## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11634. A bill for the relief of Nadira Saied Murad Khatchadurian and Najdat Sarkis Khatchadurian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 11635. A bill for the relief of Morad Hekmat-Panah, his wife, Houran Shenassa Hekmat-Panah, and their minor son, Soheil Hekmat-Panah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11636. A bill to provide for the free entry of one double focusing mass spectrometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11637. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Cieciuch Korszun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11638. A bill for the relief of Francesco Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11639. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Zamparelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11640. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11641. A bill for the relief of Gloria Esmina Clarke and Aston Fitzgerald Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 11642. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Toth and Tsuzsanne Patkos de Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11643. A bill for the relief of Bok Sin Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11644. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonardo D. Exconde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11645. A bill for the relief of Miss Hortensia Vargas Reyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11646. A bill for the relief of Georgios F. Filinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11647. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Matarangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

280. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mariana Island District Legislature, sixth regular session, Saipan, Mariana Islands, relative to the political status of the inhabitants of the Mariana Island district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. Also, petition of the County Board of Supervisors, Orange County, Calif., relative to distribution of the alcoholic beverage tax revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# SENATE

## MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the new day bathed in the tinted glories of the autumntide, for the mystic beauty of lights and shadows, weaving patterns of splendor across the templed hills.

Through it all, and in the laughter and tears of our fellow pilgrims, and in our own souls, tune our hearts to hear Thy voice that we may know we are not alone but that Thou walkest with us both in the sunshine and in the shadows.

Grant us vistas of the strength that waits to be added to our weakness for the great enterprise of world brotherhood committed to our hands. So gird the lives of Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs that they may make decisions greatly, walk always on the high levels of noble purpose, and with kindling sympathies as wide as human needs help to heal the open sores of this stricken world.

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

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 15, 1965, was dispensed with.

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Friday, October 15, 1965, the following reports of a committee were submitted on October 16, 1965:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (Rept. No. 896);

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College (Rept. No. 897);

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago (Rept. No. 898);

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington (Rept. No. 899);

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University (Rept. No. 901);

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh (Rept. No. 902);

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split-pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. (Rept. No. 903);

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. (Rept. No. 904);

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla. (Rept. No. 905);

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. (Rept. No. 906);

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota (Rept. No. 907);

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo. (Rept. No. 894); and

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La. (Rept. No. 895).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University (Rept. No. 900).

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis X. Morrissey, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

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

## EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

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

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

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session until Tuesday, October 19, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; and that committees be authorized to file reports, together with any individual, additional, supplementary, or minority views, if desired; and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

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

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

## PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. DOC. NO. 65)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $277,600,000, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin (Rept. No. 908).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2659. A bill to provide for the free entry of one double-focusing mass spectrometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2662. A bill to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

## A SPACE AGE TRAJECTORY TO THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, why cannot the same specialist who can figure out a way to put a man in space figure out a way to keep him out of jail?

Why cannot the engineers who can move a rocket to Mars figure out a way to move people through our cities and across the country without the horrors of modern traffic and the concrete desert of our highway system?

Why cannot the scientists who can cleanse instruments to spend germ-free years in space devise a method to end the present pollution of air and water here on earth?

Why cannot highly trained manpower, which can calculate a way to transmit pictures for millions of miles in space, also show us a way to transmit enough simple information to keep track of our criminals?

Why cannot we use computers to deal with the down-to-earth special problems of modern America?

The answer is we can— if we have the wit to apply our scientific know-how to the analysis and solution of social problems with the same creativity we have applied it to space problems.

The purpose of the proposed Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965 is to test new ways to use the scientific manpower and know-how of the space age to solve a great variety of social problems.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to contract directly with private firms, universities, or nonprofit institution, and with States or groups of States. They would undertake studies of the use of systems analysis and systems engineering for a broad range of local and national problems. A 5-year program totaling $25 million per year is suggested in this proposal.

This bill is an attempt to build creativity upon the successful first step work undertaken by the State of California.

A little over 6 months ago, Gov. Pat Brown, of California, decided to see if space engineers, and private space firms, could apply their know-how to a number of social problems faced by the State.

Approximately $400,000 was set aside for four research contracts. These were first-stage contracts, feasibility studies. They were surface-scratching efforts to test a new idea.

Four space companies, and four teams of space engineers, were asked to look at the problems of crime, pollution, information control, and transportation in the State.

They were asked to be broad gaged in their approach. The question was: Can we take a scientific look at each of these problems in a new way, as a system of subproblems, as an integrated whole, and thereby devise new, overall, integrated approaches to their solution?

Can we put the State in a laboratory and the problem in a computer?

Another question was stressed: Can we estimate the cost of various possible approaches—or mixes of approaches—and use computers to figure out the most efficient and economical way to do a job? In other words, can we get some idea of the cost-effectiveness of a variety of social programs?

The results of the first stage are now in. They are a success. California has proved that the concept of using space engineering on these problems is a feasible one. These preliminary studies reveal truly exciting possibilities for solving incredibly difficult social problems. I think Governor Brown's idea is the most creative idea in many years. We must now follow up the initial demonstration studies with full-blown experimental research. This means testing several projects to see how various proposals now sketched by the computers will actually work in practice.

This is one of the major purposes of this bill. Another is to try to find new uses for a great national resource: our highly trained scientific and technical manpower.

Let me give you one example of what just one California study showed.

We know that space engineers have designed a system to get information to and from space capsules. They even got us photographs from Mars. California asked whether they could not use the same techniques to help government get more accurate information right here on earth.

Our earthbound information problem is huge. In this 1 State, 23 county departments report information regularly to some 28 State departments. They

submit almost 600 different kinds of reports. In 1 year, 1 county will typically transmit nearly 10,000 separate reports.

Today we are still using horse and buggy techniques to handle this vast amount of information. In California alone there are already 75 miles of State and local government filing cabinets which store information—in a more or less efficient way. By 1990 there will be 354 miles of filing cabinets unless something is done.

By 1974 the documents stored could pave a paper trail to the Moon and back—and anyone who knows typical office procedures knows that finding the one needed piece of paper in a filing cabinet may well be as difficult as getting it back from the Moon.

All this need not be. Scientists today can put the information collected at city, county, State and even Federal levels, into computers. With a flick of a button the precise information desired can be pulled back out of the computer. It can even be done by remote control as telephone wires connect one city to another and computers "talk to each other."

This is not only an efficient way to store and process information; it is economical, for one computer can eliminate thousands of filing cabinets, millions of pieces of paper, hundreds of file clerks, and scores of frustrated executives who never seem to be able to get the right information at the right time.

Another California study has showed that these same computers can provide the information necessary to effectively deal with crime and juvenile delinquency.

The basic work of this study was completed before the tragedy of the Watts riots in Los Angeles. The study showed, with amazing pinpoint accuracy, that this clearly defined block-by-block area within the city was a dangerous and unstable spot. The study showed that there was every reason to expect trouble—and it showed precisely where that trouble might occur.

It is estimated that the Watts riots resulted in at least $50 million in direct losses, and another $50 million in indirect costs. Had we understood the meaning of this study beforehand, we might have been able to apply the principle of an ounce of prevention.

As this example indicates, one feature of the computer, systems-analysis approach, is a scientific attempt to pinpoint the dimensions of a problem with high accuracy.

In Watts there was five menacing indicators that pointed out the troubles: Low family income; Negro population concentrations of more than 75 percent—with little integration; living conditions with more than 10,000 people per square mile; extremely high school dropout rates; and a high arrest rate—100 or more per 1,000 in the age group 10–17; 25 or more arrests per 1,000 total population.

Using the proper criteria to identify the problem is only the first step. The second step is to find the answer—or more important—to find the right combination of answers, at the lowest cost.

One way to fight crime is to put a criminal in jail for life. This will keep him from committing a further crime, but it is extremely costly. It costs a great deal of money to keep a man in jail for a year.

Another way to prevent crime is to take each first offender, and instead of putting him in jail at his first offense, spend substantial amounts of money for counseling, job training, psychiatric care, to try to help him onto the right track for a productive, noncriminal life. This may cost more at first, but if it means society would not have to pay to keep the man in jail for the rest of his life, the initial cost may be cheap in the long run.

Our first response to juvenile crime is often to call the police; it is not obvious that we might perhaps be better advised to call the employment and counseling service.

The first California studies indicate that it might even be wise to look to other parts of the social system if we really want the cheapest, most efficient way to reduce crime. It may well be that a new welfare system, and new poverty programs, dollar for dollar, could do more to reduce crime than could bigger and better prisons.

The studies do not attempt to offer a pat solution to crime. We have none. What is suggested is that we must look at a great variety of problems, seemingly distantly related, to see if pulling on one strand of the tangle here may untie a knot elsewhere.

This is one way to describe systems analysis. What we are really trying to do is figure out in great detail what that ounce of prevention idea is really about.

We want to find out if an ounce of counseling, psychiatric care, and job training, at the outset of a juvenile delinquent's crime career will, in fact, prevent a pound of robbery and theft later on.

We want to see if 3 ounces of new probation counseling will prevent 5 pounds of crime.

In fact, we want to know precisely how many ounces of each possible approach to prevention will produce the most pounds of cure.

And we want to know the cost: We want to know—throughout the whole system—what is the most economical and effective way to deal with this problem, and what is the cheapest mix of solutions we should adopt.

To do this we must build a miniature world—a mathematical model of the real one—inside a computer, and test various solutions on this world instead of on the real one. This is the systems approach, and the cost-effectiveness method.

It is the same method used by Secretary of Defense McNamara to work out the best mix of weapons for our national arsenal; and the same method used by space engineers to work out the best mix of techniques for trips to the moon.

Another California study showed the value of systems engineering for quite a different problem. Today Federal, State, and local governments are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on research and engineering to solve problems of air and water pollution. But there are no research and planning studies of the interrelationship of these problems. There is no attempt to achieve a total solution through a comprehensive and integrated system of waste management.

We can take some of the microscopic solids out of industrial smoke to reduce smog, but if we dump those solids into a river or lake we have converted an air pollution problem into a water pollution problem.

What is needed is a study of an overall scientific system for waste management, taking into account the interrelationships of geographic regions and the effect of industry and urban areas on air, ground, and water pollution. Such a system is every bit as complicated as a Gemini flight and it would involve the same disciplines of biology, physiology, mathematics, physics, engineering, and others. Bringing together all of these disciplines and applying them to solving a problem is systems engineering.

The California studies suggested that in the future sewage system construction could be integrated with the construction of roadways. Tubeways would consist of traffic roadways and rapid transit systems above, on, or just below the surface. Electrical power and communication lines would be located near or under the road surface. Below this network would be water lines, sewer lines, treated waste water lines, gas lines, and perhaps, gasoline and chemical lines. By handling all of these problems at one time in an integrated way, huge sums could be saved.

Another idea is that municipal solid waste are not expected to be collected in the household, carried to trash cans, and carted to the street for collection, as at present. With a general high standard of living, homeowners are expected to insist on a more advanced solid waste handling system. This might be to provide all households and industries with grinders which could grind solid wastes fine enough to be effectively handled in the sewer system.

Or, the homemaker might deposit any solid waste into a wall inlet in each room and never be troubled with it again. Solid wastes from each room and garden wastes from outdoor inlets would be collected in a container beneath or beside the home. One idea would be an underground conveyor belt that transports the waste out to and under the street and deposits it on a central underground belt running beneath the center of the street.

Some homesite processing of liquid waste may be desirable. A homesite liquid waste processor and compactor could function as a primary treatment device for extracting solids from the liquid wastes before being broken down—the stabilized solids could be combined under the house with the solid refuse.

Perhaps instead of using tin cans, our solid waste disposal problem could be solved by using plastic combustible containers which present a minimal disposal problem.

But these are only a few of the many possible ideas arising out of systems analysis. Instead of looking at the narrow question of how to dispose of our present deluge of tin cans, the systems analyst looks at the broadest possible question, asking himself why we do not do away with tin cans altogether.

For waste management, for crime, for data—in short for almost any complicated problem facing the Nation, the secret is that no one facet of a problem can be isolated from the broader problem. All sides of any problem must be looked at together—as one system.

That is the purpose of this bill. We hope to build upon California's successful experience. Because of the brilliant work and leadership of Governor Brown, we know the basic idea is feasible. Now we need to do further research to test which specific approaches, and which specific solutions will work best. We need to move beyond feasibility studies to demonstration research tests.

Both the social problems we are dealing with and the men we are asking to deal with them are matters of concern to all of us. For this reason the bill provides that the actual studies are to be conducted in the various regions of the country where the problems require urgent attention, and where the talent to do the job exists. The results of any one study are to be made available to all States with similar problems.

Perhaps one of the most exciting aspects of this approach is that we will take maximum advantage of our highly trained manpower just as our best private firms are doing.

The leaders in this field are the space firms which have paved the way in California. They have developed the techniques of systems analysis and engineering. And they have the commitment to national objectives which is so important to the success of this proposal.

The aircraft-missile industrial complex alone employs more scientists and engineers on research and development than the combined total of chemical, drug, petroleum, motor vehicle, rubber, and machinery industries.

These figures show not only that the aerospace industry has a huge portion of the scientific manpower in America today, but also that we have committed this tremendous national resource to activities which are not directly related to the solution of our Nation's social problems.

It would be highly in the national interest to begin devoting a portion of the talents and brains of our defense and space industries to other national goals of a Great Society. This would require no diminution in either our defense or space commitments. We can do both—we can have guns and butter; we can have a moon shot and a national plan for the abatement of pollution; a polaris project is not incompatible with a new and scientific attack on the terrors of crime. Moreover, the California studies have shown that private firms can help us achieve this objective since many companies in other industries have developed a systems engineering capability.

In fact, this capability and brainpower already available throughout the Nation is a great secret weapon. It is a scientific weapon of demonstrated power, and a resource which represents a huge national investment.

Our task is to recognize that we have the scientific know-how, and the men, to solve almost any problem facing this society. Once we understand this, I am confident we will choose to use the resource; we will choose to set our highly trained manpower loose not only on space probes but on down-to-earth problems; we will choose to use systems analysis, computers, and every modern resource available to us in the quest for progress.

If we do that, we will have launched ourselves on a space age trajectory to the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the bill, and various materials relating to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2662) to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to facilitate and encourage the utilization of the scientific, engineering, and technical resources of the Nation in meeting urgent problems facing the Nation or localities within the Nation, by promoting the application of systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to such problems. The problems referred to in the preceding sentence include, but are not limited to, problems in the area of education, unemployment, welfare, crime, juvenile delinquency, air pollution, housing, transportation, and waste disposal.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall carry out the purposes of this Act by—

(1) making appropriate grants to States, and

(2) by entering into appropriate arrangements (whether through grants or contracts, or through other agreements) with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations,

for the purpose of causing the systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to be applied to National or local problems of types which the Secretary, by regulations, designates as being within the purview of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Any grant made under section 3 to a State shall be used only for the purpose for which the grant was made, and may be used by the State for such purpose directly, or through the State's entering into appropriate arrangements for the carrying out of such purpose (whether through grants or contracts, or through other agreements) with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations.

(b) No grant under this Act shall be made to a State unless the Secretary finds that—

(1) the knowledge and experience expected to be gained from the employment of such grant would have substantial relevance to problems within the purview of this Act which exist in other States;

(2) the State has presented a plan setting forth in detail the purposes for and manner in which such grant is to be used, together with the objectives expected to be achieved from the use of such grants;

(3) the State has designated an officer or agency of the State who has responsibility and authority for the administration of the program in which such grant is to be employed; and

(4) the State agrees fully to make available to the Federal Government and to other States (and political subdivisions thereof) data and information regarding the employment of such grant and the findings and results stemming therefrom.

(c) These shall not be granted to any State under this Act amounts the aggregate of which exceed 20 per centum of the aggregate of the amounts which have been appropriated to carry out this Act at the time amounts are granted to such State hereunder.

(d) Two or more States may combine to apply for one or more grants jointly to carry out the purposes of this Act with respect to one or more of the problems which they have in common and which are within the purview of this Act, and in any such case, the provisions of subsection (b) shall be deemed to require the submission of a joint plan for the utilization of the grant and the designation of one or more officers or agencies having responsibility and authority to carry out the joint plan. Each State participating in such a joint plan shall be deemed, for purposes of subsection (c), to have received an amount equal to the amount produced by dividing the amount of the grant received to carry out such plan by the number of States participating in such plan.

SEC. 5. The Secretary, in awarding grants to States and in entering into arrangements with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations, shall follow procedures established by him for the purpose of assuring that the grants or other expenditures made to carry out the purposes of this Act will be equitably distributed among the various major geographic regions of the Nation.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of making the grants and entering into the other arrangements provided under section 3 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, not more than $125,000,000.

The material presented by Mr. NELSON is as follows:

WHAT AEROSPACE SEES ON THE GROUND—FOUR MAJOR COMPANIES, USING SYSTEMS ANALYSIS, DRAW UP LONG-RANGE PROGRAMS FOR CALIFORNIA TO COPE WITH THE PROBLEMS OF CRIME, POLLUTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND DATA COMMUNICATION

The broad problems of urbanization—slums, crime, traffic, poverty, pollution—are getting tougher every day for planners at all levels of government. Frequently, the problems have defied conventional approaches.

That's one reason why the State of California offered last November to buy from private industry special studies on four of the State's thornier problems—crime, control of wastes and pollution, the handling of information, and transportation. The idea was to find whether the latest problem-solving techniques of private companies could be

brought to bear effectively on the persistent sociological woes of the cities.

As an added consideration, Gov. Edmund G. Brown hoped the aerospace companies, so important to the State's economy, would pick up the challenge and, perhaps in the process find areas of diversification that could head off unemployment if their industry were to decline.

BIG ENTRY

More than 50 companies, mostly from aerospace, jumped into the competition, though the four $100,000 contracts, offered to the winners were unlikely to cover the costs of the study. Even if there had been profits in sight, contracts of that size would have had little lure for companies of the size of the eventual winners: Aerojet-General Corp., Space-General Corp., Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., and North American Aviation, Inc.

The aerospace companies were attracted by the chance to prove that they could handle broad, nontechnical studies for the Government.

Here's a list of the subjects covered, winning companies and some of their recommendations:

The prevention and control of crime and delinquency: Here Space-General urged that the $600 million a year the State is spending on crime prevention be redistributed to bring heavier weight to bear on the more serious crimes. The State, Space-General found, spends only an average $3,700 to pursue each burglar, while it puts out $16,900 to track the average forger in the course of his career.

The study also urged closer attention to the crime-prone age group of 14–29.

The management of wastes: Aerojet-General urged that in the future all aspects of waste and pollution be lumped as a single problem, instead of being tackled separately as, say, garbage disposal, sewerage, industrial pollution. With a unified approach, the report said, society could ultimately convert wastes into usable products, while creating the desired conditions in air, water, and soil.

Statewide information: Lockheed Missiles & Space similarly saw the unified attack as the best one for the handling of information. Its analysts urged that all areas of government, down to the smallest municipality, be covered by an information network that would expand and integrate the existing equipment for data processing. A central index of all data was recommended.

Statewide transportation in the space age: Experts at North American Aviation peered 35 years into the future to find that a synthesis of existing transportation methods with the most far-out projects now being dreamed of would best provide the answer to moving people, merchandise, and raw materials.

The contracts were awarded 6 months ago, and the final reports are just beginning to reach Governor Brown. Already, State officials are calling the studies "unqualified successes," though there are still some critics in the wings muttering "boondoggle."

Generally, it's felt that the studies will make interesting reading for everyone involved in urban problems. But the companies themselves claim that the greatest significance of the reports is that they proved that well-managed systems analysis or systems engineering can be brought to bear quickly and effectively on nontechnical problems.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

In each of the studies, the company used some form of systems analysis—the mathematical and engineering techniques with which they have been handling the complexities of space.

In essence, systems analysis assumes that even the most complex problem is really a series of interrelated but definable pieces. The trick is to define all the pieces, establish the links between them, and then bring in specialists to attack each area. Generally, the experts work in teams, leaning heavily on mathematical models, computers, and science in their efforts to reduce everything to numbers.

The task force approach has been widely used since World War II on large weapons systems, and private industry has been using groups drawn from many fields in their private "think tanks." In California, each of the companies set up a many faceted team, mainly drawn from its own supply of scientists, mathematicians, computer experts, and engineers. Where there were no in-house experts—in such fields as criminology, demography, and sociology—help was sought from universities, nonprofit research centers, and assorted Government agencies.

GROUPS

Typically, on each team, about a dozen specialists would be reporting to their coordinator at a given period, but rarely with the same men working together each week. The broad, complex nature of the studies called for maximum use of technical expertise. Thus small teams of two or three specialists in, say, biochemistry or physics could move in and out of the study group as needed.

It was a fairly costly procedure. Each of the companies figures that it used up about 10,000 man-hours, and spent between $200,000 and $300,000—far more than the $100,000 paid by the State. The high cost was inherent, in the level of training required. For example, North American had six Ph. D.'s in its group of specialists studying transportation.

Right at the start, the State set up its own teams to monitor the progress of each company study. For the technical side, it hired experts from the nonprofit System Development Corp. Each monitoring team was reenforced by State experts, notably from the finance department in its monthly meetings with the industry teams. The monitors had three basic functions:

Preventing duplication of effort by the industry researchers.

Avoiding conflict with other State programs.

Making sure that all existing relevant data was available to the teams.

With fields so broad and complex, each aerospace company had a tough job of coordinating its own research. Thus Space-General quickly bumped into a problem of semantics, for the jargons of mathematicians and space engineers proved sadly opaque to criminologists and sociologists—and vice versa. Discussions of interfaces and feedback loops were as baffling as the talk about reference groups and the culturally deprived.

SATISFACTION

Despite some outside talk of less than perfect efficiency, the contract winners feel that they were ideally suited to tackle fields of such extreme complexity. Says Dr. Ernest R. Roberts, who headed the Aerojet pollution study: "We are operating on the very frontiers of technology in every field, and so we can predict where much of this technology is going. This is quite a bit different from pure extrapolation of present figures."

Roberts argues that what gives the aerospace companies their edge in this sort of problem solving is "the broad spectrum of inhouse technological capabilities." His team included economists, meteorologists, thermodynamicists, chemical engineers, and a physician.

Most management consultants deny that the aerospace industry has anything special on the analytical ball. They argue that the necessary experts can always be hired and that the real trick is to know just what talents are needed for each particular problem.

WHAT'S NEXT?

Governor Brown, enthusiastic over the report, is already angling for Federal funds to continue the research. And the companies, having taken their preliminary loss, are waiting hopefuly for bigger—and more profitable—contracts to turn up.

They got some encouragement this week when Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said he was planning a bill next year to provide Federal funds for research in the sociological problems of the cities. His measure will call specifically for private industry to handle the systems analysis.

Even without Federal help, California will probably carry through Lockheed's information proposals, since the problem is local and the plan probably not too costly. And the State is likely to take some steps toward the 3-year, $10 billion pollution design proposal made by Aerojet. In the other two areas—crime and transportation—the State is unlikely to get beyond the master plan stage, unless it gets Federal help.

---

PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, HELD AT CONFERENCE ROOM 7, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.

Governor BROWN. Ladies and gentlemen, earlier this year I asked the California aerospace industry to tell us whether the system engineering methods that are winning our race in space could be used to help us win some of our social problems here on earth.

We asked them to start with four areas: Crime, transportation, data collection, and the management of the disposal of waste.

The problem of waste management is probably less dramatic than some of the others at first glance, but if we don't learn to deal with smog and water pollution, if we don't find better ways to dispose of garbage and sewage as our population continues to explode—and we will have double the number here in 35 short years—we cannot possibly hope to preserve the quality of California's environment.

Today the report of waste management is ready for release, and I have with me a number of the executives of the Aerojet-General Corp., who will describe to you the report in detail.

Now, this is the second of the four studies we have commissioned to be turned over to the State. Like the first, this one says that system engineering can help us solve the problem of waste management. As a matter of fact, the report says the techniques which were developed to conquer space offer the only logical way to tackle this problem.

Now, as I have said before, these reports represent one of the most exciting breakthroughs in government in this generation. They respresent an entirely new approach to problems that have plagued men for years. They represent a partnership between government and industry.

I might tell you that I spoke with the President, Lyndon Johnson, about all four of these studies on the telephone last Sunday, and he had no comments or anything to say, but I feel confident that he is very interested in following through. He hasn't been briefed on any of these yet—some of the people in the White House have, but he has not. I am hoping that we will have an opportunity to present them personally to him, possibly on one of his trips to the West.

I can tell you that with the filing of these four reports, that I intend to do everything that I possibly can as Governor to follow up the first steps, and this is all these are. These are just the first steps in the programs. I intend to try to follow through in the State of California, nationally, private industry, government, local people, to see that we are able to follow through on these programs in the immediate months ahead.

Now, it gives me great pleasure to present Mr. Wayne Mullane, the vice president of

Aerojet-General, who will introduce his team and take over the presentation to you people of the press.

Mr. MULLANE. Thank you.

Governor Brown and members of the press——

Governor BROWN. Maybe you better move over. Let's move over. This is waste management.

A VOICE. Governor, it seems impossible that President Johnson didn't have some comment on that. Is that literally true?

Governor BROWN. Not literally.

Mr. MULLANE. It is indeed a genuine pleasure for us to have the opportunity to participate in such an exciting and important venture as this pioneering program by the State of California to use the talents and capabilities of the space industry in solving pressing civic problems.

We in the aerospace industry strongly believe that we can make a substantial contribution because of our background in new technology and in tackling complex problems.

As a measure of our company's faith in this approach, we have invested more dollars in this study on the California waste problems than the amount of money that was presented to us by the State of California.

I believe that there is a tremendously significant message in our report. Yet, it is a deceptively simple message, too.

It is this: We must plan now and begin to act now if we are to head off intolerable problems and conditions 10 to 20 years hence.

Today, we are constantly reminded of the inadequacy of our waste-handling system by the presence of burning, irritating smog.

But if we wish to avoid the situation in which water pollution and land pollution will get us to be as annoyed as the smog, we have to take action today.

For example, the extensive quantitative analysis we ran indicate there will be a threefold to fourfold increase in liquid and solid wastes generated in California in the next 25 years. Certainly, these facts command our attention to the problem now.

At the present, our society attacks air pollution, rubbish disposal, sewage and other forms of waste as separate problems. Yes, they have strong interrelationships.

It is the stock in trade of the aerospace industry to undertake massive problems with many complex interrelated elements and develop the cheapest and best overall solutions.

It is this approach that we have proposed here.

All in all, making this study has been a rewarding experience. We have been humbled by the magnitude of the problem, but we are certain we can contribute importantly to the solution.

The aerospace industry is attuned to find the best solution to the problems at the lowest cost. We are not tied by tradition or capital investment to any particular system of waste disposal. We don't have built-in biases. Therefore, we can evaluate and analyze all potential elements and make impartial recommendations for the best solution.

Because of the great significance that we have attached to this job, we have assigned one of our top technical minds, Dr. Ernest R. Roberts, who is our vice president for development of the corporation. He has provided the corporate supervision of the project. He is very well versed in the systems approach to problems and has added a great contribution to our work. He will tell you in detail about the report.

Dr. Roberts.

Dr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Wayne.

Governor Brown, ladies and gentlemen of the press, it is indeed a privilege to have this opportunity to acquaint you with the results of our study. To tell our story in a nutshell, I would like first to define the subject of the most important element of our study, namely, waste. Then, I would like to give you a feel of how the problem manifests itself. I would like to show you the quantities of waste, what we will have to cope with in the next 25, 30 years, acquaint you with what systems approach could do to this problem, what it entails, what would be the cost savings and potential cost implication of such an approach, and finally, I would like just to shortly state recommendations for our next step, what we feel should be undertaken without delay.

Let me first, right away, address ourself——

Governor BROWN. Pardon me. I don't think you have introduced the other members of the team. Don't you think we should do that?

Dr. ROBERTS. I certainly would. As a matter of fact, they are the members who did the job first.

I would like to introduce Dr. Dwight Culver; he is our manager of our life science division. This is the division in which this study is being pursued. I think it might be pertinent to say that while Aerojet-General is in the space industry, we have had in the several past years actual activities which are pertinent to waste management, waste management in, a much more, let's say, enclosed system, such as a space cabin; and these kinds of activities and studies were pursued also in the life science division.

The product manager of the study was Dr.—not Dr., but Mr. Tom Jackson—I promoted him just to a doctor; I think he deserves the degree. He knows enough for it.

I am sorry for my omission.

Governor BROWN. Right.

Dr. ROBERTS. As I say, I would like to start by making clear right away at the outset what we mean by "waste."

Waste is rubbish, garbage, sewage, any kind of a farm or industrial waste or smoke or smog. And, simply, waste is any material, gentlemen, regardless of its aggregate form, which, when it is discarded might become a liability to our public or to our society.

Now, why do we have a problem?

Simply, we have a problem because we have never in the past designed a waste management system which would have been designed to take in account or take care of the waste products of a very fast-growing State like California, fast growing in population, in industrialization and in opulence.

I think this statement is more than substantiated by the fact that we have smog in Los Angeles, we have the open dumps in the San Francisco Bay, we had an incident of contaminated drinking water in Riverside, we have a serious problem of pollution of the Lake Tahoe, and we have piles of refuse practically everywhere around the State.

Now, in addition to the esthetic, the beauty, the impact on health, the waste has also very serious potential impact on our economy.

Right now today we have in California farms where we cannot grow crops except if they are resistant to salt in a way, or to salt content. We have the problem of adequately drained or irrigated lands, but literally our biggest eyesore, which is attesting to the inadequacy of this waste management problem is our smog problem.

I have here a map which shows the State of California, and I indicate here with various colors the regions which are affected today by smog. The yellow little areas are the regions where we have eye irritation occurring as a result of smog. The green are the regions where we have crop damage, plant damage; and the total shaded area is the region where we are having effective impairment of our visibility because of smog.

This is representing by 70,000 square miles, that is about 45 percent, I think, of California; but this is the region where we have 95 percent of our total population.

Similar maps we could design and show which would indicate to you the problem of water pollution and soil pollution.

Gentlemen, this is how the problem manifests itself today. Is it going to be worse or better in the future? And in order to try to give a reasonably authentic answer to this, we have made substantial amounts of computations, calculations, utilizing computers, being in the industry which utilizes computers, to predict the quantities of waste what we will have to anticipate to occur in the next few decades, and we find that if we make our realistic predictions on the basis of population growth, industrial growth, and changing characteristics of the refuse, let's say, composition, we find that in 1990 the percentage growth of our industrial liquid waste production far outstrips that of the percentage growth of the population.

The same way with the solid refuse production, which is approximately twice that of the increase in our population.

As you note here that in the next 25 years the predictions are that our population in the State will double, but the increase of solid refuse production is more than 3½-fold.

Now, the total quantities of solid and liquid waste give you a feel of the increased problem of waste management.

Unfortunately, we don't have such a simple index which would be adequately indicating to you the problem involved in the gaseous waste management. There is a total quantity of gaseous emission, but this is not an adequate indicator of the smog problem; there we have a very complex series of chemical reactions which create this. As you know, smog is a photochemical reaction which occurs when certain percentages, when certain ratios of various gaseous wastes are available for such a reaction under certain extraneous facts and influences; for example, inversion layer, wind velocity, exposure to sunlight, or temperature, pressure, and so on. But in our report, of course, while we didn't present it here with a single line, because it wouldn't have an adequate meaning, in our report we have presented the various gaseous waste emissions and indicated their anticipated growth in the next few decades, and we come to the conclusion—and it should perhaps suffice here to say—that in spite of the devices what we are today envisioning for our automobile exhausts, if we don't do additional clever, preventive measures, we are going to experience in the 1990's a worse smog situation than we have today.

The research and development necessary in this area is more than indicated.

Now, in order to give you a specific, or a few specific numbers rather than just percentages, I prepared another chart, which might ring the bell, perhaps, more effectively.

We have presented here four different types of waste: Sewage, industrial liquids, municipal refuse, agricultural solids. We indicated in these four areas the quantities which we assess to be today in 1965, and what we estimate is going to happen to that type of waste in 1990.

As you may note, sewage, from 3.3 billion, will increase to 6.2 billion tons per year; industrial liquids from 830 million, or 0.83 billion, will rise to 2.5 billion. Municipal refuse, from 12 to 40 million tons per year, and agricultural solids from 13 to 22 million per year.

Now, it might interest you also that the cost of coping just with today's quantities of waste amounts to about $300 million per year; and if we were just to use the extension of the present techniques, just the techniques what we are employing today, how inadequate they may be, we estimate that the 1990 cost to amount to approximately $1 billion per year. And yet, in spite of this tremendous amount of money, the

environment that we live in would continue to deteriorate.

Now, in light of this, I am sure you all will agree that a new look at this problem of waste management is more than justified.

Now, at present we have many separate State and local authorities regulating, collecting and disposing different types of waste. No organization is charged today with the responsibility of studying and managing all aspects of this very complex problem.

We feel, gentlemen, that California needs a system responsible not only for the collection and dumping of waste, but which will truly manage waste in a way which assures us the desired environment. And on that latter part of the sentence, I would like to put the emphasis, because if we wish to put that in an engineering language, we would say that the waste management system which should be designed must be one which is capable to perform to specific output requirements. And this is just like with any weapons system.

Indeed, when you look closer, you find that there is a lot of resemblance; and this is not the only similarity between the two systems.

Practically for every step in the development of a weapons system there is a corresponding step in the development of the waste management system. Now, I certainly don't want to take the time to go into each and every step now, but I would like to call your attention to this one, which is the environmental quality goals. Now, this simply means—a fancy name which simply means to establish standards which would tell us how much pollutants, contaminants do we wish to tolerate in the air, in the liquids, in the soil, and so on.

These are easy statements to make; these are very difficult answers to give. It takes a lot of research and development to come up with very intelligent standards, because you have to keep in mind that the standards that are established will govern the total cost, or will influence tremendously the total cost of the system.

Now, without having established criteria to which the system must be designed to, and against which its performance and effectiveness can be evaluated, no profitable use can be made of the system analysis or system engineering.

For the purpose of our study, we have to make a lot of assumptions. We did so in order to come up with some tentative conclusions.

We have defined a waste management system in terms of its major activities, as it is shown in this one, this slide, or this chart, and we show these activities in a block diagram fashion, which is very accepted in our industry.

The functions to be performed are named, the collection, the transportation, the processing, the disposal, reclamation, dilution or reaction with the environment; and you note we indicate with the arrows the flow of the material. This dotted line indicates the monitoring necessity of the system. We want to know at the end whether we get out of it is what we wish to get out of it, so that we can adjust the system to do exactly what we wish to accomplish.

Now, the task of the system analysis is to evaluate all these operations and to analyze the interrelationships among these functions.

This is done in order to arrive at the most advantageous compromise in each of these operations, to accomplish the most efficient operation of the total system.

And, again, in our jargon we call that the process of optimization.

As you may note, we start the system with the collection, but I am sure you will agree to it with me that no judicious waste management can be exercised without continuously evaluating the waste prevention possibilities and methods.

I wish to emphasize "continuously," because the state of art of technology, which is changing so rapidly, is probably at any given time the most significant only factor—I mean, single factor to determine the balance between prevention and processing, or waste processing.

The best example is today perhaps the fact that we are forced to utilize prevention in case of the automobile exhaust, because we don't have a suitable technology which could economically collect the exhaust products after it is really parted from the automobile.

Now, this is not to be construed that in 20 or 30 years perhaps we will not be smart enough to do it, but if you wish to put that in a proper perspective, I would say that we need a technology similar to that that was accomplished in the solid state physics when we introduced the transistor to replace the vacuum tube.

It is a real massive process. What we need to get it runs over here to a collector.

Now, because of the ease of transforming from one aggregate state to another one, we cannot afford the luxury to look up these three types of waste, solid, liquid and gas independently. They are actually one system, a part of one system, and they have to be handled simultaneously and concurrently. This waste system diagram does not imply a size which should be pursued, or what the size of the system would be. On the other hand, I am sure you realize that in the attainable efficiency of the waste management system is going to play a significant part. Fundamentally, one could conceive of a waste management system which would be so small that it could be contained entirely within each separate home or other source of waste generation. At the other end of the spectrum, I am sure you would agree we would be able to design a system which would serve the entire Nation or continent, and it is unlikely, I think, that either extreme would represent the most efficient choice. It is also apparent that the artificial boundaries which are primarily those representing municipal boundaries would not be the most efficient choice for a waste management system.

Now, we did not reach the point in our study where we could tell what is the optimum system for the waste management which we wish to establish. It is much too complex a problem to come to this conclusion today, but we certainly can say that the waste management system's size will be affected by the meteorological, hydrographic, and topographic conditions which are prevailing in the area which it serves. With this in mind, and this management, let's say, considerations in mind, we have proposed to consider seven regions which closely approximate, I think, the watershed in California, but they are not exactly identical. As I understand there is now an acceptable verbiage which says "problem shed" and that might probably be a problem shed topography, and we show here these several regions which are picked so that each region's characteristics would be either identical or complementary in the sense that it would facilitate our integrating the waste management system as an agent. Each region from each other, of course, both in purpose and in any other way, are different.

Now, before we would decide really what the boundaries of the regions should be, a lot of additional studies should be performed so that our decision should not be arbitrary. Now, having given you a feel of what the waste management system looks like, what it would be composed of, and how we would like to take the maximum advantage of Mother Nature in integrating this system, I would like to give you just a few words about the cost implication.

In order to make a cost comparison between different waste management systems, we must appraise the total cost associated with the system. Now, this means, gentlemen, the direct cost, which is actually the cost and maintenance of the system per se, and the indirect costs, which are the damages that society suffers as a result of the ineffective operation of the system.

Now, this chart shows such comparison between three systems. The very first one is a mere expansion of our present system, you may call it that way, to cope with the increased quantities of waste. We show that the direct cost, which is shown as a blue color, is approximately a billion dollars per year. The indirect costs, which are the damages which are going to accrue as a result of the inequity of this system, amounted to about $6 billion per year. So, the total cost of the system is $7 billion, and I am sure that that estimate is extremely conservative, simply because there are a lot of damages where we can't quantitize. We don't know how to put it into the calculation.

When you have a very bad eye irritation, your efficiency perhaps in doing your job decreases. How much it costs, how much its value, I don't know. And there are a lot of annoyances which have certainly a cost value, but we don't have a dollar figure to put on it.

Now, the next system that we show here, we label as a state of art system. This simply means that we could already today undertake the design of a system which would create substantially better environment than what we have today without any necessity of breakthroughs, R. & D.'s, or any other activity, except just design and put in operation. This would naturally mean that we would have to increase substantially our waste processing activity, and as a result of the direct costs, since you are using the present technology, would go substantially up. As a matter of fact, it would double, but because we would substantially decrease the damages to our society, indirect cost would decrease. So, therefore, the total cost is still substantially less than the one that we have today.

The real logical and intelligent approach to the problem, in our opinion, would be to undertake concentrated effort to come up with improved technology and utilize this improved technology to serve this purpose, namely, our waste management purpose. If we could do so, then, we would have an invention here, a so-called development system where the actual total direct cost would be the same that we are paying for the system today, but the efficiency of the system would be substantially enhanced, and, therefore, the total cost, which includes the indirect cost, would be approximately half of the system that we are going to have, unless we do something drastic about it.

These three cost comparisons are obviously very approximate, and they have a value only to show you the relative magnitude, because a lot of assumption must be made in order to do such cost comparison.

Now, in order to accomplish, for example, a task which would end up as an advanced system, we would undertake a program which would take a total duration of approximately 10 years. Very simply facing it, it is similar to any complex weapons system or space system which we undertake today or what we would plan to undertake in the future. What we recommend right now is that we should initiate, without delay, the very first phase of this program, which is the conceptual phase. And the scope of this phase we would not only define the requirement, we would not only evaluate the number of different conceptual designs, we would prepare a preliminary development plan which would give us a much better understanding of what has to be undertaken to reach the final objective of the 10-year study, and we would actually test in hardware some of the

more sophisticated new advanced concepts in some part of the system to see whether or not we, let's say, just have a patient paper or whether we have, indeed, a very usable hardware. This is our recommendation, because we feel if we act on this today, we have the capability of saving billions, literally billions of dollars in the coming decade.

So, in conclusion, gentlemen, I would like to say that having laid the groundwork for utilizing system engineering, we are convinced that an efficient waste management system, indeed, can be developed, which will not only economically dispose of the waste, but which would help to preserve plant, animal, mineral, and marine resources.

As Mr. Mullane mentioned to you, that it was a challenging study, and I certainly agree with it, and we were very much and are very much impressed by the complexity of the problem, but we are also convinced that the use of the system approach, however complex the problem may be, we will solve our problem, and we can, but we heartily recommend that we should undertake such a problem.

Thank you very much.

Governor BROWN. That was quite an explanation. I hope you fellows took notes on everything. It was really pretty good.

Did you prepare a release?

Dr. ROBERTS. Yes, we did. We felt it is better if the accent is not printed.

A VOICE. Governor Brown——

Governor BROWN. Yes.

A VOICE. What is the status Tuesday of the other reports?

Governor BROWN. I think we are going to get the one on data processing.

Where is Hal Wald? Is he here? Jack Burby?

A VOICE. Coming in, Governor.

Governor BROWN. What is the status of the other two reports, the one on transportation and the one on data?

Mr. BURBY. The one on data will be next Thursday, the 23d, at Sunnyvale.

Governor BROWN. That is Lockheed?

Mr. BURBY. Lockheed. And the North American on transportation is the 30th out at Idlewild at their plant.

Governor BROWN. Where?

Mr. BURBY. Not Idlewild; Inglewood.

Governor BROWN. Inglewood. I wondered if I hadn't heard of a place in California. There is an Idlewild here, too, but it is up in mountains outside of Palm Springs. Might be a good place to release it.

A VOICE. Governor Brown, I am interested in the impact of these studies at the national level.

Do you feel that the problems which inspired these studies are sufficiently important to be in a new department of Government—perhaps urban affairs?

Governor BROWN. I really hadn't gone that far. I am thinking in terms of California. It looks to me like we are going to have to have a department of waste disposal to coordinate all of these things—not immediately, but in the immediate future. I think it would be well to take this up with the Department of Urban Affairs, because this is, to some extent, a problem of the movement from the country to the urban areas. I think a lot of this waste disposal is a problem, and its multiplying effect is due to people moving to the cities.

A VOICE. Governor Brown, how will you follow through on this Aerojet report?

Governor BROWN. What is your recommendation for the next step?

Dr. ROBERTS. We would recommend to undertake the conceptual study phase, which is a 2½-, 3-year program, Governor, which would give us, as I say, a blueprint of action to actually develop and to institute the system in California.

Governor BROWN. This would cost about $10 million for a 3-year program, and I am hoping that we can get some planning money from the Federal Government to follow through on this, because California is really the best place to make this study because of our growth problems and because of the fact that geographically California is locked in by mountains on all sides and the border of Mexico on the other and the Pacific Ocean. This would be a fine place to do this, to follow through on this 3-year conceptual study, but it really will affect the whole United States. All of the system studies will have a profound effect upon living, environment, and government in the United States in the next 35 years.

So, it is a national program, even though we have undertaken the initial studies. It is a national problem, and I am hoping that we will be able to convince Washington that they should make the studies in California, follow through on this, but I do hope that they will aid us financially, because we have other problems in California that are obvious to everybody; the problem of education and roads and highways and schools and crime and mental illness that we are taking care of. And for these studies, I am hoping, we will be able to get aid from Washington.

A VOICE. Governor Brown, has anybody made a study of the political difficulties? For instance, are you going to disregard counties and municipalities? Is that going to be hard to persuade people?

Governor BROWN. Let the doctor answer that for himself.

Dr. ROBERTS. The only way how I can answer it is that we obviously were aware at the very outset that we don't face here a pure technical problem; that we have political, civil, and many other considerations that we have to take into account. We addressed ourselves to this problem, and we find that we can put these considerations as constraints in our optimization and system analysis.

A VOICE. As what?

Dr. ROBERTS. Constraints.

Governor BROWN. Constraints.

Dr. ROBERTS. Similarly like we have constraints in our weapons or space system. The constraints then permit you the optimization and will give you tradeoffs which tell you what considerable political hampering does do or what you have to do to reduce it, and gives you a play where you can, in fact, really show what it means.

A VOICE. In other words, you consider it?

Dr. ROBERTS. Yes.

Governor BROWN. Yes. They have considered it, and you will observe that in one of their diagrams, one of their charts, they have set up regions. Now, they haven't been fully studied, and this is only tentative. This is not a recommendation, but they have studied it.

You notice in our air pollution districts that we are moving beyond municipal lines and county lines. There are areas that we have to consider, and some of the old governmental-political lines will have to go out the window on these things, because waste management is not confined to 1 of the 74 or 75 cities here in Los Angeles County. It moves across all of these lines.

As a matter of fact, it moves across the county. Now, water, you have got your Metropolitan Water District here in Los Angeles wherein the development of water they had to move beyond the county of Los Angeles, and this is what is going to have to happen in waste disposal, too, in my opinion.

A VOICE. Thank you.

Governor BROWN. We are talking now in long-range terms. We are not talking about next year. We are talking until 1990 in most of these.

Dr. ROBERTS. That is correct.

Governor BROWN. When you think of a water project, for example, which is a good example, you start it in 1959. You get it through the legislature. It really won't be completed for 12 years. So, you put this thing ahead 12 years from the start, and we haven't started. That brings it up to 1977, which seems an awful long time away to me right now. I hardly anticipate I will be Governor then. You can't ever tell, though, according to these recent polls.

A VOICE. Governor Brown, could you briefly comment on the special report on crime?

Governor BROWN. Well, we had a press conference on that in Sacramento last week, and I don't want to get off the subject here. These people are all here on waste disposal, and I would rather not comment on that here today.

Any further questions?

Well, thank you very, very much, gentlemen, and I hope you will all watch with great interest the steps.

I have sent two other members of my staff back to Washington. They spent a week back there last week in all of these various departments where these studies will have some effect, and we don't intend to drop this. We intend to move it at the State level, the National level, and maybe even internationally.

Thank you very, very much. That was a wonderful job that you did.

Dr. ROBERTS. Thank you, sir.

Governor BROWN. Even with the accent.

Dr. ROBERTS. It was a privilege to be here with you.

(Whereupon, at 3 p.m., the press conference was adjourned.)

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH AN ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, in behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and myself, a resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation.

Resolutions of this type are not new to the Congress. The first Atlantic Union resolution was introduced in 1949 by the late Senator Estes Kefauver, sponsored by a bipartisan group of 20 Senators. Similar resolutions were introduced in 1951, 1955, 1958, and 1959. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on this proposal in 1950 and again in 1955. In 1960 the committee reported favorably on a somewhat modified resolution to create a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, and this was approved by the Congress and signed by President Eisenhower.

The Commission was authorized to participate in a convention to explore greater Atlantic unity. In January 1962, the Atlantic Convention was held in Paris with citizen delegates from all the NATO countries except Portugal. Unfortunately, the Convention took but limited action, although it approved a general statement, the Declaration of Paris, and recommended that the NATO governments establish a special governmental commission to draw up plans within the 2 years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community.

Many circumstances contributed to the fact that the Paris Convention was not more effective. Today, there is a deeper recognition of the urgency of action. We are moving into the final years of the binding character of the treaty.

In 1969, any party will be free to withdraw. Further, it is apparent that the alliance is in serious difficulties. Fundamental questions about its future and survival are openly debated.

President de Gaulle has stated that France is determined to end the "subordination called integration." Are there any areas in which we can achieve integration without one or more nations believing that they are subordinated? In a broad sense, that is the question which faced the 13 states in 1787, states varying greatly in size, population, and economic strength.

The North Atlantic Treaty since 1949 has been effective in helping its signatory nations "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

It is time now to ask whether the organization brought into being by the treaty shall decline, shall be continued as an essentially defensive military alliance, or be the basis for continuing common efforts more mutual security and development through a Federal union.

The emphasis under the treaty has been on cooperative military efforts. This was the primary incentive for the establishment of NATO, but the purpose of the treaty was broader. The parties, under article 2, pledged that "they will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

Since 1949, conditions have changed and the need for international cooperation has increased. The achievements of science and technology have created new challenges in politics which demand a response. There is a need to consider adjustments and develop new institutions between nations with a common commitment to the "principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

In the practical order, it is necessary to consider specific problems. We have special commissions and agencies and procedures to study and formulate policy on a wide variety of international problems: disarmament, trade, monetary policy. There is danger that this fragmentation so limits our vision that each problem is examined in isolation and resolved by limited action which can be fitted into existing structures.

I believe that delegates from the NATO countries should meet to discuss the possibilities of securing agreement on a federal union. Among the areas which demand attention are defense, trade, and international finance. Any action, of course, must be gradual and include the development of interim institutions.

The resolution we introduce today provides for the establishment of an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 citizens, half of whom shall be named by the Congress and half by the President. The delegation will be authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from NATO allies who will join to explore the possibilities of developing their present alliance into a federal union and of establishing the democratic institutions necessary to achieve this goal.

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

The Concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 64

Whereas—

1. In 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity;

2. Since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advance has outstripped it and made practical union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace and freedom;

3. The fragmentation of the world in new nations, now when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, also requires them to build the pilot plant needed to spread liberty and union both by example, and by admitting to their Union other nations desiring this and able to uphold its principles;

4. They need but unite effectively their gold and other resources behind a common currency now to assure their citizens, and the developing nations, enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and prevent their disunion from ending, as in 1931, in dictator-serving crash;

5. Our Original States, when beset by disunion's dangers under their confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, which traced their troubles to their confederal structure and invented Federal Union, which has enduringly safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State of independent government of State affairs, met other challenges facing the Atlantic allies now, and not merely worked but proved that free peoples can thus work wonders;

6. Distant though NATO's transformation into a federation of the free may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, setting a timetable—as we did for our moon traget—and providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That—

1. The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such NATO allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war, depression, or other manmade catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought to the free in the past;

2. The conventions' recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure;

3. Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from one political party, and all shall be citizens of high stature and wide influence, representing together a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking, and so conscious of its importance and urgency as to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time, in the spirit of 1787 which one member of that Convention thus expressed: "Inconvenient" as it was "to remain absent from his private affairs, he would bury his bones" in Philadelphia, if need be to unite the free;

4. Eight of the delegation shall be named by the Congress and eight by the President of the United States, and all shall be as free from official instructions and as free to speak and vote individually as were the drafters of the United States Constitution;

5. The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower to serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 5, 1965, the names of Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. SALTONSTALL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2599) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS on October 5, 1965.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES L. WATSON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE JUDGE OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of James L. Watson, of New York, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court, for Wednesday, October 20, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place, persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] as chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D–119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, and Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earl Davis; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

## 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. YARBOROUGH:

Address delivered by the Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN to the Veterans of World War I and the Senior Citizens Day Celebration at the Texas State Fair in Dallas, Tex., on October 13, 1965.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965.

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

## CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 858, and that the items on the calendar be considered in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first bill.

## TRANSFERRING CERTAIN LAND IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON TO THE REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 397) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said district was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 871), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSES OF THE RESOLUTION

The purposes of this joint resolution are:

1. To authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to transfer to the Redevelopment Land Agency, the bare legal title now held by the U.S. Government to certain properties located in the Southwest section of Washington, which were authorized for use by various railroads by the Union Station Acts, although legal title remained in the United States,

2. To grant to the Redevelopment Land Agency authority to transfer to the District of Columbia government its right, title, and interest in certain sites within the Southwest section of Washington, formerly occupied by those railroads, which now form part of the land within the District of Columbia highway system. For such transfer the Commissioners are authorized to pay the Agency the sum of $82,896.

Essentially, this resolution clears title to certain lands in Southwest Washington.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

Pursuant to acts of Congress approved on February 12, 1901 (31 Stat. 767), and on February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 909), referred to as the "Union Station Acts," certain public streets in Southwest Washington were closed and abandoned, and perpetual use of these areas was granted to the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and the Terminal Co. Title to these lands, however, remained in the United States. This grant was made to these railroads by the Congress and consideration for the exchange and transfer to the United States of certain land in the District then owned by the railroads.

The areas of land involved in this usegrant to the railroads are comprised of six parcels which together contain 272,237.60 square feet of land, and are located in squares 268, 299, 386, S–463, 537, and N–583.

For many years, these lands were used by the railroads for such purposes as switch tracks, freight warehouses, loading platforms, open air storage, truckloading areas, produce stalls, etc. During this time, also, the railroads paid taxes on this land to the District of Columbia.

The urban renewal plan for Southwest project area C, approved by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners on November 30, 1956, requires that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency acquire these parcels and sell or lease them to private enterprise for the development of commercial facilities in accordance with the plan. Accordingly, during the period from 1958 through 1962, the Redevelopment Land Agency purchased the rights and interests of the railroad companies in these parcels. The purchase price, which totaled $1,521,635, was based upon the opinions of disinterested appraisers with whom the Agency contracted for appraisal services.

In view of the value of the land which the railroads had transferred to the United States in consideration for the right to use the parcels in question, and of the taxes the railroads had paid on these parcels over the years, it was the opinion of the appraisers that the value of the railroads' rights and interests in these parcels was equivalent to the value of the land had the fee simple title been in the railroads. In fact, the Redevelopment Land Agency also purchased some adjacent lands owned in fee simple by the railroads for the same price per square foot paid for the rights and interests in the land referred to above.

At the time of purchase of the rights and interests of the railroads, the Agency believed that, pursuant to the Street Readjustment Act of 1932,the District Commissioners could transfer to the Agency title to the land in the closed streets owned by the United States. On January 7, 1960, the Commissioners entered an order transferring to the Agency fee simple title to part of the areas involved; i.e., former 13th Street, 13½ Street, and E Street SW., all in square 299. On the strength of this street-closing plat and Commissioners' Order No. 60–9, the Agency has paid real estate taxes to the District since the effective date of the order transferring that land.

Following discussions between representatives of the Agency and of the District government, including the Corporation Counsel's Office, doubt was expressed as to the authority of the Commissioners, under the Street Readjustment Act, to transfer to the Agency title to the properties in which the railroads had rights and interests pursuant to the acts of Congress referred to above. In the absence of a solution to this problem, the Agency in a letter dated August 27, 1963, requested the opinion of the Attorney General as to the proper method of effecting transfer to the Agency of title to the properties. On October 22, 1963, the Assistant Attorney General, Lands Division, Department of Justice, advised the Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency that "the General Services Administration, through the Administrator, may assume control of the Government's interest in the real estate as surplus property * * * and dispose of it under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act." The letter stated that if this procedure could not be followed, "it may be necessary for Congress to specifically authorize some department or agency to take control of and convey the interest of the United States * * *."

In a letter dated April 3, 1964, the General Counsel of the General Services Administration concluded "that the Congress has retained to itself the authority to take any further action with respect to the vacated streets."

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The authority which would be granted by the enactment of House Joint Resolution 397 is needed, therefore, to facilitate the ultimate disposition by the Redevelopment Land Agency of these parcels of land to developers

who will construct necessary parking facilities, office space, and retail facilities in project area C, by perfecting the Agency's title to the land.

The land referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution, comprising those parts of former streets in square 299 presently being used by the District government as part of the right-of-way for the Southwest Expressway, is one of the parcels referred to earlier in this report. Thus, by the provisions of sections 1 and 2, the Redevelopment Land Agency would acquire valid title to this land, which the language of section 3 would permit the Agency then to sell to the District of Columbia. The authorized price of $82,896 represents the amount paid by the Agency to the railroads for their rights and interests therein.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held public hearings on this resolution on August 19, 1965, and received testimony from the Redevelopment Land Agency and the Assistant Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia. There was no opposition expressed to the resolution. The committee is informed that the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of the Budget have concurred in approval of this proposed legislation. Accordingly, your committee recommends that this resolution do pass.

## DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "LITTLE NANCY"

The bill (H.R. 5217) to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade was announced as next in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the call of the calendar.

## ANTIDRAFT MOVEMENT DISGRACEFUL AND DANGEROUS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, every decent American will applaud today's announcement by the Department of Justice that a national investigation of groups behind the antidraft movement is now underway. The Department informed me this morning that its investigation will include those contemptible groups agitating in California. Well it should. Over the weekend in Berkeley, a dirty little sheet has been distributed which is entitled "Brief Notes on the Ways and Means of Beating and Defeating the Draft." In recent days people have thrown themselves on railroad tracks in my State in an attempt to prevent passage of troop trains and railroad cars carrying military supplies to the docks for transshipment to southeast Asia. A few contemptible youths have publicly torn up their draft cards in great glee. In my State, the head of the California Democratic Council has enthusiastically praised those who have destroyed their draft cards. Governor Brown, head of the Democratic Party in my State, to his credit, has asked this person to resign, though he has been defended by the State president of the Young Democrats who notes that that organization has "gone on record advocating a shift in our Vietnam policy."

Attorney General Katzenbach has stated "there are some Communists involved" in this leftwing movement. Its ranks are replete with so-called conscientious objectors, beatniks, and those who in varying degrees oppose the southeast Asian policy of our Government.

Mr. President, I am a devoted believer in the right of constitutional free speech and of the constitutional right of any citizen to petition his Government, but what I have described here is far beyond the pale of reasonable or rational constitutional discussion or petition. Indeed, what has gone on sows the seeds of treason.

This is an American problem and both our American political parties share a feeling of revulsion and a demand that the laws of this Nation, including the Selective Service Act, be respected and enforced.

The radical left in all its facets, gleefully infiltrated by Communists, undermines respect and faith in our American Government. What a shocking paradox it is that the radical right, and all its self-styled superpatriotic leaders, simultaneously alleges that our American Government is 60 to 80 percent dominated by Communists. Both extremes are a menace to this land. Thank God, they represent a very small percentage of the fine, decent, patriotic citizens of our country. Recently in Oakland, Calif., a group was formed under the name of Responsible Citizens Aroused. They held a rally over the weekend to counteract the activities of the so-called Vietnam Committee. I sent a telegram to them. I ask consent that a copy of my telegram to that group of fellow citizens and its statement on this general subject issued on Constitution Day be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OCTOBER 13, 1965.

ALEXANDER GRENDON,
*Donner Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.:*

Regret that Senate schedule prevents me from joining you and members of Responsible Citizens Aroused as you gather together on October 16 to reaffirm your faith in the principles of this Republic and to oppose irresponsible and dangerous actions by a few in our country who object to America's role in securing the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. Please express my best wishes to those who have gathered with you on this occasion. I believe that the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of party, support the President of the United States as he attempts to secure peace in that troubled part of the world through the use of American strength and the offer of American compassion.

Regards,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*U.S. Senator.*

---

STATEMENT OF RCA—RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS AROUSED

Today, September 14, is Constitution Day. It is on this occasion that we remember the principles our country was founded upon and the men who have made it great.

But today we also mark with some degree of chagrin that there exists an element in our immediate community which openly challenges the basic framework of not only the community, but the Nation as a whole. This element, currently known as the Vietnam Day Committee, will, in 30 days, stage an organized riot for the purpose of amplifying their position. We would wonder how some of the defenders of our Constitution, such as Sergeant York, Nathan Hale, General MacArthur, and John F. Kennedy, would feel when reflecting upon the Vietnam Day Committee this Constitution Day of 1965.

Responsible Citizens Aroused believes in the principles of constitutional democracy upon which our Government is based.

RCA supports the President's role in the conduct of foreign affairs.

RCA believes in, trusts, and has faith in the discretion, dignity, and virtue of all American people.

RCA is a group of young, bay area people who intend to unite vocal support for our country and its principles and display to the community, the United States as a whole, and the world, that the bay area is populated by responsible Americans. RCA asks for other like-minded citizens to join this effort.

Let us make our position clear:

We are not objecting to picketing and peaceful demonstrations. As a matter of fact, picketing is an old tradition in America. We abhor war and desire a just peace. It is the U.S. leaders who are requesting negotiations. You hear no requests for negotiations from Peiping. We do not, however, subscribe to a policy of peace at the price of the freedom of the South Vietnamese.

The Vietnam Day Committee does not represent the feelings of Americans. Its actions have insulted the integrity of the American people. Its members have called the President of our country a "fascist" and a "dictator." They have called the former U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam a "murderer" and demanded he "stand trial" for his actions before five of their members. They have given the name of bay area cities and institutions a black eye all over the world.

We believe that the bay area community has been insulted long enough. It is now time for patriotic, responsible citizens to stand up in active support of their country and in opposition to the Vietnam Day Committee.

1. We call for pledges to attend a patriotic program on October 16 at a location to be announced, while the Vietnam Day Committee is "attacking" the Oakland Army Terminal. Major speakers are now being invited to address this program.

2. RCA calls for the public, Republicans and Democrats alike, to write their Representatives and Senators expressing support of our Government and the President.

3. RCA calls for contributions to provide advertising for the program and transportation for the speakers.

Contact: Responsible Citizens Aroused, 5350 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif., 655–8601.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have noted with growing concern the demonstrations which have been taking place throughout the Republic.

I believe in the right of assembly. I believe in the right of free speech. I believe in the right of petition. But I also believe in the law, and I believe in the law whether I personally agree with it or not.

I have been shocked at pictures showing some of the demonstrators using cigarette lighters to burn their draft cards. That is against the law. Within the past month Congress has made it against the law. I have been shocked to read that there are certain schools of thought—certain groups, that is—which

are telling young folks how to avoid the draft; how, through the use of drugs, to place themselves in such a condition that the examining authorities would not find them eligible; how some of them have feigned mental illness, how some of them have posed as homosexuals, and how some of them have used other devious means to bring about a situation which I think is a discredit and a disgrace to this country in which we live.

We have only one country, Mr. President. I would hope that those who carry on these demonstrations would recognize that as citizens of this country, they have a responsibility, and that they should act with maturity. What is happening, in effect, is to undermine what the President of the United States is trying to do, as he has said time and time again, to bring about a negotiated settlement of the situation in Vietnam. What these people have done is furnish fodder to Hanoi, to Peiping, and to the Vietcong. What they have done has been a disservice to this country.

There are many of us who have questions on our minds about Vietnam. Not the least among them is the President himself, who has tried through every possible avenue he could think of to bring this matter to an honorable conclusion.

What is happening on the part of demonstrators, who show a sense of utter irresponsibility and lack of respect, who openly flout obeying the law, is to place this country in a position which is unbecoming a republic of stature and dignity.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with all other Senators, I swell with great pride in listening to a great American, MIKE MANSFIELD, a great leader of his political party, in the splendid comments he has just made.

The vicious, venomous, and vile leaders of this infamous movement who attempt to influence young people of this country to evade the draft by fraud and chicanery is an ugly page in the history of the Nation.

Let the whole world clearly understand that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States, now almost 200 million strong, stand for law and order, stand for orderly processes, and support the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, when our country faces danger, particularly as my able friend the Senator from Montana has just indicated, when the Chief Executive of this country is confronted with an honorable commitment to the free people of South Vietnam.

I am exceedingly proud that the Senator from Montana has commented as he has.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment my colleague, the Senator from California, as well as the great majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and associate myself with them in their remarks today.

I have been one of those who supported the President of the United States from scratch on the issue of Vietnam. Unfortunately, this issue is not being presented as fairly as it should be—this is true not only in the slums of our cities, where people are easily worked on, but also in our universities and colleges.

Thank God for the indication that the great majority of the students of America in its colleges and universities are seeking to do the right thing and are beginning to make themselves heard on this very important question.

It is high time that the Senate took under consideration as a major part of its business the points which the Senator from California has just made.

I am only one Senator, but I am sure the Senator from California will agree with me that the Senate should pass a bill to punish, by fine or imprisonment, those who would seek to delay military personnel or military materiel. Such a bill is now pending in committee. I believe that before Congress adjourns, it should make sure that such a bill is enacted into law. There is so much to be said for its enactment, and so much more to be taken into consideration, that we should make it a major item of our business immediately, to punish those who would do a disservice to our land, to our military forces, and to all those who seek so assiduously to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, very much. I associate myself with his remarks with respect to new legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, mention has been made concerning the pending bill, which would make it a crime for any person willfully, intentionally, and physically to interfere with the movement of troops, military equipment, or property. That bill was introduced by me. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is one of its cosponsors. I invite the Senator from California to become one at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to be a cosponsor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. The present occupant of the chair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], is also a cosponsor.

However, I wish to say to the representatives of the Departments of Defense and Justice that I cannot understand why they have not filed an appraisal of the bill with the Committee on the Judiciary.

When I first presented the bill, I made a study—through the experts—to determine whether there was any statute now on the books making it a crime to interfere with the movement of troops. The investigation disclosed that there was not.

For 1 month I have been in contact with both the Departments of Justice and Defense, begging them to file a report; but no report has yet been filed.

The Committee on the Judiciary is prepared to act immediately. It wishes to send the bill to the floor of the Senate. It is waiting for the appraisal of the merits of the bill from the two Departments. I just do not understand the reason for the delay.

This morning, Mr. Katzenbach stated that the Department of Justice would investigate what happened throughout the Nation over the weekend.

With due respect to the heavy burden which the Attorney General carries, I wish he would take a look at the bill and report to the Committee on the Judiciary whether or not he feels it should be enacted into law. I expect that the Department of Defense likewise will make a determination whether it will or will not support such a bill.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As one of the many Senators who have joined the Senator from Ohio in the introduction of his bill making it a crime to interfere with and obstruct the movement of either Army personnel or materiel, I certainly join him in expressing the view that the Departments affected will render a prompt decision, recommendation, and opinion on the matter, because I believe that nothing will suffice so well as to enact a criminal statute dealing with this pressing problem.

I support the position completely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of course, I enthusiastically support the views expressed by the majority leader and the minority whip, concerning interference with the draft. Any violation of the law that strikes so deeply at our security as a Nation must be prosecuted vigorously and swiftly. I support the views of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] which he expressed so vigorously on the floor of the Senate the other day, that this calculated program to defeat the draft must be yanked out by the roots.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are discussing the demonstrations that took place last week that we believe to be harmful to the security of our country. More and more of these events will be happening unless we dig out the perpetrators and leaders of the operations. Between the 10th day of June and the 28th, at Ringwood, N.J., about 40 miles from New York, there was assembled a seminar led by Communist leaders of the United States. Between 75 and 80 students of universities were present. They were paid expenses incurred in going to and coming from the seminar. They were paid up to $50 a week while operating in this particular field.

While they were at that seminar, they were prohibited from making any telephone calls to the outside world. They were forbidden to write letters. They were there to learn the Communist technique of inciting disorder and creating demonstrations.

It is estimated that the seminar in the neighborhood of Ringwood, N.J., cost $100,000. The 75 to 80 students who were present left the seminar and moved back to their respective communities to

carry out the teachings which were given them at that Communist operation.

The point I am trying to make, is that, substantially, these demonstrations are the product of Communist leadership. Countless innocent, uninformed youth of the country are participating in them, not knowing that they are following the flag of the Reds and bowing to the voices of the Communists dictating how they shall create disorder and bring the United States into disrespect.

Mr. President, by unanimous consent, may I have 3 additional minutes?

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. The meeting which I am describing as having taken place at Ringwood, N.J., took place between June 10 and June 28. What I have said is corroborated without question. This matter has been on my mind for the last 2 weeks, and I have been checking to ascertain whether the report is true or not.

Now I go to another matter. On September 11, 1965, at McMillin Theater at Columbia University in New York City there assembled the first panel of the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in the United States. They originally were supposed to meet at Rutgers University. However, when word got out that these Socialist scholars were to meet at Rutgers University, indignation flashed into the mind of a candidate for the Governor of New Jersey, State Senator Wayne Dumont, Jr. He called for the removal of the scholars on socialism. When he did, the decision was made to transfer the meeting from Rutgers University. Mr. Wayne Dumont, Jr., the man who raised the complaint, called for the removal of Prof. Eugene D. Genovese because of the latter's remarks at the Rutger's teach-in on Vietnam on last April 23, when Dr. Genovese said:

> I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it.

In other words, this scholar on socialism stated that he did not regret the impending victory of the Vietcong in South Vietnam; he welcomed it. The meeting was held in Columbia University on September 11, 1965, and various scholars of the Socialist philosophy were present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Speakers were among others, Paul M. Sweezey, Connor Cruise O'Brien, Said Shah, Staughton Lynd, and Herbert Aptheker. One of them was a person who spoke about the riots in California, mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. He addressed the last meeting. He repeated the words that were so often spoken at Watts, Calif.: "Burn baby, burn"—meaning, burn down the buildings and the property and the houses in making protest against what is going on.

Mr. President, we cannot stand idly by with reference to this matter. The youth who are serving our country in South Vietnam are complaining about what we are tolerating back home. They are not complaining about the requirement to stand by their country. Every one of them is responding willingly. There was in my office this morning a Lieutenant Kapelka. Perhaps he is in the gallery now. He received his notice to report to Vietnam. He said:

> I am glad to go, but do something about stopping these disorders which are breaking down the morale within our country.

Whatever steps we take within the framework of the Constitution cannot be too severe in handling this problem.

Long-whiskered beatniks, dirty in clothes, worn down, seemingly, by a willingness to look like a beatnik, are the ones who are in the vanguard.

They are not entitled to our respect. In my judgment most of them are the antithesis of what a real patriot is. They do not have the backbone or courage to stand up for their country. They want to go into some hiding place completely devoid of the attributes and character of genuine true-blooded Americans. They are interfering with the lives of genuine American citizens, and with the security of our Nation.

I will in the next few days introduce a bill making it a Federal felony for a person to induce or influence a military person or a prospective draftee not to respond to the call of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that I have not heard all the statements made this morning on this subject, but I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my own profound contempt for these demonstrations, and my sickness of soul at the weakening of the body politic and the patriotism and spiritual life of this Nation that these demonstrations indicate.

Mr. President, on previous occasions I have said on the floor of the Senate that the fact that people in high places had encouraged campaigns of civil disobedience throughout this land in other cases would bring home at other times under other conditions campaigns of civil disobedience that would be much more far reaching and dangerous than those they had encouraged.

One sure effect of these campaigns and demonstrations, will be to prolong the war in Vietnam. The prolongation of the war will certainly increase the casualty lists of American boys who are being sent there to support this country and its flag. Every protest will cause the Communists to believe they can win if they hold on a little longer.

The time has passed now to discuss the wisdom of our entrance into Vietnam. Many of us have varied opinions on that score. I was one of those who opposed our involvement in that conflict. But we are committed there now. Our flag is committed, our national honor is committed, our prestige is committed, and our whole power for the maintenance of world peace and avoidance of a nuclear war is laid squarely on the line in Vietnam today.

As for the young men taking part in these demonstrations, some of them are pathetic because they are being misled by wily agitators. These boys do not know what they are doing.

Some of them are digging their own graves, because when they encourage Ho Chi Minh to extend and prolong this war, many of them will be caught up in the military draft. Some of them will be trained and sent to Vietnam. Many of them will not come back.

Either that or they will wind up behind the bars and finally receive a dishonorable discharge. They will go through life dishonored and die unsung. They will have failed in the first duty of man—to defend his homeland—and in this case the greatest way of life ever known.

Mr. President, I would that there were some way to reach and punish those who encourage and incite these young people.

On yesterday afternoon I paid a visit to Walter Reed Hospital where I had an opportunity to talk to seven or eight battle casualties of the Vietcong who had been flown back to this country. Without exception, the first thing that each of these men mentioned was these demonstrations. They asked what Congress proposed to do about them. There is a great feeling of bitterness on the part of men who have been out there on foreign soil that American citizens without let or hindrance, and without vigorous condemnation from the press and other media of communication, are permitted to take steps that will slow down the war and inspire the hopes of eventual victory in the mind of Ho Chi Minh.

He has stated again and again that the American people do not have the patience to carry to a successful conclusion the kind of war he intends to fight there. These demonstrations will lead him to believe that impatience with the war, and war weariness, on which he so strongly depends, is already being manifested in this country.

It takes but a handful of people in a demonstration of this kind to generate the opinion overseas that there is a great mass of similar thought, because this is one of the few countries on earth where there can be public demonstrations of this kind against a fixed policy of the Government.

We pay a terrible price sometimes for the freedom to demonstrate in this country, and we pay too great a price when it amounts to a conspiracy to injure the U.S. fighting man 10,000 miles away.

I hope that all of those in positions of power—all of those who encouraged these other demonstrations—will now come out and say this one is aiding a foreign enemy and that we must find a means to deal with it.

It is sad, indeed, to think that so many foolish, misled young people who will themselves be caught up in the draft may pay the penalty of their lives because their demonstrations have encouraged Ho Chi Minh and the Chinese to think that if they will just hold on a while longer, just carry on the war for a few more months or years, the American people will eventually weary of it and pull out.

We cannot leave now, Mr. President. If we do, we will leave behind in that country, where this dirty war is being fought, in the jungles and rice paddles—if we tuck tail and run now—the heritage of greatness, freedom, and courage that has marked this country since its birth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the spectacle of young men, willing to perjure themselves to avoid the draft and willing to let the world know that they do not support other young Americans arrayed in battle in Vietnam in the cause of freedom, is enough to make any person loyal to his country weep.

Ascribing the blame to Communist influence or to leaders of pacifist causes is a subterfuge which does not come to grips with the real issue and does not place the blame where it belongs; namely, on the wailing, quailing, protesting young men themselves.

Where in the name of conscience is their sense of history?

They can indulge in this counterfeit undertaking because this is a free land. But it is a free land because other young men long before them faced up to their duty to make it so and keep it so.

Perhaps they have forgotten that men fought at Valley Forge under ghastly conditions for 22 cents a day or perhaps they are so cynical and cowardly as not to care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that the signers of the Declaration of Independence were hounded to their graves, and perhaps they do not care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that two generations ago, millions of young Americans went to the corners of the earth to resist autocracy and that thousands of them did not return alive.

Perhaps they have forgotten that 17 million were in uniform a generation ago to defend the cause of freedom against dictators.

It is high time they begin to rethink their history and what it cost to give them the lush benefits of a free country.

Shakespeare was right. He said:

> Cowards die many times before their death. The valiant never taste of death but once.

What a tragic future lies ahead for such craven souls.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, I should like to add my word on the subject of the young people who hold meetings and teach-ins and who try to find ways to dodge the draft and avoid military service.

I feel certain that every Senator has had the experience I have had of having to write the parents of young boys who have been killed in Vietnam. They are difficult letters to write. I know something of how those parents feel because Mrs. Saltonstall and I lost a son in World War II.

When, after writing a letter to bereaved parents of servicemen killed in action, I read about the fact that young men and women in various parts of the country—and especially in my own city of Boston where they paraded last Saturday and held a meeting on Boston Common—when I read that young people are organizing against American policy and refusing to meet their service obligations, I am shocked.

As the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, put it so well in New York recently before the Conference of NATO Parliamentarians, it is because we believe so much in the integrity of our country's word that we are giving assistance to the Vietnamese. We have stated that we will help them to maintain their freedom and to maintain their own way of life as they wish to do.

Therefore when we hear, read, and see pictures of these demonstrations we are shocked to think that the participants have no knowledge or understanding of the problem that exists or of what our country is doing to try to solve it. None of us want American lives to be lost. We all want a peaceful world.

I hope that the words that are expressed in this body today will have some effect on the professors and others who are teaching these young people as well as on the leaders of this campaign who are stimulating the young people to act as they have been acting. I hope that the heads of institutions which permit these activities to take place will, while they safeguard freedom of speech, also promote patriotism.

We know the situation in Vietnam is a serious one, to which our Government is giving a great deal of attention and thought. It is taking what it believes to be are the right steps. Some boys will not return from Vietnam. The boys who are there, who are suffering and are exposed to danger, are those who deserve our support—not those who are trying to avoid their duty to their country.

I commend Senators who have spoken on this subject this morning. I am proud and honored to join with them.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today, for the reason that at 4 o'clock on Sunday morning I returned from a 19-day visit to southeast Asia. Because of the time differential of 12 hours between Vietnam and Washington, I thought I would rather get my feet on the ground before I made a report to the Senate of my observations there. I desire, of course, to be exceedingly careful and to go over my notes, so that I will not disclose, in the Senate or outside the Senate, any top secret or classified matter that came to my attention. However, I feel that I should mention one or two incidents at this time.

I was assigned to the visit by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and I, as members of that committee, went first to Korea as guests of the Government of Korea and at the expense of the Government of Korea. The Korean Government requested that this great Nation be represented at their Armed Services Day, when they said goodby to a fine, lean, well-trained division of Koreans—ROK's, as they are called—who were sent to Vietnam to aid in the struggle against Communist aggression. We were present at the departure of 22,000 young men, highly trained soldiers, of Korea.

By the way, on my return trip, when I stopped briefly at Clark Air Force Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, two of the ROK soldiers who had been in Vietnam were already casualties and were being treated in the hospital.

Today I merely wish to speak briefly pertaining to the subject discussed earlier. In the course of the days—and they were hard, long days, extending from early in the morning until night, while in every part of Vietnam, and then in every part of Thailand—I spoke with and shook hands with almost 200 Ohio boys who are serving there in our Armed Forces.

When I asked each of those boys, "Have you any problem?" The answer was practically unanimous: "No, no problem; no problem, sir." Perhaps 2 of almost 200 boys had some problem or grievance, and as one who has served as a private in our Armed Forces, and later as an officer, I could only think that they were liabilities of Uncle Sam from the moment they were inducted into the armed services.

The morale of our soldiers in southeast Asia is of the highest. They have no problems.

I am sure that they are not interested whatever in what the extremists do in this country, and that it has no effect on them.

Recently, in Vietnam, in a tent in a receiving hospital for the armed services, with the temperature around 100 degrees, I saw seven women nurses who were assigned to that hospital. Three of them were there at the time, assigned to work around the clock. In going around and shaking hands with the wounded, I was told, "There is an Ohioan here." Right at the end, I came across a young man, John Hart, of Cuyahoga County, who lived in the neighborhood where I lived some 15 years ago. He is a fine athletic young man. His right leg was amputated below the knee. I talked with him and said: "I am going to talk with your parents when I return to Washington. I shall call them in Cleveland."

He and I talked briefly. When I was leaving the hospital shortly after—and this is something that made me feel very good—the head nurse said: "Senator, I want you to know that that young man was feeling very despondent. His best friend had been killed and he was feeling very low because of losing part of his right leg. When you spoke to him and told him that modern medical science had done miracles and would continue to do miracles, and that, while perhaps he will not be able to play football, he will certainly be able to bowl and enjoy certain other activities, I believe that you helped him greatly. I was fearful about him. However, after you finished, I no longer have any feeling of fear."

Shortly after that, at Clark Air Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, I learned that this young man had already been sent to Walter Reed Hospital. I have an appointment to see him tonight. That is the story of merely one young man who nearly gave his life for his country.

While I was at that hospital, another soldier died. Others were very cheerful and said, "We are just wounded and will be back in combat soon."

The practice is that if they are seriously and permanently disabled, they are sent back to their homes as soon as possible. If they are slightly injured, then, while the extremists are denouncing the fighting, they are sent back to their units, and they continue to fight. As the chairman of our committee stated, it is too late to say that we should not have gone there in 1954, because we are now there, and we have every reason to be proud of the conduct of our soldiers there.

I assure my colleagues that the morale of our soldiers in Vietnam is not being disturbed in the least by what a few extremists in this country may be saying or doing.

## AMERICAN VIETNAM PROTESTERS PROLONG VIETNAM WAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Bill of Rights—the very heart of this democracy of ours—is to mean something, the right to protest must be preserved, even when that protest contradicts what most of us regard as our country's clear interest.

The right of protest is feeble and empty if it must confine itself to matters that concern us little, or on which the Nation's vital interests are not touched.

It is only when the protest offends us and seems to strike at our country's deepest purposes that the meaning of our Bill of Rights—the right to disagree and protest in this democracy—is really tested.

Thus, Mr. President, while I vehemently disagree with the protests against our Vietnam policy, while I am convinced that they are woefully in error, and while I am convinced that they do our cause in Vietnam a grievous disservice, nevertheless where they are lawful and nonviolent, they are in accordance with the essence of our free democracy—the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President in an article published in the New York Times this morning, James Reston points out that one of the supreme ironies of recent years is that these protesters are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and are creating all the things they fear the most.

They are not promoting peace, because if there is any hope remaining in the hearts of the Vietcong and their leaders in Hanoi and Peiping, it is the distant wish that somehow the American people disapprove the Vietnam war and will make their disapproval felt, reverse our Vietnam policies and call our troops home.

It is this wish—this gross misreading of the attitude of the American people—which more than anything else is keeping the war going, in spite of our immense power superiority and our solid military victories. It is this which is preventing peace.

And what is fostering the wish that keeps war going but the protests of the so-called peace marchers themselves?

As Reston says, they are not persuading the President or the Congress, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has clearly and carefully spoken his desire for peace and negotiations, not once, but many times. This country's leaders want peace, and any protester who can read must in his heart know that.

If these peace marchers want peace, the best contribution they can make is to address their plea to the Communists. Let the Communists know that this country is ready to negotiate and that this country will keep on a massive military pressure until they negotiate; but let the Communists know that even the peace groups in this country now recognize that if peace is to be had in southeast Asia, it will never come from an American surrender, but from a Communist recognition of the reality of military power and a Communist recognition of the absolute determination of this country to pay whatever price is necessary to keep our commitment to South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred by James Reston in today's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western World about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that Commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will, in the end, give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937

to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2(3) is amended by inserting "such container and pack requirements provided in section 8(c)(6)(H)", immediately after "establish and maintain".

(c) The proviso at the end of section 8c(6)(I) is amended by inserting: ", carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, nectarines, celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados" immediately after "applicable to cherries".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, was passed by the Senate some time ago. It went over to the House and was amended by the House. That amendment is contained in the message from the House.

I shall ask that the House amendment be concurred in as amended by an amendment which I send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 11, after "lines," insert "olives, pecans,".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, as passed by the Senate, would permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to include provisions for paid advertising.

This bill was introduced by me at the request of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. It covers products which are produced in Florida, as elsewhere, and simply refers to marketing agreements.

The House amendment extends the Senate provision to the following additional fruits and vegetables: carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, and nectarines. The House amendment also authorizes the container and pack requirements of marketing orders to be effective when the price of the commodity is above parity. The present law does not permit that except when the price is below parity.

The amendment I am offering to the House amendment would add olives and pecans to the commodities covered by the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] requested, on behalf of pecan producers of his State and elsewhere, that that commodity be added. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] requested on behalf of the olive producers in his State that that commodity also be added to this bill.

The Department of Agriculture has advised informally that it has no objection to the inclusion of olives and pecans in the bill, and so far as we have been able to determine there is no objection in the House. The bill merely provides authority which may be used if the Secretary finds that it will be useful, and if the producers approve it by at least two-thirds in number or volume in a referendum.

At the time of reporting S. 2092, the committee gave some consideration to a proposal of the National Milk Producers Federation that milk be added to the commodities covered by the bill. At that time the committee felt that marketing orders for milk are substantially different from marketing orders applicable to other commodities and the inclusion of advertising authority for milk would therefore present a somewhat different situation than for other commodities. In fact, the form of the bill would have to be completely changed since marketing research and development projects are not now authorized for milk. There is sentiment on the part of some members of our committee for the extension of this authority to milk. In addition to writing to the committee just prior to the time the committee reported S. 2092, the National Milk Producers Federation offered testimony at page 1139 of the committee's hearings on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, suggesting a draft bill to provide such authority for milk. I do not, however, suggest that milk be added at this time. Milk marketing orders do differ substantially from those for fruits and vegetables, and I do believe that a separate bill should be introduced for milk by the sponsors of such a proposal, so that the views of all interested persons could be obtained and the committee could have the advantage of their testimony.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a moment.

My able friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], has once again indicated his dedication to American agriculture and his ability to bring about a successful solution to the problem.

I thank the Senator on behalf of the olive agriculture industry in my State for accepting its position which will be included in this rather excellent piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to my able friend, the senior Senator from Florida, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OCTOBER 4, 1965.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture Production, Marketing and Stabilization of Prices, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SPESSARD: I enclose a copy of the letter from Congressman HARLAN HAGEN, of California, with reference to H.R. 10206 now before your committee. He notes that this legislation permits certain specified commodities which are under Federal marketing orders to expend money for advertising and promotion. He states that he understands the olive industry would like to have olives included in the list of stipulated commodities which could take advantage of this provision. I wonder if it would be possible to include canned olives in this legislation when it is reported from your committee? If you feel testimony is needed from the olive industry on this, I would be glad to contact Mr. R. W. Henderson to whom Congressman HAGEN refers.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend, the senior Senator from Florida, for the service that he has rendered to American agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the House amendments.

The amendment to the House amendments was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendments as amended.

The amendments of the House, as amended, were concurred in.

## THE GI BILL: AN INVESTMENT, NOT A COST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 20 years ago this fall, the veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the educational institutions of this country under the GI bill. Although many people had doubts about the success of this bill, there has been no better proof in our history of education being an investment, not merely a cost.

In the September issue of American Education magazine, a publication begun this year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. John R. Emens, president of Ball State Teachers College in Muncie, Ind., has written an article entitled, "Education Begets Education." In this article, Dr. Emens describes the vast contributions to this Nation which have come from the World War II GI bill. There is no reason to doubt that similar great and lasting benefits to the Nation will come from the cold war GI bill which this body passed this year by a vote of more than 4 to 1, but which now seems to be bottled up in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Dr. Emens described what happened under the GI bill of World War II when the colleges first opened their doors to veterans in the fall of 1945. He said:

Twenty years ago this fall the first veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the Nation's educational institutions. They were the beneficiaries of one of the most remarkable acts of faith in America's history—the GI bill of rights. Two decades have passed. Today thousands of the estimated 1,445,000 students beginning college are the children of those former members of the Armed Forces, many of whom were the first of their family lines who had the opportunity of a higher education.

This is, therefore, the anniversary of a precedent-setting moment in our country. An act of Congress was to change the lives of millions of Americans and directly influence the decisions of their children.

It is now clear to all that education begets education. Many of the parents of today's

college freshmen would have been unable to go to college without the GI bill. Many young men and women would not be pursuing studies beyond high school now if their veteran parents had returned from the war to a choiceless land.

Mr. President, that is all we are leaving these veterans of the cold war, a choiceless land. They come back, after having lost an average of 2½ years' time. The 60 percent who did not serve have gone ahead with their civilian life, their education, their jobs, their seniority——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have an extension of 3 minutes' time.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And yet, with the experience of World War II and the Korean conflict bill, these men offer their lives in Vietnam and other places, and many lose them, and many of those who come back have injuries to their psyches, to their minds, to their spirits, but we say to them, "You are cast out, you have no chance to go to school."

I say it is time for the administration, now that we have 200,000 men in Vietnam, to call on that House committee to unblock that bill and let us pass it this week. I am confident that it would pass the House by a vote of 4 to 1, as it passed the Senate by a vote of 4 to 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Dr. Emens be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EDUCATION BEGETS EDUCATION: THE GI BILL 20 YEARS LATER

(By John R. Emens)

Twenty years ago this fall the first veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the Nation's educational institutions. They were the beneficiaries of one of the most remarkable acts of faith in America's history—the GI bill of rights. Two decades have passed. Today thousands of the estimated 1,445,000 students beginning college are the children of those former members of the Armed Forces, many of whom were the first of their family lines who had the opportunity of a higher education.

This is, therefore, the anniversary of a precedent-setting moment in our country. An act of Congress was to change the lives of millions of Americans and directly influence the decisions of their children. It is now clear to all that education begets education. Many of the parents of today's college freshmen would have been unable to go to college without the GI bill. Many young men and women would not be pursuing studies beyond high school now if their veteran parents had returned from the war to a choiceless land.

The GI bill, with the choices for betterment it provided, was signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, 16 days after the Normandy invasion. It was, in every sense, an expression of faith in ultimate victory: although the struggle was far from over, the United States had made plans for its veterans. This, as we look back, was a most fortunate time to make a major investment in the future, and this venture proved that education is an investment, not merely a cost, as was recorded in the report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947.

There were some who feared that veterans would have a permanent itch in their trigger fingers. They agreed with the ominous forecast of a sociologist who said that Mussolini and Hitler got much of their strength from veterans and warned that "veterans have written many a bloody page of history, and those pages have stood forever as a record of their days of anger." There were other gloomy predictions: one prominent educator said that veterans "would turn the Nation's campuses into intellectual hobo jungles."

Rejecting such prophecies, the Congress affirmed its faith in the quality of our young people by passing the GI bill without a dissenting voice.

The veterans who took advantage of the education and training section of the GI bill were, by and large, superior students; they strove toward excellence with single-minded determination. Some had been college students for whom military service was an interruption; when they returned as veterans they were even more successful academically. Others were new students, who, as one educator observed, "brought an intentness of purpose to the classroom that brooked few fraternity pranks." The undergraduate campus was soon to have, as another educator said, "a graduate school atmosphere."

Known officially as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the GI bill was designed to give back to a generation of young people something of what it had had to sacrifice during the war years. For the war that had meant death and physical pain to many had also left the less visible wounds of lost time and economic dislocation, spiritual anguish, and uncertainty.

The veterans needed not a dole or a monetary reward but an opportunity to find lost paths, and the GI bill gave them that opportunity. Under the provisions of that bill veterans could get such benefits as guaranteed home and business loans, unemployment compensation, help in finding jobs, and an education.

Victory brought demobilization: the number of returning veterans reached a million a month. The average World War II veteran had been away from civilian life 2½ years, and no one expected him to adapt easily to the cadence of normal life. He faced an uncertain economy, which many experts felt would stagger under the double blow of retooling for peace and satisfying the hunger for jobs. One economist predicted that 8 million veterans—half the number of all the Americans who went into uniform—would be jobless during reconversion.

It was a time of delicate balance. On one side were the ingredients of economic disaster; on the other, the GI bill and the same spirit which had won the war.

Many prophets turned out to have very faulty vision indeed: 7,800,000 veterans took some form of training under the GI bill. By the time the last of the veterans had finished their studies, the Nation was richer by 450,000 engineers; 360,000 teachers; 288,000 metalworkers; as many doctors, dentists, nurses, and scientists as the population of Alaska; enough mechanics, electricians, construction workers, lawyers, businessmen, and executives to populate four cities the size of Indianapolis. According to Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, for example, fully 5 percent of the population of his State studied under the GI bill.

Pete Wheeler, director of the Georgia Department of Veterans Service, has said that those who would have been unable to get an education without the GI bill "fully appreciate the value of what they have received and will insist on their children putting forth the effort to become educated." Mr. Wheeler recalled the expression used at the turn of the century to justify a woman's education: "Educate a girl and you educate a family." The expression might be revised to read: "Educate the parents and you educate the next generation."

This fact is borne out by the findings of the Bureau of the Census (Current Population Reports, series P–20). Young people whose fathers are college graduates are far more likely to continue their studies after high school than those who fathers never had that opportunity. In October 1960 about 62 percent of men aged 20 to 24 whose fathers had completed college were already following in their footsteps. By contrast, 28 percent of men in the same age group whose fathers had completed high school but did not attend college were enrolled in a college. The figure for the young men whose fathers were not high school graudates is even more revealing: only 12 percent had continued their formal education beyond high school.

The direct relationship between the parents' and the children's education shown by those statistics does not end there: only 4 percent of the children whose fathers went to college did not finish high school. On the other hand, 44 percent of the children whose fathers did not complete a high school education failed to receive a high school diploma.

The many letters received by the Office of Education during the preparation of this article add warmth to these statistics.

There is Fritz M. Fossdal, of Lombard, Ill., "All of my education," he explains, "was sponsored by the GI bill. My stepdaughter expects to receive her degree from Northern Illinois University in January 1966. My next eldest daughter is already making plans to continue her education after graduation from high school."

There is Herbert J. Edelman, Brooklyn N.Y. "Only God knows what would have become of me," he writes, "if it had not been for the GI bill. My studies were a factor in my daughter's decision to further her education; she begins college this fall." And there is Robert Matthews, Siletz, Oreg., a high school teacher who studied under the GI bill, and whose son, Kirk William, is now a freshman at Lewis and Clark College, where he was born on January 1, 1947.

And there is Ismael Vega from Puerto Rico, who is perhaps typical of the men who would have been lost to education without training under the GI bill. "In January 1946," he writes, "I was a young veteran with only an eighth-grade education and little hope for the future. The education program of the GI bill of rights was my refuge. It opened many avenues to a good and useful life for me. Today I am the superintendent of schools in Aguada, Puerto Rico, a town of 23,000 people."

There are many more such stories in the archives of American life today. They come from homes where the spark of education has not only brightened lives but improved the economic standing of the family.

According to the Director of the U.S. Employment Service, veterans enjoy an average annual income of $5,100 compared with $3,200 for nonveterans; their unemployment rate in a recent representative year was half that of nonveterans.

With higher incomes, GI bill beneficiaries are also inevitably paying higher taxes. Estimates based on Census and Internal Revenue data show that income added by GI bill training produces tax payments of about $1 billion a year to the U.S. Treasury and that this amount will increase as the incomes of veterans continue to pull ahead of those of nonveterans. This means that the $14 billion cost of the educational provisions of the GI bill has already been well repaid to the Nation. That education is one of the soundest economic investments can therefore be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the most skeptical critic.

But there were other effects as well: the GI bill challenged social stratification. It

reopened society's clogged channels. Large numbers of veterans who before the war had been in relatively low-paid occupations moved upward to much higher paying jobs and to the professions.

As a result of the opportunity offered by the GI bill, the ratio between college enrollment and the college-age population nearly doubled between 1941 and 1940. A college education, formerly too often available only to the well to do, now entered the "lifespace" of youth from other strata of the population. Certainly this program, available to all veterans and administered by the Veterans' Administration without discrimination, opened many avenues to the socially and economically underprivileged, particularly to the Negro veteran.

The GI bill did not, however, include any bar against discrimination by participating universities and colleges. Notwithstanding the enlightenment shown by the Congress when it passed this historic wartime legislation, the Nation still lacked the understanding that would have demanded a civil rights clause in the GI bill. It is interesting to speculate on the progress our generation would have seen had it been otherwise. Perhaps the social revolution we are now experiencing would have occurred 20 years earlier, and—since veterans alone would have been affected—without the degree of rancor we have witnessed.

The GI bill did much to insure, however, that modern America would maintain the belief of the Founding Fathers that the only kind of aristocracy for which we have room is "an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

The field of education itself was to become one of the major beneficiaries of the law. Statistics clearly reflect that the largest group of veterans who needed the GI bill were future teachers. About one-third of them later reported that they could not have finished their education without the help of the GI bill.

Now a new generation of Americans—many of them sons and daughters of veterans—are taking their first steps in higher education. All of them, in some respects, will become the future educators of the Nation. Whether they become teachers, scientists, or businessmen, they will be educators. For as the rich attainments of the GI bill have shown, education begets education.

We need merely reflect upon the accuracy of the 1947 prophecy of the report of the President's Commission on Education:

"Education is an investment, not a cost. It is an investment in free men. It is an investment in social welfare, better living standards, better health, and less crime. It is an investment in higher production, increased income, and greater efficiency in agriculture, industry, and government. It is an investment in a bulwark against garbled information, half-truths, and untruths; against ignorance and intolerance. It is an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy, and peace."

## VICTIM OF CRIME IS THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on June 17, 1965, I introduced S. 2155, a bill to compensate the innocent victims of crime. Since that time, several Members of the House of Representatives have introduced a companion bill to compensate an innocent victim of criminal acts.

On Friday, October 1, Chet Huntley, of NBC News delivered a succinct, brief perspective on this bill which traces the history of the theory of compensation of the victims of crime. Because of the information contained in that telecast, I ask unanimous consent that the script of Chet Huntley's perspective be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PERSPECTIVE

(By Chet Huntley)

The victim of crime is frequently the forgotten man. Modern society has gone on the premise that if the criminal were punished, crime would be so reduced, that society might take comfort in there being so few victims of the criminal. But it hasn't worked out that way. There are more victims of crime today than ever before and jurists and lawmakers in this country and abroad are saying it is time we do something about it.

More on this in a moment after this message from NAVL.

(Commercial.)

A bill was introduced in Congress last June 17 by Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, which would establish a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission to aid victims of 14 specified crimes. This proposed Commission, true, would operate only in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power—the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States. However, Senator YARBOROUGH said it was his hope that the States would follow the Federal example and establish their own commissions.

One State has already adopted the program. California is the first State in the Nation to give limited compensation to the victims of crime. New Zealand and Great Britain initiated crime compensation programs last year. New Zealand paid out $4,888 in the first 18 months of the program; Britain paid out $232,235, in 11 months.

The concept of compensating the victims of crime is not new. It is almost as old as law itself. The penal codes of ancient Babylon, Israel, Greece, and Rome all required the criminal to compensate the victim with a sum of money or property. Compensable offenses ranged from robbery and burglary to libel, slander, assault, and murder. Compensation for crime reached its zenith in Anglo-Saxon England. The seventh century documents from the Kentish laws of King Ethelbert include a list of payments for a variety of crimes. The amount of compensation to be paid in each case was carefully graded. A murderer might have to pay 100 shillings to the victims dependents, but restitution was limited to 20 shillings if the assailant succeeded only in smashing his victim's shinbone.

In the eighth century, two things occurred. The Christian concepts of sin and penance were absorbed into penal law and punishment replaced compensation as expiation for crime. Also, the kings and the feudal lords began to demand a share, or all, of the money formerly given to the victim by the offender.

But now it is suggested that society has somehow failed to protect the victim of the criminal and therefore society should pay.

## MEDICAL CARE SERVICES OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the debate on medicare, it was frequently remarked how far behind most of the other countries of the world the United States was in providing medical care to its citizens. To give an accurate picture of the state of medical care services provided by most of the countries of the world, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Medical Care Protection Under Social Security Schemes" appearing in the June 1964 International Labour Review, on pages 570 through 585, published by the International Labour Organization, of which the United States, along with 110 other countries, is a member, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEDICAL CARE PROTECTION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEMES: A STATISTICAL STUDY OF SELECTED COUNTRIES

The present study is the second [1] in a series undertaken by the International Labor Office to give effect to the recommendations by various committees held under the auspices of the ILO to extend the activities of the Office in the field of social security statistics.[2] Although, like its predecessor, it is also in the nature of a pilot study based only on information available at the ILO, it is hoped that it will usefully complement the first study and throw further light on this aspect of social security statistics.

Medical care systems may be compared from many different points of view; it is therefore necessary to clarify at the outset the types of comparisons envisaged in this study. It should be emphasized that no qualitative assessment of schemes is attempted. Medical care schemes are only assessed quantitatively, from the point of view of coverage or scope of protection, expressed in terms of the number of individuals effectively covered under the schemes. This fact should be borne well in mind when making comparisons between countries.

The contingency dealt with in the study is "condition requiring medical care in general." Medical care provided under employment injury schemes is not taken into account, although such schemes usually provide for the necessary medical care in respect of employment injury victims.

After an initial general discussion of the types of social security medical care schemes, the scope of the study and the statistical data which have been compiled, the study goes on to describe certain specific national systems; here the statistical measures of the scope of protection are also quoted and commented upon. The absolute figures on the number of persons covered, which are of some interest in themselves, as well as the series of statistical measures of the scope of protection, are given in the appendix.

TYPES OF MEDICAL CARE SCHEMES

Different countries have adopted different approaches to the provision of medical care under social security schemes. However, the various systems fall into one or other of the following four categories.

[1] The first, entitled "Old Age Protection Under Social Security Schemes," was published in International Labour Review, vol. 82, No. 6, Dec. 1960, pp. 542–571.

[2] Special mention may be made of: (1) a resolution adopted by the Ninth International Conference of Labor Statisticians (Geneva, April–May 1957) requesting the Office to "compile statistical information from various countries on * * * scope and level of protection"; (2) the report of the meeting of the ILO. Committee of Social Security Experts (Geneva, January–February 1959) in which the Office was asked to "compile and publish information on the scope of protection"; and (3) the report of the Actuarial Subcommittee of the Committee of Social Security Experts (Geneva, October, 1960), which recommended that "the ILO should initiate the systematic collection, general analysis and periodic publication of social security statistics * * * coordinated with the activities it is already performing in the field of social security statistics."

*National health services*

Under the national health service type of program the entire population, or practically the entire population, is entitled to free medical care as of right, i.e., without having to satisfy any special qualifying conditions except the condition of residence; and the whole expenditure, or at least a major part of it, is borne by the State.

*Social insurance schemes*

Under this system, insured persons (and often their dependents) are entitled to medical care, among other benefits; but the award of benefit, as well as its duration, may be dependent upon whether certain qualifying conditions are satisfied by the individual concerned or by his or her breadwinner. Further, such schemes are usually financed on a bipartite or tripartite basis—insured persons, employers, and sometimes the State, contributing directly or indirectly. Most social insurance schemes are limited to employees [3] only, though a few extend their coverage to self-employed persons also. Insurance may be made compulsory for certain classes of persons and voluntary for others; sometimes it is voluntary for self-employed persons or employees earning above a certain maximum. Pensioners are covered under most of these schemes.[4] Many schemes extend their coverage also to some, or all, dependents of insured persons.

*Employer liability programs*

In many developing countries there is a provision in the Labor Code requiring at least the larger employers to make provision for a certain measure of medical care for their employees, and sometimes for employees' dependants also. Some employers take the initiative and provide some medical care for their employees even if they are not obliged to do so by the law. In some of these countries the government provides free medical care for certain classes of employees, for example for governmental or semigovernmental employees.

*Public medical care services*

Finally, most countries provide for some medical care for the population, under the general health services. The state itself, or other public authorities like municipalities, set up clinics or hospitals where medical care facilities are available to the public. Free treatment, however, is often limited to the indigent, other users of the public medical care services having to bear part or all of the cost of treatment. These public medical care services usually act as a second line of defense, serving those not covered by other organized medical care schemes of the social insurance or the employer liability type.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study is to present as complete a picture as possible of the scope of medical care protection available under social security schemes in selected countries. In its inquiries on the cost of social security [5] the Office, instead of formulating a definition of what constitutes social security, has found it convenient to enumerate certain criteria and to include in its inquiries only such schemes as meet them. These criteria are as follows:

"1. The objective of the system must be to grant curative or preventive medical care, or to maintain income in cases of involuntary loss of earnings or of an important part of earnings, or to grant supplementary incomes to persons having family responsibilities.

"2. The system must have been set up by legislation which attributes specified individual rights to, or imposes specified obligations on, a public, semipublic or autonomous body.

"3. The system should be administered by a public, semipublic or autonomous body."

The present study, however, does not cover public medical care schemes under which free medical care is available to the indigent, although these schemes meet the criteria above. The chief difficulty in covering such schemes is the problem of defining and estimating persons who are potentially eligible for benefits. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the public medical care services may be the main, or even the only, form of medical care protection available to the population in many developing countries.

On the other hand, the employer liability type of medical care scheme clearly does not meet the criteria used in the ILO inquiries on the cost of social security; but the fact remains that in many developing countries such schemes established under the provisions of the Labor Code may play a very important part. It is not easy, however, to compile accurate data on such schemes by reference only to material available at the ILO. Nevertheless, whenever it is known that such a scheme exists, reference has been made to it and, if possible, an attempt has been made to present some data relating to the scheme, so that it may be possible to have a better appreciation of the scope of medical care protection in the country concerned. In the cases of India and Turkey it has been possible to give some indication of the coverage under such schemes. As the information available is limited, it has not been possible to insure that all such schemes are covered in all the countries considered. The data on the number of persons protected should therefore be considered as minimum figures setting a lower limit to the number of persons to whom medical care protection is available, especially in the case of developing countries.

DATA COMPILED

In the statistical treatment of the scope of protection under medical care schemes, it is possible to consider three different measures:

(a) Total number of persons protected (i.e., including dependents, pensioners, etc.) as a percentage of total population.

(b) Number of economically active persons protected (i.e., excluding dependents and pensioners) as a percentage of total economically active population.

(c) Number of employees protected as a percentage of total number of employees.

The first measure would give the overall picture of protection in the country, but it raises two difficulties. Firstly, it is usually the case that statistics on dependents are less accurate than statistics on insured persons,[6] so that by including dependents the error in the computed measure is increased. Secondly, bringing dependents into the picture makes international comparisons more difficult because there are wide differences among schemes as regards the relative extent and duration of medical care provided to dependents as compared with what is available to insured persons. These difficulties are obviated in measure (b), where dependents are completely excluded. Measure (c) is proposed because it is the class of employees that is usually the first to be covered by social security schemes and is very often, as mentioned earlier, the only class covered. As the necessary analysis of the global statistics is not available in sufficient detail in many cases, it has often been impossible to compute all the three relative measures described above.

Wherever possible, figures have been given for a number of years running in order to illustrate the trend. The periods covered, however, do not coincide for the different countries; this is necessarily one of the limitations of a study for which such data as were available had to be drawn from many different sources.

In certain cases, when the relative measures were computed, values exceeding 100 percent were obtained. This may be attributed to the fact that the figures compared were drawn from two different sources, e.g., a census or estimate of the protected population on the one hand and a census or estimate of the total population or the labor force on the other. In such cases it has been assumed that the true value of the relative measure in question is 100 percent and this is the value shown in the tables.

The date in the year to which the data on the insured population and the like refer has been indicated wherever it has been explicitly stated in the original source, and comparisons have been made against total population, etc., relating to the same date. In cases where the time reference of the data on the insured population is not known, comparisons have been made against the midyear population estimates. This procedure might give a slightly misleading picture if, for instance, the figures on the insured population, etc., related to December 31 of the year. But the timelag between the two dates can only be half a year at the most, and the effect of this lag may not be very serious except perhaps in the case of fairly new schemes which are in the stage of implementation.

In order to facilitate comparisons, the countries covered [7] have been presented in three different groups: (1) countries with national health service schemes; (2) countries with social insurance schemes of fairly wide coverage; i.e., schemes where the present coverage may be estimated to be at least 50 percent of the total population; and (3) other countries with social insurance schemes of limited coverage.[8]

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE SCHEMES

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. are countries where the population is entitled to practically free medical care, as of right, without having to satisfy any special qualifying conditions. In Bulgaria, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. the whole resident population is covered.

In Czechoslovakia free medical care is available to all persons except self-employed persons and their dependents; however, all children under the age of 15 are entirely covered, and free maternity care is available to all women. At present it is estimated that about 95 percent of the population of Czechoslovakia is covered by the national health service and is entitled to free medical care. Even the remaining 5 percent is entitled to

[3] The term "employees" is used here to denote both wage earners and salaried employees.

[4] See "Medical Care for Pension Beneficiaries," in International Labour Review, vol. 83, No. 3, March 1961, pp. 273–286.

[5] See ILO: "The Cost of Social Security," 1949–57 (Geneva, 1961), p. 2.

[6] In some cases the number of dependants is only roughly estimated, for example by applying a proportion to the estimated number of insured persons. Sometimes the data on dependants are clearly underestimated; the figures refer only to those who are "registered" with the administration and not to all dependants potentially eligible for benefits.

[7] As stated above, the data compiled have been drawn solely from published sources available at the ILO. The following analyses may not, therefore, correspond exactly to the situation in certain countries, and the Office would welcome comments on the data presented.

[8] Absolute figures on the number of persons covered as well as the series of statistical measures of the scope of protection are given in the appendix, except in the case of the first group, where total or virtually total protection may be assumed.

some measure of free medical care; e.g., preventive examination, treatment of contagious diseases, etc., but has to bear part of the cost of other medical care.[9]

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEMES OF FAIRLY WIDE COVERAGE

*Austria*

Austria has a general social insurance medical care scheme which covers employees, apprentices, homeworkers, and unemployed persons receiving unemployment benefit. Pensioners are also covered by the scheme. Dependents are covered but receive reduced medical benefit.

Special schemes are in operation for the following categories: civil servants and railway employees, self-employed persons, and employees of local authorities.

Coverage under all the above schemes in 1960 was about 71 percent of the total population. In 1961 the schemes covered about 75 percent of the economically active population and very nearly 100 percent of employees.

*Belgium*

In Belgium there is a a general scheme covering employees, who are required to enroll with a mutual benefit society or with the public auxiliary fund. There are special systems for miners, seamen, and railwaymen. Pensioners are also covered, as are also dependents of insured persons and of pensioners; dependents are entitled to the same standard of medical care as insured persons.

There is provision for voluntary insurance of self-employed and nonemployed persons and certain other categories like public officials, domestic servants, etc.

About 73 percent of the total population, or 75 percent of the economically active population, was covered in 1960.

*Chile*

Chile has a social insurance program for medical care, which includes wage earners, urban self-employed persons whose earnings do not exceed a certain limit, pensioners, and salaried employees in public and private employment.

There are special schemes for railroad employees, bank employees, seamen, port workers, and other groups. Wives of insured men are entitled to the same medical care as insured women; as regards children, until they attain the age of 2 they are eligible for complete medical care, but between the ages of 2 and 15 they receive reduced care.

The total coverage for medical care may be estimated to be 74 percent of the economically active population in 1960.

*Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden*

The medical care system in Denmark, which is based on social insurance principles, may be described as semivoluntary. It is organized on the basis of sickness benefit societies, and membership in these societies is of two types: active and passive. Passive membership is compulsory for all resident adults who are not active members (optional for juveniles between 14 and 21 years) and is available on the payment of a nominal annual premium. Active membership is voluntary but is a condition for eligibility for benefits; thus, practically all insured persons are active members.

In Iceland, Norway and Sweden too, the medical care schemes are based on social insurance, and membership is compulsory for all resident adults. In Iceland invalids maintained by public assistance are exempt from compulsory insurance.

Children under specified ages[10] are treated as dependents and are eligible for medical care under the title of their parents' insurance.

The coverage under the schemes in 1960, in terms of the total population of the respective country, was as follows: Denmark, 90 percent; Iceland, 94 percent; Norway and Sweden, 100 percent.

The scope of protection obtaining in these countries therefore approaches that found in countries with national health service schemes.

*France*

In France there is a general and compulsory scheme covering all nonagricultural employees, and special schemes for the following groups: agricultural employees, agricultural self-employed,[11] miners, railway employees, public employees, seamen, students, etc. Medical benefit is available to pensioners; dependents of insured persons are also covered and are eligible for the same medical benefits as insured persons.

The scope of protection in 1960 was about 66 percent of the total population. The bulk of the self-employed and nonemployed persons who are not covered by the schemes should account for the remaining 34 percent.

About 68 percent of the civilian labor force and very nearly 100 percent of civilian employees were covered in the same year.

*Germany (Federal Republic)*

There is a general scheme covering all employees; salaried employees are covered compulsorily subject to an income limit of 7,920 marks a year; i.e., those earning salaries above this limit are excluded from compulsory insurance but may insure themselves voluntarily. Certain categories of nonagricultural own-account workers are also insured, subject to the same income limit as above, and pensioners are covered. Public officials have an employer liability type of scheme, the State refunding to them a part of their expenses on medical care.

Dependents of insured persons are covered and get the same medical benefits as insured persons.

In 1960 about 80 percent of the economically active population was insured; the corresponding figure for 1951 was about 74 per cent.[12]

*Italy*

The general scheme applies to employees and pensioners. Special schemes exist for seamen, journalists, public employes, self-employed artisans, and self-employed farmers. All insurance is compulsory; there is no provision for voluntary insurance.

Dependants of insured persons are entitled to the same medical care as insured persons, with minor exceptions.

About 79 percent of the total population appears to have been protected in 1960, as against 60 percent in 1955, reflecting the extension of medical care to more and more workers, in particular to self-employed persons. The proportion of employees protected has remained fairly constant around 90 percent over the same period.

*Japan*

Japan has two principal schemes for medical care, and several smaller schemes covering special groups. The health insurance scheme covers employes of firms with five or more regular employees. It also covers dependants of insured persons for the benefit and provides them the same standard of medical care.

The national health insurance scheme covers compulsorily all residents who are not under another health insurance program.

There are special schemes for day laborers, seamen, public employees, teachers, and public utility employees.

The scope of protection under these several schemes increased from about 74 percent of the total population in 1957 to about 98 percent in 1961.

*Luxembourg*

There is a general scheme which applies to employees (both private and public) and self-employed artisans. Special schemes exist for railway workers and self-employed persons. Pensioners are also covered.

Dependants of insured persons are covered but receive reduced medical benefit.

The scope of protection was 83 percent of total population in 1960, the corresponding figure for 1955 being 74 percent; the increase is clearly due to the inclusion of self-employed persons in 1958. It appears that about 76 percent of the economically active population and 100 percent of employees were covered in 1960.

*Netherlands*

There is a general scheme which covers employees earning not more than 9,700 guilders a year. Voluntary coverage is available to other persons and to pensioners, subject again to an income limit. Special schemes exist for miners, railway workers, and public employees.

Dependents are covered and are entitled to the same medical benefits as insured persons.

The scope of protection was about 75 percent of the total population in 1960.

*Switzerland*

Medical care is provided through a mixed compulsory and voluntary social insurance system. The system is organized on the basis of approved social insurance funds, and the conditions governing compulsory insurance vary from canton to canton. In some cantons insurance is compulsory for all residents; in others only for residents in certain cities. Again, some cantons cover compulsorily only those earning below a specified limit, while others cover all residents irrespective of income. In some cantons all foreign workers are compulsorily covered, and in one all agricultural workers are covered.

Family members have to join a medical care fund individually in order to be covered.

The scope of protection in terms of total population increased from about 56 percent in 1951 to about 73 percent in 1960.

*Yugoslavia*

Yugoslavia has a medical care scheme based on social insurance principles. The coverage of the scheme extends to the following categories: employees, apprentices, students, members of certain liberal professions, elected officials and pensioners, as well as a large part of the farming population.

Dependants of insured persons are covered and receive the same standard of medical benefit.

The scope of protection increased from 28 percent of the total population in 1952 to 49 percent around 1960. Since 1960 the scope of protection has most likely attained a higher level with the introduction of a special health service for agricultural producers.

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEMES OF LIMITED COVERAGE

*Burma*

A general social insurance scheme providing medical care, among other benefits, was introduced in 1954. It now applies to all persons employed in industrial or commercial establishments employing 10 or more workers; railways under the Union of Burma Railway Board; ports; mines; oilfields; steve-

[9] See Zdenek Stich: La Santé publique tchécoslovaque (Prague, Ministère de la santé publique de la République Socialiste Tchécoslovaque, 1963).

[10] Under 15 years in Denmark, under 16 in Iceland and Sweden, and under 18 but earning less than 1,000 crowns a year in Norway.

[11] This scheme was set up in 1961.

[12] These figures, however, do not take account of the public officials' scheme.

doring establishments; and the Social Security Board. Permanent public servants are excluded from coverage. The scheme does not provide any medical care to dependants of insured persons.

The scheme is being implemented in stages in different parts of the country. It is now effective in the capital and in some of the bigger towns.

In 1962 the scheme covered about 1 percent of the total population.

*China (Taiwan)*

There are two distinct social insurance schemes in operation in China (Taiwan).

The labor insurance scheme covers employees in industrial firms, mines, and plantations, with 10 or more employees; public utility employees; fishermen; self-employed persons; and sugarcane farmers, on the basis of a contract with the corresponding employers' organization. This scheme, however, provides only in-patient treatment in hospitals.

The Government employees' scheme applies to officials of both the Central and the Provincial Governments. Under this scheme both in- and out-patient treatment are provided to insured persons.

The coverage under the schemes increased from 4 percent of the total population in 1956 to 7 percent in 1961. In terms of the economically active population, the coverage increased from 13 to 22 percent over the same period.

*Costa Rica*

Medical care is provided under a social insurance scheme which applies to employees earning less than 1,000 colóns a month. The scheme applies in certain regions and is being gradually extended to others.

Dependents of insured persons are covered and are entitled to the same standard of medical care as insured persons. Pensioners and their dependents are also covered.

The scope of protection appears to have grown from about 13 percent of the total population in 1955 to about 18 percent in 1961. In terms of the economically active population, the scope of protection increased only slightly during the same period, from 25 percent in 1955 to 27 percent in 1961.

*Dominican Republic*

The medical care scheme in the Dominican Republic applies to employees in industry, commerce, and agriculture; wage earners in public employment; homeworkers; and small frontier farmers. Pensioners are also covered. Voluntary coverage is available to independent workers, small businessmen, etc.

Salaried employees earning over 46 pesos a week, domestic servants, and family workers are excluded.

Dependents of insured persons are not covered, except that wives of insured persons are entitled to maternity care.

About 9 percent of the total population was protected in 1959.

*El Salvador*

Employees in industry, commerce, and Government employment are covered by the social insurance medical care scheme. However, the following categories are excluded from coverage: employees in firms with less than five workers; those earning over 500 colóns a month; and agricultural, domestic, and casual employees.

Wives of insured persons receive maternity care but no other medical care benefit is available to dependents of insured persons.

About 2 percent of the total population, 5 percent of the economically active population, or 7 percent of employees appear to have been covered around 1960.

*India*

The employees' state insurance scheme, introduced in 1952, applies to employees in industrial firms with 20 or more workers, excluding those earning over Rs400 a month. The scheme is being implemented in stages in different industrial centers of the country.

Initially only insured persons were eligible to receive medical care; since 1959 medical care has been extended to dependents wherever feasible.

The employees' state insurance scheme accounted in 1961 for only about 1 percent of the total population. In the same year the number of economically active insured persons constituted 1 percent of the total economically active population. However, there are a few other schemes for special groups of employees, on which some information is available at the ILO. These are:

1. The contributory health service scheme for Central Government employees in New Delhi; based on the insurance principle, this provides benefits comparable to those under the employees' state insurance scheme, and covers about 450,000 persons,[13] inclusive of dependents of insured persons.

2. The railway health service covers railway employees and their dependents, numbering about 5.5 million.[14] The Indian railways, as employers, bear the cost of the scheme.

3. The Plantation Labor Act provides for a measure of medical care, under an employer liability system, to specified categories of workers in rubber, tea, coffee, and cinchona plantations. It covers about 0.8 million workers.

4. The coal, mica, and iron mines' labor welfare funds, which are financed out of a cess levied specifically for the purpose, provide for the medical care of these miners, among other welfare benefits. The total number of persons employed in coal, mica, and iron mines was about 0.48 million in 1960.[15]

The 4 schemes mentioned above account for about 7.2 million persons. If these are added to the employees' state insurance scheme figures, it would appear that about 3 percent of the total population was covered in 1961.

Considering that the coverage under the employees' state insurance scheme has more than doubled since 1961, it may be assumed that the present coverage under all the schemes should be in the neighborhood of 4 percent of the total population.

*Mexico*[16]

The general medical care scheme in Mexico is based on social insurance principles and covers the following categories: employees, members of productive cooperative societies; apprentices; workers for the state; workers in undertakings of a family nature; homeworkers; agricultural workers; domestic workers; and casual and temporary workers. The scheme is being applied gradually by region and by type of gainful activity. It also covers pensioners as well as dependents of insured persons, who are eligible for the same standard of medical care.

The scheme, which covered only 4 percent of the economically active population in 1950, was being applied to over 10 percent of the economically active in 1960. The coverage in 1961 was probably much higher, considering the rather rapid increase in the number of insured persons from 1960 to 1961. In terms of the total population the coverage may be estimated to have been 10 percent in 1960.

In addition to the above general scheme there are special medical care schemes for public employees and railwaymen. Thus, from the point of view of the present study, the above figures should be regarded as slightly underestimating the scope of medical care protection as a whole.

*Nicaragua*

The social insurance system covers employees in industry, commerce and public employment. Coverage is being gradually extended to different areas and categories of workers. At present the scheme is operative in Managua urban area only.

Wives of insured males receive maternity care, but are not elegible for other medical care; the children under 2 years of age of insured persons are, however, provided with complete medical care.

About 3 percent of the total population was covered in 1961 compared with only 1 percent in 1957.

*Panama*

The following categories are covered by the social insurance system: employees of private employers in specified urban districts; public employees throughout the country; and pensioners. Voluntary coverage is open to other employees and self-employed persons, as also to dependents.

About 7 percent of the population was covered in 1961.

*Turkey*

The first compulsory and contributory sickness insurance scheme in Turkey was put into force in 1951. At the outset only persons employed in undertakings employing 10 or more people were covered by the scheme, but in 1952 establishments employing 4 or more persons in cities with populations of 50,000 or more were brought within the scope of the scheme. Agricultural employees, seasonal workers and family workers are not covered. Dependents of insured persons are not entitled to medical care; wives of insured men, however, are entitled to a measure of maternity care. The scheme covered in 1960 about 4 percent of the economically active population, or 20 percent of employees.

To complete the picture, mention must be made of the following special schemes, which are in fact older than the general scheme mentioned above, but are not based on insurance principles:

1. The schemes covering railway workers and employees of military ordnance factories. The number of workers covered was about 13,000 in 1959.[17]

2. The noncontributory scheme for public officials, which covered about 250,000 persons in 1959.[18]

Considering all three schemes together, it would appear that about 6 percent of the economically active population or 29 percent of all employees was covered in 1959.

*Venezuela*

The social insurance scheme covers employees in industry and commerce, subject to an income limit, as well as their dependants. Coverage is gradually being extended to different parts of the country.

The scope of protection in 1960 was 10 percent of the total population, 11 percent of the economically active population or 18 percent of employees.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As mentioned earlier, this is only in the nature of a pilot study and any conclusions drawn from it can only be of limited validity. Nevertheless, the following observation may be made.

---

[13] Government of India, Ministry of Health: "Report of the Health Survey and Planning Committee" (New Delhi, August 1959–October 1961), vol. 1, p. 131.

[14] Ibid., p. 115.

[15] Central Statistical Organization, Department of Statistics, Government of India: "Statistical Abstract of the Indian Union, 1962" (New Delhi, 1962).

[16] For details see "Medical Care Benefits in Mexico," in International Labour Review, vol. 88, No. 2, August 1963, pp. 157–179.

[17] Mustafa Ertem: "Sickness Insurance in Turkey", in Bulletin of the ISSA (Geneva), June–July 1959.

[18] Ibid.

It is seen that the scope of protection measured in terms of total population varies considerably in the countries covered. While almost the whole population is protected under most national health services and in some countries with social insurance schemes, and at least 50 percent are covered in many other countries with social insurance schemes, the countries with limited social insurance schemes included in the study have a coverage ranging from as low as 1 percent to 18 percent of the total population.

In interpreting these figures it should, in particular, be recalled that public medical care services, which assume considerably greater importance in countries with social insurance schemes of limited coverage, have been excluded from the study. Another point worth recalling is that the figures on scope of protection in respect of these countries should be regarded as minimum rather than as absolute figures, in view of the possibility that employer liability schemes may not have been completely covered in the study.

It should also be noted that the schemes in some of the developing countries covered in the study are fairly young and are in the process of gradual implementation. The eventual coverage under these schemes when they are fully implemented would probably be much higher than at present.

Many of these social insurance schemes of limited coverage either exclude dependents or cover them partially, so that if the scope of protection were to be expressed in terms of the economically active population, higher percentages of coverage would probably be obtained. Lack of data has made it impossible to compute this additional relative measure for many of these countries, but China (Taiwan), Costa Rica, and El Salvador clearly illustrate this point.

Again, most of these schemes cover, in the main, employees, and the structure of the labor force in developing countries is such that the proportion of employees in the economically active population is relatively low. Hence, if the scope of protection were to be expressed in terms of employees, still higher percentages of coverage would most likely be obtained. This is illustrated by the cases of Turkey and Venezuela.

---

## ACQUISITION AND PRESERVATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ITEMS OF EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 836, H.R. 9545.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9545) providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that no hearings were held on this bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The House Judiciary Committee refused and denied an opportunity to Mr. King, the purchaser of the weapons, to appear before that committee. It is my belief that the matter needs more careful study than it has been given. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement from Mr. King, who bought the weapons, which is very revealing, and I think from the letter it will be understood why he was aggrieved at the thought that he was not able to appear before the House committee.

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

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. KING BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE REGARDING H.R. 9545, UNION CALENDAR NO. 366

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am John J. King, the present owner of the rifle and pistol used to such tragic purpose by Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas on November 22, 1963. I wish to express my thanks to your chairman and to all of you for having granted me the privilege of appearing before you in opposition to H.R. 9545, a bill relating to the preservation of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy—a privilege once promised me but subsequently denied by the House subcommittee to which it was referred.

H.R. 9545, while it appears to be a routine bill, is really a most extraordinary piece of proposed legislation; one which merits a most careful analysis and consideration by this distinguished committee.

First, inasmuch as it is a clear and unmistakable effort on the part of the Federal Government to override the statutory provisions of the State of Texas, and to assume unto itself certain powers properly and historically vested in the State, this bill poses a serious challenge to States rights in all areas. If enacted, it would invite further Federal transgression into this important field.

Second, by seeking to take full advantage of honest emotions, this bill would extend the right of eminent domain to personal property, and thereby establish a most dangerous precedent and a basic threat to the future security of all personal property rights. If enacted, it would invite future confiscatory legislation directed at personal property of whatever nature, selected at the whim of the executive branch.

Third, it is unusually nonspecific. It does not identify the items which it seeks to condemn, nor does it define the ultimate disposition of these items. In short, it grants carte blanche to the Attorney General for selection and to the Administrator of General Services for disposition of the unidentified items with which it is concerned. Accordingly, if enacted, it would significantly accelerate the relentless shift of authority from the legislative to the executive branch.

Fourth, it is an attempt retroactively to correct, at the expense of private citizens, certain past executive oversights. House Report No. 813, which accompanies this bill, includes a letter from the Attorney General to the Speaker of the House to the effect that, prior to the completion of its work, the Warren Commission requested the Justice Department to take the necessary steps to provide for Federal retention of certain items of evidence. This is substantiated by a letter from J. Lee Rankin to the Acting Attorney General written on leftover Warren Commission stationery, dated a month and a half after the Warren Commission had completed its work according to its own letter to the President. This bill was requested by the Justice Department over 7 months after the receipt of Mr. Rankin's letter.

H.R. 9545 and its accompanying report No. 813 claim as its public purpose the preservation of items of evidence in order to substantiate the conclusions arrived at by the Warren Commission. Public pronouncements by spokesmen of the Justice Department have suggested the possibility of a future reexamination of the evidence. The weapons with which I am personally concerned have been subjected to every known relevant test and analysis by impeccably qualified experts. The conclusions reached by the Warren Commission on the basis of the testimony of these experts have been widely read and fully accepted—except by a miniscule fringe of irresponsible and unqualified critics. No further tests or analyses are needed. None have been made to my knowledge on previous Presidential assassination weapons. Sulfur casts have already been made of the rifle chamber. They can easily be made of the revolver chambers and of the bores of both weapons. Bolt face impressions can be made of the rifle and breachplate impressions can be made of the revolver. These things, combined with the various cartridge cases and related bullets are all that the Government would ever need for any future ballistic reexamination. Further, no request has ever been made of me or of the Oswald estate regarding our attitudes toward the gift, loan, or sale to the Government of any of our property for which it may feel a subsequent need. For myself, I would of course be more than willing to allow Federal authorities to examine the weapons from time to time and to conduct further tests on them should the need therefor be truly felt, provided, of course, that adequate assurances were made that the weapons be not further mutilated, or altered, or displayed publicly.

The Attorney General's aforementioned letter to the Speaker alludes to the fact that allegations and theories contrary to the conclusions of the Warren Commission feed on secrecy and uncertainty—and I certainly agree with this. It is, however, of interest to me that the present governmental custody of the assassination rifle has been characterized by the utmost secrecy. The FBI refused so responsible a journal as Life magazine to even photograph it.

It is perhaps here in order to observe that, of the three previous presidential assassination weapons (1) the revolver which killed President McKinley—was acquired by private interests; while (2) the derringer which killed President Lincoln and the revolver which killed President Garfield—were taken over by the Federal Government since those two assassinations occurred in the District of Columbia and were hence subject to Federal jurisdiction. Only two of these three historic weapons survive—the privately owned McKinley assassination revolver and the federally owned Lincoln assassination derringer. History thus accords private custody twice as good a record of preservation as it accords governmental custody.

During the discussion on the floor of the House—it cannot properly be called a debate since only the pro side participated—some consideration was given (as it most certainly should have been) to the eventual cost to the taxpayer of this bill. The figure of $10,000 was bandied about as an approximate value of the two weapons with which I am personally concerned. These two weapons are unquestionably the two most carefully documented and most valuable in the world today. From a collector's point of view, they are to the field of firearms what the Mona Lisa is to the field of painting, what La Pieta is to the field of sculpture, and what the Hope diamond is to the field of gems. In short, they are invaluable. Discounting their exhibition value throughout the free world—which in itself is almost incalculable—they are worth greatly in excess of a million dollars. Coupled with the value of the weapons themselves, consideration must also be given to the value of some of the other items concerned, principally owned, in-

sofar as I know, by the Oswald estate. For example, a measure of the value of the original manuscripts of Oswald's 2-page farewell note, of his 12-page historic diary, and of his 17-page undelivered speech may be gleaned from the fact that a miscellaneous Oswald letter—an item considered of so little importance by the Warren Commission that it did not even attempt to retain it—brought $3,000 at a recent auction. It would appear from this that the Oswald papers alone have a value of something over $100,000. If the proposed legislation is passed and its constitutionality confirmed, the constitutional guarantee of just compensation will result in an expenditure of a staggering amount of taxpayers' dollars for the acquisition of materials for which the Government honestly has no further conceivable need.

Finally, this proposed legislation is in the nature of a private bill, specifically designed to reverse the inevitable outcome of a civil action now properly before a U.S. district court. This bill was proposed by the defendant in that action after the complaint had been properly filed, and the bill's pendency before the Congress has been relied upon by the defendant in seeking repeated delays in filing his response. It is noteworthy that defendant's counsel was privileged to appear before the House subcommittee in support of this bill, and that plaintiff's counsel was not privileged to appear in opposition thereto. In other words, you are here concerned with a clear attempt on the part of a defendant, a member of the executive branch, to shift the venue in a civil action from the U.S. district court in which it was properly brought by the plaintiff, a private citizen, to the very Halls of Congress. To my view, this is an outrageous attempt to circumvent the operation of—yes, even a direct insult to—the system of checks and balances between the three branches of our Government. The late President Kennedy himself said: "Our Constitution wisely assigns both joint and separate roles to each branch of the Government; and a President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will neither permit nor attempt any trespass."

In conclusion, H.R. 9545 constitutes an insipient threat to States rights, to personal property rights, and to our system of checks and balances. It represents a totally unjustified waste of the taxpayers' money. It should not be enacted.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 851), explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

H.R. 9545 would authorize the Attorney General to designate, by publication in the Federal Register, which items considered by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy are required by the national interest to be acquired and preserved by the United States (secs. 1 and 2(a)). All right, title, and interest to these items would vest in the United States upon publication of the Attorney General's determination in the Federal Register (sec. 2(b)). Authority to effect such acquisition would expire 1 year after the date of enactment of this legislation (sec. 2(c)).

Under the bill, claims for just compensation must be filed within 1 year of the date of publication of the Attorney General's designation. The bill grants concurrent jurisdiction to the Court of Claims and the U.S. district courts over claims for just compensation hereunder and provides that a claimant filing in the Federal district court may request a trial by jury (sec. 3).

All items acquired pursuant to the bill are to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Administrator of General Services and preserved in accordance with rules and regulations which he may prescribe (sec. 4).

The bill provides that all items acquired by the United States hereunder shall be deemed personal property within the meaning of provisions penalizing removal or mutilation and theft, sections 2071 and 2112, title 18, United States Code (sec. 5). The bill authorizes such appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act (sec. 6).

STATEMENT

In the course of its investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the President's Commission on the assassination acquired a large number of items of physical evidence pertaining to the assassination and related events. The most important of these belonged to Lee Harvey Oswald and his wife. The Commission recommended that a substantial number of these items of evidence, particularly those relating to the actual assassination of the President and the murder of Patrolman J. D. Tippit, should remain in the possession of the Government. In furtherance of this objective, the Attorney General requested the introduction of the present measure.

These items include the assassination weapon, the revolver involved in the murder of Officer Tippit, among many other exhibits. The working papers, investigation reports, and transcripts of the Commission have been transmitted to the National Archives. The items of physical evidence are being retained in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee is persuaded that the national interest requires that the Attorney General shall be in a position to determine that any of these critical exhibits, which were considered by the Presidents' Commission, shall be permanently retained by the United States. The committee concurs in the view expressed by the Attorney General that in years ahead allegations and theories, concerning President Kennedy's assassination may abound. To eliminate questions and doubts the physical evidence should be securely preserved. A failure to do so could lead to loss, destruction, or alteration of vital evidence and in time might serve to encourage irresponsible rumors undermining public confidence in the work of the President's Commission.

The authority conferred by this legislation authorizing the acquisition and preservation of certain items of evidence considered by the President's Commission is vital in the national interest. One private party has already filed suit against the Attorney General of the United States for possession of the assassination weapon and the .38 caliber revolver involved in the death of Police Officer Tippit, claiming to have purchased all right, title, and interest in these items from Mrs. Marina N. Oswald. The Government has not yet responded to the complaint. The effect of this legislation would be to deny the plaintiff possession of these items but would afford due process of law by providing a procedure for recovering just compensation by permitting the claimant his day in court to litigate his asserted rights.

The committee believes that the need for this legislation is manifest and in the public interest, and accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 9545, without amendment.

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 854, H.R. 9495; Calendar No. 859, H.R. 5217; and the two succeeding bills.

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

## TO INCREASE THE APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The bill (H.R. 9495) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 867), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSES OF H.R. 9495

H.R. 9495 would increase the expenditure authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission from $25,000 to $125,000 and would extend indefinitely the time for the Commission to select and report to the President and to the Congress on another design for a permanent memorial to former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

BACKGROUND

The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission was established by Public Law 372 of the 84th Congress, approved August 11, 1955, for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Frankin Delano Roosevelt, in the District of Columbia or its immediate environs. In an interim report to Congress on January 2, 1959, the Commission recommended—

(a) That the portion of West Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, which lies between Independence Avenue and the inlet bridge be reserved as a site for the proposed memorial; and

(b) That the Commission be authorized to conduct a national competition, with appropriate prizes, to determine a suitable design for the proposed memorial.

The agreement of Congress to the recommended site and the proposed competition was expressed in Public Law 86–214, approved September 1, 1959. That law also stipulated that the proposed memorial should be "harmonious as to location, design, and land use with the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Lincoln Memorial," and that the Commission should avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, of the National Capital Planning Commission, and of the National Park Service. There was authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the provisions of that public law.

The competition was organized and held in 1960, 574 architects and sculptors participating. A jury of architectural authorities awarded first prize ($50,000) to Pedersen and Tilney of New York, for their design consisting of eight monumental steles or tablets grouped in a cluster. The winning design was approved by the Memorial Commission, with the inclusion of a statue or bas-relief of former President Roosevelt, and duly reported to the President and to the Congress, although it lacked the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Although it is customary for designs for memorials in Washington to evoke some controversy, the recommended memorial to former President Roosevelt was welcomed with such unusual criticism that the Congress decided to seek a modification in the design. Public Law 87–842, approved October 18, 1962, returned the matter to the Commission and instructed it to report back, with the concurrence of the Commission of Fine Arts, either (a) a modification of the Pedersen-Tilney design, (b) another design from among those submitted in the competition, or, (c) a plan for a living memorial, such as a stadium, an educational institution, information center, memorial park, etc. An appropriation authorization of $25,000 was included in that law.

The present bill, H.R. 9495, would amend Public Law 87–842 in two respects. It would remove the provision that the Commission should report on another design by June 30, 1963, and would increase the appropriation authorization for the Commission by $100,000, from $25,000 to $125,000.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISION

A financial statement submitted by the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission is as follows:

"On August 1, 1965, the Commission had a balance of $203.07 from the $25,000 authorized by 76 Stat. 1079, 87th Congress, and received by the Commission on May 25, 1963. This amount will be completely expended by August 12, 1965. These funds have been used for the operating expenses of the Commission over the past 2 years, and to prepare the modified winning design for presentation to the Commission of Fine Arts.

"The Commission requests the following funds for its operation over an approximate 2-year period:

| | |
|---|---|
| "Personal services (including salary of Administrative Secretary) | $15,500 |
| Telephone and communication expenses | 600 |
| Supplies and materials (including stationery, stamps, etc.) | 1,000 |
| Expenses of Commission members (travel, miscellaneous) | 1,500 |
| Other services | 1,400 |
| Total | 20,000 |

"The Commission feels justified in requesting $80,000 in order that funds would be available to proceed with a plan. To consider any adequate plan for the development of our present site into a park for President Roosevelt, properly landscaped and terraced with a statue of the President—or for any other development of the site that may be suggested—the Commission will have to have a careful architectural plan developed before going to the Commission of Fine Arts. A substantial fee would be required to obtain the services of a first-rate architect, as there are few who do this kind of work."

## DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "LITTLE NANCY"

The bill (H.R. 5217) to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Presient, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 872), explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to restore coastwise privileges to the 35-foot sport fishing vessel *Little Nancy*.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 18 and hearings were held on the bill by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on July 14, 1965. Favorable reports were received from the Departments of Commerce and Interior. No opposition was expressed to the legislation. The bill passed the House on October 5, 1965.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The *Little Nancy* was built in the United States in 1952 and sold to a Bahamian citizen in 1963. In connection with the sale, a second American citizen took a note for the amount of the purchase price of the vessel from the purchaser. The purchaser was unsuccessful in having the vessel transferred to Bahamian registry and after operating the vessel for 2 years surrendered possession to the noteholder. By reason of the fact that the vessel was sold to a noncitizen, it lost its coastwise privileges although in fact never registered as a British vessel. The present owner, who advanced the money for the transaction, seeks by this legislation to have the coastwise privileges restored.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The enactment of H.R. 5217 would involve no additional cost to the Federal Government.

## TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR HARDWOOD LUMBER

The bill (H.R. 10198) to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 873), explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to restore the tariff filing requirements with respect to ocean shipments of hardwood lumber.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

The legislation was introduced at the request of the hardwood lumber industry. The House passed the bill on October 5, 1965, without opposition. The legislation is supported by the Department of Commerce and the Federal Maritime Commission.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Shipping Act of 1916 requires every common carrier by water in foreign commerce to file with the Federal Maritime Commission rates for transportation on all cargo except bulk cargo and lumber. The exclusion of lumber from tariff filing requirements was added by Public Law 88–103 enacted in August of 1963 primarily to permit the softwood lumber industry to compete with Canadian lumber exporters. During the past 2 years the hardwood lumber industry has felt that this exemption from tariff filing requirements on all shipments of lumber was detrimental to their interests in stable ocean transportation rates to Europe although the exemption nevertheless benefited the softwood lumber industry in meeting its primary competitor, Canada.

This bill will amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended in 1963, to limit the term "lumber" under the exemption to softwood lumber and thereby reinstate the previous requirement for the filing of tariffs on the movement of hardwood lumber. No opposition has been expressed to this legislation.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The enactment of H.R. 10198 would involve no additional cost to the Federal Government.

## MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

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 considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 874), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSES

H.R. 11420 will accomplish four purposes:

1. Provide free airmail service for first-class letter mail, including cards, for members of the Armed Forces in an overseas combat area, as designated by the President, or hospitalized as a result of such service. This privilege would be extended on a reciprocal basis to certain military personnel of friendly foreign nations.

2. Provide for the reimbursement by the Department of Defense for the loss of revenue incurred by the Post Office Department as a result of this concession.

3. Establish an air parcel post zone rate for the distance between the U.S. mailing or delivery point and San Francisco or New York, whichever city serves the military post office involved. Present law requires the rate for the eighth zone for such air parcel regardless of the distance involved.

4. Provide that parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined sent by or addressed to members of the Armed Forces at or in care of post offices in overseas combat areas be transported by air on a space available basis between the point of embarkation and the overseas post office. The mailer of such a parcel will pay the regular domestic surface parcel post rate.

JUSTIFICATION

Free mailing privileges were extended to U.S. servicemen during World War II (act of Mar. 27, 1942, ch. 199, 56 Stat. 181, as amended (59 Stat. 542)) and the Korean conflict (act of July 12, 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 891)). Precedent for the extension of free mailing privileges to foreign personnel is contained in the act of February 14, 1929 (ch. 203, 39 U.S.C. 4168), which grants members of the diplomatic corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States free use of the U.S. domestic mail service on a reciprocal basis.

The Military Pay Act of 1965, Public Law 89–132, approved August 21, 1965, enacted provisions (10 U.S.C. 1040) which authorize any first-class mail matter sent by a member of the Armed Forces from Vietnam or any other overseas combat area to be transmitted in the mails without postage. Section 1040 will be repealed by section 3 of the bill.

The committee believes that the provisions of this bill with respect to free letter mailing privileges are preferable to those in 10 U.S.C. 1040 because (1) the free mailing privileges are specifically defined as applying to letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, and (2) provision is included for reimbursement by the Department of Defense for the loss of revenue incurred by the Post Office Department as a result of this special con-

cession to assist a Defense activity. It need only be pointed out that first-class mail under 10 U.S.C. 1040 could include any item up to 70 pounds, whereas it is intended by this legislation to extend the free privilege only to letter mail.

The second important feature of this legislation relates to parcels mailed by or to a member of the Armed Forces. It will correct a great injustice now imposed in connection with the rate on air parcel post having an Army, Air Force, or fleet post office address. This legislation will establish air parcel post rates to and from overseas military post offices commensurate with the air service which the Post Office Department actually provides.

The legislation also provides a means of speeding up the delivery of certain parcels mailed to or by servicemen at Army, Air Force, or fleet post offices in overseas combat areas, as designated by the President. The air transportation would be on a space available basis on U.S.-flag carriers at rates approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for space available parcel service which shall not exceed the minimum rates charged for the airlift of military cargo on scheduled airline service.

COST

The cost of the first section of the bill, relating to mailing of first-class letter mail at no cost to members of the Armed Forces in combat areas, is estimated to be $1.45 million annually. The cost of overocean transportation by air under section 2 of the legislation for parcels between the port of embarkation and the overseas combat area is estimated to be $6 million annually.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

## HOPE FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT EARLY NEXT YEAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when the Senate reconvenes in January, one of the first items of legislative business should be the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am hopeful that every effort will be made to bring this issue to a vote. In the 18 years of its existence, it has been the cause of continued turmoil and unrest in virtually every State in the Union. In many of the 19 States where section 14(b) has led to laws forbidding union shop contracts, there has been a suffocation of union strength and a stifling of economic growth. I strongly favor repeal of section 14(b) as I regard this as an obnoxious section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Free trade unions are vital to the welfare and growth of our Nation. They stand for mankind's loftiest aspirations. Through their unions, working men and women have won hard-earned victories, the fruits of which will continue to be reaped by generations yet unborn.

The facts, are, if any Americans should be and are enthusiastic over the American way of life and the American free enterprise system, it is members of labor unions.

Under our system, they have won for themselves a full life with the highest standard of living anywhere and a fair share of their own production. American workers and American labor unions are the envy of workingmen and workingwomen the world over. They rear their families on the right side of the railroad tracks and they walk with dignity and love of country.

In order to protect adequately the interests of American working men and women, their unions must have the right to negotiate union shop contracts. A union is in an industrial plant because a majority of the workers voted for a union. Our Federal laws provide that unions must afford every worker whether a union member or not with the same gains, benefits, grievance procedure, and protection that all other workers receive. Section 14(b) permits individual States to enact so-called right-to-work laws which permit some workers to derive all the benefits of union membership with none of the responsibilities of membership. This is equivalent to passing a law which states that all citizens are entitled to police and fire protection, to educational opportunities and to all other services provided by government, but anyone who does not wish to pay his taxes does not have to. The right-to-work laws force unions to carry freeloaders.

In reality, they are union-busting laws. Since passage of the Wagner Act, the cornerstone of Federal labor law has been encouragement of labor organizing and of free collective bargaining. Under this Federal encouragement, trade unions have grown and have helped build a strong economy and an unparalleled standard of living. Right-to-work laws stand as a constant threat to the continued growth and welfare of trade unions, and to the continued expansion of our economy.

These laws are bad. They plant government squarely at the bargaining table and interfere with orderly free collective bargaining. They penalize employers by creating instability and uncertainty in the work force. They penalize employees by weakening the unions that represent them. They protect neither rights nor jobs. They are simply a smokescreen for union busting.

Even the title "right-to-work" is a phony one. Right-to-work laws do not guarantee anyone a job. They do not create any new jobs. They hold out no hope for the unemployed, nor can they protect any worker facing layoff from his job. They promote no positive right, and have nothing to do with work.

Many of those who support right-to-work laws and oppose the repeal of section 14(b) have no concern whatever for the rights of union members or for the welfare of American working men and women. They are never heard calling for higher wages. They never speak out for greater job protection or security. They opposed Federal aid to education and hospital and medical care for the elderly and other beneficent legislation for the welfare of all Americans. It is only when they are urging the adoption of right-to-work laws or retention of section 14(b) that they show any interest whatever in the problems of American workers.

Then, we hear loud cries of anguish from all sorts of committees, each claiming to seek freedom from the captive union member chained to his union against his will. Their concern for union members is as phony as the right-to-work laws they advocate. Their real interest is in weakening the labor union movement, and in establishing a cheap labor force.

Though other factors are unquestionably involved, the fact is that in States with so-called right-to-work laws labor standards are lower. These States lag behind free collective bargaining States in economic growth and in per capita income. Their workmen's compensation laws are weaker, and other laws protecting workers are less effective. In this space age, economic factors do not recognize State boundary lines. The result is a drag on the entire economy of the Nation.

For example, when Georgia enacted an open shop law in 1947, per capita income in the State was $432 behind the national average. By 1961, it was $614 behind the national average, a drop of $182. This fact prompted the Atlanta Constitution to observe at that time:

> Georgia's right-to-work law may be crippling the State's economic progress.

Similarly, South Dakota's average per capita income was only $84 below the national average in 1947. After years of experience under right-to-work, it had plummeted to $388 below the national average.

Georgia and South Dakota are not unique among right-to-work States. To the contrary, they are typical.

In human terms, people in right-to-work States have a lower standard of living. They do not receive as much for their work. They cannot buy as much. Their job conditions are poorer, and their job security shakier. What is worse, their prospects for improvement are dimmer, and their children's future less promising.

Despite the misleading title, right-to-work laws are not meant to help working people or to guarantee anyone a right to a job. The one objective of these laws is to hamper trade unions and limit their effectiveness.

American working men and women do not need the right-to-work law, so-called, but they do need the right to unify. They need this not only to protect their own interests but also because only by unification can labor or management have assurance that agreements made between them will always be honored. Repeal of section 14(b) will aid in preparing the groundwork for improved relations between labor and industry. Production depends equally on both. There is a mutuality of interest. Labor and capital are truly partners in production.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act hinders that partnership, is unfair to both labor and management and has a deterrent effect on our entire economy. It has accomplished no purpose worth the bitterness and controversy it has stirred up among our citizens. It should be repealed and forgotten, unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

## THE NEED FOR AN OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, despite the recent enactment of a law creating a new Cabinet-level agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, there remains a real need for an Office of Community Development, situated in the Executive Offices of the President, to coordinate and rationalize the proliferating governmental programs designed to deal with the problems of our metropolitan and urban areas. This was the main idea in a speech by Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, at the convention of the International Association of City Managers, Montreal, Canada, on September 21, 1965. Governor Smylie, who is chairman of the Republican Governors Association of the United States, is an outstanding chief executive whose views on intergovernmental relations, as they relate to the problems of our metropolitan areas, merit serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Smylie's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL-STATE INVOLVEMENT IN METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

As a Governor, I find it a particular pleasure and privilege to speak to an assemblage of municipal officers.

Although I realize that your group has rather widespread international membership, most of my remarks will be addressed to intergovernmental relations in the United States.

I suppose that in a gathering such as this I leave myself open to a charge of gross parochialism by so limiting my talk, and I can only reply in answer to such an accusation that I am most comfortable discussing a topic that I know something about.

Let us concede at the outset that you do not need a primer course in urban affairs. You deal with the problems. You are the workshop.

You already are aware that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. You already know that within 25 years these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people.

You need no proof that there are multiplying problems of city core decline and haphazard suburban growth, and I can spare you further statistics.

With this phenomenal urban growth, the problems of society—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, discrimination, open spaces, and all the rest—have become increasingly complex.

There is no escaping the fact that governments at all levels in our Federal system have assumed increased responsibilities in relation to metropolitan affairs. Competition for industry between the States and a wide variety of other factors have presented State and local governments with an increasingly difficult job in raising the revenues they need to meet their problems—problems which are increasing in magnitude and which frequently cross local and even State boundaries.

Yet, is there a city manager here who would say that the States and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems? The American system has made the responsibility yours. Who can deal better with the problems than those who know them best?

Each of us at the other levels of government needs to help provide you with the sinews it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or only slogans which are going to do it. You know that, too.

As a Governor, I am conscious of the role which we must play in helping you solve urban and suburban problems. I am conscious, too, of our limitations, even as you are conscious of yours.

Perhaps the greatest concern we feel is with the appropriateness of the role of the Federal Government in the solution of urban problems, indeed, with the role of the Federal Government in solving human problems in general.

One extreme says that the Federal Government has no role at all, and the other extreme says that this is an exclusive Federal problem and the States and localities have no role. Most of us reject both extremes.

The extreme which perhaps concerns us most, because it seems to be growing more vocal, says that State and local governments have abrogated their responsibilities and should be bypassed in the world of tomorrow. They make the case that at the State and local level, we have not taken the lead in solving some of these human problems and we are, therefore, incompetent.

There is no understanding of the tremendous lack of financial capacity under which States and localities labor. We might facetiously suggest to these critics of State and local government that, perhaps, we would show more leadership at the State and local level if the State and local governments could have all of the revenue from the Federal corporate and personal income tax.

State and local governments would then be in a position of making grants-in-aid to the Federal Government, provided, of course, that the Federal Government would meet certain standards established by the State and local governments.

We would, of course, be willing, in turn, to surrender to the Federal Government our less lucrative State and local tax sources.

None of us would, of course, advocate such policies except in a humorous vein, but it does illustrate the very grave problems of finance that we have in the local government field and it does indicate to anyone who will listen that we, at the State and local government level, will very strongly support proposals which we now understand to be under active consideration, to turn back some revenues to the State and local governments on a nonearmarked basis.

Perhaps this single move would do more to revitalize State and local government and to install new confidence in our capacity to solve problems than any other development.

We fear that even these measures, however, will not still the critics of State and local government. These people always delight in pointing out, for example, that in the typical urban area, we have a whole welter of cities, counties, townships, school districts, special service districts, and other local units of government, and that it is impossible for us to function.

The implication, of course, is that the Federal Government is superbly well-organized and they do not have the problems of fragmentation.

I would suggest to these critics, then that they make a little analysis and they will find, for example, that some 30 Federal agencies have some role in providing financial assistance, technical aid or planning assistance in the area of recreation alone. I believe that they will discover that there are some 50 Federal agencies that are providing planning assistance of one type or another.

Again, we are not suggesting that there is one effective way to organize the Federal Government to decrease this fragmentation, but we are suggesting that the Federal Government does not have a much better record in this regard than we do at the State and local level.

We also hear, and I think quite properly, that we are less effective at the local level because there is city and county rivalry in areas where it is not constructive. We plead guilty, and we are doing everything we can to decrease this tension. However, we would also point out that if you think you have really seen interagency rivalry at the local level, you ought to examine the rivalry between the various Federal agencies in Washington over who is to administer new programs.

We also hear our critics say that those at the city and county level have inadequate governmental machinery. We plead guilty, but, again, is the Federal Government doing much better? We hear, for example, that every one of our counties should have a planning agency and we certainly agree, but where is the Federal planning agency? Where is the Federal long-range capital improvement program? Where do we go to find out what the Federal Government plans to do in the way of capital construction in the next 5 years?

Again, the point is not to downgrade the Federal Government, but to see these problems in perspective and to find ways to correct our common weaknesses.

The creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs—now a fact—is the latest step and an obviously important one, in nailing down the primacy of the Federal interest in your affairs. Simply elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet status will not, I submit, solve very many, if any, of your problems.

For even with the Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs now a reality, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government as they affect urban and suburban areas is a necessity. We do need—and badly—an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

Here is why it is necessary. By ignoring some 60 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and elevating HHFA to Cabinet rank, a Department of Urban Affairs cannot hope to achieve coordination, efficiency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines.

The necessary coordination can be achieved without any drastic increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning bureaucracy, by an Office of Community Development in the White House.

To understand why just changing the status of HHFA won't do the job, let's look at the relationships of some Federal programs today. Take the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, under the Commerce Department and the HHFA, for example. Under the President's plan, the activities of public roads will not be brought into the new Department. Highway planners, as you all know, have great concern for traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones.

Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and HHFA—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash. And, in some urban places in America, it can raise cain with the dream of America the beautiful.

By way of example, in one urban Eastern area, some of the most far-reaching urban renewal projects in the Nation are underway. The Federal Government has committed hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out more than a dozen projects in this area.

But in the same densely populated urban complex, an interstate highway is planned. It is sorely needed to break a traffic stranglehold which is delaying economic and social progress throughout the region. It would be built with Interstate Highway funds, 90 percent supplied by the Federal Government. The highway would pass through or near a number of urban redevelopment areas. This causes local officials to insist that, in order to avoid construction of a Chinese wall through the communities, the freeway should be built below existing surface level.

This, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads refused to do. According to the Bureau, it would cost the highway trust fund an additional $5 million. Arguing the local case for a depressed freeway, officials pointed to the obvious evidence of dilapidated residential and commercial areas alongside an elevated railroad structure which is located only a half-mile from the site of the proposed freeway. Here, they said was proof positive that an elevated structure can depress property values and help create new slums.

Only an ingenious financial solution arrived at by State highway officials in cooperation with city officials saved the day and permitted the freeway to be built at a lower level.

This is an absurd situation. The Federal Government, through HHFA, would be paying out of one pocket for urban redevelopment at 20 times the cost of depressing the highway through these urban renewal areas.

Clearly, these Federal programs are in conflict. Two Federal pocketbooks are involved, one, the loan and grant fund of the Urban Renewal Administration and the other the highway trust fund of the Bureau of Public Roads. Because the immediate decision involved highway design, the Bureau of Public Roads was the tail which wagged the urban dog.

Clearly, this situation will not be helped one iota by elevating HHFA to the same status as the Department of Commerce, in which the Bureau of Public Roads is housed. Rather, a referee is needed in this dispute between urban redevelopment priorities and highway location and design. A White House office manned by persons with extensive experience in State and local problems would seem to be a more appropriate umpire.

There are other problems, too, in the urban scheme of things, with regard to the relative place of highways and rapid transit plans.

Some months back, the White House released a technical report prepared by a group of experts which suggested, in part, that more express buses, operating in reserved traffic lanes, might be mass transit's answer to the growing problem of traffic jams that tend to strangle our metropolitan areas. Conceivably, the Mass Transportation Act now on the books, will yield not nearly as much an increase in rail passenger facilities as it will a significant increase in express buses on our highways.

There is clearly no objection to locating mass transit programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But a significant increase in the number of buses on the streets would quite obviously affect what another agency of Government is trying to do to combat air pollution. And this is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Today, these activities of the Federal Government are administratively unrelated. Nor would they be related under the proposal submitted by the President and approved by Congress to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Beyond this, duplication and waste would inevitably follow if mass transit plans are centered in the new Department while another Federal agency, the Department of Commerce, continues to guide, finance, and control the construction of urban and suburban roads.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs.

Nor will the new Federal Department help you in your efforts to wage a war on poverty. For the new Department created in part to establish a more direct line between Washington and the cities will do absolutely nothing, per se, to make you partners in the administration of local antipoverty programs.

Beyond that, how many of you have seriously considered how you are going to find your increased share of funds—a 40-percent increase—required by law if the poverty program is to continue beyond August 20, 1966?

The program calls for Federal assistance for the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs up to 90 percent of costs for the 2-year period ending August 20, 1966, or 50 percent thereafter.

Local governing bodies, to say nothing of city managers, are generally bypassed by the direct contact between poverty officials in Washington and local action groups, but where will the pressures go for continuation of the program with 40 percent less Federal participation?

Why, the pressures are just as liable to end on the desk of the city managers—and you know it. You are going to be hounded by a public acclimated to the program. But you will be asked to find the money for a program in which you have participated not at all.

Now, the purpose of my comments has not been to detract one iota from the important role the Federal Government can, and must, play in solving metropolitan problems; rather, I hope that I have left with you today a healthy skepticism regarding the Federal Government's ability to offer instant solutions to perennial metropolitan problems.

The same administrative hurdles that have impeded solution of these problems by State and local officials are merely multiplied by the current trend of Federal intervention.

Instead of a proliferation of agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels with overlapping jurisdictions and built-in self-interests, can't we begin to talk about interjurisdictional planning agencies that will benefit from the knowledge, finances, and energies of all three levels of government as they seek common solutions to problems that are indeed the common property of us all regardless of where we live.

If an Office of Community Development in the White House could be designed to accomplish this goal, I feel we would be taking a real step in the proper direction.

## WEARY OF ALL DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for those of us who support the administration's policy in South Vietnam, it is heartening to know that not all the opponents of that policy believe in public demonstrations or pro-Communist protests.

The Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register recently has voiced opposition to the administration's policy on South Vietnam, but an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, October 17, 1965, edition voices stronger criticism to protest demonstrations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

WEARY OF ALL DEMONSTRATIONS

Regardless of one's personal views on U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, there can be no condoning the type of protest demonstrations being staged around the country.

To tell the truth we are sick and tired of all demonstrations, marches, riots, and disorders and we believe the majority of Americans are weary of the same. By now it should be clear that even the most sincere and honest of these protests sooner or later become the vehicles for infiltration by pro-Communist agitators, wild-eyed beatniks, and ordinary law breakers.

On Friday the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released a study to support what it termed the Communist infiltration and exploitation of the teach-in movement on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The report read, "A substantial Communist infiltration (of the teach-in movement) is demonstrable, a much more substantial infiltration is probable, and there has been a tragic blurring of the distinction between the position of those who oppose our involvement in Vietnam on pacifist or idealist or strategic or other grounds, and those who oppose our involvement in the war because they are Communists or pro-Communists."

Simply because a movement of this nature is sponsored by an institution of higher learning does not mean that it is free of Communist taint or exploitation by extremists and even hoodlums. Many a worthwhile cause has been terribly damaged because of such infiltration and Americans are becoming increasingly disgusted with such mob tactics.

There is nothing wrong with speaking out in disagreement with Government policies, but there is no need to resort to mass rallies in the streets, sit-in demonstrations and disorderly conduct which disturbs the peace and welfare of the country.

Already we have spawned such shocking episodes as seeing young Americans tearing up their draft cards and rebelling against military service. Unfortunately, the protest movements set an example for our younger people and in a way many of these efforts directly involve the youth.

What must be remembered is that half of today's world population is under 18 years of age. By next year half of the U.S. population will be under 25. Youth therefore is a potentially explosive force, which unless channeled into productive paths, can lead in the future to upheaval and rioting for the mere thrill of rioting. If there is no way left in our Nation to register a dissenting opinion, other than through civil disobedience and mob tactics, then we are in a sad way indeed.

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like my colleagues to note that today is the anniversary of the birth of Ellen Browning Scripps, one of the most intelligent and selfless ladies our country has known. I want to take this occasion to express the pride and gratitude with which the people of Illinois remember Miss Scripps, for her belief in the power and glory of education, a belief which she supported by inestimable philanthropies.

Ellen Browning Scripps was born in London on October 18, 1836. Her family

moved to the United States while she was still a child, and she spent her girlhood in Rushville, Ill. She attended public schools in Rushville, and taught school herself after graduation from high school, in order to finance her tuition at Knox College in Galesburg, Ill. After graduation from Knox College, in 1859, Miss Scripps taught until 1866, when she joined her brother in Detroit to work for the Detroit Tribune. The next move was to Cleveland and then, finally, to California where she lived for the rest of her life. Thanks to Miss Scripps, the San Diego area is generously endowed with university and hospital facilities, libraries and community centers. All of this amply illustrates her attention to environment and education as crucial concerns of a community.

The people of Rushville, Ill., are indebted to Ellen Browning Scripps for a community building and a park. Such gifts are infinitely greater than the cost of construction. They represent an inexhaustible investment in the well-being of the town and of many generations of its people. I can think of no finer memorial to a noble and generous lady.

## TALKING SENSE ABOUT CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, not too many days ago Cuban Premier Fidel Castro announced that he would permit a number of his countrymen to leave for the United States. It can be assumed that Castro apparently counted on using the people he betrayed as pawns in a propaganda game. However, on October 3, President Johnson announced the United States would offer sanctuary to the Cubans, in line with our traditional humanitarian policies. This entry must be handled on an orderly basis. I am sure that Castro, realizing the United States will require clear ground rules, is now hesitating.

Certainly a continuation of the Dunkirk-style evacuation cannot be allowed. Greater Miami, which has already demonstrated its compassion by absorbing many thousands of Cuban exiles, understandably does not know what to expect. South Floridians and the Nation should get some answers and the United States should spell out its requirements.

The Miami Herald has commented on the subject with cogency and restraint. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled, "Clear Up the Refugee Muddle" be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

CLEAR UP THE REFUGEE MUDDLE

The promise of Fidel Castro to let his betrayed people go has given the United States an unparalleled opportunity.

Properly handled, the bearded dictator's abject failure will be demonstrated for all the world to see and communism will be given a setback in this hemisphere from which it can never rebound.

Bungled, it will give Castro a sharp propaganda weapon to tighten his control over a nation whose economy is rotting.

The misadventures of two groups of impatient exiles who tried to rescue friends and relatives show how easily the situation could be bungled.

One group engaged in a shoot-out with Cuban coastal guards. One exile was wounded, one guard reportedly killed. The incident gives Castro a made-to-order excuse to slam the door shut again whenever this suits his purpose.

Another group embarked in a stolen boat and while in Cuba was used for anti-American propaganda. The Havana radio quoted them as complaining about conditions in the United States, which had given them refuge.

These things must not be allowed to continue.

Ten days after Fidel Castro announced all Cubans were free to leave the country, no U.S. official has yet spoken out firmly and clearly to lay down ground rules for an orderly movement.

South Florida's huge exile population doesn't know what to expect. Many, therefore, try to make the best deal they can to get their people out of Cuba. This is an invitation to disaster.

Greater Miami doesn't know what to expect—whether we face a chaotic future or whether the Federal agencies intend to keep their promise to relocate the incoming tide and reduce some of the exile burden we already have.

Some authority must spell this out and make clear also that U.S. laws and regulations must be observed by exiles and American citizens alike.

This is no time to appeal to Fidel Castro to act like a reasonable person. He knows now his offhand speech was an incredible mistake for his cause and could depopulate his country.

His interest is in trying to rectify his error.

The interest of the United States is to show that, given the opportunity, the people of Cuba choose freedom. This would be the end for Fidel.

He is on the hook and the United States has the initiative. If we allow the situation to drift until he can squirm off, the hopes of the Cuban people will be dashed and their eventual freedom postponed again.

Let the proper officials speak up now and the U.S. position be made unmistakable.

## THE EQUAL TIME ABSURDITY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an important question which I hope Congress can consider next year is whether to amend or eliminate section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. I am pleased that the National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns, held recently in Washington under the auspices of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc., dealt with this issue. As the author of S. 1287, a bill to amend section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, I am keenly interested in the matter of the equal time on the air for candidates for public office.

An excellent editorial identifying the shortcomings of section 315 as it is presently written, appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 8, 1965.

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

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

THE EQUAL TIME ABSURDITY

Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act requires broadcasters to give candidates for public office equal time on the air. This means that a station which wants to give major candidates an hour of free time to present their views or engage in debate must give equal time in comparable time slots to all the other minority candidates.

In concept, this regulation appears democratic and noble enough in purpose. In practice, it can prove unfair and absurd, as can be plainly witnessed today during the mayorality campaign in New York.

There are two major party candidates for the office: JOHN V. LINDSAY, who holds both the Republican and Liberal nominations, and Abraham D. Beame, the Democratic nominee. Running also are five minority party candidates. The best known of these is the Conservatives' William F. Buckley, Jr. Others are the nominees of the United Taxpayers' Party, Socialist Workers Party, the Socialist Labor Party, and even something called the Losers' Party.

Should the broadcasting stations in New York plan coverage of the two or three important candidates, outside of the regular newscasts exempt from the law, they would have to clutter up their schedules, and the air, with equal coverage of all the other candidates, no matter how obscure and how remote their chances of election.

Because of the expense involved, the scheduling difficulties, and public indifference to the views of most of the minority candidates, the stations have naturally gone slow in extra coverage of the top candidates.

The stations are frustrated, the campaign loses a sparkle it might otherwise be given, and the public loses out. The equal-time provision has become an added incentive to anonymous characters and political crackpots to run for office for the sake of personal publicity. They know that if one candidate receives free air time, they, too, must obtain it.

The practical answer lies in modification of the FCC provision so as to bar absurdities as well as discrimination. Pennsylvania's Senator HUGH SCOTT is sponsor of a bill which would make the equal time regulation apply only to parties which received 10 percent of the vote in the preceding election. This would seem to be a reasonable compromise, but the Scott bill lies in the bottom of the bin in a Senate committee. The debacle in New York provides a good reason for resurrecting it.

## ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, October 11, 1965, marked the 100th anniversary of the founding of the George Washington University Law School. Today, as the 15th oldest law school in the United States, it ranks sixth in enrollment.

To honor this institution and its distinguished alumni, many of whom have served and are currently serving in Congress, our Federal Courts and throughout the Government and Armed Forces, a special convocation was held on Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at which Associate Justice William Joseph Brennan, Jr., of the Supreme Court of the United States, received the honorary degree of doctor of laws, and delivered the address of the evening.

Being an alumnus of the George Washington University Law School, and a former member of the law school faculty, I wish to make available to my colleagues in the Congress and to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Justice Brennan's remarks on this occasion.

I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

(Address by William J. Brennan, Jr., Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court)

At the outset, let me express my deep appreciation for the honor tendered me of admission to the degree of doctor of laws of this distinguished university. It is a distinction that I shall always cherish. And it gives me the greatest pleasure to join in the law school's centennial celebration. The occasion marks the completion of a century of devoted service by the law school to the profession and to the Nation. But this centennial is not merely an occasion for looking back on the evolution of this law school and congratulating all those responsible for its solid success. It is also an occasion for charting the future, as witnessed by the fact that today we are celebrating both an anniversary and a birth—the construction of the new library. And you have chosen, most appropriately, to further commemorate your proud record through a conference addressed to the problems of educating those who will practice law for and before the government. We may all draw satisfaction from this forward-looking zeal on the part of those who are charged with the heavy responsibility of educating our young people to the law.

To be unique is usually the result of accident; to take advantage of that uniqueness requires sensitivity and perception. The late Mr. Justice Jackson was among your trustees who revealed this sensitivity and perception. He and his fellow trustees realized that the very location of this law school in the Capital presented a unique challenge and an equally unique promise. The promise lay in the resources peculiarly available to the law school, those derived from its proximity to the Nation's tribunals, its administrative agencies, and myriad governmental departments. The challenge lay in the law school's major responsibility for educating those who serve in government, or serve those who deal with it.

No other law school finds as many students drawn from government service, and as many who turn to it.

The result has been the National Law Center. The next hundred years of this law school's history have merged with the development of that institution, which already is meeting with imagination and awareness many of the challenges of modern legal education. The tremendous volume of published law material makes specialization in the study and practice of law almost inescapable. Increasingly, law schools are developing areas of specialization, like undergraduate colleges, as part of their standard curriculum. Nowhere is the mountain of statutes, cases, and administrative decisions more evident than in the field of public law. The need for an institution to tackle this burgeoning growth is tremendous. It must be shifted, compacted, organized, and made available to students and the profession. The law center serves this vital need. It not only enriches the law school's conventional curriculum with the spirit of scholarly achievement and the spirit of the organized bar, but is a workshop where scholars, practitioners, and judges can be assembled; where seminars can be held; research directed; and serious consideration given to the future of public law. Its output can be scholarly and objective, a welcome supplement to the haphazard competition between litigants whose conflicting self-interests frequently provide the force that directs our law. Through the center, the entire profession can participate in the growth of the law as professionals obligated to the public, not merely as the advocates of special interests.

My main point tonight is that answering the challenge of proliferation and specialization of law is not enough. The law center, and the law school, would be failures if all they taught were technical understanding of our complex new relationships with government and of the bodies which administer them. To stop with technical competence is to contribute to our profession's already dangerous myopia. The principal gift a law school can and must bestow is an understanding of the law as a living process, responsive and responsible to changing human needs.

Thankfully, the day when such recognition was denied is passing away. Increasingly, the shift is to justice and away from finespun technicalities and abstract rules. The vogue for positivism in jurisprudence—the obsession with what the law is, which leaves no room for choice between equally acceptable alternatives—gave way first to the concept of sociological jurisprudence, primarily under Roscoe Pound's onslaughts begun over half a century ago. But sociological jurisprudence, too, had a defect: which it "shifted the emphasis away from positivism * * * it did so at the expense of reality by substituting the abstract idea of society for the actuality of the individual human beings who constitute society in fact." It was succeeded by the "new realism" and today we move further still. To quote a recent ABA report,[1] "The new trend is not back to an exaggerated individualism, which had been corrected in part by the notion of a sociological jurisprudence. Neither is it reaffirmation of the 'jurisprudence of interests,' which was a positivistic effort to spell out in jurisprudential terms the property and power priorities of society. The new jurisprudence constitutes, rather, a recognition of human beings as the most distinctive and important feature of the universe which confronts our senses, and of the function of law as the historic means of guaranteeing that preeminence. * * * The new jurisprudence, as a whole, may be summarized as tending to explore specific, and familiar, situations from a new viewpoint. In a scientific age it asks, in effect, what is the nature of man, and what is the nature of the universe with which he is confronted.

"Why is a human being important; what gives him dignity; what limits his freedom to do whatever he likes; what are his essential needs; whence comes his sense of injustice?"

Because it focuses on public law, the law center should be especially concerned with the preservation of human dignity and freedom when man deals with government. When this law school was founded, freedom and dignity found meaningful protection in the institution of real property. In a society still largely agricultural, a piece of land provided men with the means of economic independence, the necessary precondition of political independence and expression. Not surprisingly, property relationships formed the heart of legal practice, and lawyers and judges tended to think stable property relationships the highest aim of the law.

The days when common-law property relationships dominated legal practice are past. To a growing extent, economic existence now depends on less certain relationships with government—licenses, employment, contracts, unemployment benefits, welfare, and the like. Government participation in the economic existence of individuals and groups is pervasive and deep. Administrative matters and other dealings with the government are at the epicenter of the exploding law. We turn to government and to the law for controls which would never have been expected or tolerated a century ago, when a man's answer to economic oppression or difficulty was to move 200 miles west.

We are accustomed to thinking that government participation in the creation of wealth—whether through licenses, contracts, or welfare programs—should not be hampered by property-like notions, that the government should be free to set conditions on which it will give or withhold these benefits if the public interest is to be served. As Prof. Charles Reich, of Yale Law School, has cogently observed,[2] however, such conditions were once imposed on property, too. He argues that, "Regulation of property [was] limited, not because society had no interest in property, but because it was in the interest of society that property be free. Once property is seen not as a natural right but as a construction designed to serve certain functions, then its origin ceases to be decisive in determining how much regulation should be imposed. * * * The real issue is how it functions and how it should function."[3]

Professor Reich concludes that "[I]t is time to reconsider the theories under which new forms of wealth are regulated, and by which governmental power over them is measured." "Above all," he says, "the time has come for us to remember what the framers of the Constitution knew so well—that 'a power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will.' * * * If the individual is to survive in a collective society, he must have protection against its ruthless pressures. There must be sanctuaries or enclaves where no majority can reach. To shelter the solitary human spirit does not merely make possible the fulfillment of individuals; it also gives society the power to change, to grow, and to regenerate, and hence to endure. These were the objects which property sought to achieve, and can no longer achieve. The challenge of the future will be to construct * * * institutions and laws to carry on this work."[4]

One may well disagree with the particulars of Professor Reich's argument, but I am in full agreement with his conclusion. If free government is to endure, those who govern must recognize human dignity and accept whatever limitations on their power are necessary to preserve that dignity and the air of freedom which is our proudest heritage. Such recognition will not come from merely a technical understanding of the organs of government, or the new forms of wealth they administer. It requires something different, something deeper—a perspective which comes from personal confrontation with the wellsprings of our society. For a school which trains so many who will either serve in government or deal with it, teaching that perspective is the great challenge of the years that lie ahead.

The particulars of meeting that challenge are, I hope, something that will be much discussed at your forthcoming conference, and by your faculty. It might be appropriate, however, for one who speaks from a nonacademic vantage point to throw down the gauntlet of a few ideas of his own.

My first suggestion, relating to the undergraduate curriculum, is that you join the growing number of law schools turning with increasing vigor to the urgent and welcome task of training lawyers to meet the problems of the poor in both civil and criminal matters. Such programs help make legal protections as meaningful for the poor as are the legal obligations the poor are accustomed

[1] ABA Section of International and Comparative Law, report of committee on new trends in comparative jurisprudence and legal philosophy (Rooney, chairman), Aug. 10, 1964.

[2] "The New Property, 73 Yale L. J. 734 (1964).

[3] Id., at 779.

[4] Id., at 787.

to have enforced against them. In accomplishing this goal, teachers and their students bring home the dignity of the individual and the evenhandedness of the rule of law to all. Your school, with its special interests, could take a special responsibility in this vital area, by concentrating on the legal relationships and interactions between government and the poor.

For example, most persons who require welfare aid or have a claim to unemployment compensation stand alone when they appear before the agencies charged with administering these programs. Too often, these agencies are accustomed to the callousness of paternalism. Before the recent growth of neighborhood legal services, little thought was given to providing representation before these agencies, or to the nature of the benefits they dispense. Even now, these services are overwhelmed with requests for help, and have difficulty extending the representation they planned to offer. The law school would perform a substantial service to the community and its students if it took a hand in this task.

One means of accomplishing this end would be by an enlargement of the student program of voluntary legal assistance. Most law schools, including this one, have programs in which students volunteer their services in the preparation of cases for trial or appeal. A usual shortcoming of such programs, however, lies in their almost exclusive concern with rendering assistance in the judicial forum; the horizon must be enlarged to include assistance in the administrative forum, whether it be a formal administrative proceeding or a day-to-day confrontation with government officers. As I stressed earlier, this type of interaction is coming to have a greater significance in the life of the ordinary citizen. Thus, the need for such assistance becomes more and more imperative. The ordinary citizen must be assisted in detecting and protesting against arbitrary action by government officers, especially when it is camouflaged in bureaucratic complexity, as is so often the case. The responsibility for rendering such assistance must be shouldered by lawyers. But the unfortunate fact of life is that those most needing legal assistance are those least able to pay for it. Part of the solution to this problem lies in government supported legal services; the remainder lies in volunteer work, for which the law student can be called upon.

I think this law school could be a pioneer in establishing such a program of legal assistance in the administrative forum, which would serve as a model for law schools throughout the country. Such an enlargement of the legal aid programs would be a natural outgrowth of this school's special concern with public law; and the location of the law school in the Nation's Capital, with its proximity to the administrative agencies, affords an unparalled opportunity to develop such a program. It would have a tremendous educational impact, especially for the students at this law school, who so often have served government or plan for a career in government. The attorney-client relationship, with its special nuances and difficulties, would become less of an abstraction to the student and he could relate to a sector of the population whose special needs can rarely be effectively communicated in a classroom.

We all know that claims to be made before agencies are apt to be won or lost at the level of the first bureaucrat. That's the point where the law student could be of great help to the claimant. And it is not a one-way street. The student-lawyer's observance of the administrative process in microcosm would be serviceable to him in the practice before agencies which is becoming so large a part of the lawyer's life. Such a program could as easily be included as a course much like those you presently offer in trial and patent practice. The student could combine a study of the theory of the programs, viewed through the statutes and legislative proceedings which established them, with a study of their practical functioning. He should see both the administrative and the claimant perspective; perhaps he could engage in supervised practice on both sides of the fence. Learning what a program is about, seeing whether those ends are being accomplished, thinking how they might be attained—this would seem to me a supreme experience in legal education, especially if it resulted, as I think it must, in a greater recognition of the place of human dignity.

I also want to suggest that the law school should not stop with merely setting students upon their way. Insights may grow dim under the pressures of daily routine. The law school should aggressively seek the chance to renew them through its graduate and extension programs. Far too often a private lawyer's vision is restricted by a ruthless pursuit of his client's individual interest, while the government lawyer overzealously seeks to promote his conception of the public interest. They talk at cross purposes; they are unable to understand the other's problems; each overstates his case; and resort is had to less than scrupulous techniques. The result is often outrageous: settlement through negotiation is made impossible; the courts and agencies find themselves unable to rely on either side; the integrity of the law is drawn in question; and there is no concern for the best interests of the public. Although this problem has been long recognized, I think the time has come for law schools, especially this law school, to make some contribution in this area.

Here, too, the standard equipment of the postgraduate curriculum, seminars, conferences, night courses, and the like, can play an important role. But I wonder if something more isn't called for. Lawyers should be exposed to the other side, not only through academic interaction, but also through participation as advocates. Private law firms already recognize the advantages of practicing sabbaticals, through leaves of absence for government practice and the like. Cannot the government do as well? Those who participate in welfare programs would gain much, it seems to me, from spending some time as an advocate for the poor; a lawyer for an agency distributing research contracts would gain new insight into the effects of his actions on scientists and others who depend on such contracts if he had the experience of helping scientists to obtain them. To be sure there are problems involved—but they are problems private firms have been able to conquer. The government has no less ability to do so. And consider what it would gain. Lawyer exchange programs, like international student exchange programs, could significantly contribute to establishing and maintaining the understanding and broader perspective I deem so essential. This law school, with its location and contacts in government and private practice, is ideally suited to begin and coordinate such an endeavor.

I do not want to spend so much time delving into detail that we lose sight of the goal—maintaining the law's focus on human dignity in an era of ever-increasing legal complexity and governmental regulation. Finding the way is the great challenge you face in the coming century. I am sure your efforts will mirror the success the law school has already achieved in the century just past.

It is a pleasure to have participated in this ceremony. As we commemorate both the century past, and the vigorous future represented by the new library building, I am reminded of an old oriental proverb: "If you want to plan for a year, plant rice; if you want to plan for 10 years, plant a tree; if you want to plan for life, educate a man."

Your president and board of trustees, the donors who are making the new library possible, and your faculty are carrying on the great work of those who preceded them, planning for life and for the lives of generations to come. I congratulate all of you and wish you continued happiness and success.

## EPISCOPAL CHURCH DENOUNCES INJUSTICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Right Reverend John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, of which I am a member, deserves the praise of all concerned citizens for his eloquent and forthright statement of October 4 in which he deplored the travesty of justice which took place in a courtroom in Hayneville, Ala. Declaring that civil rights murders may have to be made Federal capital offenses, Bishop Hines expresses the view that a more appropriate remedy in the long run for what has transpired in the courts of Hayneville and other communities is "the mounting of a jury selection process which reduces to an absolute minimum the cultural and emotional pressures in localized areas."

Even the most intensive campaign for voter registration will founder—

Bishop Hines points out—

if potential voters, looking ahead, are able to discern only the wreckage of their hopes for justice on the jagged rocks of bias and discrimination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bishop Hines' statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN E. HINES, PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, ON THE ACQUITTAL OF THOMAS COLEMAN IN HAYNESVILLE, ALA., ON SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

Seminarian Jonathan Daniels and his fellow civil rights worker, the Reverend Richard F. Morrisroe, were gunned down by Deputy Sheriff Thomas Coleman on August 20. It was not the "shot heard round the world," even though its reverberations have not lessened; but the verdict rendered by the jury on September 30 in Haynesville was heard around the world.

What it said about the likelihood of minorities securing evenhanded justice in some parts of this country should jar the conscience of all men who still believe in the concept of justice in this land of hope.

It is simply inconceivable to intimate acquaintances of both young men that Jonathan Daniels flashed a knife or that Father Morrisroe was armed. Alabama's own attorney general branded testimony that they were armed as perjury. The studied care with which the defense assassinated the character of a man already dead rightfully angers fairminded men everywhere. Fortunately, Jonathan Daniels' integrity survives such despicable action.

A more pervasive question is whether or not the jury system, as it is now administered in the State of Alabama (and some other areas), if allowed to perpetuate itself without radical reform, will deal a blow as lethal as Coleman's shotgun blast to the common man's hope for justice. The horror of the Coleman case may bring cries for swift

Federal intervention, legislative and otherwise, by which capital crimes connected with civil rights be made Federal offenses.

Such may indeed be a viable strategy for more equitable justice, but more germane and safer in the long run would be the mounting of a jury selection process which reduces to an absolute minimum the cultural and emotional pressures in localized areas. The end result would be a jury genuinely representative of all the people over whom it holds such powers of judgment. As basic as is the right to vote, the right to a jury trial by a man's peers antedates it in the long struggle for responsible freedom. Even the most intensive campaign for voter registration will founder if potential voters, looking ahead, are able to discern only the wreckage of their hopes for justice on the jagged rocks of bias and discrimination. The Philadelphia Inquirer's editorial comment is pertinent—"the ancient form of trial by a jury of his peers cannot function if the peers in effect admit they would have committed the same senseless criminal act as the defendent if they had had the opportunity."

The acquittal of Thomas Coleman, which is surely a travesty of justice, is not the price we must pay for the jury system. Rather it is the fearful price extracted from society for the administration of the system by people whose prejudices lead them to sacrifice justice upon the altar of their irrational fears.

The life of Jonathan Daniels is no more and no less valuable than that of any other man in the sight of God. But the cause in which he offered it is a cause dear to everyone who breathes the air of free men. Because of this free men must not permit the devastating verdict of the Haynesville 12 to be the final word of injustice in Alabama or anywhere else.

## DEFENSE AGAINST CRIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 14, I spoke to a luncheon meeting of the Junior Bar Section of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and stated my belief that recent decisions on cases in Federal courts, involving police interrogation, arrest and detention, and search and seizure, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal effectively with criminal elements.

I pointed out that steps should be taken to reverse this trend, so that the threat of punishment of the guilty will be no idle threat, for the guilty man upon whom the court fails to impose punishment is encouraged to commit further crimes. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CRIMINAL COURTS AND SOCIETY'S DEFENSE AGAINST CRIME

Ladies and gentlemen, you have doubtlessly noted that one of the most constantly recurring items in your daily newspapers are the latest crime statistics. These are reported for the Nation as a whole and for the District of Columbia, our Nation's Federal City.

Recently, the FBI released its 1964 report on crime in the United States. The statistics showed, throughout our Nation more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported during 1964, a 13-percent rise over 1963. No one knows how many less serious offenses went unreported.

Since 1958, crime in the United States has increased six times faster than our population growth. More than 1,100,000 burglaries were reported in 1964. More than 300 robberies occurred each day during that year, of which 57 percent were armed robberies and 43 percent were of the strong-arm type.

What was the role of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, in this panorama of crime? The crime rate in the District has risen, significantly and steadily, during all of the years of the 1960's, to a recent high point where, again according to the latest FBI statistics, serious crime in the District has now increased 15 percent for the first 6 months of 1965 as compared to the last 6 months of 1964. These are not just figures taken from a Government report, to be glanced at and thrown aside as of only faint interest. They sound the tocsin of war. A war between criminals and society. This is a war, gentlemen. Make no mistake about it. It is a war which the criminal element is slowly but surely winning. The Federal Bureau of Investigation "Crime Clock" for 1964, shows that a serious crime was committed in the United States every 5 minutes during that entire year, a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill every 2½ minutes, an aggravated assault every 3 minutes, a robbery every 5 minutes, and a burglary every 28 seconds.

Lest it be thought that criminal law enforcement is a local matter and that it is not of immediate concern to the Federal Government, your attention is invited to the U.S. News & World Report of August 23, 1965, which carries an article entitled "Alarmed Capital Fights Violent Crime—Even the Halls of Government Are Invaded by Washington's Growing Army of Criminals." It points out that "a police report issued August 11 showed 2,844 crimes in the District of Columbia in July—92 crimes in every 24-hour period—making July the 38th consecutive month in which crime rates rose. The biggest increases were in rapes, robberies and aggravated assaults." The article shows that the criminal elements have become so bold that now "in most Federal offices, special precautions are taken to protect workers, especially women, on duty at night or in isolated areas. In the year ended June 30, 1965, official reports showed 69 crimes at Government buildings, including assaults, vandalism incidents, other types of violence, plus 10 gambling cases. The count the year before: 49 crimes, 12 gambling cases. Not reported, hundred of lesser incidents, including petty thefts." To bring this appalling situation even closer to home, I would remind you that women in our own offices have been assaulted in the streets around the Capitol. Now the area is patrolled by armed guards and police dogs after 5 p.m. and according to the article women are escorted to their cars after dark if they ask for protection and many of them do.

Even more shocking, of the 92,869 offenders processed for fingerprint identification by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 76 percent were repeaters. This works out to about 70,528. And "for the criminal repeaters, those with two or more arrests, the average criminal career was 10 years during which period they averaged five arrests for different criminal acts." Of this group, about 51 percent had been granted leniency in the form of probation, suspended sentence, parole and conditional release.

I reminded you that your daily newspapers carry constantly recurring reports on crime statistics. What do the editors of these newspapers have to say about these facts which they continue to bring to public attention?

At the annual meeting of the Associated Press member editors, in Buffalo, N.Y., last month, Mr. George Beebe, the association president, urged the Nation's newspapers to become "crime fighters" and root out corruption in law enforcement. He hit hard at the criminal menace growing in the United States, and pointed out that crime has been flourishing in major cities across the Nation and "thieves and racketeers continue to practice their nefarious trades while lenient judges and clever criminal lawyers keep them free on appeal after appeal after appeal."

And what is the general reaction of the American public to this situation? On September 24, the Gallup poll reported: "As newspapers and magazines continue to report increases in both the number and the rate of serious crimes in this country, there has been a sharp increase in the number of people who think courts deal too leniently with criminals."

The crime situation has become so bad that the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress on "Crime, Its Prevalence and Measures of Prevention," in which he said, "Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness. This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. It means giving new priority to the methods and institutions of law enforcement." He then pointed out three areas where such priorities are needed—the police, the courts, and the correctional agencies. He indicated that he would appoint a Presidential Crime Commission to devise ways and means of increasing Federal law enforcement efforts, assisting local law enforcement, and to make a comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the nature of crime in modern America.

Undoubtedly, all of these measures are urgently needed. Unquestionably, more and better police, improved correctional agencies and more courts and judges are absolutely essential. All of this laudable effort may come to naught, however, if the courts fail to recognize and enforce the rights of society to be secure against the lawless and criminal elements. The President appears to have recognized this when he said in his message that "there is misunderstanding at times between law enforcement officers and some courts. We need to think less, however, about taking sides in such controversies and more about our common objective: law enforcement which is both fair and effective. We are not prepared in our democratic system to pay for improved law enforcement by unreasonable limitations on the individual protections which ennoble our system. Yet there is the undoubted necessity that society be protected from the criminal and that the rights of society be recognized along with the rights of the individual." While crime rates increase, acquittals by the courts have also increased. "Acquittals and dismissals of adult offenders for the serious crimes amounted to 26 percent of the total adults charged compared to 24 percent in 1963."

The "Uniform Crime Reports of 1964" state that "the restrictive court decisions affecting police prevention and enforcement activity have influenced, at least in part, the downward trend in [police] clearances and the increases in acquittals and dismissals." These facts, when brought into juxtaposition would seem to indicate that the courts, through decisions, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal with criminal elements. For the courts to be lenient, to suspend sentences, and to acquit on mere technicalities, releasing the criminal to further prey upon society, seems the height of folly.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned: "We mollycoddle youthful criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew on society. The bleeding hearts, particularly among the judiciary, are so concerned for criminals that they become indifferent to

the rights of law-abiding citizens. We must have judges with courage and a high sense of their duty to protect the public and to adequately penalize criminals if we are to stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against society. We must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the lenient approach and it has failed."

Although the public attention is centered in the Mallory rule, wiretapping, Gideon, and the right to counsel, and others which I will deal with in due course, at the outset, let me point out that these are merely a few of the areas in which judicial casuistry has turned criminals loose to prey upon law-abiding citizens. For example, John Barker Waite, in an article in the Hastings Law Journal, points out a number of cases in various jurisdictions in the area of criminal attempts. I will comment upon only one of these cases.

"Miller on Criminal Law" defines a criminal attempt as consisting "of an act done by the accused with a specific intent to commit a particular crime by means apparently reasonably adapted to the accomplishment of that end and under circumstances which make its accomplishment apparently possible; which act goes beyond mere preparation and carries the project forward within dangerous proximity of the criminal end sought to be attained, but which nevertheless falls short of consummation of the intended crime."

In *People* v. *Rizzo*, 246 N.Y. 334 (1927), Professor Waite comments that, "Charles Rizzo knew where to lay the finger on a paymaster who would be easy making for a stickup. Tony Dorio could get an automobile; Tom Milo and John Tomasello had pistols. They combined assets and went after the money. But Rizzo's timing was off. Rao, the paymaster, had already been to the first place they looked; he had not reached the second. They went to the bank where he got his money but he had left. While they were looking for Rao elsewhere, the police, suspicious of their actions, picked them up. In due course they were indicted and convicted of attempted robbery. Dorio, Milo, and Tomasello took their medicine and went to Sing Sing; Rizzo's attorney appealed. The appellate division sustained the conviction. The court of appeals reversed it."

"That court began its opinion: 'The police of the city of New York did excellent work in this case by preventing the commission of a serious crime.' Then the court set Rizzo free. He had intended to commit the crime, the court said, and would have done so had he been able. But up to the point of arrest he had not yet attempted a crime."

"Of Rizzo's companions Judge Crane added: 'Two of these men were guilty of carrying concealed weapons, pistols, contrary to law * * * Two of them, John Tomasello and Thomas Milo, had also been previously convicted, which may have had something to do with their neglect to appeal. However, the law would fail in its purpose if it permitted these three men, whoever or whatever they are, to serve a sentence for a crime which the courts subsequently found and declared had not been committed. We therefore suggest to the district attorney of Bronx County that he bring the case of these three men to the attention of the Governor to be dealt with as to him seems proper in the light of this opinion.'

"Accordingly those three also were given their freedom."

Professor Waite subsequently comments on this case (Hastings Law Journal): "As to Rizzo and his pals there would seem no possible question of their demonstrated social menace. To be sure, in the course of his exempting opinion Judge Crane after basing his decision casuistically upon precedents does say: 'The law must be practical and therefore considers those acts only as tending to the commission of the crime which are so near to its accomplishment that in all reasonable probability the crime itself would have been committed but for the interference.' (Rizzo case, p. 337.)

"Then with not unprecedented judicial illogic he holds that Rizzo's acts were not indicative that the crime would have been committed; in complete disregard of his own opening sentence, 'The police of the city of New York did excellent work in this case by preventing the commission of a serious crime.'" Professor Waite, in his article notes a number of cases in the area of criminal attempt, including attempts to commit crimes of violence, in which the courts have turned obvious criminals loose to prey further on society. In another article entitled "Why Do Our Courts Protect Criminals?" American Mercury, he notes additional cases. While the cases noted by Professor Waite are examples of State court judicial casuistry in just one area, it would not seem unreasonable to say that there are other areas in which State courts engage in such practices. Overly protecting the criminal is not common to State courts alone. Some of the recent decisions of the Federal courts, particularly of the Supreme Court, also appear to disregard the right of society to be secure.

Since the extension in 1925 by the U.S. Supreme Court of a part of the 1st amendment of the U.S. Constitution to the States via the 14th amendment in *Gitlow* v. *New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (see also *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940) that Court has continued to apply more and more of the Federal Bill of Rights to State court decisions. For more than a century and a quarter prior to that decision it had been thought that the Federal Bill of Rights applied only to the Federal Government. Without entering into a discussion of the wisdom of this change and assuming that such a change is both wise and desirable, it should also be pointed out that the Court has gone about enforcing this change by opinions in criminal cases promulgating technical rules of legal procedure. The result has been in the field of criminal justice that more and more criminals have been given their freedom on the basis of legal technicalities—popularly referred to as the "exclusionary rule"—without regard to their obvious guilt. The rule may be briefly stated as one excluding evidence from being received at the trial of a case which had been obtained through violation of an constitutional right of the accused. In *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), Miss Mapp had been tried and convicted of having in her possession certain lewd and lascivious books, pictures and photographs in violation of paragraph 2905.34 of Ohio's Revised Code. On appeal the Ohio Supreme Court found that her conviction was valid under Ohio law though based upon evidence obtained during an unlawful search of her home. The U.S. Supreme Court, on the basis of enforcing the fourth amendment, applied the exclusionary rule and Miss Mapp went free regardless of the fact that she was obviously guilty of the offense with which she had been charged. Further, the Court extended the application of the rule in fourth amendment cases to all of the States.

The case that has caused more comment and concern than any other is that of *Mallory* v. *U.S.* 354 U.S. 449 (1957) which occurred in the District of Columbia. Mallory confessed to having raped a woman in the basement of an apartment house. He was arrested and questioned by the police for about 3 hours, broken up into several periods including the taking of a lie detector test, after which he confessed. He was convicted on the basis of this confession in the lower courts. The U.S. Supreme Court, however, threw his confession out because rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 327 U.S. 821, requires that arrested persons shall be taken before a magistrate without unnecessary delay. The Court said in part that "Provisions related to rule 5(a) contemplate a procedure that allows arresting officers little more leeway than the interval between arrest and the ordinary administrative steps required to bring a suspect before the nearest available magistrate." The guilt or innocence of Mallory was not examined by the Court, only the police delay.

This same Mallory, following his release from custody, attacked another female and was subsequently again arrested and sentenced to 60 days in jail. Later on, a State court gave him a long term for burglary and for assault on a housewife.

The outcry of law enforcement officials against this decision has been long and bitter. Ex-District of Columbia Police Chief Robert Murray said "the restrictions imposed by this decision had made it practically impossible to obtain convictions of criminals in many serious cases where neither scientific evidence nor eyewitness identification is available" ("Crime in the District of Columbia"—Joint hearings before the District of Columbia Committees of Congress; 88th Cong., 1st sess.).

Col. Stanley R. Schrotel, chief, Cincinnati Police Department said that "the Mallory rule is beginning to be felt in Ohio cities and towns ('we are beginning to get the brunt of it'), and it is proving to be a very serious obstacle to effective police work." (Hearings before the Senate District of Columbia Committee, on Mallory and Durham rules, investigative arrests and amendments to the criminal statutes of District of Columbia, 88th Cong., 1st sess.)

O. W. Wilson, superintendent of police, Chicago, Ill., said "the Mallory rule arbitrarily excludes the truth on the peculiar theory that by doing so, the Court can punish the police for what the Court considers to be a violation of the rights of the accused. But it is society that is being punished, not the police. The only beneficiary is the criminal. As a consequence, crime is overwhelming our society."

While no one advocates third degree methods, it would seem fundamental that the police should be permitted 2 or 3 hours at least, in which to question a suspect. It frequently happens that, although at the time of arrest circumstances point to the arrested individual as the guilty party, he will voluntarily furnish information clearing himself as an innocent party and thereby prevent the police from charging the wrong person. Of course suspects should not be and are not under any compulsion to answer any questions. The police, however, can only act upon the circumstances known to them. If the suspect is actually innocent and voluntarily furnishes additional information which they can check out, he can then be freed from the necessity of formally answering a charge of crime. The tendency of the Mallory decision is to prevent all questioning by the police, even reasonable and proper questioning. Closely akin to Mallory in its effect on law enforcement is the development of the right to counsel under the sixth amendment in the *Gideon*, *Massiah*, and *Escabedo* cases.

Before *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963) the right to counsel at the trial of a case in State courts was governed by State law. State practice varied widely among the

States. In Federal cases, the absolute right to counsel, unless the defendant had intelligently and freely waived the right, had been made clear in *Johnson* v. *Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458 (1938). With *Gideon*, the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that in both State and Federal cases defendants were, under the sixth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, entitled to be represented by counsel at the trial of their cases. If the defendant was too poor to pay for a lawyer, the Court, Federal, or State, would have to appoint one for him. No one can quarrel with this. It was a good decision. Since *Gideon*, however, the Supreme Court has gone much further.

In *Massiah* v. *U.S.*, 377 U.S. 201 (1964), a seaman was convicted of transporting narcotics. He was indicted, retained an attorney and was free on bail. During the bail period, in investigating the crime further, narcotics agents arranged to hide a radio transmitter in his codefendant's car. Without knowledge of the situation the seaman, Massiah, made incriminating statements while talking with the codefendant. The Supreme Court held that these statements, elicited from Massiah in the absence of his lawyer, violated his right to counsel under the sixth amendment and could not be used against him. This seems an unreasonable extension of the right to counsel. Mr. Justice White in dissenting from the Court's opinion said: "Undoubtedly, the evidence excluded in this case would not have been available but for the conduct of Colson in cooperation with Agent Murphy, but is it this kind of conduct which should be forbidden to those charged with law enforcement? It is one thing to establish safeguards against procedures fraught with the potentiality of coercion and to outlaw 'easy but self-defeating ways in which brutality is substituted for brains as an instrument of crime detection.' *McNabb* v. *United States*, 318 U.S. 332, 344. But here there was no substitution of brutality for brains, no inherent danger of police coercion justifying the prophylactic effect of another exclusionary rule. Massiah was not being interrogated in a police station, was not surrounded by numerous officers or questioned in relays, and was not forbidden access to others. Law enforcement may have the elements of a contest about it, but it is not a game. *McGuire* v. *United States*, 273 U.S. 95, 99. Massiah and those like him receive ample protection from the long line of precedents in this Court holding that confessions may not be introduced unless they are voluntary. In making these determinations the courts must consider the absence of counsel as one of several factors by which voluntariness is to be judged. See *House* v. *Mayo*, 324 U.S. 42, 45–46; *Payne* v. *Arkansas*, 356 U.S. 560, 567; *Cicenia* v. *Laqay*, *supra*, at 509. This is a wiser rule than the automatic rule announced by the Court, which requires courts and juries to disregard voluntary admissions which they might well find to be the best possible evidence in discharging their responsibility for ascertaining truth."

Finally, in *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964), the Court extended the sixth amendment's right to counsel back, even before the initiation of judicial proceedings, to the area of police interrogation. The facts were that Escobedo was arrested without a warrant in connection with the shooting of his brother-in-law. His lawyer secured his release. A number of days later, after another suspect made statements incriminating Escobedo, he was again arrested and taken to the police headquarters. While under police interrogation his requests to see his lawyer were refused. Meanwhile his lawyer, who had arrived at the headquarters also made repeated requests to see him which were also refused. Under police questioning Escobedo made incriminating statements which were used against him at his trial where he was convicted. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed his conviction by the State courts, holding that police refusal to honor his request to consult his lawyer during the course of police questioning constitutes a denial of his right to counsel under the 6th amendment as extended to the States through the 14th amendment. Mr. Justice White again dissenting said:

"By abandoning the voluntary-involuntary test for admissibility of confessions, the Court seems driven by the notion that it is uncivilized law enforcement to use an accused's own admissions against him at his trial. It attempts to find a home for this new and nebulous rule of due process by attaching it to the right to counsel guaranteed in the Federal system by the 6th amendment and binding upon the States by virtue of the due process guarantee of the 14th amendment. *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, *supra*. The right to counsel now not only entitles the accused to counsel's advice and aid in preparing for trial but stands as an impenetrable barrier to any interrogation once the accused has become a suspect. From that very moment apparently his right to counsel attaches, a rule wholly unworkable and impossible to administer unless police cars are equipped with public defenders and undercover agents and police informants have defense counsel at their side. I would not abandon the Court's prior cases defining with some care and analysis the circumstances requiring the presence or aid of counsel and substitute the amorphous and wholly unworkable principle that counsel is constitutionally required whenever he would or could be helpful.

* * * * *

"The Court may be concerned with a narrower matter: the unknowing defendant who responds to police questioning because he mistakenly believes that he must and that his admission will not be used against him. But this worry hardly calls for the broadside the Court has now fired. The failure to inform an accused that he need not answer and that his answers may be used against him is very relevant indeed to whether the disclosures are compelled. Cases in this Court, to say the least, have never placed a premium on ignorance of constitutional rights. If an accused is told he must answer and does not know better, it would be very doubtful that the resulting admissions could be used against him. When the accused has not been informed of his rights at all the Court characteristically and properly looks very closely at the surrounding circumstances. See *Ward* v. *Texas*, 316 U.S. 547; *Haley* v. *Ohio*, 332 U.S. 596; *Payne* v. *Arkansas*, 356 U.S. 560. I would continue to do so. But in this case Danny Escobedo knew full well that he did not have to answer and knew full well that his lawyer had advised him not to answer.

"I do not suggest for a moment that law enforcement will be destroyed by the rule announced today. The need for peace and order is too insistent for that. But it will be crippled and its task made a great deal more difficult, all in my opinion, for unsound, unstated reasons, which can find no home in any of the provisions of the Constitution."

Perhaps I have gone into too much detail in reciting these cases to you. It is not my purpose to reargue them nor to bore you with the recitation of further cases, though many are available. They do, however, illustrate my point, that the courts, by their decisions, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal effectively with the criminal elements. Every time the courts turn loose an individual charged with crime on technical grounds such as these, they shirk their responsibility. Every time the courts fail to determine the probative value of the evidence offered and free the defendant on a technical rule of exclusion, the innocent man forever after bears a stigma of guilt among his fellows. He got off on a technicality. He beat the rap. On the other hand, the guilty man upon whom the court has failed to impose punishment is encouraged to commit further crimes. It can be argued that the psychological effect of this on the individual in just a few cases is relatively unimportant in the law enforcement picture nationwide. This, in ordinary circumstances, is probably true, but as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, circumstances on a nationwide basis are not now ordinary. The criminal elements appear to be making war upon society. That war has been brought to the very doors of government. When the courts, through judicial casuistry, fail to punish obvious lawbreakers or when the U.S. Supreme Court uses its decisions to promulgate administrative rules for the guidance of law enforcement agencies, without regard to the guilt or innocence of the defendant, they swing the balance which should be maintained between individual rights and the rights of society, against the rights of law-abiding citizens.

We appear to be in an era when respect for law and order has largely broken down. Society must defend itself from lawlessness. The use of punishment for the commission of crime is as old as the history of the criminal law. The guilty must be punished. Most of the judge-made law has favored the wrongdoer rather than sought to control him. To permit escape from punishment on technicalities, is to create indifference to the threat of punishment. In order to counter this indifference, society, and this includes the courts, must make sure that the threat of punishment of the guilty is no idle threat. Further, the stigma attached to punishment of unacceptable criminal conduct will tend to induce respect for law and order among all of us including the criminal elements.

One legal authority has said, "The stamping of an act the commission of which the State will prosecute with unrelenting severity, immediately rouses the feeling that the act is unsuitable, inadmissible, disreputable, contrary to duty * * *. Thus general prevention operates rather quietly, slowly and penetratingly, making the consciousness of right sharper, intensifying the general feeling of right and wrong" (Aschaffenburg, "Crime and Its Repression" (1913).) An able British jurist has written, "The sentence of the law is to the moral sentiment of the public what a seal is to hot wax. (It) constitutes the moral or popular sanction of that part of morality which is also sanctioned by the criminal law." (Sir James Stephen, 2 "History of the Criminal Law of England" (1883).)

I conclude my remarks by quoting the concluding paragraph of Professor Waite's article in the Hastings Law Journal, supra, with respect to the value of punishment as a deterrent to crime: "Because of this value of punishment as an open and notorious stigmatization of what is socially intolerable, every judicial refusal to impose a punishment merited by the facts inevitably suggests judicial tolerance of the activity. It may be tolerance of the crime as compared with some minor official misconduct, as when relevant and material evidence is rejected, or tolerance of it over departure from conventional rule, as in the cases here discussed. But on any basis of comparative tolerability, a judicial exemption from deserved punishment weakens the subconscious public sense of intolerance for the act. A single decision of this sort may wreak more deterioration in

the factors of individual abstention from crime than thousands of offenses unpunished because the offenders are unknown. Thus every judge who sets casuistry above merited penalty must accept individual responsibility to an appreciable extent for the country's burden of crime."

Thank you for the privilege of letting me express some of my convictions on this very vital matter.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the principle of improving world relations through the exchange of knowledge and experience is one to which I am sure most of the Members of this body subscribe. Nevertheless, I believe that it is important to keep underscoring this truth whenever possible by pointing to special examples of successful intellectual interchanges.

South Dakota State University at Brookings, S. Dak., has twice hosted international seminars and conferences on particular problems shared by many nations of the world. The first, in 1962, was on problems of soil and water conservation, and this summer a second Conference, bringing together word extension leaders was held.

These extension leaders found that the problems each faced were common to nearly every other area of the world—that people were pretty much alike and that the experiences of a Latin American country, for instance, could be helpful to an African nation or a country in southeast Asia.

Mr. John L. Pates, the extension news editor, at South Dakota State University, has summed up the success of the Conference very well in an article he has written for the November issue of Extension Service Review. I presume that through special efforts of local or national extension officials this will reach most of those people who participated in the Conference. I think it is too bad that there is no publication which can reach extension leaders and workers in every country so that future articles of this kind can have general distribution. This was one of the recommendations of the Conference—that some media for the exchange of information, on a continuing basis, be established. The participants will continue to work on solving that problem.

Mr. President, I ask permission that Mr. Pates' article "Guiding Principles Featured at International Extension Conference," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FEATURED AT INTERNATIONAL EXTENSION CONFERENCE

(By John L. Pates)

"Much of the universal hope for worldwide peaceful social and economic progress lies in extension education * * * for what people do for themselves when they put knowledge to work is what makes a strong and prosperous economy and a great and growing nation."—Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Washington, D.C., welcoming speech to the participants of the International Conference of Extension Leaders, July 22, 1965.

Cultural differences between countries which dictate varying educational methods, but a united concern for helping people farm and live better, characterized discussions at the International Conference of Extension Leaders at the South Dakota State University in early August.

Seventy-five agricultural and extension leaders from 43 countries spent a solid 2 weeks at South Dakota State University, Brookings, sharing principles of informal adult and youth education. After July orientation sessions in Washington, D.C., they traveled to Brookings via Ohio and Indiana where they observed county extension workers in action. On their way back to Washington after the 2-week seminar they visited Iowa State University, viewed extension work with low-income groups in St. Louis, Mo., and studied rural resource development work in Paintsville, Ky.

Djaffar Rassi, former Director of Extension in Iran, summed up the feelings of many participants saying, "Education principles are the most important foreign aid the United States can offer."

South Dakota Extension Director John T. Stone, general chairman of the conference, outlines major objectives of the seminar:

"The first was to provide those with extension-type education leadership responsibilities in various countries an opportunity to get together and become personally acquainted. A second objective was to identify, describe, and define basic educational, operational, and organizational principles which may have universal application for the administration of extension programs anywhere in the world."

Throughout the conference discussion leaders as well as participants were quick to point out the wisdom of sticking to guiding principles rather than trying to transplant specific techniques from one country and its culture to problems of another.

Discussions revealed some of the real problems which face these education pioneers.

These problems are well expressed in the seminar youth committee report.

"The major resource of every country is its people. So long as this resource remains underdeveloped, all other resources of the nation must be less fully utilized. Inadequate education, low levels of nutrition, poor health and sanitation, disease, and other problems continue to plague the people of every nation. All countries must continue to search for ways to help every citizen reach his highest potential. Extension can and must serve these needs through rural youth programs."

The report went on to point out that the educational work of worldwide extension through rural youth programs such as 4–H, 4–C, and 4–S is a major means of supplementing the efforts of schools and other developmental agencies in preparing young people for responsibility in a complex, changing world.

Similar needs were faced realistically by the home economists. Granting that principles in education are important, the ladies discussed roadblocks to carrying out educational programs with women. They wrestled with questions such as the need for research to determine problems that exist and the need for training and education to develop strong, efficient leadership.

Recognizing the cost involved, the group recommended that countries continue or at least begin simple studies and evaluations on which to base programs. These may develop and evenutally culminate into real research projects in different home economics areas and can help determine the best teaching methods. So important is research to the furtherance of good home economics programing it was recommended that this topic be the focal point of any future international conference dealing with the "home" aspect of extension work.

Dr. Stone said a third objective was to develop some proceedings from this conference that would "help facilitate a continuing exchange of ideas and pertinent information among extension leaders."

Such a report is being made. It includes a brief status report of extension programs in many participating countries; it will list major educational programs and objectives; it will include charts to help interested countries set up an organizational procedure; it will list titles and job descriptions of key extension leaders, and it will include some common professional terms used in different countries.

In his talk Dr. Stone suggested that such a summary might include recommendations for improving the effectiveness of agricultural, home economics, and youth extension programs throughout the world.

The conference participants recommended the establishment of a worldwide extension organization. The sectional report of extension administrators suggests that such an organization would accomplish three primary goals: it would promote and improve the exchange of ideas, experiences, techniques, methods, and assistance in the fields of extension work. It would help strengthen and advance professional qualifications of extension workers throughout the world. It would help develop a greater concept of extension work as a scientific profession. The administrators appointed a committee comprised of one representative from each of the five continents represented to study the formation of such an association. Members include Carlos Arroyo B., Costa Rica; Djaffar Rassi, Iran; Karl G. Kruse, Netherlands; Ahmed El/Amin Abdel Rahman, Sudan; and Albert S. Bacon (assistant to the FES Administrator) of the United States. Dr. Stone was elected executive secretary.

## ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 18, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Paul Jones, deceased.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 18, 1965:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.