedom can be either enhanced or destroyed by either public or private group force. Not fear, but caution, comes from the realization that democracy's destruction in other nations has been less a consequence of an incumbent government's tyranny than of some private group's uncontrollable ascendancy.

Then Mr. Wirtz begins to examine the problems posed by private associations and membership therein. His comments regarding freedom, group membership, and the ballot box are particularly noteworthy.

W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, volume 13, 1952–53:

The American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Elks and the Moose are the very embodiment, in our thinking, of our privilege as individuals to choose our own company. It is a basic assumption in American traditions and emotions that any group power other than that which funnels through the public election booths is part of democracy's private functioning—part of the exercise of freedom rather than in any sense a threat to it.

Next, Mr. Wirtz examines the problem of restraint on the part of government and private officials. His views seem to underscore the need of some kind of counterforce to government and private agents.

More generally, and most basically, this record appears to confirm those doubts, mentioned at the outset, as to whether our concern about the threat of group force to individual freedoms has been broad enough. It seems to emerge as a relatively obvious proposition, not just of logic, but now of actual experience, that the danger of group force does not depend upon whether the agency exercising it is called "government" or a "labor union" or a "corporation," or a "momewrath;" it depends rather upon the degree of counterforce which operates against it. All that we have long recognized about the concentration in "the Government" of power delegated by individuals begins to appear equally true of concentrations of power resulting from similar delegations to any agencies. The question is not who has the power, or whether his use of it is in an exercise of "sovereignty" or of "free enterprise." Private group agents manifest no more self-restraint than do public group agents. The only question, in either case, is what outside restraints are operative. (W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, vol. 13—1952–53.)

Mr. President, if government will not serve as a counterforce to the private agents and groups in our society, what check or balance is there for the labor union? Of course, the finest and most effective would be the right of an employee to withdraw while still retaining his job. This would force the union officials to care and be concerned over the welfare of the individual employee.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stands in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEIF ERICSON DAY AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Saturday I was invited to go to the World's Fair in New York, and particularly to the Danish Pavilion—which pavilion was filled with other Scandinavians at the time—and participate in making the annual Leif Ericson Day Award.

The Leif Ericson Foundation, a nonprofit foundation, gives this award each year to worthy people throughout the world who excel in the pioneering spirit. This is, of course, based upon the fact that Leif Ericson was a great pioneer himself and was the discoverer of America. Several people of Italian descent were present who had some doubts about this.

It so happens that Leif Ericson Day, which was on Saturday, is followed on tomorrow by Christopher Columbus Day. These dates fall rather closely together.

Many years ago the Senator from Washington introduced a resolution, with many cosponsors, to provide for a Leif Ericson Day. The Senate passed that resolution last year. Last Saturday was the first official Leif Ericson Day.

The award was given to Dr. Albert Schweitzer before he died this year. This necessitates that we, at some future time—although the award was publicly announced on Saturday—present the award posthumously. Either his sister or his daughter will come to America at the proper time and accept the award.

An amazing historical discovery has been made since Saturday pertaining in the matter of the discovery of America.

Many historians and others have participated in this discussion over the years. Some sound historical facts have been revealed concerning Leif's two voyages to the United States. Apparently definite proof has now been discovered. This was announced today in this morning's Washington Post and, I suspect, in all the other newspapers throughout the country.

It was pointed out in an article on the first page of this morning's Washington Post that:

An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.

In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, a research was conducted by Yale University and British museum scholars.

This research disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere based upon the travels of Leif Ericson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Leif Ericson Hailed as Discoverer—America of Vikings Shown on Pre-Columbian Map," appearing in this morning's Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LEIF ERICSON HAILED AS DISCOVERER—AMERICA OF VIKINGS SHOWN ON PRE-COLUMBIAN MAP

(By Howard Simons)

An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.

In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, Yale University and British museum scholars yesterday disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere. It is based on the travels of the intrepid Leif Ericson.

Ingredients for the incredible tale of the map's existence and discovery include two 11th century Viking explorers; a Papal emissary to the Tartars of Ghengis Khan; an unknown 15th century scribe; three ancient manuscripts; worm holes; and a book dealer in New Haven, Conn. A dash of absurd coincidence completes the recipe.

It was in October 8 years ago that the map's existence came to light. New Haven bookseller Laurence Witten dropped by the Yale University Library to show Scholars Alexander O. Vietor and Thomas E. Marston a new acquisition from "a private collection in Europe."

A slim volume, bound in recent calf, the book contained a hitherto unknown account called the "Tartar Relation," of John de Plano Caprini's mission to the Mongols in 1245–47, and a world map including Iceland, Greenland, and Vinland.

Map and seemingly unrelated text appeared authentic. Yale scholars judged that both were written by the same hand somewhere in the Rhineland about 1440—50 years before Columbus set sail.

Still, there were puzzling features about the volume. Why didn't the worm holes on the map and the "Tartar Relation" match? More disconcerting, how could the scholars account for the statement on the first leaf of the map: "Delineation of the first part, the second part (and) the third part of the Speculum"?

"Mr. Vietor and I believed," relates Marston, "that until these two factors could be satisfactorily explained, the map would remain suspect, no matter how convinced we were of its genuineness."

Six months later Vietor and Marston got their answer in a bizarre act of chance.

In April 1958, Marston received a catalog of manuscripts for sale by a London bookseller. To add to a collection, he went off to cable an order from Bruni't translation of Plutarch's lives of Cicero and Demosthenes.

On his way to place his order, Marston leafed through the catalog again. He spotted a copy of a portion of Vincent of Beauvais' Speculum Historiale, an encyclopedia of world history first published in the early 13th century.

As an afterthought, Marston ordered the Vincent.

Three weeks later two manuscripts arrived in New Haven. Marston invited Witten to examine them. Witten asked if he could borrow the Vincent and Marston readily agreed.

"That evening," says Marston, "I did not return home until after 10 o'clock. I had hardly entered my house when the telephone rang. It was Mr. Witten, very excited. The Vincent manuscript was the key to the puzzle of the map and the Tartar Relation. The hand was the same, the watermarks of the paper were the same; and the wormholes showed that the map had been at the front of the volume and the Tartar Relation at the back."

RELATIONSHIP SWORN

Obvious now was the physical relationship of the three documents. Once they had been bound together; the Vincent Speculum between the map and the account of Carpini's mission to the Mongols. Sometime later, the manuscripts were separated and rebound into the two volumes now in Yale's possession.

This story and the detailed account of 7 years of painstaking research to authenticate and determine the origin of the map are told in a handsome, 291-page book entitled: "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation." The book is being put on sale today by Yale University Press—2 days after Leif Ericson Day and on the day before Columbus Day.

The account of scholars Vietor, Marston, R. A. Skelton, and George D. Painter about the map's genesis and its relation to the text—much of it based on educated assumptions—amounts to this:

Between the years 1000 and 1004, Leif Ericson and the lesser known Viking explorer Bjarni Herjolfsson voyaged from Norway to Greenland and then chanced upon America, which they called Vinland. The discovery was recorded in Norse sagas. And though no Norse map charting the discovery ever has been found, it is conceivable that such a map or maps do exist.

CARPINI MISSION

More than 200 years later, in 1245, Pope Innocent IV sent Franciscan Friar Carpini on a diplomatic mission to the Mongols in Asia. On Carpini's return journey he and other members of the mission lectured extensively on their experiences. One of these lectures, by a Friar Benedict, was copied and edited by a C. de Bridia. De Bridia's transcription thus became the original Tartar Relation.

Two hundred years after that, a church council was held in Basel, Switzerland. This important meeting stretched from 1431 to 1449. Church dignitaries from throughout Europe gathered to spread their ideas of intellectual history.

Sometime during the meeting an unheralded monk was assigned the task of copying a world history. He bought some parchment, "definitely second quality, perhaps the best he could afford," and began his task. At times, it was tedious and frustrating. The monk ran into a rough hair that bothered his writing and tried a finer pen. From time to time he used different inks.

His was not an original history. Rather, the monk copied a portion of Vincent's Speculum and the Tartar Relation that had been put together by someone else, perhaps in the 13th century, with the map added in the early 15th century.

RELEVANCE NOTED

How had the three documents originally come together? The most plausible explanation, according to the scholars, is that an early historian saw the relevance between the Tartar Relation and that portion of the Speculum that dealt with Carpini's mission and bound them together.

Then, much later, came the map as a product of a cartographer asked to illustrate the twin accounts of Carpini's mission. What this cartographer did presumably, was to stretch the mid-15th century knowledge and view of the world across his map—from the Asia of Carpini to the America of Leif Ericson.

What happened to the original text and map is not known. The scholars hold forth the prospect that it or even more revealing maps still exist; hidden away in someone's bookshelf as was the Vinland Map and Tartar Relation.

MAP OF "VINLAND"

The map, itself, which will be exhibited at Yale University Library, is done in brown ink on a piece of parchment measuring 11 by 16 inches. Europe is easily recognizable. Africa and Asia are much less so. But it is the upper lefthand area of the map that is most significant.

Here is Iceland, an uncannily accurate representation of Greenland and a large island labeled "Vinland." This is the America discovered by Leif Ericson and Bjarni Herjolfsson, according to the legend on the map. Scholars suggest that the two large river inlets cut into "Vinland" are the Hudson Straits and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Together, the Yale and British Museum researchers tried every imaginable way to authenticate the map and text short of subjecting them to modern scientific tests, which would destroy parts of the manuscripts.

BACKS VIKING THEORY

Nonetheless, the scholars are convinced that map and accompanying text are genuine; products of a hand that flourished at least 50 years before Columbus "rediscovered" America. Accordingly, the scholars take the view that the map proves claims of America's discovery by the Vikings.

Moreover, speculation by the scholars raises these possibilities:

That the hypothesis of a 12th century Norse settlement in Vinland now deserves serious consideration and further search.

That Columbus and other early explorers either heard about or saw copies of the Vinland map or similar maps of America based on Norse accounts before embarking for the New World.

Columbus Day may never be the same.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we cannot print the map. However, the map is reproduced in full in this morning's Washington Post and in other newspapers throughout the United States. It shows the voyages of Leif Ericson. Apparently this is now real, definite, and uncontroverted proof of his travels to what we now call the United States of America and the North American Continent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an address delivered by me on Saturday on the occasion of the annual Leif Ericson Day Award to Dr. Albert Schweitzer. I would not do this for myself. The speech does not mention the Senator from Washington, but does mention Leif Ericson and Dr. Schweitzer and his fine work.

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

PIONEERING FOR THE FUTURE

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON)

It is a singular honor to have the opportunity to address you on the occasion of the presentation of this fine award to such an outstanding man.

It is altogether fitting and proper that Dr. Albert Schweitzer receive the award that bears the distinguished name of Leif Ericson. Each risked his personal comfort and his personal safety to advance the cause of mankind. Leif Ericson opened new worlds of abundance to burgeoning early man, and he and his followers penetrated to the very midwestern North American frontiers—where my ancestors proudly trace their Viking heritage. Albert Schweitzer lived an example of humanity to his fellowman as he devoted his inestimable talents to bringing Christianity and a modicum of modern medicine to the remote regions of Central Africa.

Dr. Schweitzer was a true pioneer, in every sense of the word. His accomplishments—his findings, his writings, his teachings, and his care for the ill and the infirm, are well known. Whether writing a definitive biography of Bach, or a sensitive portrayal of Christ, his achievements were always memorable. Yet, the glory in which we rejoice is not the achievements themselves, but the contributions to the immortality of all mankind, in theology, medicine and in music. Popular acclaim and public recognition were sedlom Dr. Schweitzer's reward, although they were his for the taking.

It was a further measure of his humanity and humility that he preferred to employ all his energies and his hours to his chosen tasks, which certainly must have been drudgerous, dreary and often discouraging, rather than bask in the applause of other men.

He sought judgment not for himself, but for the fruit of his works. It is that basis upon which we must bestow honor on Dr. Schweitzer.

Still, one might well ask, "Just what did Dr. Schweitzer accomplish in one small leper colony in the middle of a continent across the world from Western civilization? Wasn't it really a waste of a long life of a man who was acknowledged to possess vast abilities?" In the answer to those questions lies the identification of Dr. Albert Schweitzer as a pioneer for the future of humanity. First, we must count as positive achievements the medical relief and the spiritual and cultural guidance he administered to his followers. But his contribution to the immortality of all mankind, which is the essence of true pioneering, is discernible in his example for present and future generations. His dedication of a life that, beyond question, could have produced for him a level of social and material security in the first rank stands as a monument to selflessness and humanity in a world too often characterized by self-service and a total absence of concern for one's fellow man.

I hope his story will be told and retold, so that it may serve as an inspiration for others to follow. He has lighted the way along the path of conviction, of belief that man is capable of compassion unknown in the lower forms of life, as no other person has done within our memory. He is the pioneer who calls to the attention of the timid, of the unconcerned and uncaring, that there is a route through the wilderness of a life devoid of meaning to a greater and extradimensional life that sparkles with purpose and with quality. I hope, and I am certain, that among those who will pause to listen to the story of Albert Schweitzer, there will be some who will reflect, and then will perceive that Dr. Schweitzer realized pinnacles of satisfaction and contentment, in an environment outwardly brutish and primitive, that most of us will never enjoy in our rose-scented, cushionaire drive through life. These incisive listeners will properly regard Dr. Schweitzer as the pioneer who blazed for them the trail of a meaningful life of service, of compassion, and of feeling.

According to Viking legend, and I am proud to claim the heritage of descendants of those brave and fearless Scandinavians, Leif Erikson was a powerful, fierce, and dauntless warrior and adventurer. He was a pioneer in the classic tradition, braving the unknown in boats and under circumstances that would deter ordinary men from confronting perils that were both known and understood. Erickson was fierce; Schweitzer was gentle, Erikson lived the tempestuous life of an adventurer; Schweitzer lived the quiet life of a healer and a teacher, Erikson was motivated by desires for conquest, acquisition, and adventure; Schweitzer sought only to conquer illness and spiritual defects. Yet, they shared an indomitable spirit that made them oblivious to adversity and seemingly insurmountable obstacles. With both Leif Erikson and Dr. Albert Schweitzer the result was the same. Each made it possible, by his life and his example, for mankind to advance. Leif Erikson encouraged further exploration and inhabitation. Of course, the tangible result of that encouragment was the development of the North American Continent.

Dr. Schweitzer has encouraged a commitment to the improvement of the quality of life for mankind everywhere. However, it is up to us to provide the tangible result of Dr. Schweitzer's encouragement.

For, we, too, are pioneers—all of us. Giants like Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer have attained the stature of symbols, whose virtues we pursue and strive to attain. In my home city of Seattle a large and handsome statue of Leif Erikson stands at the water's edge and surveys with a steady gaze the incoming waters of the vast Pacific Ocean. In that symbol there is an enthusiasm for and a confidence in what the future will bring, if only we follow the pioneering course.

We Americans are a nation of pioneers. Every elementary school student learns of the hardships and uncertainties our Founding Fathers endured in the Jamestown and Plymouth settlements, how their journey across the sea in search of individual freedom was regarded as folly by the well-placed gentry in the Old World. Truly the pioneering spirit dominated the personalities of those hardy families who clung to life and liberty in the face of hostile natives, unrelenting forces of nature and designing foreign monarchs. Yet they not only survived, but they prospered, and confounded those they left behind with the resiliency and strength of the human spirit.

Then, as their numbers and prosperity increased, strife with heavy-handed rules across the seas induced a bold Declaration on Independence. And again, they were successful, much to the surprise of the rest of the world. That done, they set out to establish a government that dared, in Thomas Jefferson's words, to "let dissenters stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reaon is left free to combat it." Can it be doubted that this was a pioneering venture in popular government? Yet, the descendants of these industrious patriots were not content to live in conditions made by and for an earlier generation, and the westward movement began. No one needs to be reminded of the difficulties, despair, and heartbreak experienced by those who undertook the long and arduous trek across the Mississippi, through the Great Plains fraught with danger from hostile savages and merciless drought, and up and over the formidable Rocky Mountains to the fertile valleys of the Pacific coast. We are as familiar as we are proud of the everyday heroics of these American pioneers of the last century, and the better remembered names: Jim Bowie, Linus Rawlins, W. C. Cody, the Donner party, Fort Laramie, symbolize for us the pioneering spirit that has always been ours.

We Americans unquestionably pioneered the presentation to the world of the age of nuclear physics. Of course, from our present and limited vantage point we often are tempted to regard that pioneering venture as a mixed blessing, presaging an uncertain future. But it is this very uncertainty of the future that emphasizes both our most recent pioneering achievement and our role as pioneers for the future.

I repeat, we are all pioneers. The future is as exciting as it is challenging. In America alone the prospect of growth and change is staggering. A prominent research economist reports that by the year 2000 there will be 150 million more Americans than there are now. Such a population increase will produce a demand for two homes, two schools, two hospitals, etc., for every one we have today. In other words, as President Johnson has said, in the next three decades—decades, not centuries—we will have to build another America. Five times as much electricity as the present production will be required. There will be 244 million cars on our streets and highways, and urban development and highway construction will devour 33 million more acres of land.

Therefore, while we thrill to the explorations of celestial reaches of outer space, and to probes to the darkest depths of the ocean floor, there is much pioneering waiting for us in the social sciences. While present-day pioneers of space must journey far above the earth and far below the surface of the oceans Leif Erikson so daringly crossed, and Albert Schweitzer forsook the more pleasant circumstances of 20th-century civilization for the difficulties of a more primitive existence, many of us daily pioneer from our armchairs, in offices in the commercial world, in academic institutions and research centers, and in legislative halls in Washington, D.C., and across the land.

Massive technological breakthroughs in the physical sciences are reported with breathtaking frequency and rapidity. New uses for computers and refinements in computer technology are continuously contrived. From astrophysics to zoology, the sciences are contributing to man's potential development.

Yet all these pioneering advances in pure science remain to be translated into solid improvement in the lot of the human race by those of us engaged in the social sciences and the humanities. It is what we do with these new and better tools the scientists provide for us that really counts.

Each time a business executive makes a decision relating to a new use or adaptation of automation techniques, he is pioneering in a small way. When a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America shows a local farmer how to improve his crop and his land through contour plowing, he is pioneering. When a researcher at a great university arrives at a tentative conclusion after observing the effects of air pollutants on a rabbit under controlled conditions, he is pioneering. And each one of them is making a contribution to the future of mankind, in the same manner—if not to the same extent as Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer. All of them identify with some facet of the aspirations of man: cultural, social, material, spiritual. The point is, you, too are pioneers in your daily affairs. Although the rugged, heroic individualism in the sense that we think of Leif Erikson no longer characterizes leadership, still the same necessity for an individual dedication and perseverance and determination are crucial to success and progress: In addition to Albert Schweitzer, the names of Dag Hammarskjold and Admiral Rickover quickly come to mind as contemporary pioneers who possess those attributes. To pioneer for the future we must do as these leaders have done, and you are doing in your own ventures, be unafraid to forsake a harbor of security and to embark upon the treacherous seas of the unknown.

Those of us who have devoted our energies to the governing of our vast and growing society like to believe we are sometimes pioneers, too. Many words have been written and spoken about the enormous quantity of important legislation we have enacted in this Congress, and I believe our record is a good one. And you know, we have done a little pioneering in the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, too—the committee I serve as chairman. This session, for example, we authorized a study of new and revolutionary concepts in high-speed ground transportation, that will perhaps result in the development of a system of rapid transit that will transport large numbers of people up and down the east coast at speeds of up to 400 miles an hour. Also, in this session of Congress, the Senate unanimously passed our bill to make possible the development of new programs and techniques in the exploration of the oceans. Through that action we hope someday in the near future to be able to utilize fully the manifold resources buried in the sea—to use them for the further advancement of mankind. Right now the potential of oceanographic research and employment is barely underway.

Just a few years ago, you may remember the Commerce Committee initiated the action that led to the formation of the Communications Satellite Corp., which has now made possible live television transmission from one continent to another. That certainly was a pioneering step.

Compared with the fundamental issues and questions confronting us in the Congress in the next few years, these present

and recent achievements will pale into lesser shades of significance. Although Leif Ericson pioneered for material gain and adventure, and Albert Schweitzer pioneered for physical and spiritual advances, we are pioneering for all the future. And we will need all the help we can get from the business and academic worlds.

Our ancestors came to America and then moved on westward to escape various oppressions, to maintain independence and individuality, and to avoid the pressures of the industrial revolution. We still covet the same values, but the problems seem to be ever-more complex, and we must continually renew our resolve to prevail. Although the environment has changed, and the dangers appear in new and more subtle forms, the individual qualities required for triumph have not changed. The same spark and courage that Leif Ericson had on his perilous voyages must accompany us as we pioneer for the future.

The multitudinous technological breakthroughs that I mentioned earlier demand that we answer new questions about the quality of human life, about relationships between man and man, and man and his environment that never before were ours to control. We must delineate anew the responsibilities of private individuals, the responsibilities of private associations and groups of individuals, and the responsibilities of government. We are forced to fit new and startling concepts into value systems that were constructed long before such scientific developments were ever contemplated. For example, biologists report the day is not far when we will be able to influence the traits and intelligence and personality characteristics of unborn infants, and perhaps even create life itself, artificially. Although our first reaction may be to recoil in horror at the prospect of such a "brave new world," someone must reach some conclusions and establish some guidelines, all within the framework of our reverence for the sanctity of the individual and devotion to democratic principles. Is it for some government agency to prohibit any such further biological experimentation? That would only impose a temporary delay, and be a suppression of truths already discovered. History has amply shown us the futility of attempting, by sovereign order, to close doors science has opened. What, then is the proper approach? Should government, in the name of all the people, assume any role at all? Or should government retire to the sidelines and permit private interests to make all the decisions concerning the very personalities of the next generation of Americans? If government does have a role, what is it? What are the criteria? How do we equate personal freedom of the individual with the ability of a single mortal man to determine what characteristics an unborn person shall have?

Additionally, we are told the future promises us the power to control the weather, and even the climate. Who should decide if we have rain on the Fourth of July? Should it be the National Safety Council, with an eye toward keeping motorists off the highways? Should it be the Congress, with some Members representing constituencies that rely heavily on tourism, with others representing agricultural areas badly in need of rain? Should we refer the question to a national election each week or each month? Or is this an individual decision?

International complications aside, what will we do with the moon once we establish regular passenger and freight service to that curious place? Will it be placed under public ownership, on the theory that public funds provided the means to establish the link, or will we put it up for grabs, like the Oklahoma Territory, to maintain consistency with our principle of private property?

Or, in a more personal sphere, is there a government function in the life of the individual as he finds more and more leisure time available? Is there a public interest in the utilization of the time that has been released to the individual through the progress of automation? Are some decisions we once believed to be reserved for individuals now a matter of public concern?

We must recognize these problems, must face up to them, and must do our best to resolve them. There is no doubt that we are pioneering for the future when we approach any one of these modern, complex issues. Perhaps a resolution of one or more of them will occur when we in Washington decide that we should not participate any further in the particular matter. But that, too, will be pioneering, for we will be affirmatively declaring that this is a matter for determination in the private sector of our society, and is not properly within the jurisdiction of government.

Ladies and gentlemen, the problems Leif Erikson met were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems that Albert Schweitzer faced were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems we all face together are difficult, but, working together, facing decisions in government, and in business, and in academic research and civic activity, we must and will, succeed.

Thank you.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on having his position sustained by this recent discovery.

The Senator from Washington has made a study of this matter for a number of years, and has written articles to the effect that Leif Ericson had, in fact, discovered the United States.

It appears from the article which the Senator has just caused to have printed in the RECORD that hundreds of years before Columbus is reputed to have discovered America, Leif Ericson had discovered Greenland and sailed from there across a large body of water and discovered an area that he described as Vinland. Apparently no one realized at that time that Vinland was the North American Continent, and that it was thought to be merely a remote place beyond Greenland. Apparently no one grasped the significance of what had been discovered. It was felt that this was perhaps a big island, such as Iceland or Greenland, when, in fact, Leif Ericson had actually made a landing on North America.

The maps, to which the Senator has referred, have apparently been completely authenticated. The writers, writing one or two hundred years before Christopher Columbus discovered America, had actually had maps and discussed the discovery of Vinland by Leif Ericson on his voyages.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Yale and British museum scholars came to the further conclusion that the circulation of this map—and in those days many of the stories were passed by word of mouth—probably led to discussions with other mariners from Portugal and other European countries, who believed that this land did exist. Those people became enthusiastic over hoping that they could find out about it, which they did.

The old Norwegian sagas—and I have read many articles in fine publications such as the Sons of Norway Bulletin, the Order of Vasa, or some such magazine—has been an area of great research. I believe this authenticates the claim for Leif Erickson's discovery when Yale and British museum scholars categorically say that this map is correct. I am sure that they have nailed it down as much as historians can.

There is a great deal of history involved in this.

We talk now about changing weather conditions and the fact that the world weather seems to run in cycles. In those days Greenland was actually green. The first Christian church was established in Greenland by Leif's mother. Leif's father and mother were kicked out of Norway by the king because they were pagans. They finally ended in Iceland. They first fled to Ireland. One can stir up a great argument concerning St. Patrick's Day by suggesting that Leif's grandfather ruled Ireland for some period of time and then was kicked out of Ireland.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, were they related to the O'Murragh clan by any chance?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. They went to Scotland, and then to Ireland, and then ended up in Greenland, which they explored in almost open boats. Of course, the boats of Columbus were not too seaworthy either, as one can see from examining the replicas. They ended up in Vinland. On the second voyage, according to the sagas, they lived on a part of Long Island. No one knows the location. It could have been Martha's Vineyard. There were a great many wild grapes in the place. That is what the name Vinland comes from. They had trouble with the Indians, as most of those first pioneers did, and finally sailed back again. Because they were not in communication much with Europe, since they had been banned from coming back to Scandinavia, I suppose their maps and accounts encountered difficulty in being communicated throughout Europe.

But everybody is happy now, and reconciled to the fact that Christopher Columbus and Leif Ericson both were the discoverers of America, and John Smith, of course, was its first permanent settler.

We take great pride in those Scandinavians, because they were adventurers. They moved a great deal by sea. They could hardly sit still; they were going all the time. A well-known fact in history is the invasion of what is now Normandy by Scandinavian warriors in boats. The Irish became a little tired of them, apparently, and kicked Olaf the White out. He went to Scotland and had terrific battles there, as was typical.

So I am glad that we have both a Columbus Day and a Leif Ericson Day, and history now seems to be settled, unless the Irish come up with some voyage prior to the time of Leif Ericson, perhaps by some leprechaun who might have come here, stayed a while, and then left; I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY. No doubt the Senator will yield for the suggestion that the consideration now would be to join the Scandinavians with the Spanish and the Italians; and we Irish will join such an association if the others will let us have first place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana for placing in proper perspective some of the pages of our country's history. Though I think we have created no history here, I thank the Senators for correcting some erroneous impressions which may exist.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to receive this support, because our next project is to have an appropriate statue of Lief Ericson erected in our Nation's Capital, down by the Potomac.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA AND EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months I have been doing all in my power to persuade our Government to drop a foolish, self-defeating restriction against the exchange of American wheat for Russian gold. That 2-year-old administration ruling requires that if the Russians or certain other Soviet-bloc countries in Eastern Europe wish to buy our wheat, they must pay premium shipping rates on 50 percent of it by utilizing higher cost American ships. This restriction is applied only to wheat and only to wheat sold to Russia and Eastern Europe. It has the effect of pricing our wheat out of a market that is now netting Canadian wheat farmers and exporters hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

I regard the continuance of this barrier as the most obviously harmful and ridiculous policy now being pursued by our Government. It hurts every American and helps not one single American citizen, except our cartoonists who are beginning to see it as an appropriate theme for biting cartoons. It costs American wheat farmers $200 or $300 million a year in lost sales, it damages our balance-of-payments position to that extent, it costs our taxpayers continued farm storage and farm program costs for surplus wheat that we could otherwise exchange for urgently needed gold, it denies our exporters, our railroad industry, our dockworkers, and others profitable labor. It generates not one dime of business for the maritime unions who are insisting on it. It does permit a handful of maritime labor leaders to demagog on a phony issue. But it gives the maritime workers and their industry 50 percent of nothing since it kills our sales opportunities in Eastern Europe and Russia and therefore, we are shipping no grain to these countries in our ships or in any other ships.

Furthermore, it is a violation of our commercial treaties with 30 nations and of the U.S. Export Control Act. A resolution introduced by Senator SYMINGTON and me has led to hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A majority of that committee has found the restriction to be not only wrong on legal grounds, but harmful to the interests of the United States. Eleven members of the committee signed a letter to the President dated October 7, the basic facts of the letter being supported by other members of the committee, urging that the restriction be dropped, not only on legal grounds, but more significantly because it is in the national interest to drop it.

As the committee's letter to the President put it:

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

The letter was signed by Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, and FRANK CARLSON.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 7, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodities in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious, also, that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, and FRANK CARLSON.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the hearings conducted by Senator FULBRIGHT and the members of his committee on this issue. I commend them for their thoughtful conclusions and ask unanimous consent that the letter of the committee to the President be printed at this point in the RECORD.

My belief that continuation of the requirement that 50 percent of wheat sold to Russia be carried in U.S. ships is costing the United States tens of millions of dollars in wheat trade is strongly supported by an article in the current Southwestern Miller. The Miller carries an article from New York, reporting on an unexpected address of Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev to the Communist Party Central Committee, indicating that Russia still needs more wheat, and some high-grade wheat, to avoid a bread shortage.

The story confirms an estimate I have cited previously that the Russian shortage is still at least 3 million tons, of 110 million bushels. It is quite probable that the Russian shortage may still be as high as 6 million tons or something over $300 million in potential sales in this current purchasing year. I ask unanimous consent that the Miller article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

MARITIME LABOR LEADERS DICTATE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am a longtime supporter of a strong mer-

chant marine. Furthermore, I believe that in a democracy, spokesmen for our merchant marine industry should properly participate in full and frank public discussion and debate of both foreign policy and domestic issues. I am disturbed, however, by the threat of certain maritime labor unions to go beyond the debate and the exercise of their democratic right to criticize the adoption of certain policies. They are using their union power to subvert American foreign policy—to force their mistaken views on the Nation.

The Washington Post, in an editorial of Tuesday, October 5, called the conduct of the maritime unions "blackmail." The editorial points up an aspect of these maritime union activities which cannot be taken lightly, for here is a challenge to the execution of adopted foreign policy decisions made in the national interest. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the attitude of certain maritime labor leaders on this issue was revealed in a story in the Baltimore Sun of October 6 under the byline of Helen Delich Bentley. Reporting on a recent meeting of a joint maritime labor committee, the article said:

> The joint maritime labor committee, headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association, went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.
>
> "We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

Mr. President, I believe that it is inconceivable that a group of labor leaders would deliberately set aside American foreign policy decisions merely because they do not happen to like them. I do not think our Government can tolerate such a lack of patriotism. No matter how these labor leaders try to mask their efforts in some kind of anti-Russian position, what they are basically taking is an anti-American position. One is hard pressed to imagine a more unpatriotic act than a deliberate pronouncement of influential labor leaders that their unions will not load wheat to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe even though our Government has decided officially that it is in our interest to do so.

I do think, Mr. President, that the maritime industry has a legitimate concern about its future economic well-being. That is why I have always supported the Cargo Preference Act, which is of great value to our maritime industry. Under the Cargo Preference Act, 50 percent of our food-for-peace shipments are carried in American ships. That is perfectly proper since these shipments represent either gifts or concessional sales of American wheat and other farm commodities. These are not regarded as normal commercial sales and as such, they do not come under the terms of our commercial treaties with other countries. These shipments generate 25 percent of the entire income received by the American merchant fleet. They represent 100 percent of the cargo carried by many of our bulk carrying grain ships. It would be a disastrous blow to the merchant marine if these food-for-peace shipments under the Cargo Preference Act were lost to American industry.

Let me make it very clear that while I do not favor applying the Cargo Preference requirement to normal commercial sales of the kind that are proposed in Eastern Europe and to the Soviet Union, I do favor very strongly continuing the food-for-peace Cargo Preference principle. I have felt for some time, based on conversations with maritime industry leaders, that the real reason labor leaders are opposing the removal of the restriction on sales to the Soviet Union is that they fear this will eventually lead to the loss of the Cargo Preference Act. For that reason, I would like to suggest, as I have previously in private communications, that the administration give assurances to the maritime industry that the Cargo Preference Act will be continued as it relates to food-for-peace shipments. Such assurances should be coupled with an announcement that the administration is dropping the 50-percent shipping requirement on commercial sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This kind of package announcement would provide adequate assurance that the valuable Cargo Preference Act will not be jeopardized by removing the totally worthless 50-percent shipping requirement on Soviet sales.

I strongly urge that some such package announcement be made by the administration at an early date, in the interest of the merchant marine, in the interest of American farmers and taxpayers, in the interest of the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and, indeed, in the interest of a commonsense commercial and foreign policy for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Bentley's article referred to above 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 Baltimore Sun, Oct. 6, 1965]

SHIP POLICY CHANGE HINTED ON WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The White House is seriously considering removal of the American-flag shipping restriction regarding the sale of wheat to Russia, it was learned today from high administration sources.

"This is so even though the President knows that not a bushel will be loaded once the requirement that 50 percent move on American bottoms is lifted," is was said.

About the same time that the White House discussions were revealed, the Joint Maritime Labor Committee—headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association—went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.

WE WILL NOT DEVIATE

"We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

When the emergency meeting was first called, the AFL–CIO joint committee had intended to concentrate on the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, which it condemned today. However, in the interim, Gleason said he was tipped off that something was about to happen on Russian grain by a telephone call from Washington last night.

EXPECT MOVE IN SENATE

Labor officials today thought there might be a move by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to have the Senate rescind a resolution it had passed nearly 2 years ago calling for the use of American ships in transporting one-half of any wheat sold to Russia.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted last Friday to call for the lifting of the American-flag stipulation. However, as far as could be learned late today, its action has not yet been transmitted to the White House.

Most of the Senate committee members are from States with large agricultural interests all of which are condemning the American merchant marine for wanting to move part of the goods—at a higher rate than foreign ships.

BENEFIT HELD DOUBTFUL

The pressure to lift the 50-percent restriction has been tremendous even though top Government officials and a spokesman for the wheat interests testified before Senate committee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, that they did not know whether the Russians would buy a single bushel from the United States if the ship-American restriction was removed.

The State Department also has been applying extreme pressure on the administration to wipe out the 50-percent stipulation.

In testimony before the Fulbright committee last month, Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated that policy concerning the Russian wheat movements would be forthcoming soon.

Gleason indicated today that he was having trouble getting his dockers in Duluth, Minn., to load Canadian wheat moving through there aboard Canadian ships bound for Montreal, where the wheat would be reloaded aboard oceangoing vessels, primarily Russian, bound for Communist bloc countries.

Russia purchased 217 million bushels of wheat from Canada August 11 and additional amounts from Australia and Argentina earlier that month. Ever since the American wheat interests have been complaining about and attacking the shipping restriction.

Because American-flag shipping costs are higher, the freight rate aboard American ships ranges from $3 to $7 a ton higher on wheat. Supposedly the higher price makes American wheat undesirable, the agricultural interests contend, while maritime and labor sources argue that the Russians are going to buy wheat from the United States only as a last resort regardless of what the circumstances are.

The joint labor committee was born as a result of the initial boycott against Russian wheat movements in February 1964. All segments of the maritime labor movement have participated in it ever since.

The President's Maritime Advisory Committee also was formed at the same time; its establishment was part of the agreement reached between President Johnson and George Meany, AFL–CIO president, when it was determined that 50 percent of all Russian and Communist agricultural sales then and in the future would move on American-flag ships.

"If we give in on the wheat, then we might as well fold up, because that gave us our start," Gleason declared.

"My people don't want to load anything for Russia anyhow and if they thought the American ships were not benefiting in the least from it, they'd balk regardless.

"The Great Lakes longshoremen feel that some of the Canadian wheat is going to help North Vietnam and Cuba and they don't like being a part of it whatsoever."

EXHIBIT 1

HINT OF ADDED RUSSIAN WHEAT BUYING NEED—COMMUNIST PARTY CHIEF TELLS CENTRAL COMMITTEE "IMPROVEMENT" IS NEEDED TO INCREASE BREAD SUPPLY "QUALITATIVELY AND QUANTITATIVELY"

NEW YORK, October 4.—In an unexpected address on the state of the Soviet agricultural economy to the Communist Party's Central Committee last Wednesday, Leonid Brezhnev, party chief, hinted that the wheat Soviet Russia already has bought from Western nations might not be sufficient to prevent a bread shortage and that further purchases would be undertaken.

Mr. Brezhnev told the policymaking committee that the party and the Government "envisage further improvement in supplying the population with bread, both qualitatively and quantitatively."

MIGHT NEED AS MUCH AS IN 1963–64

According to some Moscow observers, the present Government may need to purchase almost as much as the 12 million tons bought from Western sources in 1963–64 under the leadership of Premier Khrushchev. Thus far, Russia has bought about 9 million tons from Western countries for 1965–66 delivery.

"Mr. Brezhnev's statement was a hint that this summer's wheat purchasing efforts had already failed to meet the goal of enough bread for the population during the coming year," said Stuart H. Loory on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune in Moscow.

Because the Khrushchev purchases came rather late in the 1963–64 crop year, shortages of bread did develop during that year. The present Russian leaders began their 1965–66 buying program much earlier in an effort to avoid a similar situation.

BUREAUCRATIC BRAKES ON AGRICULTURE

In his address to the Central Committee, Mr. Brezhnev also criticized bureaucratic inference with agricultural progress in Russia, particularly for giving priority to industrial advances. "The tendency has not been overcome to improve other affairs, to balance the figures at the expense of agriculture, to infringe on the interests of the collective and state farms," he said. "And this happens despite the absolutely clear-cut decisions of the March plenum of the Central Committee."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 5, 1965]

BLACKMAIL ON WHEAT

In threatening not to load wheat sold to the Soviet Union if the requirement that 50 percent of it be carried in American ships should be lifted, the maritime unions are attempting to blackmail their own Government. The telegram to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Thomas W. Gleason, Chairman of the Joint Maritime Labor Committee, is clothed in all sorts of patriotic anti-Communist sentiments. But in fact it amounts to an unconscionable attempt to dictate foreign policy so as to preserve union perquisites.

If the United States were engaged in a total boycott of Communist countries, as Representative FEIGHAN among other advocates, restrictions on grain shipments might make some sense. But this has never been American policy, because we have found nonstrategic trade to be a useful door-opener. At the same time, because of the higher cost of the shipping requirement, we make sure that we can't sell the wheat we are perfectly willing to sell for hard currency. Thus we administer a good stiff uppercut to our own jaw.

This constitutes, really, an ineffective subsidy of the merchant marine and maritime unions at the expense of the wheat producers—and of the balance-of-payments position, which would be improved by dollar exports. It may be technically true that no country has recently expressed interest in American wheat—because of the cost. But there are sizable grain deficits in the Soviet Union and several countries of Eastern Europe. Meanwhile Canada, Mexico, and other grain exporting nations get the market at a time when expanded American trade might be a significant lever.

It is within President Johnson's power to end this artificial requirement imposed by President Kennedy at the behest of the unions during the 1963 wheat deal with Russia. Similar restrictions in another context inhibit the effectiveness of our economic aid to free nations by reducing their purchasing power. If there is reason to subsidize the merchant marine, better ways can be found—and the new maritime policy now under study might offer an opportunity to develop them. For the administration to yield to this blackmail would be to invite every other special interest to put its oar into the conduct of foreign policy.

THE CONNECTICUT RIVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Hartford Times has performed another great public service for Connecticut, New England, and people concerned about preserving and restoring our natural beauty everywhere. On October 5, 1965, the Times published a special 12-page supplement called "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste." The articles and photographs in that section graphically illustrate the tremendous need for action in saving one of the most precious assets of the Northeastern United States—the Connecticut River.

I pay special tribute to Ivan Robinson, the Times reporter who wrote the stories. Mr. Robinson traveled the length of the river, flew over it and interviewed those who know the river, care about it, and have plans to clean it up. He talked to sportsmen, officials of the State and Federal Governments, boaters, and countless others. And out of his experience he has written a compelling account of the history, the potential—and the sad neglect—of the Connecticut River.

I also saluate Times photographer Charles Vendetti, whose pictures add so much to the impact of the Connecticut River story. All those who want to restore the Connecticut to its former glory and who want to save the beauty we have left owe a debt of gratitude to the Hartford Times, Editor Robert Lucas, and those who made the Connecticut River special supplement possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONNECTICUT—RIVER GOING TO WASTE

(By Ivan Robinson)

(NOTE.—How dirty is the Connecticut River? Why clean it? What's being done? What must be done? To find the answers, Times Staff Writer Ivan Robinson and Photographer Charles Vendetti traveled the river by boat, walked its banks, scouted it from Long Island Sound to the Canadian border in a low flying airplane. Newsman Robinson talked to a wide cross section of people concerned with the river—officials in Washington and four Connecticut Valley States, conservationists, skindivers, fishermen, boaters, sanitary engineers. The result is this special section, a comprehensive view of the Connecticut River and its pollution problems.)

THREE CENTURIES AFTER BLOCK—A NEED FOR REDISCOVERY

The Connecticut River was 70 million years old when Adrian Block, the Dutch explorer, discovered it in 1614.

On February 2, 1900, a mere 286-year speck later in its lifetime, it had become so polluted and full of disease that Connecticut's State Health Department declared it an "open sewer," unfit to drink from or to swim in, and Hartford stopped using it as a water supply.

At fault: The 368 towns, 3,000 industries, and 1.7 million persons that followed Block's little ship, the *Restless*, into the 400-mile valley.

Also to blame: The frontier philosophy that America's riches were inexhaustible. Natural resources like rivers, forests, and fertile soil were to be exploited until they choked up, petered out or blew away. There were always more next door—up north or out west.

Now the picture has changed. Connecticut and her valley neighbors—Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire—are taking a harder look at the long untidy river they have been treating as a sewage canal for so long. The reasons are obvious:

The river is a future source of drinking water.

It must meet the needs of a burgeoning population for places to swim, fish, picnic, and go boating.

A clean river will be a big boost to commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

The river deserves to be cleaned up for its own sake, as natural beauty in our midst.

The Federal Government is ready to step in if the States don't do the job.

It is certain the river will have to be used eventually—experts say in 20 to 35 years—as a drinking water supply. Reliance on upland reservoirs, a Yankee peculiarity, is becoming a worrisome luxury. There won't be enough to go around someday and, despite our druthers, we'll have to start drinking "second-hand" water.

The current 4-year drought and New York City's water panic have spotlighted the problem.

But water famines come and go. The real crisis is in the population boom. About 1,680,000 persons now live in the Connecticut Valley in all four States. By the year 2000, the figure is expected to nearly double to 3,110,000.

Water use will surely more than double. Americans, who already use more water per capita than any other people, are continually buying more heavy-use appliances like air conditioners and dishwashers and building more swimming pools.

The average person in the Hartford area used 50 gallons a day in 1960. By 2000, he will be using and estimated 73. Factories, stores, government buildings, parks, and unmetered users now account for another 69.7 gallons per capita daily. By 2000, their use will total 84.

It will take more water to feed, clothe, entertain and inform the 2000 population, too. It takes 5 gallons to process a gallon of milk, 600,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber, 2.5 gallons to make a phonograph record and 150 gallons to make a 5-pound Sunday newspaper.

The Hartford Metropolitan District Commission's water supply, which will reach a maximum storage capacity of 60.5 million gallons in 1968, will be unable to meet the demand in 2000. Like others along the Connecticut River, it will undoubtedly be tapping the stream at its door.

The river is a reliable faucet. Its average flow is 11 billion gallons a day. During the lowest flow ever recorded (1,060 cubic feet a second Aug. 28, 1949), it was still delivering 700 million gallons a day past Hartford. The MDC's peak daily demand is 73.5 million gallons, or about 10 percent of that record low flow.

Since most of the water used by homes and industry ends up in a sewer line and back into the river, the effect on the river's level would be negligible.

Other cities have been taking their drinking water from rivers for years out of necessity. Los Angeles pipes it from as far away as the Colorado River and is now looking 800 miles to the north to Washington's Columbia River. Here in the East, Lowell, Mass., has started taking water from the Merrimack River, treating out the pollution from paper mills and upstream cities.

At the moment, the cry for recreational space is more insistent than that for drinking water. Families tired of bucking the traffic to the shore or to the lakes scattered around Hartford want a place near home, like the river, where they can fish or swim.

"Cleaning up the river," said one boatowner, "would be like adding 120 miles to the State's coastline if you count each bank."

The public's feeling against swimming in the river is strong. There's no law against it, just State and local health advisories. But few swim in it.

One of the best beaches on the river, in fact, is a lovely strip of sand in South Glastonbury and its sole occupants are cows, which amble down from a nearby farm, lie in the shade of trees along the bank, wade in up to their ankles and sometimes, health warnings notwithstanding, take a drink.

One longtime Hartford resident said people used to swim by the hundreds on the first sandbar north of the city's Riverside Park until typhoid fever struck some of them in the 1920's.

"That's when the swimming really stopped," he said.

Now at Riverside Park, the no swimming signs are in both English and Spanish and the children swim only in the pool.

A Puerto Rican boy, asked what the "Se Prohibe Nadar" signs means, replied, "No swimming. The river's too dirty."

But some people are forgetting what this boy has learned.

A Windsor Locks father lets his children go swimming near the upper end of the canal, as he did when he was a boy. "I just tell them to keep their mouths shut," he said.

Water skiing, a contact sport, is common downriver from Hartford and swimmers can be seen diving from moored boats, especially in Hamburg Cove and other places below Middletown where the water looks cleaner.

"Five years ago," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer for the State health department, "we didn't seriously consider cleaning the river for swimming again because nobody was interested in swimming there. Now people are getting interested and, whether we want them to or not, they're going into the water."

A new public park has sprung up on the west bank in North Cromwell, made from sand recently dredged from the channel. Upriver, there are riverside parks everywhere. The stretch below Northampton is busy with a large marina and a combination campside and beach. There are boats above every campsite and beach.

Joseph N. Gill, State commissioner of agriculture and natural resources, has estimated that pollution of the Connecticut River is costing this State at least $840,000 a year in recreation dollars, half of it from swimming alone.

His figure is based conservatively on getting a capacity crowd of 140,000 persons on 12 days during the recreation season, paying an average of 50 cents a day for facilities.

"It's a shame," said Bernard W. Chalecki, director of the State boating safety commission, "that a river consisting of half the best waterways in the State is not being used."

Mr. Chalecki said lakes are highly developed and crowded with boats, causing conflicts between boaters and the cottagers who have invested money there for peace and quiet.

"The river, on the other hand, is not populated," he said. "Boats pretty much have it to themselves."

An estimated 5,000 to 7,000 boats now use the river on a good weekend day. Ten years ago, the number was half that. Ten years from now, it is expected to be double.

Most of the boating along the stretch in Connecticut is below Essex, from where a boat can easily get to the sound. When small craft warnings are flying at sea, the river gets even more play.

To meet the demand, the State has built nine public boat launching areas between Old Saybrook and the Enfield Dam to supplement about 30 marinas, town facilities and yachting clubs.

The Enfield Rapids and the shallows north of the Bulkeley Bridge prevent anything except rowboats and canoes from going farther upriver during most of the year. In the spring, when the water is high, some Massachusetts boatowners take their craft down to the sound, using the Windsor Locks Canal to bypass the rapids. They bring them back up in autumn after heavy rains.

Dredging the river to make it navigable all the way to Holyoke Dam would attract even more boats since it would connect its two largest cities on the river, Hartford and Springfield.

The idea, still alive through dormant, has been talked about since the turn of the century.

Bulkeley Bridge, opened in 1907, was designed as a drawbridge, in fact, because the Federal Government felt the river was navigable in theory above Hartford.

The 100-foot steel draw was eliminated at the last minute and a ninth stone arch (the first on the Hartford side) went up in its place. Hartfordites had convinced Washington the draw was a waste of money. Their main argument: Of the 11 bridges between Hartford and Holyoke, only one—a railroad bridge to East Hartford—was a drawbridge and its draw was partly over dry land.

A clean river, besides becoming a highway for pleasure boats and a source of drinking water, would also be an important resource for commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

Fish, finned or shell, have a tough time surviving in polluted waters. They can't spawn on a riverbed thick with sludge. They can't find the insect larvae and other food that usually lives in clean water. And they suffocate because human waste and other organic material deplete the oxygen in the water in the process of breaking down.

Fish kills occur periodically in the river. They usually happen in hot weather when the water is low, the ratio of pollution high, and the water warm and less oxygenated.

The State board of fisheries and game has the power to haul into court anyone who pollutes the water badly enough to cause fish kills. But, because so many factors may be involved, it doesn't try too often.

One kill wiped out so many fish it was impossible to count them. They lined both sides of the river for miles. The estimate was tens of thousands. No legal action was taken, however, because no one could tell who or what was to blame.

One reason for this stalemate in fighting pollution is the tide. The Connecticut River is affected by Long Island Sound tides all the way to Hartford, where it falls and rises an average of 1.2 feet twice a day. (The range is 3.4 feet at the mouth.)

"Tests have shown," said Cole W. Wilde, the board's chief of fisheries, "that if you throw a cork into the river at any point below Hartford it will drift back and forth seven times before finally staying below that point."

It's difficult, therefore, to tell where fish were killed. The spot where they are first seen belly up can be miles from the pollution.

Salmon and shad were once plentiful in the Connecticut River. Settlers used to catch 40-pound salmon with torch and spear as far upriver as Lancaster, N.H., 300 miles from the sound.

The salmon were so thick, noted one historian, that " a man could walk from bank to bank on their backs if he was wearing snowshoes."

Shad, often called "the poor man's salmon," also were numerous. At one time it was against the law in Connecticut to feed bonded servants the cheap fish more than three times a week.

The small number of salmon and shad today is blamed by pollution foes on the foulness of the river. Mr. Bampton says, however, the decrease results from the many dams that have been built, preventing these anadromous fish from going upriver to spawn. His department has been building fishways to overcome this problem.

The shad run, although smaller than in colonial times, is still substantial. For Connecticut it is a $13-million-a-year industry when you count manpower, boats, and tackle involved. The commercial catch has averaged 98,200 fish a year; the sport catch 27,200.

Amateur shad anglers spend 14,000 mandays a year wetting their lines at Enfield Dam. Most of the sport catch is taken between there and Wilson and between Holyoke Dam and the mouth of the Chicopee.

No fun fishing

Shad now go as far as the dam at Deerfield, thanks to an elevator built for them in 1955 at Holyoke Dam. The elevator carries up 30,000 shad a year.

As for other fish, any kind found in other waters in the State can be found in the Connecticut. These include trout, largemouth and smallmouth bass and great northern pike as well as the more pollution-resistant rough fish like carp, eels and suckers.

Taking a fish from the river is one thing. Eating it is another.

"A fish caught between Middletown and Hartford," said Mr. Wilde, "has a high flavor of petroleum. Cook it and it smells like you are frying gasoline." It is ironic that the Latin name for the kind of shad found in the Connecticut is alosa (shad) sapidissima (tastiest).

Local Tom Sawyers know the score. Wrote a Cromwell fourth grader earlier this year in a letter to the editor about the river: "It is

not much fun to go fishing in it because you are never sure what the fish have been eating."

Shellfish, which siphon huge amounts of water through their systems and screen food out of it, are seriously affected by pollution. Shellfish areas are closed off every year by the State health department to prevent people from getting hepatitis, an intestinal disease.

Connecticut oyster growers, who farm about 67,000 acres, transplant their oysters on Long Island for final maturing before market. It takes an oyster about 2 weeks to flush the Connecticut pollution from its system.

The net worth of Connecticut's shellfish crop (both clams and oysters) is $550,000 a year. The emigrant oysters are worth another $1.5 million but are credited to New York's economy.

Saving the river as a future water supply appeals to planners, as a recreational area to boaters and swimmers, as a fishing ground to fishermen, but saving it for its beauty appeals to all. Significantly, "The Long Tidal River," a film about the history and abused beauty of the Connecticut, drew more viewers at the Plaza 7 Arts Festival this summer than a documentary about President Kennedy.

Everyone who has seen the river beyond Hartford's roller coaster highways and equally view-proof bridge railings has a warm feeling for it, highly personal and deeply felt.

The reason may be partly psychological. Man has always been fascinated by water, which is why he builds fountains, vacations at the shore and travels hundreds of miles to see Niagara Falls and why his children run delightedly toward it when they first see it.

The Connecticut is undeniably beautiful meandering through the meadows of Massachusetts or surging into the sea at Old Saybrook. In purer days, travelers extolled it as one of the world's three most beautiful rivers, along with the Rhine and the Hudson. It is a comfortable river, tree-lined, always twisting and turning in surprising ways, seldom treacherous, never too broad to overwhelm. It is the kind of little river the American essayist, Henry Van Dyke, wrote about.

"A river is the most human and companionable of all inanimate things," said Van Dyke. "Little rivers seem to have the indefinable quality that belongs to certain people in the world—the power of drawing attention without courting it, the faculty of exciting interest by their very presence and way of doing things."

Beauty may be antipollutionists' biggest selling point in the fight to clean up the river. The public's need and desire for it is becoming an immeasurable political force which has just started being tapped by President Johnson's Great Society plans, Connecticut's open space program and, more recently, Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF'S campaign to make the river a national parkway.

Herculean task

Hercules, when he had to clean up the huge Augean stables, simply diverted two rivers through them. He didn't have to clean up the rivers afterward. This sort of super-Herculean labor is what the four valley States now face. Among their problems:

Places like Chicopee, Mass. (population 61,550) that still dump all their sewage raw into the river.

Places like Hartford which, as part of a metropolitan sewage district that serves eight towns of about 350,000, gives its sewage only primary treatment, which is 35 to 50 percent effective.

Combination sewers that carry both sewage and storm waters. During rainstorms, when these sewers are roaring full, the treatment plants are bypassed to avoid overtaxing their limited capacities and the whole load goes into the river.

Low river levels in the summer, accentuated by old industrial rights such as those of the Holyoke Water Co., which literally turns off the entire river on weekends.

The abundance of papermills (11 between Northampton and Hartford alone), discharging thousands of tons of fiber waste each day.

Textile and chemical plants streaking the river with dyes and poisonous substances, some so new and complex that no one knows how to treat them.

Pesticides, herbicides, and other agricultural control chemicals, also complex, from the farms that cover about 25 percent of the valley.

Barges and boats discharging human waste and leaking oil and gasoline.

How polluted is the Connecticut River?

"The Long Tidal River," the popular film by conservation-minded businessman Ellsworth Grant, of West Hartford, has given popular currency to the phrase, "the world's most beautifully landscaped cesspool."

William S. Wise, director of the State water resources commission, contends the statement is not based on one iota of fact and has enormous eye and ear appeal for the uninformed. But it's easy for a layman to agree with Mr. Grant.

In the stretch between Hartford and the Massachusetts line, an observer will see many signs of our effluent society—streaks of oil and dye in the river as well as flotsam from riverside dumps, paper and other material of dubious origin, spongy cakes of yellowish grease, strange plastic pellets, and an overall peppering of scum.

In inlets like Wethersfield Cove, he may see men raking up filth that has washed up on the beaches after a rainstorm and he will see algae slime at the waterlines of the 50 or so pleasure boats moored there, a sign of organic matter in the water.

A typical reaction was expressed by a Simsbury man who was on an afternoon cruise with his family on the riverboat *Dolly Madison*. "I don't know how bad it is exactly," he said, leaning over the rail and studying the water, "but I would never let a child of mine go swimming in it."

Those who must go swimming in it, skindivers who recover bodies from the Connecticut River, take every precaution.

Already protected by typhoid and tetanus shots they usually get boosters after working the river. On the job they wear basketball sneakers because, if they don't sink up to their waists in the bottom muck, they are sure to step on tin cans, wire fencing, car parts, refrigerators or oil drums.

After a river search they rush for the showers for a thorough scrubbing—of themselves—to prevent infection, and of their bright orange rubber suits to prevent rot.

Pollution experts, going beyond sight and smell, have drawn up objective yardsticks to measure contamination.

An ABC report-card grading is used by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, a group formed in 1947 by interstate compact and made up of the six New England States and New York.

The commission's designations:

From Northampton to the mouth of the Farmington River in Windsor and from Hartford to East Haddam—Class D (good only for sewage and industrial wastes, power, navigation and some industrial uses).

From Northampton to Massachusetts' north boundary, from East Haddam south to the Sound and along the brief stretch between the Farmington River and Hartford—Class C (good for boating, irrigation of crops that must be cooked before eaten, habitat for wildlife and food and game fish, industrial cooling and most industrial uses).

The river has not yet been classified in Vermont and New Hampshire. Indications are it will be class C in the more developed stretch below Lebanon, N.H. Above Lebanon, it will be class B (Good for swimming, irrigation and esthetic value and for drinking if filtered and chlorinated.)

Obviously, most of the pollution is in the class D waters between Northampton and East Haddam The concentration, as a U.S. Public Health Service team found in October 1963, is in the Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee and Hartford areas.

Sampling along the 62 miles between Hatfield just above Northampton and the Rocky Hill-South Glastonbury ferry 12 miles below Hartford, the team noted sharp increases downstream in coliforms, the rod-shaped bacteria typically found in human waste.

Such bacteria, if they come from a diseased person, can transmit disease to someone else. Organisms that have escaped sewage treatment and found their way into streams, according to one study, have included the bacteria of typhoid, paratyphoid, cholera, salmonellosis, tuberculosis, anthrax and tetanus; all the known viruses including polio, and tape, round, hook and pin worms and blood flukes.

Nowhere did it find the coliform count below 1,000 per 100 milliliters of water (about half a cup), the Connecticut standard for swimming.

The count totaled 31,000 above Northampton, reached a peak of 947,000 where the Chicopee River enters the Connecticut from the east at Chicopee, dropped to 315,000 at the State line and 41,000 above Hartford, then jumped again below Hartford to 162,000.

Noting that the count at the State line was 315 times the swimming standard, the team reported: "Anyone ingesting a single drop of water at this point would have swallowed at least 26 bacteria that originated in excreta that entered the river in Massachusetts."

Sewage from Hartford and East Hartford, given only primary treatment, made conditions farther downriver just as unpleasant.

Below Hartford, the team said, a drop of water contained 33 fecal bacteria, "of which not more than one probably originated in Massachusetts."

Foul bottom

Massachusetts accounted for 63 percent of the bacteria load along the 62-mile reach and Connecticut for 37 percent. Biggest sources: Hartford, 31 percent; Springfield, 20; Holyoke, 13, and Chicopee, 13. Fifteen other towns accounted for the remaining 23 percent, with no one town exceeding 6 percent.

The Connecticut River is also loaded with solids—and not just the silt that makes the Mississippi River "too thick to navigate and too thin to cultivate."

The Public Health Service team discovered that 145,000 pounds a day entered the river in Massachusetts and about half that in Connecticut.

Massachusetts industries accounted for 22,300 pounds. Sources were 10 papermills (46 percent), three syntehtic chemical plants (also 46 percent) and a brewery, a rendering plant and a textile mill. Connecticut's only industrial source, a Windsor Locks papermill, discharged 900 pounds daily.

Organic or decomposable solids giving off gas bubbles and the rotten-egg odor of hydrogen sulfide totaled 63,600 pounds daily. Much of them settled to the bottom and formed a sludge.

"In the areas of major sludge deposits," said the team, "decomposing clumps and rafts of sludge boil to the water surface, buoyed by gas bubbles of decomposition. These unsightly masses decrease the esthetic appeal of the stream below Holyoke and in the vicinity of Springfield."

Such muck cannot support insect larvae and other fish food but sludge worms thrive on it.

The team counted eight sludge worms per square foot on the relatively clean bottom above Northampton, 1,408 at the mouth of the Chicopee, 994 at the State line, 50 above Hartford and 211 below Hartford.

It found only three per square foot below Holyoke. "Conditions in the major sludge deposit were so foul," it observed, "that even the worms could not thrive here."

In short, the team found that nearly two-thirds of the sewered population of 734,265 between Northampton and South Glastonbury might as well have been dumping raw sewage straight into the river.

The pollution in the river was equal to the waste from 412,910 persons in bacteria, 444,600 in suspended solids and 559,010 in biochemical oxygen demand (the amount of oxygen required by organisms to break up organic matter).

More recent, though less comprehensive, measurements of Connecticut River pollution echo the 1963 report. Little, if anything, has changed.

In the face of all this pollution, State agencies are making headway but their work is slow, cumbersome, and often timid.

Their most optimistic forecast is that it will take another 10 years to clean the river—and then only to swimming condition above Holyoke and below East Haddam. The stretch between, passing by Springfield and Hartford, will be good for noncontact recreation like boating.

Of the four valley States, Connecticut is unquestionably the leader in fighting water pollution.

Its first action was in 1886 against Meriden for dumping raw sewage into the Quinnipiac River. This led to construction in 1891 of the State's first treatment plant, a simple sand filter system.

Connecticut courts ruled early against pollution (*Morgan* v. *Danbury*, 1963), declaring that a property owner along the river had a right to expect clean water and that this right was more important even than a city's need to use a stream for sewage disposal.

One cannot, said the courts, deprive another of his property without compensation "on the plea that the injury to the one would be small and the advantage to the other, or even to the public, would be great."

The general assembly subsequently sent four study groups into the field—in 1897, 1913, 1917, and 1921. They all reported pollution was bad and getting worse. So in 1925, the assembly passed antipollution laws and created a State water commission to administer them. Connecticut became the third State in the country to have such laws, after Rhode Island and Pennsylvania.

At this point, as a result of 40 years of study and court actions, certain fundamentals had been established. As seen by Merwin E. Hupfer, the commission's principal sanitary engineer, they were:

The State has the power to direct treatment by a municipality.

Private riparian rights, even though small, cannot be abused, even for public benefit.

Primary emphasis should be on municipal sewage discharges.

Pollution affects more than public health.

Correction of problems should be systematic, constructive, and reasonable.

The program should protect existing pristine water.

Industrial pollution should also be controlled by the State.

The commission of three men—increased to seven in 1957 when the agency was renamed the Water Resources Commission and took over supervision over flood control, water policy and dams—was given the power to call a polluter to a hearing and, if necessary, order him to correct the pollution and get a court injunction to stop him from polluting. New pollution after 1925 was prohibited unless the commission found it in the public interest to permit it.

Soft sell

Armed with a strong law and backed by enlightened courts, the commission had an attack of benevolent fuddy-duddyism. In its first biennial report, it noted two possible courses:

To rely on the authority conferred by law and, after proper investigation, to issue orders to eliminate specific causes of pollution.

To "attempt by education and personal conference to develop a sentiment calling for correction and, by assistance to and cooperation with both industry and communities, and in bringing about the desired results."

The commission chose the second, which was like David laying down his sling and inviting Goliath to talk things over.

It has spent the last 40 years alternately cajoling and threatening towns and industries, doing research for them on their treatment problems, wrestling with him—first attitudes, trying to pry sewage plants from the bottom of their priority lists, waiting out long delays and trying again.

At the same time, it has tried to get the most possible use out of the river. It has allowed pollution, for example, where it felt a nuisance would not be created or where natural purification should take care of it. The dump on the East Hartford side of the Charter Oak Bridge, which has a permit from the commission to be on the waterline, is an example. So are some new apartments on the bank in Warehouse Point, which received permission this year to discharge partly treated sewage until that community builds a treatment plant.

Commission Director William S. Wise's definition of clean water is "what is practical to get under existing conditions."

The commission has picked up its sling, the hearing process, 61 times since 1925, always as a last resort. (The first time was in 1932.) The hearings resulted in 42 orders against polluters who remained uncooperative—towns in 34 cases, industries in 8. Five orders were appealed—two by towns, three by industries. The commission was upheld in each case.

The persuasion technique has worked of course.

Statewide, 95 percent of all human waste running through sewers from towns and cities is treated and 52 percent of all industrial waste.

On the river, every community provides at least primary treatment except Warehouse Point, which has delayed because half its sewage comes from a State facility, the receiving home for children. The State this year agreed to pay its share and plans are proceeding. Industrial pollution on the river is relatively small and sporadic although it includes disturbing elements such as paper fiber, acids, dyes and, in Middletown, blood and offal from a slaughterhouse.

Of the 59 Connecticut towns in the watershed, 56 either have plants, are planning them or don't need them. The remaining three are Colchester, Avon and Chester, which need them but have not committed themselves to construction.

Persuasion has shown results but it has taken the commission 40 years to get this far. That is a long time, even considering delay caused by the depression, World War II and the Korean war. The commission has just started its "second phase"—getting all towns to build secondary plants and to chlorinate the treated effluent.

Target dates are 1968 for chlorination and 1975 for secondary treatment. This would make the river swimmable below East Haddam and good for boating and other noncontact recreation above.

In Massachusetts, sources of most of the industrial pollution and two-thirds of the human waste contamination in the river, control measures along the Connecticut did not start until 1945. Before then, Massachusetts considered the river, along with the Merrimack, an "industrial stream" only. Its pollution was not banned in Boston.

Of the 99 Massachusetts towns all or partly in the watershed, only 10 had treatment plants in 1945. Now 24 have them and at least 4 others are planning them.

Nine towns are dumping raw sewage into the river and need plants but have no plans for them.

Chicopee, with 61,500 persons, is the biggest offender. It has plans for a $3 million plant at the mouth of the Chicopee River and for $5 million worth of sewers, including interceptors to connect Westover Air Force Base. It failed to get 50 percent Federal aid under the APW (Accelerated Public Works) program for depressed areas because the money ran out.

"Now," said a Massachusetts State official, "Chicopee won't go with 30-percent Federal aid under Public Law 660 (the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956). It's waiting to see if more Federal aid will become available."

"We should be referring Chicopee to the Attorney General," said Worthen H. Taylor, chief sanitary engineer of the State's public health department and head of its antipollution efforts.

Also on the verge of legal action is Westfield (population 26,000), which so far has given only lip service to correcting its pollution. It received a study report from a consulting engineer a year ago, has gone no further.

Athol (population 10,000) is another problem town. It has started new plans for a treatment plant after its old ones became outdated. The six other problem towns, all small, are Orange, Erving, Hatfield, Palmer, Wilbraham, and Templeton.

ACTION UPRIVER

The two large Massachusetts cities of Springfield (population 174,000) and Holyoke (population 53,000) are polluting the river but are taking corrective action. Springfield is studying ways to improve the effectiveness of its two primary plants. Holyoke has completed a primary plant and is planning sewers to pick up waste from 65 percent of its population.

Like Hartford, the big and old Massachusetts cities have their problems with combination sewers. The expensive job of separating these into storm and sanitary pipes is a long way off. As a result, heavy pollution will occur in heavy rains when the sewers are filled and the treatment plants must be bypassed. But, fortunately, this usually occurs in early spring when the river is not used for recreation.

In New Hampshire and Vermont, where the population served by sewers is small and river pollution has never been extensive, control measures on the Connecticut River began even later than in Massachusetts.

The two Upper Valley States started their major effort in 1957, after 30-percent Federal aid (up to $600,000) for building town treatment plants became available under the Water Pollution Control Act.

Unlike Connecticut and Massachusetts, both provide further incentive with State aid. New Hampshire pays 40 percent of a town's cost and Vermont 20 to 45 percent, with more going to poorer towns under a 1965 law. To be fair to towns that already had plants, New Hampshire made its aid retroactive to 1947, the year it passed its first antipollution laws.

As Connecticut has started to do this year (under public act 465, enacted July 1) and

Massachusetts has done since 1961, the Upper Valley States allow local property tax exemption for industrial pollution abatement equipment.

Before 1957, only three Vermont towns had treatment plants, none in the Connecticut River watershed. Less than 5 percent of the sewered population was served. Today, the State has 24 plants serving 73 percent. The only city in the Connecticut River watershed that has a plant, however, is Brattleboro (population 6,355) and its plant is inadequate. Of the other 115 towns in the watershed, 2 others are planning to build plants and 8 need them but have not approved construction.

The only pollution court case pending in Vermont involves a dairy in the Lake Champlain Valley.

R. W. Thieme, director of the State's pollution control agency, the three-man water resources commission, said money has been the big problem. The no-action town represent only 4 percent of the sewered population, he said, and they will probably move now that up to 45 percent State aid is available.

Mr. Thieme believes, however, that some pollution should be allowed since the river's natural purification process can take care of a certain amount.

"Vermont has no coastline," he said, "so industry must have the capacity to use its inland waters. It's either that or we will wind up doing nothing but entertaining tourists."

In New Hampshire, of 94 towns in the watershed 7 have plants and 11 are planning or building them. Eight other towns need plants but have not gone beyond preliminary studies.

William Healy, director of the State's water pollution board, said no legal action has been necessary since Federal aid became available.

"The towns are well acquainted with the need," he said. "The drought has emphasized the need for preserving water quality. So now it's just a matter of timing and priority."

JOBS AHEAD

With neighboring Vermont also focusing its efforts on the Connecticut River now, said Mr. Healy, the waterway should be up to class B standards from Canada to the northern Massachusetts line in 10 years.

To get a clean river by 1975—swimmable everywhere except between Holyoke and East Haddam and possibly a few industrialized areas in Vermont and New Hampshire—the States have three jobs to fulfill:

Optimum sewage treatment. The cost: $90 to $100 million each to Connecticut and Massachusetts, $35 to $50 million each in Vermont and New Hampshire.

Chlorination, which Massachusetts is now doing during the recreation season, May 1 to September 15, and which Connecticut hopes to start doing by 1968.

Constant and forceful pressure on industries to clean up their pollution.

If the States fumble or advance too slowly, the Federal Government is in the background ready to pick up the ball. Washington has become avidly interested in natural resources as a result of the New Frontier and Great Society programs.

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF's bill to save the Connecticut as a national parkway and recreation area, if passed, is sure to hasten its cleanup as would another bill of his to increase Federal aid for town sewage plants from $100 to $400 million a year.

Washington's big stick, however, is the Muskie bill (S. 4), now up for action in Congress.

The bill, introduced by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, with Senator RIBICOFF among the cosponsors, would strengthen the Federal role in pollution control by taking it away from the Public Health Service, a branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and giving it to a new HEW branch answerable directly to the HEW Secretary.

This would be recognition of a view the States have been reluctant to accept—that water pollution is more than a health problem, that it affects welfare as well.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, authorized the HEW secretary to set Federal standards for clean water. The States have opposed this, fearing that Washington will not make allowances for local conditions—that is, the practical need of a town or industry to pollute and a river's ability to absorb this pollution. The House, going along with the States, amended the Federal standards out of the bill and threw it to the compromise committee.

On September 17, the committee recommended passage of a compromise on standards—allowing the setting of Federal standards only if a State does not set its own standards by June 30, 1967, or if a State's standards are not adequate.

State officials, who feel they are doing a good job, would prefer to see Washington provide money but otherwise keep hands off. They subscribe to a statement of the engineers joint council:

"Pollution of water should be regulated at the lowest governmental level adequate for the particular situation. Federal jurisdiction and participation should be limited to the administration of existing laws and to research investigation and guidance upon which sound State laws and local regulations may be based."

"If interstate pacts can't get the States together," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer in Connecticut's State health department, "then we need Federal legislation. But we don't need it every time somebody complains. Let's not insinuate that the program will be lost without the Great White Father in Washington."

Mr. Wise, who joined Connecticut's water resources commission as an associate engineer in 1928 and has been director since it was reorganized in 1957, believes in that agency's stability and has been critical when Washington looked over its shoulder.

Of the 1963 Public Health Service report on pollution in the river, Mr. Wise said:

"It does not represent a balanced picture of the river's condition but purports to show it in the most unfavorable light. It leaves the inference that pollution has robbed the river of all its normal useful purposes.

"It emphasizes recreational uses but it ignores the fact that, in the reach above Hartford, shallow water, exposed riverbed, shoals, topography and physical conditions greatly restrict its use for waterborne recreational activities during most of the recreation season.

"It appears to discount the habits and customs of the large percentage of people in this area who prefer sandy beaches and salt water to muddy riverbeds even if the fresh water is clean.

"It neither presents meager data nor offers criteria in support of its conclusion that the river's condition endangers the health and welfare of the people of Connecticut, nor does it offer any interpretation of that statement.

"It * * * ignores the impractical aspects of controlling the frequent contamination of the river during periods of rain and natural drainage from the many municipalities and agricultural lands located along its banks.

"Finally, the report does not acknowledge the progress that has been made in pollution abatement along the entire river, the activities which are now directed toward accelerating these programs or the policy for achieving the ultimate goal—a river of beauty, utility, and enjoyment."

Mr. Wise advocated continued State control with Federal financial help. "Money," he said, "is the critical need."

"We believe in State authority," said Mr. Taylor in Massachusetts. "We like to take advantage of natural purification. The Federal Government would raise a river to its highest use."

Mr. Thieme, of Vermont, said parts of the Connecticut River should be like the Ruhr Valley, which is often cited as an example of industry and beauty living together.

Francis J. Lariviere, executive secretary of the New England Interstate Pollution Control Commission, feels Federal intervention will mean waste.

"An industry or an individual can do the pollution control job cheaper," he said. "When a State or a Federal agency enters the picture, you get a lot of people just looking over other people's shoulders."

And costs will rise, he said, because technology and construction will not be able to keep up with the outpouring of money from Washington. With jobs for all, competition will disappear and bids will be higher. A study, he said, has shown that bids in the accelerated public works program were 30 percent above normal.

A group of Congressmen opposing Federal standards, led by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, said in a report:

"Standards of water quality are concededly badly needed but should be established by the State and local agencies, which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of establishing and enforcing stringent standards of water quality."

Furthermore, the group said, authorizing the HEW Secretary to set standards would discourage the States from developing their own plans and standards and it would give a single Federal official the power to establish local zoning measures since he would be controlling use of land in watershed areas.

There are many arguments in favor of Federal power, however.

President Johnson himself proposed it last February 8 to Congress in his message on natural beauty. He urged legislation to "provide, through effective water quality standards, combined with a swift and effective enforcement procedure, a national program to prevent water pollution at its source rather than attempting to cure pollution after it occurs."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in a statement before a congressional committee early this year, criticized the traditional State view that some pollution should always be allowed.

"For too long," he said, "even so-called good waste disposal practice has been geared merely to the concept of limiting pollution loads to the assimilation capacity of streams. This is a negative approach. We must begin now to adopt a positive approach to insure clean water."

Senator RIBICOFF, champion of the Connecticut River, has emphasized that the States must stop looking at pollution as a limited health and welfare problem with the focus on disease prevention.

"I will say to my good friends in the State agencies," he said here in January at a meeting of fish and game commissioners, "that pollution which prevents a man from fishing or a child from swimming or a teenager from water skiing or a family from going to the beach for a Sunday picnic certainly has affected the welfare of the people of Connecticut and I am pleased to note that the Federal officials agree with that interpretation of the term."

Mr. RIBICOFF has also noted that "prospects of Federal action seem to expedite compliance, oftentimes in situations which have dragged through State and local courts for years."

"The complaint about invasion of States rights," said the New York Times in an editorial, "is the rallying cry of the chemical,

leather, paper, steel, power and other industrial firms that oppose Federal action because they find it much easier to put pressure on State and local governments."

Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field, said in a talk with the Times in his Washington office that the States fear of an insensitive big brother in Washington is baseless.

"Anyone can stop pollution by denying industry and population," he said. "Our challenge is controlling them. We are not dealing with pollution in a vacuum. Our job is to help people. One way to help people is to make sure they have jobs."

Mr. Stein believes each waterway is unique and should be treated that way.

"All we ask," he said, "is that once a State agrees to a standard it should be lived up to. You can't set a 25-mile-an-hour speed limit and let a few people go 45."

Even Mr. RIBICOFF doesn't expect perfection.

"It would be unrealistic," he said, "to expect to restore the river to the pristine condition of bygone days (when Adrian Block sailed it). It would be defeatist, however, not to hope and to work to restore it to a condition that will permit men and women, boys and girls, to find recreation—for many of them release from the pressures of crowded city life."

Increased Federal action, whether the States like it or not, is coming. There is talk in Washington of a "massive" antipollution effort in Congress next year, now that President Johnson has gotten his top priority medicare and civil rights programs.

Bills are already in the works. The Muskie bill is one. The Ribicoff parkway and increased aid bills are others. Also proposed—by Representatives JOHN S. MONAGAN and ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, as well as others—is legislation to increase Federal aid in various ways and to give industries a 3-year tax writeoff on antipollution equipment. The momentum comes from a renewed interest in natural beauty in outdoor recreation, awakened by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Meanwhile, the pace of State programs is quickening. The evergrowing need for the Connecticut River as a recreational strip, a place of beauty and eventually a water supply is a reality that can no longer be denied. The heavy pollution that now defiles it, everybody realizes, will have to be cleaned up.

This generation, as a result, may be the lucky one that sees the river again as Yale President Timothy Dwight did in the early 1800's. He wrote:

"The purity, salubrity and sweetness of its waters, the frequency and elegance of its meanders, its absolute freedom from all aquatic vegetables, the uncommon and universal beauty of its banks—are objects which no traveler can thoroughly describe and no reader can adequately imagine."

TO THOSE WHO CARE—THE BEAUTIFUL

Seen from a low-flying airplane, the little pond in the northern tip of New Hampshire seems insignificant. Boggy, half full of vegetation, its couple of acres hidden in scrub spruce, it is a puddle misplaced high on a mountainside.

It is the source of the Connecticut River.

Called Fourth Connecticut Lake, the pond is the first accumulation of water that will flow 404 miles through four States—New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. A drop of rain that falls here eventually ends up in Long Island Sound. A drop that falls 600 feet away, on the north side of the ridgeline that forms the Canadian border ends up in the St. Lawrence and the sea at the heart of Canada's Maritimes.

Fourth Lake is perched on Mount Prospect, 2,600 feet above sea level. It is surrounded by wild, wooded, bear and moose country. At the foot of the mountain is the only building around, a red-roofed customs house flying the Canadian maple leaf.

"Almost the only sound that relieves the monotony of the place," wrote a New Hampshire geologist, "is the croaking of the frogs, and this must be their paradise."

From Fourth Lake, the river—at this point merely a stream a man can straddle—tumbles half a mile to the Third Connecticut Lake, which spreads out at the base of the mountain 500 feet below. It flows on through Second and First Connecticut Lakes and then Lake Francis. From the air, it appears only as a narrow cut in the trees where it links the lakes.

The river bears the mark of man almost from the beginning. Route 3 winds along Third Lake into Canada. There are power dams on Second and First Lakes and Lake Francis. The first community on the river in Pittsburg, N.H., a lumber town whose small white houses stretch out below the Lake Francis dam, 20 miles downstream from the source.

At Pittsburg, the Connecticut stops being a lake connector and becomes a full-formed river. Here, where log drives to Massachusetts were staged as late as 1910, the river gurgles over a rocky bed, ankle deep and 30 feet wide. It has already picked up its characteristic tea color from tannin, the strong dye in the vegetation along its banks.

The river at Pittsburg begins its long, enchanting, winding way to the sea between the Green Mountains of Vermont on the west and the White Mountains of New Hampshire on the east. It will play, as one writer said, the roles of "damsel, vixen, lusty matron and eccentric dowager."

It will go through a watershed of 11,265 miles (twice the size of the State of Connecticut) and through a country that is 67 percent forest, 23 percent farmland, and 10 percent towns, cities, roads, lakes, and rivers. It will spill over some 16 dams on its main route and will pick up water from 16 major and many minor tributaries. The width of its valley will generally run from 20 to 50 miles. The river itself will rarely get wider than 2,000 feet. In the watershed are all or part of 368 towns—94 in New Hampshire, 116 in Vermont, 99 in Massachusetts, and 59 in Connecticut—and about 1.7 million persons.

At West Stewartstown, N.H., 11 miles from Pittsburg, the river takes a sharp bend southward and assumes the grave responsibility of dividing New Hampshire from Vermont. The line runs, not in the middle of the river, but at the waterline on the Vermont side, so anyone wishing to fish on the river must have a New Hampshire permit.

As testimony to the mountainous terrain, the river drops 1,500 feet by the time it reaches West Stewartstown. The descent from here on is gradual—200 feet in 50 miles.

The first industry on the river is New Hampshire's largest, the Groveton Paper Co. in Groveton, about 70 miles from the source. Here, logs jam the river from bank to bank, waiting to be processed into pulp. Two mountains of logs on the shore tower over nearby houses and a tiny covered bridge. Waste taints the river a greenish white.

Twenty miles south of Groveton, the Connecticut swells into a lake behind the upper dam at Fifteen Mile Falls. Power from this and the lower dam lights lamps as far away as Boston. Barnet, at the foot of the falls, was the extreme head of navigation in the early 1800's although the practical limit was Wells River 12 miles downriver.

Between Barnet and Hanover, home of Dartmouth College, the river takes some dramatic turns, sweeping in great oxbows and turning on itself to form shapes that look like pretzels and the longhand "e."

The river is so crooked, an ancient local historian once wrote, that a hunter could "stand in New Hampshire, fire across Vermont and lodge his ball in New Hampshire again."

A few more industries appear on the reach south to the Massachusetts line, mostly on the New Hampshire side—paper and textile mills in the Claremont-Newport area and paper mills and a tannery in Hinsdale.

The first sign of sewage—cigarettes in pools of waste—shows up between Bellows Falls and Brattleboro, just before the river enters Massachusetts at Northfield. Yet, there is attraction here. At Bellows Falls, the loitering stream becomes a foaming torrent in a narrow, rocky channel, rushing and leaping in zigzags to a grand finish 50 feet below. (A historian with a penchant for exaggeration wrote over 150 years ago that the speed and pressure of the water were so great here "between the pinching rocks" that an iron bar could not be forced into it). Brattleboro is where Rudyard Kipling lived for a while and wrote "Captains Courageous."

When it enters Massachusetts, the river is tranquil again. Now in one of its most attractive phases, it turns through lush fields, cleaves a chasm of rock and winds through a quilt of vegetable and shade tobacco farms. At Turners Falls, it plays a joke and actually flows north for a short distance, then settles down to cleave the green-rock gorges of Deerfield and flow by Mount Sugarloaf into the land of the dinosaurs around Northampton (the footprints are still visible).

The river idyll, fairly consistent all the way down from Canada, comes to a stomach-turning halt at Holyoke, which Author William Manchester of Middletown, who followed the river a few years ago, calls the "eyesore of the valley."

"Here," he said, "the river plunges 60 feet and an intricate, century-old system of canals provides power for paper factories which repay the Connecticut River by defiling her waters and blighting her banks with Dickensian tenements."

No far below on the opposite bank, where the Chicopee River enters from the east at Chicopee, the Connecticut gets slugged with its heaviest dose of pollution. Human waste from Chicopee, North Wilbraham, Ludlow and Westover Air Force Base raises the bacteria count to 947,000 per 100 milliliters (half a cup), or 947 times the maximum for swimming. Here also are the most sludge worms, which thrive on organic wastes that have settled to the bottom. Fifty-four percent of all industrial wastes discharged into the river between Northampton and Rocky Hill enter here.

The Connecticut River is virtually a sewage canal from Holyoke to the State line.

It spills over its last fall, the 4-foot Enfield Dam, just after crossing the line, cleans itself a bit along the 5-mile Enfield Rapids thanks to natural purification and dilution from the relatively clean Farmington River, then gets belted again by pollution from the Hockanum River, Hartford and East Hartford.

At Hartford, the river begins to live up to its name, Indian for "long tidal river." Tides here average 1.2 feet between high and low water.

Hartford founder Thomas Hooker is probably whirling in his grave behind Center Church at the way the city has turned its back on the river. In his day, it was the lifeline to the sea and the highway to the frontier up north. Columbus Boulevard, now walled off from the river by dikes and highways, was then a river road connecting Hartford with the other two settlements of Windsor and Wethersfield.

The river was vital to transportation of freight and passengers right up to 1931, when the city of Hartford stopped making overnight trips to New York. Its heyday was in the early 1800's, when 60-foot flatboats negotiated the canals and rapids all the way to

Barnet, Vt. Before the Windsor Locks canal was built in 1829, goods were taken to Warehouse Point at the foot of Enfield Rapids, stored there and eventually taken by wagon to boats above.

Tall-masted vessels stood two and three deep in the Hartford harbor in the days of sail. To the frustration of skippers, a sailing ship took 2 weeks to get from the West Indies to Old Saybrook and another 2 weeks to sail up the winding river to Hartford. Wethersfield, a privateers' nest in the Revolution, became a trade center because the river then looped south there (in what is now Wethersfield Cove), the straw that broke many a captain's back.

From Hartford to Middletown, the river is surprisingly empty of activity. The banks are thick with uninterrupted foliage. Civilization seems far away. But the reason is simple: The banks are low and level and flood danger is high, so construction has been light and most of the land is used for farming.

At Middletown, the river's principal port in the late 1700's, the river gets busy again but does not suffer too much pollution. Middletown treats and chlorinates its sewage. Chances are good the river will become suitable for swimming again below East Haddam.

From Middletown southward, the Connecticut is as lovely as anywhere in its upper reaches. And it has the added appeal of salt marches below Hamburg, where the river becomes briny 7 miles from the sound.

This is the stretch that impressed Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall on his recent river trip in connection with the proposal to make the river a national parkway.

The banks along these last 25 miles of river are full of attractions—the Goodspeed Opera House at Middletown, four shoreline State parks, Gillette Castle high on a hill at East Haddam, a mixture of modern and colonial homes and numerous boat moorings.

Selden Creek, making an island of Selden Neck just below Hudlyme, invites the canoeist or small boat owner to explore its long, narrow channel, which divides marshes from wooded cliffs.

At Old Saybrook, the river completes its long journey and empties into the sea, pouring a daily average of over 11 billion gallons of fresh water into the sound. Because of the Saybrook sandbar, curse of ship captains since colonial days, the Connecticut is unique among rivers in not having a major city at the mouth.

From the little mountainside pond near the Canadian border to Old Saybrook, the river rarely loses its charm. Those who get to know it invariably agree with a historian who wrote in the early 1800's:

"This stream may perhaps with more propriety than any other in the world be named the Beautiful River."

"YOU CAN'T SEE A FOOT IN FRONT DOWN THERE"

Hartford police skindivers know what it's like to swim in the murky, dirty Connecticut River. They go in it to recover bodies, guns, and loot.

"We have to go in," said Lt. Robert Pilon, head of the 13-man team. "The bottom is so covered with debris it's impossible to grapple."

Swimming for them is anything but carefree. They have to worry about disease, equipment damage, debris, and turbidity.

The men guard against disease by having typhoid and tetanus shots periodically and, usually, boosters after they have been in the river. Even then, some have gotten sick. The bacteria in the river can also cause dysentery, diarrhea, and other illnesses.

Equipment must be carefully tended. Suits will rot if the algae is not scrubbed off soon enough or thoroughly enough. An air regulator, a vital device which a diver treats like a fine Swiss watch, can be wrecked by the oil that streaks the water.

To protect themselves against debris, the divers wear basketball sneakers and work from boats instead of wading out from shore. If they're lucky, they don't get snagged on the car parts, refrigerators, fencing, tin cans, wire, oil drums, and other junk on the bottom.

The river's turbidity—a tea-colored opaqueness caused partly by vegetation and partly by pollution—defies countermeasures.

"You can't see a foot in front of you down there," Lieutenant Pilon said. "Lights don't help. You have to search by feel."

Training Officer Dennis Hurley said that 5 feet down, a diver can no longer see daylight overhead.

"He has to rely on his bubbles to see which way is up," he said, "but he has to look quick. The bubbles are only visible for about a foot."

Divers always maintain positive buoyancy when they're working in the Connecticut. This enables them to float up if they get into trouble.

In contrast, the diver's train in the No. 5 reservoir in Farmington where a man working on the bottom 50 feet down can be observed from the surface. In a search for bodies in a mica quarry in Cromwell a few years ago divers could see daylight 70 feet overhead and could see 15 feet ahead of them, despite the unreal glitter of myriad specks of mica in the water.

The turbid river hides bodies well.

Two years ago, a boy drowned at Hartford's Riverside Park and disappeared. A diver, taking part in his first search for a body was groping blindly along the bottom muck when his hands suddenly touched the boy. The diver panicked and shot to the surface. Although the location of the body had been pinpointed and other divers went down repeatedly, it could not be found again. Six days later, it came up downriver.

CHEAP SEWAGE TREATMENT

Cities looking for a cheap but efficient way of treating their sewage may find the answer in an ancient resource, coal.

The Rand Development Corp. of Cleveland, seeking new markets for the coal industry, believes it has found an important one in sewage treatment.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Washington thinks it may be a breakthrough, has awarded Rand a $617,000 contract to build a small pilot plant.

"It's the kind of idea that is so simple it could be great," said Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field. "It's like the paper clip. You wonder why nobody ever thought of it before."

Activated charcoal has been tried in the past as a final polishing-off agent in the filtering process, Mr. Stein said, but nobody had thought of using it at the beginning.

Basically, Rand's idea is to grind coal down to the graininess of sugar and then filter raw waste through it.

A 1,500-gallon-an-hour plant it has been operating for the last 20 months in Cleveland has removed 80 to 85 percent of organic matter, 90 percent of detergents, 85 percent of phosphates, and 100 percent of odor.

What's more, the coal can still be burned after it has become saturated. A city can thus reduce costs by selling it to powerplants or using it itself.

Rand estimates it will take 5 tons of coal to treat a million gallons of sewage.

The Hartford Metropolitan District's big sewage plant at Brainard Field treats an average of 39 million gallons a day, so would need 195 tons of coal daily.

But the MDC would have no trouble getting rid of the coal. The Hartford Electric Light Co.'s powerplant at South Meadows uses an average of 1,000 tons daily, and its Middletown plant uses 3,000 tons a day. Each plant has equipment to grind the coal down to the graininess of talcum, the consistency at which it is blown into the boilers to be burned.

A Rand official said operation costs have not been figured out yet, but will certainly be less than that for the activated sludge process, a secondary treatment with which the MDC is experimenting as a possibility for its Hartford plant.

The Hartford plant now gives primary treatment—chopping up and removing large material from sewage, taking out grit and settling out the suspended solids. The method is 35 to 50 percent effective in cleaning polluted water.

The most popular form of secondary treatment now—the kind used by the MDC in its new Poquonnock plant—is the trickling filter method. In this treatment, the primary effluent is further cleaned by spraying it through a rotating boom over crushed rock inhabitated by bacteria that oxidize organic matter.

The activated sludge process, and its modifications, contact stabilization and step aeration, oxidize the primary effluent by bubbling air up through it, much as a pump does in a home fish aquarium. They are about 85 percent efficient.

Metcalf & Eddy of Boston, MDC's consultant engineers, have estimated it will cost $7,322,000 to add secondary treatment to the Hartford plant.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RIBICOFF

I commend the Hartford Times for its concern with the future of the Connecticut River.

As you know so well, the Connecticut River is a priceless heritage—not only for Conecticut but for New England and the Nation. But if future generations are to enjoy its beauty, all of us—public officials at the Federal, State, and local levels, industry, private organizations, and concerned individuals—must work together to clean it up and preserve its scenic splendor.

Cleaning up the river is more than a matter of beauty. In 15 years, the Connecticut River will be one of our most important sources of life-giving water—for drinking, for industry, and for the hundreds of uses of our urban civilization.

Time is running out and, for these reasons, I have moved on two fronts: To establish a Connecticut River National Parkway and Recreation Area; and to quadruple the Federal effort in water pollution control.

I intend to do everything possible to have my bills enacted into law, but it will take public awareness and cooperation to insure that the efforts to save the Connecticut River are successful. I take off my hat to the Hartford Times for the great contribution it is making to the battle.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have now reached the time at which the Senator from Utah was authorized by the majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess. Therefore, under the authority given me by the majority leader, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

U.S. MARSHAL

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, vice Thurgood Marshall.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE

Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Harry Lee Walker, resigned.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan, vice William M. Rountree.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972. (Reappointment.)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971. (Reappointment.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Edward L. Bailey to be lieutenant commander, and ending Charles H. Leckrone to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 24, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Frank C. Morgret III to be lieutenant, and ending Stephen L. Richmond to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Horton Salutes Polish Americans on Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Count Casimir Pulaski came to these shores to serve the cause of freedom by fighting in the American Continental Army commanded by Gen. George Washington. He received an appointment from the Continental Congress as one of Washington's cavalry commanders, and distinguished himself in many engagements with the enemy. While leading an attack to relieve the captured city of Savannah, Ga., he received the wounds from which he later died on October 11, 1779. It is the anniversary of the death from battle wounds of this great American patriot, and this great Pole, Casimir Pulaski, that we observe here in this Chamber.

He fought the Russian domination of Poland, and he fought the British domination of America. It is his memory and his achievement in these causes that we celebrate today on the 186th anniversary of his heroic death.

His military career in America was tragically short. In September of 1777, Pulaski served with Washington at the battle of Brandywine, and fought with great distinction. He commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton, and later at Flemington. He served with General Wayne in scouting for supplies for the starving troops at Valley Forge.

In March of 1778, Pulaski was asked to organize an independent cavalry corps. He established headquarters at Baltimore from which he was sent to protect American supplies at Egg Harbor, N.J., where his legion was ambushed and defeated because of information given to the British by a deserter. Indian massacres in the Cherry Valley caused Pulaski to be sent to Minisink on the Delaware River. After 3 months there he was ordered to go to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina.

He arrived at Charleston in May of 1779, and was defeated by the superior forces of General Provost. Joining General Lincoln and the French fleet in their attack on Savannah, he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, and fell gravely wounded. He was removed to one of the ships of the fleet, the *Wasp*, whose surgeons were unable to help him, and he died on board.

His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans, whatever their descent may be. Polish Americans should take special pride in the fact that at the time of the birth of the American Republic a Pole was at the head of an heroic cavalry charge against the enemy of this new country dedicated to liberty. Since those days, Polish Americans have made many contributions to American struggles against tyranny. In so doing they have followed the example set for them and for all Americans by the brave Pulaski.

Americans of Polish descent, like their great hero, Count Casimir Pulaski, have died in the defense of freedom while fighting in the Armed Forces of the United States. During the height of the fighting of World War II, President Roosevelt recognized the extent of the service and sacrifices made by Polish Americans when he told the Polish American Congress in Buffalo on May 28, 1944, that, "All of us are proud of the unsparing efforts of this group of Americans in our war effort, at the front, in our factories, and on our farms."

Some Polish American mothers had as many as 11 sons on active duty at the same time. It is estimated that from 900,000 to 1,000,000 Americans of Polish descent saw active duty in our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force during the Second World War. Over a hundred Polish American priests served as chaplains. Whether they were on the battlefield or on the home front, Americans of Polish descent served the United States during the war with a full measure of devotion, just as they do today. Then, as now, they were true to the momory of Pulaski.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, by Presidential proclamation, and especially in my home State of New York, by gubernatorial proclamation, this day, October 11, is being observed as Pulaski Day. For their pertinence to my remarks and their further tribute to the memory of this great Polish patriot, I am pleased to include the text of President Johnson's and Governor Rockefeller's proclamations.

PROCLAMATION 3665—GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY, 1965, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas Casimir Pulaski, Polish patriot and valiant defender of freedom, offered his services to the Continental Army during the American War for Independence; and

Whereas Congress acknowledged his brilliant military leadership at Brandywine by awarding him the rank of brigadier general and allowing him to form an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which won acclaim as Pulaski's Legion; and

Whereas this year marks the 186th anniversary of his death from wounds received while leading a cavalry charge during the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas it is proper that the American people continue to pay grateful tribute to General Pulaski for his heroic sacrifice in freedom's cause, and to the manifold and continuing contributions of Polish Americans in the defense and progress of this Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Monday, October 11, 1965, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day. I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in