NEW YORK
Francis E. Gilhooly, Alexander.
John B. Goodwin, East Rochester.
Evelyn F. Kurtz, Henderson Harbor.
John L. Ingalls, Hornell.
Florence Robinson, Lawrence.
Henry A. Walter, Loch Sheldrake.
John J. Bridgeford, Rensselaer.
Mary E. Cawley, Witherbee.

NORTH CAROLINA
Raymond G. Gaylor, Ayden.
William E. Twiford, Kill Devil Hills.
Gerald B. Gibson, Pine Hall.
Billy V. Overman, Rockwell.

NORTH DAKOTA
Edward A. Seel, Rugby.

OHIO
Henry C. Waggoner, Amsterdam.
Harry R. Kimball, Jr., Green Springs.
Carl J. Burkhart, Leavittsburg.
Willard C. Geis, Massillon.
Thomas W. Feldman, Minster.
Robert D. Maidlow, Prospect.
William P. Moran, Roseville.

OKLAHOMA
Charles M. McCurdy, Tupelo.

OREGON
George A. Hansen, Halfway.
William C. Green, Oregon City.

PENNSYLVANIA
Chester P. Tracewski, Eynon.
Joseph A. Ferace, Greensburg.
Mary C. Klingel, La Plume.
Edward D. Oliver, Montrose.
Leonard H. Stackhouse, Muncy Valley.
Henry A. Springer, New Stanton.
Albert L. Wessner, Pine Grove.
Doris I. M. Moyer, Virginville.

SOUTH CAROLINA
Walter A. Clark, Vance.
Stanmore T. McClain, Williston.

SOUTH DAKOTA
LaVerne V. Johannesen, Erwin.
James W. Preston, Hermosa.

TENNESSEE
Lyle P. Varnell, Adamsville.
Robert M. Sams, Dandridge.
Harold A. Hutcheson, Soddy.
Grover B. Tucker, Tracy City.

TEXAS
Narvie L. Caperton, Cameron.
Edison Monroe, Eustace.
Sidney L. Gustafson, Gonzales.
Ruby F. Henderson, Groesbeck.
Nina F. Ruby, Pollok.

UTAH
David F. Parrish, Centerville.
Garr B. Ashby, Holden.
Michael D. Pavich, Midvale.
Pete L. Bruno, Price.
Ernest R. Farnsworth, Santaquin.
David C. Weeks, Smithfield.

VIRGINIA
Richard E. Durham, Millboro.

WASHINGTON
Charles S. Shepard, Cheney.

WEST VIRGINIA
William S. Penn, Jr., Bluefield.
Charles H. Gillilan, Jr., Frankford.

WISCONSIN
Robert J. Kane, Cassville.
William Ihrig, Jr., Centuria.
Clarence E. Sandberg, Clear Lake.
Donald E. Peters, Juneau.
Julia M. Binning, Kansasville.
Robert F. Hartsworm, King.
Silas J. Paul, Montfort.
Richard H. Vollmer, Mukwonago.
Carl S. Nordin, Siren.
John P. Seckar, Vandyne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Psalm 85: 8: *I will hear what God the Lord will say unto us for He will speak peace unto His people.*

Almighty God, who art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word, may this verse of sacred Scripture, with its message of peace and loving kindness, of comfort and assurance, be unto us a revealing light and a sustaining power during all the hours of this new day.

We rejoice that Thy Word is a lamp unto our feet and its entrance giveth light to our path.

Grant that the meditations of our hearts may daily be tempered and disciplined by the spirit of charity and sympathy, of tolerance and cooperation, as we seek to solve the difficult problems of human relationships.

May Thy Word illumine our spiritual insight and bring it into harmony with a great faith and enable us to meet each day with courage and fidelity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Journal of the preceding session.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The Clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 14, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal of Thursday, October 14, 1965, as read, will stand approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and concurred in House amendment to Senate amendment No. 17.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. L1 to the bill H.R. 9022, an act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7812) entitled "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8310) entitled "An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 317. An act for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. EDWIN W. EDWARDS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 371]

Abbitt	Goodell	O'Konski
Andrews, George W.	Gray	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Aspinall	Gubser	Philbin
Bell	Gurney	Pickle
Berry	Hagan, Ga.	Poage
Blatnik	Halleck	Pool
Bolling	Hanna	Powell
Bonner	Hansen, Iowa	Purcell
Brock	Hansen, Wash.	Quillen
Cahill	Hardy	Reifel
Callaway	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Casey	Hays	Reuss
Celler	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Cleveland	Holifield	Roudebush
Clevenger	Horton	Schisler
Conable	Hosmer	Sisk
Conyers	Hull	Smith, N.Y.
Culver	Jennings	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Stratton
Dickinson	Kornegay	Sweeney
Diggs	Laird	Talcott
Donohue	Latta	Taylor
Dow	Lindsay	Tenzer
Duncan, Oreg.	Long, Md.	Thomas
Edmondson	Love	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Ala.	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Mackay	Tunney
Fino	Madden	Vivian
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Flynt	Martin, Nebr.	Watkins
Fogarty	Mills	Weltner
Ford, Gerald R.	Mize	Whitten
Frelinghuysen	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
Fulton, Tenn.	Morton	Wilson, Charles H.
Fuqua	Mosher	Wyatt
Gathings	Murphy, N.Y.	Young
	Nelsen	
	Nix	
	O'Brien	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama submitted a conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert "That the consent of Congress is given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and to the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity as consented to by the Congress in the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee that approved this bill as it came to the House. I wish the gentleman would explain the impact of this amendment on the House version of the legislation.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad to explain the amendment to the gentleman who is the author of the bill.

The amendment is a technical amendment and an unimportant amendment so far as the merits of the legislation are concerned. It simply substitutes the words "to become parties to" in place of the words "to enter into" a compact, and so on.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, obviously the amendment as explained by the gentleman from Louisiana does not affect the basic purposes of the legislation as it passed the House and, therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF 124,200,000 POUNDS OF NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—WORK PLANS—COMMUNICATION FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read and which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, WATERSHED, AND STATE

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Back Swamp, N.C.

No. 1422, 89th Congress, Big Slough, Fla.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Blue Eye Creek, Ala.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Escondido Creek, Tex.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Frogville, Okla.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Little Delaware-Mission Creeks, Kans.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Lower Bayou Teche, La.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Margaret Creek, Ohio.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Mill Creek, Ind.

No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mill Creek, Tenn.

No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mosquito of Harrison, Iowa.
No. 1633, 89th Congress, Plain Honey Creek, Wis.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Revolon, Calif.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Swan Quarter, N.C.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Turkey Creek, Kans.
No. 1422, 89th Congress, Upper Big Nemaha, Nebr.
No. 1532, 89th Congress, Williams Creek, Tex.
No. 1603, 89th Congress, Zeigler Creek, Nebr.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AS AMENDED — COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

STATE WATERSHED, EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, AND COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Louisiana, Bayou Boeuf, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Mauch Chunk Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Middle Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.
Pennsylvania, Oil Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT DENTON, TEX.—COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on October 13, 1965, approved a prospectus for the construction of the following building, which prospectus was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Texas, Denton, Post Office and Federal Office Building.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The House is not in order and we could not hear the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asked unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Higher Education Act.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TRANSFER FIVE COUNTIES TO WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8317) to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire if this will involve an additional Federal judgeship.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This does not in any manner involve an additional judgeship or any expense whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado advise the House as to the basic necessity of this reallocation of countries of Oklahoma into judicial districts?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman, this is for the convenience of litigants and witnesses. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], I am sure, can answer any other details the gentleman may have in mind.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he wishes to furnish additional information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement which I intend to insert in the RECORD. I might say that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] and I support this legislation, as does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], whose district also is represented.

Mr. HALL. Whose districts are involved in this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The districts involved are those of Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JARMAN, and mine. The bill moves five counties from Mr. JARMAN's district and my district, which are presently in Mr. EDMONDSON's district, to the Oklahoma City district. This is simply a matter of geographic convenience to accommodate all parties concerned.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman explain why the views of the Department of Justice are not printed in the report?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, the Department of Justice always yields to the Judicial Conference that makes these recommendations. I am sure the gentleman understands how the Judicial Conference is composed.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Missouri knows about the Judicial Conferences, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman asked about the Justice Department and its views. The report contains a letter from the Deputy Attorney General and if the gentleman has no objection I shall be glad to read that letter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would just insert the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have just referred, addressed to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and dated August 10, 1965, as it relates to H.R. 8317, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

AUGUST 10, 1965.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 8317, a bill to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. district court for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

The bill would amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, by providing that the counties of Garvin, Grady, McClain, and Stephens, which are presently in the eastern district of Oklahoma, shall be transferred to the western district of Oklahoma. It would also provide that Chickasha and Pauls Valley, which are now places of holding court for the eastern district of Oklahoma, shall be places of holding court for the western district of Oklahoma.

Inasmuch as this legislation is of primary concern to the judiciary, the Department of Justice defers to the Judicial Conference of the United States concerning its enactment.

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

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], whether the local attorneys and residents concur in this reallocation of counties?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; they do.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that this regrouping of judicial districts in Oklahoma will not require an additional Federal judge. I get the impression these days we have too many Federal judges in some places, at least in the State of Massachusetts, where there has been a vacancy since 1961, and where the attempt is now being made to fill the vacancy with an unqualified candidate. I am pleased to know that there is a surplusage and that we will not be called upon in the near future to create any more Federal judgeships.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct. Nothing in this bill creates a Federal judge.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] that there will be no cost involved, and no additional Federal judge's office established, and on the basis of the reassurance given by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out (1) "Garvin, Grady,", (2) "McClain,", and (3) "Stephens,".

(b) The second sentence of section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out (1) "Chickasha," and (2) "Pauls Valley,".

(c) The first sentence of section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "Garvin, Grady," immediately after "Garfield,", (2) by inserting "McClain," immediately after "Logan,", and (3) by inserting "Stephens," immediately after "Roger Mills,".

(d) The second sentence of section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "Chickasha," immediately before "Enid", and (2) by inserting "Pauls Valley," immediately after "Oklahoma City,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike the language on page 1, line 3, through line 7 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Eastern District comprises the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Carter, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Haskell, Hughes, Johnston, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McCurtain, McIntosh, Marshall, Murray, Muskogee, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pontotoc, Pushmataha, Seminole, Sequoyah, and Wagoner.

"'Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Ada, Ardmore, Durant, Hugo, Muskogee, Okmulgee, Poteau and S. McAlester.'

"(b) Section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Western District comprises the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Garvin, Grady, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Jefferson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, McClain, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Stephens, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, and Woodward.

"'Court for the Western District shall be held at Chickasha, Enid, Guthrie, Lawton, Mangum, Oklahoma City, Pauls Valley, Ponca City, Shawnee, and Woodward.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation is important to three counties in the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma and has been requested by members of the bar in Grady, Stephens, and Jefferson Counties.

This bill, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], would transfer five counties from the eastern to the western district of Oklahoma. The legislation affects two counties in the Fifth Congressional District. I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 8624, at the request of the Honorable Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th district, and members of the bar of the three counties.

Early in the session I received petitions signed by members of the bar in Grady, Stephens, and Jefferson Counties asking that legislation be introduced to transfer these three counties from the eastern to the western judicial district. I understand that there has been agitation for this realinement for more than 30 years but the members of the bar and others interested simply have never been able to quite agree upon it until recently.

As stated in the committee report, the basic purpose of this transfer is for the convenience of the litigants and their attorneys in the five counties in question. Currently, all the the filing is done is Muskogee and involves substantial travel and expense, but these costs will be lessened by the transfer to Oklahoma City.

It is my understanding that the reason the five counties were attached to the eastern district at the beginning was because they were a part of the old Indian Territory which formed the boundary between the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma when the Federal courts were organized at statehood in 1907.

Under the pending legislation, Oklahoma City would become the court town for these counties, instead of Muskogee, and, of course, Oklahoma City is far more convenient and accessible.

There now are five Federal district judges in the western district. One judge resides in the eastern district. Two of the judges residing in the western district also are judges in the northern and eastern districts. But inasmuch as they live in Oklahoma City, which is easily accessible to the counties south of Oklahoma City, it is my understanding that much of the litigation originating in the counties affected by this legislation is tried in Oklahoma City by agreement.

I thank the Committee on the Judiciary for its prompt attention to our problem and I hope the legislation will be enacted at this session.

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

PLACING STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) to authorize placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have one simple question: Is it true, as according to the customs of the Capitol, that this will not exceed the allocation per State of two statues in the rotunda?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. This will be the first statue from New Mexico.

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

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senator Dennis Chavez Statuary Hall Commission is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion, and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate Concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF LATE SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) to authorize the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of the late Dennis Chavez, presented by the State of New Mexico, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of New Mexico.

Passed the Senate September 10 (legislative day, September 8), 1965.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINT, PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF LATE SENATOR CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) to print as a Senate document the proceedings of the presentation, dedication, and acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Dennis Chavez, to be presented by the State of New Mexico in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two thousand eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of New Mexico, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New Mexico.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11267) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations.

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the RECORD show, if possible, if there are any proposals pending to increase the aggregate amount which may be expended for the equipment involved?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I believe I might throw some light on that question. I do not know of any pending legislation or resolutions for that purpose. Actually, the necessity for that has been lessened due to the fact that some weeks ago the House adopted a resolution authorizing the purchase of an automatic typewriter which would not come out of the electrical equipment fund.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that as far as the chairman of that particular subcommittee is concerned, there would certainly be no necessity for any increase in it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman indicate as to whether or not there is any authority to use this type of equipment in our district offices?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no additional authority granted through the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it there are certain districts where the GSA has a pool and it is possible for Members of Congress to obtain typewriters and other equipment; whereas, in other areas that is not the case.

I believe, perhaps, the committee might well consider this question as to whether some of the Members are unable to obtain sufficient equipment for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

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

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

H.R. 11267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives", approved March 25, 1953 (2 U.S.C. 112a(d)), is hereby repealed.

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

SAN ANTONIO 250TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7526) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio.

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

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

H.R. 7526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the Hemis-Fair Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization for the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the San Antonio community, national medals in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and designs, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Not more than one hundred thousand of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 31, 1968.

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is a technical amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GONZALEZ: On page 1, beginning on line 4, after the words "furnish for the", strike out "Hemis-Fair Corporation" and insert "San Antonio Fair, Incorporated."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word. May I inquire of the gentleman proposing the amendment on the original bill H.R. 7526, if indeed this is for the HemisFair celebration in San Antonio by an act that was passed by this body wherein we authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal at no cost to the United States?

Mr. GONZALEZ. It authorizes the San Antonio Fair, Inc., which is the corporate entity responsible for the liability and undertaking the cost necessary to strike the medal, which is also sponsoring the HemisFair to coincide with the commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio.

Mr. HALL. This is a corporate body that is putting on what we voted for as the HemisFair in recent weeks in this body.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. What is the purpose of the commemorative medallion, Mr. Speaker? Is it just one of these medallions that would commemorate the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio after migration to the north through El Paso del Norte?

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is correct. The gentleman is correct, it commemorates the 250th anniversary of the founding of the first settlement in that area.

Mr. HALL. Are these medals to be sold, or presented, or given away, or will there be some reimbursement by this corporation for this authorization?

Mr. GONZALEZ. As I understand it, the corporation undertakes the complete cost the Treasury assumes in striking the medal. They will be limited as to the number they can strike. The corporation in its wisdom can either sell or obtain through the disposition of these

medals what I would consider the bare net cost.

Mr. HALL. It will be a self-liquidating proposition, it does not come out of the $125,000 of Federal funds advanced by this body?

Mr. GONZALEZ. There would be nothing connected with Federal funds. It would mean that the corporation undertakes the liability for reimbursing the Treasury for any cost that might accrue for striking the medals.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 516) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution.

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

S. 516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), is amended by striking "eleven" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen".

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking "Six" and inserting in lieu thereof "Eight".

SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, immediately after "Congress" in the last sentence thereof, the following: "except that in no event shall the Commission terminate prior to December 31, 1966".

SEC. 3. Such joint resolution is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $25,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes', approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 6 through 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, immediately after 'Congress' in the last sentence thereof, the following: ', except that the Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

On page 2, strike out lines 10 through 15.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT LEXINGTON, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5493) to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to point out to the House that this is one of two bills involving the flying of our emblem, our national colors, in two places, perhaps deserving, today. At the present time this is authorized by the Congress in only five different spots—the U.S. Capitol, the White House, Fort McHenry, Betsy Ross' home, and the U.S. Marine Iwo Jima Memorial—in the United States of America. We should carefully consider, and I have no opposition to this particular bill because the colors are lighted during the hours from sundown to sunup; and I think it is a deserving situation, where the Minute Men first withstood the British on the commons—or on the green—at Lexington in Massachusetts—but I think we should give serious consideration to these requirements and, secondly, to realize that we are opening up a floodgate of precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5493

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That, notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942 (36 U.S.C. 171–178), the flag of the United States of America may be flown for twenty-four hours of each day on the green of the town of Lexington, Massachusetts. The flag may not be flown pursuant to the authority contained in this Act during the hours from sunset to sunrise unless it is illuminated.

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

NATIONAL PARKINSON WEEK

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 571) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas more than one and one half million people are afflicted with Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas the National Parkinson Foundation has been established to promote research concerning and to assist persons afflicted by Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas many persons have dedicated themselves to diagnosing, treating, and rehabilitating persons afflicted by Parkinson's disease and to research into the cause or causes of such disease and a cure for it; and

Whereas the Nation's first Parkinson Rehabilitation, Diagnostic, and Research Institute was established at Miami, Florida, in 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the week beginning October 25 of each year as National Parkinson Week and inviting the Governors of the several States to issue similar proclamations. It is requested that such proclamation invite the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in a national program for the control of Parkinson's disease to unite during such week in public dedication to such a program and in a concerted effort to impress upon the people of the United States the necessity for such a program.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

On page 2, line 5, after "25", strike "of each year" and in lieu thereof insert ", 1965,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I rise to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in supporting this most significant resolution, in high hope that the declaration of a National Parkinson Week will bring Parkinson's disease to the concern and sympathetic attention of the American people.

Parkinsonism is a devastating disease, numbing mind and soul as well as body. Neither cause nor cure is known, and therapy serves only to retard the progress of deterioration. Hope for the million and a half Americans afflicted with Parkinson's must lie mainly in research and, therefore, in public education.

The last few years have witnessed substantial progress in public concern and governmental support. Particularly outstanding efforts are being made by the National Parkinson Foundation, a private organization which coordinates and sponsors research, operates an outpatient unit in Miami for treatment and rehabilitation and is building a 100-bed inpatient facility for intensive care of Parkinson victims.

The foundation is headed by Mrs. Jeanne Levey, a valiant woman who found through her own husband's affliction the strength and courage and urgent need to work for the many thousands suffering similarly. Always the thrust of her effort is the same: to reach more and more people, to convey the necessity, to rouse concern, to enlist support. Thousands of Americans have found hope and encouragement from her dedication and her untiring and unselfish efforts. I am sure that all present here today in this great body join in commending Mrs. Jeanne Levey and her coworkers for their outstanding humanitarian work.

Surely we can aid such efforts. As we have learned in the past, successful and rapid attack on disease depends heavily on public understanding and involvement. I believe the declaration of a National Parkinson Week would be a great stimulus to such active participation. Press, radio, the medical profession, interested agencies, and individuals would unite during the week in a special and concentrated campaign to educate the people of the United States about Parkinson's disease. And this, in turn, will lead to demand for, and support of, research into the cause and effective treatment of this dread disease.

As you may know, my own urgency in the matter rises from personal experience: I have seen the ravages of Parkinsonism in my family.

I urge your support of this resolution. There is much to be gained.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT THE GRAVE OF CAPT. WILLIAM DRIVER

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 12) to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any reason why in view of today's Consent Calendar No. 221 permitting the flag to fly 24 hours a day over the green in Lexington, Mass., providing it is lighted from sundown to sunup, that the same provision is not made on this bill, Calendar No. 223, House Joint Resolution 12?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman must recognize that the bill does not authorize the appropriation of any funds. We have stated in the report that this should be illuminated between the hours from sunset to sunrise. As I say, that is set forth in the report. My understanding is that the expense in connection therewith will be borne by the American Legion of Nashville. It was introduced in a different form and we did not want to change it or amend it, but we have the assurance that is what will be done.

Mr. HALL. Will not the gentleman agree with me that it would be much better to put this in the authorizing legislation, if indeed we are to allow additional flying of the colors 24 hours a day?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. To have it in the authorizing legislation perhaps would be a better method. However, I do not contemplate that an organization like the American Legion will not carry out our understanding as set forth in the report.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of this I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over temporarily until such an amendment can be drawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3993) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate one of the chief sponsors responsible for this bill. I see the gentleman from Ohio is on his feet and I want to ask the gentleman this question. In sponsoring this bill today, are you taking into consideration the announced new proposed treaty with Panama that would cancel our lease on the Panama Canal Zone and which would, in effect, nullify the purposes of this bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. This bill was approved before the announcement of that agreement. This is a bill which would permit the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone because the Canal Zone is not included within the definition of the United States. The only reason for this legislation is a matter of convenience for those in the Canal Zone who are U.S. citizens or who may be U.S. citizens and eliminates the necessity for them to leave the Canal Zone to go to the United States to accept their certificate of citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylavnia. Mr. Speaker, I have a further question. I notice that for purposes of taking the oath of citizenship, the bill considers and designates the Panama Canal Zone as a part of the United States. In view of the very sensitive relationship that we have with Panama at the present time, does the gentleman from Ohio think that it would be wise to have the Panama Canal Zone declared a part of the United States for this purpose?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That would be done for this specific purpose only; that is, jurisdiction to issue certificates of citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Has the bill been cleared with the State Department and with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It has been considered by the Department of Justice and, I understand, the State Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In view of the negotiations going on with Panama—and do not let anyone think that I am in favor of giving away the Panama Canal—does the gentleman think that the President will sign this bill if it is laid on his desk, in view of the negotiations that are being conducted with Panama?

Mr. FEIGHAN. As I said before, this bill was approved before the negotiations, or the results thereof, were made public. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Attorney General to issue in the Canal Zone certificates of citizenship to all classes of U.S. citizens specified in section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It would do nothing more than that. It would be a matter of convenience to those who are eligible U.S. citizens.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio why the other body refused, as late as 1962, to pass this bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I cannot give any reason for their not passing it, except probably they have been pressed for time and it has been delayed. I see no reason why, if the other body had time to consider this measure, they would not approve it. I see nothing wrong with it. It would merely be a convenience to persons who are eligible to be citizens of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. According to your report, this same bill was passed by the House in April 1962. The interval of time between then and now certainly has given the other body ample opportunity to take some favorable action on the bill if it so desired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I cannot speak for the other body at all.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If a treaty is made by which we give away the Panama Canal Zone, then, of course, the proposed legislation would be void. I said, "If." I hope the "if" in my question is a big one. The Canal Zone Company has been pressing for years for this legislation in the interest of American citizens who have children born in the Canal Zone and who had to go to a great deal of

trouble to certify and get birth certificates. The bill would provide a convenience for the people of the United States who live in the Canal Zone.

As I have said, if the Canal Zone is done away with, then, of course, the measure would be voided.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentlewoman from Missouri could give us a clue as to why the other body has not acted. I now find that the other body refused to act on this bill as late as last year. So, in 1962, 1963, and 1964, the other body has refused to do anything about this legislation as previously passed by the House.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. To answer the gentleman's question, I think it is just lack of interest in the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in view of the purposes of the bill, it would be a deterrent to giving away the Panama Canal, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

BURT COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5026) to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

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

H.R. 5026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, be, and is hereby, authorized to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon said Burt County Bridge Commission all such authority, rights, and powers as are necessary or required to enable said Burt County Bridge Commission to issue its refunding revenue bonds for the purpose of refunding and refinancing said outstanding revenue bonds, including the payment of reasonable financing costs and expenses in connection with such refunding and refinancing.

SEC. 3. The said Burt County Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of the Army under the authority contained in the General Bridge Act of 1946, enacted August 2, 1946.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize said refunding revenue bonds, including interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum and reasonable financing costs and expenses, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed fifty years from the date of issuance of said refunding revenue bonds. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of such refunding and refinancing, the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 through 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon said Burt County Bridge Commission, all such authority, rights and powers as are necessary or required to enable said Burt County Bridge Commission to issue its refunding revenue obligations for the purpose of refunding and refinancing said outstanding revenue bonds, including the payment of reasonable financing costs and expenses in connection with such refunding and refinancing. Said obligations are, in order of priority, as follows: Two thousand series A bonds of par value of $500 each, total value of $1,000,000, bearing interest at 4 per centum per annum, due August 1, 1985, and redeemable at 100 per centum of par value and accrued interest on any interest payment date; two thousand non-interest-bearing notes in the amount of $375 each, total value of $750,000, due not later than August 1, 2004; and two thousand series B bonds of par value of $500 each, total value of $1,000,000, bearing no interest, and principal due not later than August 1, 2004."

Page 2, strike out line 21 and all that follows down through and including line 12 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize said refunding revenue obligations. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, but in any event not later than August 1, 2004, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of such refunding and refinancing, the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall provide the Secretary of Commerce with a copy of its semiannual audit report, which shall be subject to review by the Secretary, and who, if he deems necessary, may undertaken on-site audits of the Commission's records at no expense to the Commission."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

USE OF LAND AT LA JOLLA, CALIF., FOR A MARINE BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1735) relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman who asked unanimous consent would explain the bill. I do not have a copy available, though I hasten to add that the gentleman has discussed it with me.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. I am delighted to explain the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to implement an agreement with the University of California, made by the Secretary of the Interior, under which the United States acquired title to 2.4 acres of land for the construction of a Fishery-Oceanography Center.

In 1962 the University of California conveyed this land to the Department of Interior, more particularly to the Bureau of Fisheries. At that time an effort was made to put a reversionary clause in. That was not acceptable to the Department of Justice; and then consideration was given to a 99-year lease. Again, that was not acceptable; so there was an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the regents of the University of California, to the effect that if the property were conveyed—and it was conveyed to the Federal Government for this purpose—the Congress would be called upon to enact legislation which would permit the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey the property to the regents of the University of California if and when the property was used for a purpose different from the purpose for which it was originally deeded to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman would stipulate, then, that this is merely a "reverter clause" to the original donor to the U.S. Government?

Mr. LENNON. In substance it will authorize the Secretary to reconvey the property to the University of California, only when the property is no longer used for the purposes for which it was deeded to the Federal Government.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I note in the report, as the gentleman has stated, that the university insisted originally upon this reversionary clause, but dropped its insistence apparently for the reason that it wanted the laboratory more than it wanted a reversionary clause at that time.

Now we are confronted with an after-the-fact call to do something which should have been done, it seems to me, during the process of originally awarding the laboratory on land held by the university.

I am not going to object to consideration of this bill at this time, but in the future, it seems to me, we should insist that demands of this type be carried out or that the Government locate its laboratories in other places.

Mr. LENNON. I can appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Iowa, but I believe it should be made crystal clear for the RECORD that the Department of the Interior in the first instance contacted the regents of the University of California because of their desire to locate a marine laboratory in this particular area. As a matter of fact, the hearing record will reflect that the University of California was solicited by the Secretary of the Interior for land on the campus.

The University of California, through its board of regents, was quite acceptable to the idea of deeding the property to the Federal Government with a reversionary clause, but the Department of Justice intervened and said it would not accept it under those conditions. Then the question of a 99-year lease was considered, and that was not acceptable, either. So the full import of this legislation, sir, is that the Secretary of the Interior and the regents of the university then agreed to go ahead with the transaction with the understanding that Congress would enact legislation that would give the Secretary of the Interior the legal authority to reconvey the property at some subsequent or future date, which I frankly do not believe will happen, in the event that the property is not used for the specific purposes for which it was deeded.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying to my friend from North Carolina is that here today we are called upon to do something, it seems to me, that ought to have been worked out in the first instance. That is my criticism.

Mr. LENNON. I agree. As the chairman of the subcommittee, that is exactly the position I took. It is water over the dam, now, though, and has to be done in this way.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

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

S. 1735

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to carry out the understanding between the Secretary of the Interior and the Regents of the University of California when the latter donated approximately two and four-tenths acres of land situated on the San Diego Campus of the University of California, for establishment thereon by the United States of a marine biological research laboratory, and in recognition of the restriction in the deed conveying the land to the United States which requires the land "to be used exclusively for research on the living resources of the sea or their environment; or for purposes compatible with activities of the * * * Scripps Institution of Oceanography (situated on said Campus) or for any other purpose expressly approved by the Grantor", the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reconvey to the Regents of the University of California, or their successors, title to the donated land and the improvements constructed or placed thereon:

(a) Whenever he determines that the land and improvements are not in his judgment needed by the United States for the limited uses permitted by the deed, such determination to be made after receiving the views of other Federal agencies regarding their possible use of the land consistent with the limitations in the deed; or

(b) Whenever the United States ceases to use the land and improvements for more than two years exclusively for such limited uses.

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

TARIFF TREATMENT—COPRA, PALM NUTS, PALM-NUT KERNELS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for alteration of the duties on importation of copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels and the oils crushed therefrom, with the amendments as reported in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the article description preceding item 175.09, and items 175.09 through 175.12, inclusive, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended to read as follows:

"	Copra:		
175.09	Entered during the effective period of special proclamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 of this part, or entered after July 3, 1974	Free	Free
175.10	Entered on or before July 3, 1974, when no such special proclamation is in effect	1.25¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
175.11	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory	Free	
175.12	If produced elsewhere than in the Philippines or the Trust Territory wholly of materials the growth or production thereof	Free	Free ”

(b) Such Schedules are amended by striking out items 175.27 and 175.30 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"	175.28 Palm-nut kernels and palm nuts	Free	Free ”

(c) The article description preceding item 176.04, and items 176.04 through 176.13, inclusive, of such schedules are amended to read as follows:

"	Coconut oil:		
176.04	Entered during the effective period of special proclamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 of this part, or entered after July 3, 1974	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.05	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article, entered on or before July 3, 1974	Free	
176.06	Other	1¢ per lb.	
	Entered on or before July 3, 1964, when no special proclamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 is in effect:		
176.07	Crude	3¢ per lb.	4¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.08	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article	Free	
176.09	Other	1¢ per lb.	
176.10	If produced elsewhere than in the Philippines or the Trust Territory wholly from materials the growth or production thereof	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
176.11	Other than crude	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.12	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article	Free	
176.13	Other	1¢ per lb.	”.

(d) Such Schedules are amended by striking out the article description preceding item 176.32 and all that follows through item 176.36 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"	Palm-kernel oil:		
176.32	Rendered unfit for use as food	Free	Free
176.33	Other	0.5¢ per lb.	1¢ per lb.
176.34	Palm oil	Free	Free ”,

(e) (1) Items 465.05 and 465.15 of such Schedules are amended—

(A) by striking out "4.5¢ per lb." each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "3¢ per lb."; and

(B) by striking out "7.5¢ per lb." each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "6¢ per lb.".

(2) Items 465.25, 465.35, 465.45, 465.65, 490.24, 490.48, and 490.73 of such Schedules are amended by striking out "3¢ per lb. +" each place it appears.

(3) Items 465.55 and 490.92 of such Schedules are amended by striking out "1.5¢ per lb. +" each place it appears.

(f) (1) Headnote 3 for schedule 1, part 14 of such Schedules is amended by striking

out ", palm-kernel nuts and palm nuts, and a 3-cent part of each of the rates of duty in subpart B on coconut oil, palm-kernel oil and palm oil".

(2) Headnote 2 for schedule 4, part 8, subpart A of such Schedules is repealed.

(3) Schedule 4, part 13, subpart A of such Schedules is amended by striking out "Subpart A headnote:" and by striking out headnote 1.

(g) The article description preceding item 903.30 and all that follows through item 930.65, the article descriptions preceding item 907.70 and all that follows through item 907.77, and the article description preceding item 907.85 and all that follows through item 907.88 of such Schedules are repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) The headnotes for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of such Schedules are amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (c) and (d) of headnote 2 as subparagraphs (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by striking out subparagraph (b) of headnote 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) 160,000 tons during calendar year 1965,

"(c) during calendar years 1966 through 1967—

"(i) if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of this subpart, 160,000 tons, or

"(ii) if such a proclamation has not been issued, 120,000 tons,"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"3. If, before May 1, 1966, the President determines that for the calendar years 1966 through 1967 the Republic of the Philippines has waived its rights with respect to copra under paragraph 5 of article IV of the revised trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, he shall so proclaim."

(b) The appendix to such Schedules is amended by inserting after item 903.21 the following new item:

"903.25	Copra provided for in item 175.10, if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of part 14B of schedule 1	Free	1.25¢ per lb.	On or before 12/31/67	"

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) (1) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965. Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any such article—

(A) which was made after December 31, 1964, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) the liquidation of which has been made without regard to such amendments, shall, if necessary to give effect to such amendments and notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

(2) The amendment made by section 2(b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after December 31, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be deemed inappropriate for me to note, in view of some of the proceedings that went on earlier in the day, that it is rather fortuitous that the first bill on which there is any debate today is a bill concerning oil, coconut oil, a very soothing oil. I hope that it will soothe the tempers of the House. However, beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add I trust that it will not be so soothing that it might impair the relatively quick adjournment of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill does three things; it repeals permanently the 3 cents processing tax on coconut oil, which tax has been suspended by temporary action since 1957.

Second, it increases for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967, the duty-free quota of Philippine coconut oil from 120,000 to 160,000 tons.

Third, and quite importantly, it conditions the increase of the quotas duty free for 1966 and 1967 upon the waiver by the Philippine Republic of their existing 1¼-cent preference on copra.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, I think meets with the virtual approval of all those who might directly or indirectly be concerned. It certainly meets with the approval of the U.S. importers and goes far to meeting all of the objections of the domestic crushers. It is of untold, proven, and inestimable value to the consumers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to review in more detail the background and provisions of the bill:

Coconut oil was subject to a regular duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, and in 1934 was made subject to a domestic processing tax. Copra was free of regular duty, but became subject to a proportionate processing tax in 1934. In 1957 the processing taxes were suspended for a temporary period, and this suspension was periodically extended by legislation. The processing taxes were assimilated into the new tariff schedules and consolidated with the regular duties, where applicable, effective August 31, 1963. In so doing, however, recognition was given to the suspension of the processing taxes in the appendix of the tariff schedules by providing for the suspension of that portion of the duties on coconut oil and copra that reflected the former processing taxes. Because of an obligation in the Philippine-United States trade agreement, a duty of 1.25 cents per pound remains applicable to non-Philippine copra so long as adequate supplies of Philippine copra or coconut oil are readily available for processing in the United States.

H.R. 6568, in its original form, provided for the repeal—permanent removal—of the processing taxes which have been under suspension since 1957. There was no opposition to this proposal from any source, and section 1 of H.R. 6568, as reported by your committee, would accomplish this purpose.

Under the Philippine-United States trade agreement, Philippine coconut oil has been the subject of progressively declining duty-free quotas and will remain so until 1974. Overquota imports are subject to duty at 1 cent per pound. H.R. 6568, in its original form, provided for the repeal of the 1-cent-per-pound duty on overquota Philippine coconut oil. It was claimed that with the declining duty-free quotas the 1-cent duty operated as a deterrent to the importation of adequate supplies of coconut oil which is used mainly in the United States in the manufacture of inedible products, such as soaps and detergents. The duty, it was urged, will have the effect of causing domestic producers of soaps and detergents to shift to synthetic substitutes, which, in turn, would deflect Philippine oil to European and other markets where it is used largely in edible products and thus compete with U.S. vegetable oils in those markets. On the other hand, U.S. copra crushers contended that the 1-cent duty on overquota oil was their only protection from destruction of their copra-crushing operations so long as they had to pay 1.25 cents per pound duty on non-Philippine copra imports.

Taking all factors into account, including that of the difficulties imposed by the Philippines on access of U.S. fats, oils and oilseeds in their market, the bill developed in the committee provides, in this regard, as follows:

The tariff quotas for Philippine coconut oil would be increased from 120,000 to 160,000 long tons for 1965, 1966, and 1967, provided that the increase for 1966 and 1967 would not be effective unless the President, before May 1, 1966, proclaims that the Philippine Republic has released the United States for the 2 years 1966 and 1967 from its obligation to maintain the duty of 1.25 cents per pound on non-Philippine copra. If this proclamation is issued, the quotas will be increased for the 2 years, as provided in the bill, and the duty on copra will be suspended for those 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I believe that the various domestic interests are agreeable to the provisions of the bill as reported, and the Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this bill is approved by everyone why is there not some indication of that in the report? There is not a single letter or communication from any agency or department of Government stating a position with reference to this legislation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I can say to the gentleman that the reports of all the departments of the Government interested in this legislation were favorable. Those reports were on the original bill. They reported in person to the committee their approval of the committee bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, those reports will be found in the public hearings. I realize this does not make them a part of the RECORD itself, but, as the gentleman says, they were favorable and they are available to the Members.

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

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr GROSS. As I understand this legislation it would cut the tariff on coconut oil imports into the United States; is that correct?

Mr. KEOGH. That is correct; it would increase the duty-free quota for 3 years, conditionally.

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 5 of the report that the Philippine Congress last year passed legislation lowering by 50 percent duties levied on U.S. soybeans, but that legislation was vetoed by the President of the Philippines. What kind of reciprocity is it when we provide under the terms of this legislation to accept more imports of coconut oil and they refuse to extend us reciprocity in our export of soybeans to that country?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, as always, raises a very cogent point. I would say to him that our committee went carefully into this matter and we decided that it would not be fitting on our part to attempt to guess why an autonomous legislative body in a friendly, allied country does certain things, no more, we hope, than some of them would attempt on occasion to guess why we here do certain things.

But I will say to the gentleman that your committee—and this report, incidentally, is unanimous out of our committee—that your committee has conditioned the continuance of the duty-free quota on their not only waiving their existing and longtime preference on copra, but as I am sure the gentleman has noted, the report invites the attention of the executive branch, in dealing with this problem, to go into all the others.

But I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion it would be unwise for us, with respect to the Philippine Islands, to make any more narrow, or to narrow to any further extent, the conditions except those that are laid down in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what did the committee hearings develop with respect to the supply of domestic edible fats and oils situation in this country?

Mr. KEOGH. That clearly the best interests of the edible fats and oils produced in this country and sold worldwide are far better protected in the manner which your committee has reported in the pending bill than attempting, as I am sure the gentleman is always opposed to, any futile effort to do it piecemeal, to do it narrowly, and to do it with respect to the Philippine Islands where the problem is nonexistent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I come from an agricultural area, and I am wondering——

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering, as I look at this legislation, what the situation of edible fats and oils is within this country. Are we now going to bring in more coconut oil to load on what may be a domestic surplus of edible fats and oils?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, coming as he does from and speaking in behalf of a great agricultural section of this country, knows very well that the use to which coconut oil is put primarily in this country, is not at all competitive with that of edible fats and oils.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute.

Mr. KEOGH. But, for the most part this coconut oil goes into the making of detergents and the unavailability of any supply would force the domestic detergent manufacturers into the manufacture of synthetic detergents, with the creation of further collateral problems with which the gentleman from Iowa is fully familiar.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman, my good friend from New York, very well knows, detergents, soap, and so forth, can be made and are made from inedible oil in this country. We have a lot of inedible oil as a byproduct of our livestock industry.

Mr. KEOGH. Precisely; and it has been so testified to. But the trend of the domestic detergent industry is in two directions. They use coconut oil when available and they go to synthetics when it is not available. There is no gainsaying that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill deals with two separate taxes or duty applicable with respect to the importation and processing of coconut oil. Practically all of our coconut oil is either imported from the Philippines, or is produced in the United States from copra which has been imported from the Philippines.

In the Revenue Act of 1934, coconut oil was subjected to a processing tax of 3 cents per pound if processed from a product of a U.S. possession or the Philippines, and 5 cents per pound if processed from other sources. Since 1957, we have suspended this processing tax.

The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 provided for the favorable differential in the processing tax as applied to the Philippines. By agreement with the Philippines, the United States undertook an obligation to maintain this 2-cent-per-pound preferable differential in the processing tax between Philippine coconut oil and non-Philippine coconut oil. As applied to the copra, this differential works out to 1.25 cents per pound of copra to be processed.

In addition to the processing taxes, the Tariff Act of 1930 imposed a 2-cent-per-pound duty on the importation of coconut oil and a 1-cent-per-pound duty on palm-kernel oil fit for human consumption. Pursuant to GATT, it was reduced to 1 cent, effective January 1948.

Originally, the processing taxes were designed to protect domestic vegetable oils in a use of the production of edible products such as margarine. The use of coconut oil for such products became economically impractical because of a price differential. Accordingly, coconut oils are used almost wholly for the production of soaps, detergents, and the like. No coconut oil is used for edible purposes in the United States, except where used as a film on certain bakery products.

While the processing tax has been suspended, the regular duty of 1 cent per pound has been in effect with respect to imports of Philippine coconut oil within specified quotas since 1948. The quota which could be brought in from the Philippines duty free was scaled to decline from 200,000 tons initially to 160,000 tons by 1962 and 120,000 tons by 1965, and thereafter in stages to be completely eliminated by 1974. Thus, the amount of coconut oil which could be brought in free of duty from the Philippines was declining, while at the same time the U.S. demand for coconut oil to be used in the production of soaps and detergents was increasing. This year the duty free quota was filled within the first 6 months of the calendar year. This meant that all coconut oil imported from the Philippines after June 1965, came in at a duty rate of 1 cent per pound. The users of coconut oil asked that the duty be eliminated, or the quotas increased since there was no domestic production of copra.

There were a few domestic crushers of copra who opposed any increase in the quota, or elimination of the duty, unless we also removed the discriminatory duty that applied to non-Philippine copra imports of 1.25 cents per pound. These domestic crushers stated that so long as that duty remained in effect, they did not have access to any non-Philippine copra, and with the elimination of the duty on imports of oil from the Philippines, could not compete with copra crushed in the Philippines.

The bill seeks to provide an equitable adjustment both with respect to the preference granted to the Philippines and with respect to the duty imposed on non-Philippine copra.

First, the bill increases the quota-free imports of coconut oil from the Philippines to 160,000 long tons. This will correspond with the quota in effect for the calendar years 1962–64.

Second, the quota of 160,000 long tons will be effective for the years 1966 and 1967 only if the Philippine Republic agrees to release the United States from any obligation to maintain a duty of 1.25 cents per pound of non-Philippine copra. In other words, if the Philippines wishes to have the advantage of a higher duty-free quota, the Philippines must agree in turn to permit the U.S. domestic crushers to buy copra from outside the Philippines without paying a discriminatory duty of 1.25 cents per pound.

While the bill does not provide an ultimate solution to the problem insofar as it relates to the problem of protecting the interest of domestic crushers of copra without unreasonably penalizing domestic users of coconut oil, we believe that the quotas provided for in the bill, accompanied by a waiver of the discriminatory duty on non-Philippine copra, will provide benefits for all concerned by 1968, we will have a much better idea of what a permanent solution should be.

The bill also provides for the repeal of the processing taxes which have been suspended since 1957. These suspensions have become pretty much automatic, and there is no objection from any source to this section of the bill. Our only problem arose in attempting to satisfy the domestic users of coconut oil who objected to the payment of a duty on Philippine oil required in excess of the duty-free quotas, and the interest of a few domestic crushers who rightly contended that they could hardly stay in business if coconut oil was admitted duty free, that they could not buy copra—the raw material—without the payment of a duty.

I also believe it should be said at this point that as far as the competition is concerned between coconut oil and domestic edible oils, while that used to be a problem some number of years ago and that is why in the first instance a processing tax was imposed, we have suspended this processing tax for a number of years simply because there is not the competitive situation existing today that used to exist some 10 years ago. So that really is not the issue any more.

What we are trying to do here through the passage of this bill is to maintain, in a sense, the status quo as far as the importation or the payment of duty is concerned on coconut oil coming from the Philippines and get something in return for our copra processors in this country: namely, a relaxation of the preference which in effect means that you can only purchase copra from the Philippines. We made the implementation of this legislation depend on whether the Philippines agrees to waive the preference which they now enjoy in the sale of copra to this country.

Also, we have suggested in our report to the department involved—and you will note it referred to on page 5 of the committee report, that we hope the executive branch in consulting with the Government of the Philippines will also discuss with them the attitude on the part of the Philippines today which we think is unreasonable and which restricts our edible oils going into the Philippine Islands. It is our hope that by acting in this way they in return will reciprocate; not only insofar as their attitude toward copra is concerned, but that they will also yield in their restrictive attitude toward the exportation of other oils from this country to the Philippines.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, surely.

Mr. GROSS. We are taking a tangible action here today in the House to lower the tariff.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. For 1 year; and we point out that as far as next year's increase in quota is concerned, it shall not go into effect unless the Philippines provide this waiver to which I have referred. So this is not a completely self-operating piece of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad to hear that it is limited and that it is limited to 1 year. But, again, we get this story of "we hope the Philippines" or we hope someone else in some foreign country will do something.

Some of us are going to die in despair around here in this business of hoping that they are going to be reciprocal in their approach to us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think if the gentleman will study the report and will study the hearings he will discover that this bill is more for the benefit of this country and the domestic consumers than it is for the Philippines.

The situation we find is that the Philippines is today the exclusive source for copra. Because they are the exclusive source we seek a mechanism to make them at least move in the direction of easing the situation as reflected by their attitude toward some products that are exported from this country to the Philippines. But whether they agree or not, I think this legislation would be good legislation without this condition simply because the fundamental benefit is going to be for our people.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am glad to see our legislative body keeping its finger on this, as well as keeping the Reciprocal Trade Act that you have just so well explained as a basis for our negotiations.

Can the gentleman tell me why this amendment that further amends the Tariff Act of 1931 is needed in addition to the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1962 which authorizes the President to reduce all tariffs up to 50 percent?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It arises out of the fact we have a special agreement that was entered into with the Philippines, I think first in 1946, and then was revised in 1959, that gives special privileges. It gives preferential treatment to the Philippines in connection with a number of items, including coconut oil and copra. We have agreed, for instance, they will always have a 2-cent-per-pound tariff differential in their favor. We cannot import coconut oil from any other country unless we charge them 2 cents more per pound in duty than we charge the Philippines. That is what we ask them to waive.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman is saying this is not embraced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This is a special agreement. We have an understanding with GATT that recognizes such agreements that we have with the Philippines, entered into as a step in their independence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefore, and for other purposes."

SOUTHEAST HURRICANE DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11539) to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby recognizes that the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi suffered extensive property loss and damage as a result of Hurricane Betsy in 1965 (including, but not limited to, loss and damage from flood, high waters, and wind-driven waters caused by such hurricane) and that there is a need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate these States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of highways and public works projects, and to otherwise rehabilitate these devastated areas.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, trailers provided as a result of Hurricane Betsy as temporary housing under clause (d) of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855b), may be sold directly to the persons who are the occupants thereof at prices that are fair and equitable.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(b)), in the case of property loss or damage in the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi resulting from Hurricane Betsy, the Small Business Administration, to the extent such loss or damage is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, (1) shall at the borrower's option on that part of any loan in excess of $500, (A) cancel up to $1,800 of the loan, or (B) waive interest due on the loan in a total amount of not more than $1,800 over a period not to exceed three years; and (2) may lend to a privately owned school, college, or university without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources, and may waive interest payments and defer principal payments on such a loan for the first three years of the term of the loan.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the emergency loan program under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961–67), in the case of property loss or damage in the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, resulting from flood, high waters, or wind-driven water or uninsurable crop loss, caused by Hurricane Betsy, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, to the extent such loss or damage is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, at the borrower's option on that part of any loan in excess of $500, (1) cancel up to $1,800 of the loan, or (2) waive interest due on the loan in a total amount of not more than $1,800 over a period not to exceed three years without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall undertake an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal disaster insurance, as well as the existing flood insurance program, and shall report his findings and recommendations to the President for submission to the Congress not later than nine months after the appropriation of funds for this study, except that the findings and recommendations on earthquake insurance shall be reported to the President for submission to the Congress not later than three years after the appropriation of funds for this study.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $70,000,000 to carry out this Act, and such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. This Act, other than sections 5 and 6, shall not be in effect after January 1, 1967, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act on or before such date.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to appear on this floor today as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works, and report to this body that the legislation which is being considered at this moment is needed and necessary legislation. It comes into being as a direct result of a trip taken to the State of Louisiana recently by the Subcommittee on Flood Control. We visited the devastated areas of New Orleans and Baton Rouge and held public hearings. We heard testimony from Federal, State, and local officials and private individuals as to the magnitude of Hurricane Betsy.

It appears that in the terms of the numbers of people affected and in the terms of monetary loss the damages caused to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi by this hurricane of September 1965, may be greater than any of the previous natural disasters.

H.R. 11539, the legislation we consider today we believe will go a long way toward restoring the area to its full scale vitality. I point out that it operates within the framework of existing law and will provide, to those individuals who suffered damage by this disaster, relief for housing, property loss, and crop damage. It will as well, by acting again within the framework of existing law, go a long way to help replace the damaged schools in the area. The legislation authorizes some $70 million for the purposes of the bill which in essense would waive at the borrower's option up to $1,800 of a loan issued by the Small Business Administration if the loan is in excess of $500 to begin with or would allow interest to be waived on such loan for a period of 3 years but once again not in excess of $1,800.

In the case of the farmers who are affected by this legislation as well as stockmen and oyster planters in the affected areas the Farmers Home Administration will be allowed to give additional assistance to these people and as in the case of the Small Business Administration where a loan is in excess of $500 cancel up to $1,800 of such loan or waive the interest due on the loan up to $1,800 over a period of three years all without regard to whether required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

Mr. Speaker, may I say between January and September of this year the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works has taken six separate trips to various disaster stricken areas of our country from the Pacific coast to the Gulf of Mexico. We believe these trips have been effective not only as a physiological stimulus to the people whom we visited in the areas and where we held hearings but have as well provided concrete results in the increased authorizations for existing projects, and definite legislation as in the case of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida which we consider today

In the States of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi between 800,000 and 1 million people were affected by the hurricane. Over 1,500 homes were destroyed and more than 150,000 homes were damaged.

There were 2,000 trailers damaged or destroyed and 1,400 farm buildings and 2,600 small businesses.

It is obvious that these people must receive all the help possible. I pay great tribute today to the various Federal agencies which immediately moved into these areas and did so much for the regions that were affected. However, I believe that legislation such as H.R. 11539 is needed and is necessary. I trust this body will pass this legislation today.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to commend the gentleman and all of his colleagues on the Public Works Committee, including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] the ranking Republican member of the committee.

I should like especially to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle who took time off on a busy weekend and gave up their whole weekend to go to Louisiana and take testimony on the damage done in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

I should also like to commend the gentleman from Alabama and the members of the Committee on Public Works on the breadth of the proposed legislation. As the gentleman from Indiana knows, hearings have been conducted by the gentleman's committee on the need for general legislation.

I think what the gentleman is trying to do is to take care of the situation in the manner in which we took care of the situation in Alaska, the Northwest, and elsewhere where disasters have recently occurred, and at the same time anticipate the passage of a general bill in the future, and also you are taking a real look at the need for flood and earthquake insurance. I commend the gentleman and everyone associated with him.

This bill is vitally important to the States affected and will bring measurable relief to a great many people.

Mr. Speaker, the recent Hurricane Betsy which struck Florida, Mississippi, and my State of Louisiana, was the worst natural disaster ever to strike the North American Continent, in terms of property losses. Many millions in insurable losses were suffered by homeowners, farmers, small businessmen, and by colleges and universities in south Louisiana, the area which received the most severe blow from Hurricane Betsy.

The Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act, which we are considering in the House today, is a most important piece of legislation to the stricken people of my State, and those of Florida and Mississippi, many of whom suffered almost irreparable losses from Betsy's wrath. This legislation will bring sorely needed financial assistance in those areas where existing law does not provide adequate relief. Homeowners, farmers, fishermen, small businessmen, and private schools, colleges and universities, will be able to obtain more financial aid than is now available on their property losses by flood, high waters, and wind-driven waters. In cases, where their property losses from flooding, high waters, and wind-driven waters exceeds $500, the homeowners, farmers, and small businessmen will be able to obtain a "forgiveness" up to a maximum of $1,800, from the Small Business Administration, or from the Farmers Home Administration, or they will have an option to waive the interest due on a loan of up to a maximum of $1,800, and to have more liberal repayment terms.

Schools, colleges, and universities, privately owned or religiously supported, will be able to get SBA loans without regard to whether the needed financial aid can be obtained from private commercial sources. These institutions, many of which sustained severe damages from the hurricane, also will be able to waive interest payments and defer principal payments on such loans for the first 3 years of the term of the loans.

This legislation also will permit those citizens who are living in Government-owner trailers, like those being provided to people at Grand Isle, to buy these trailers at fair and equitable prices.

In addition, the bill also provides for a comprehensive study of the whole field of Federal disaster assistance and relief, including various methods for offering Federal disaster insurance such as the existing Flood Insurance Act enacted by Congress in 1956.

From this thorough study, a report on findings and recommendations will be made to the President—with the end result that such special legislation for each

individual major disaster may not be necessary in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of a fully cooperative effort between the legislative and the executive branch. It is the product of many good minds, and it has the support of the administration and of the Bureau of the Budget. It is vitally needed for the stricken people of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, because with Hurricane Betsy, the destruction was so widespread—the misery and suffering so great—and the property losses so extensive—that existing law for these citizens and for private schools and colleges is not adequate.

There are so many people who deserve thanks for their cooperation and their help in bringing this legislation to the attention of Congress for its action. My distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. BOB JONES, who heads the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, has really been the leader in drafting and presenting this legislation. His genuine concern for the people of my State, and of Florida and Mississippi, is most heartening. He directed the conduct of thorough hearings in New Orleans and Baton Rouge before this legislation was drafted. He gathered the necessary testimony and facts to emphasize the need for this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

The problems that were presented in this disaster were unique from all the rest we considered. For that reason, I believe all members of the committee have been very skillful in drafting the relief that would be responsive to the despair of the people of that area.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. I wish to commend the gentleman for the outstanding and very diligent and wonderful work that he has done on this legislation. As I heard my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] say, the amount of time and sacrifice that you and the other members of the committee put forth in going to Louisiana was a most outstanding and unselfish job. No chairman or members of this committee have ever worked any harder, and the results today, in passing this emergency and needed legislation is truly a masterpiece of work. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman and to say that I think that this has certainly been a very outstanding job and one that is most appreciated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. I wish to join with my colleagues in their expression of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues on the committee who visited Louisiana and held on-the-spot hearings.

This legislation is perhaps some of the most important that has come before this body in many years. I believe the thanks of the Nation go to the gentleman from Alabama, as well as the thanks of those of us who come from Louisiana, who are immediately affected, and of the people of Mississippi and Florida.

This is emergency legislation of the moment, but carried in the bill is a more important item relating to future legislation which will be based upon this type of legislation. It is to be hoped that in the future, under the splendid leadership of the gentleman from Alabama, if ever a hurricane, tornado, earthquake or flood should occur in another section of this Nation, the people of that area will not be compelled to wait for emergency legislation. In the future they will know immediately.

In this particular instance, as has been pointed out, under the law the Government could do no more than it did. It did a magnificent job. It did a splendid job. But now we need this additional emergency legislation, which I hope will be a pattern for the future, for permanent legislation.

Again I express the thanks of the people of Louisiana in my district, who probably were struck harder than any other section of the Nation, to the gentleman from Alabama, and his committee.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said, and I commend the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues on the committee, as well as the members of his staff.

This is a good bill. It will bring deserved relief. I appreciate the bipartisan spirit which has brought it to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I assure the gentleman that it has been a bipartisan spirit. The Members on the left of us have been as diligent, as earnest, and as devoted to the cause as any Member of the majority.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN.]

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. I believe I speak for all of the wonderful people of the great State of Louisiana, especially those of the Fifth Congressional District, when I say thank you very, very much for moving into action and getting this needed legislation passed during the present session of the Congress. It is especially pleasing to me to see the Congress give the same consideration to Americans that we have been extending to many foreign nations, and that is interest-free money, in fact, the right of cancellation of loans as well as outright grants. To do as much for our own people is not more than should be expected.

Many of my fellow Louisianians have lost their life's savings, and without a helping hand from their Government, and for that matter, their neighbors and organizations that are in position to help, they would never be able to become sufficiently rehabilitated to pick up the loose ends and try to replace that which has been lost.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in their support of H.R. 11539, a bill which will provide assistance to the States of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, for assistance in the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent Hurricane Betsy.

I have just been confirmed by the House of Representatives as a Member from the Seventh District of Louisiana, and I consider it a privilege to have as my first duty the opportunity to join in the views of my colleagues and to vote for this bill, which will do much to mitigate the tremendous losses caused by Hurricane Betsy with which you are all familiar.

From what I understand, the damage caused by Hurricane Betsy is the worst of record in the United States. Betsy's September 1965 smash of the Gulf Coast was one of the most destructive in all history. Even experienced disaster workers were appalled more and more every day as storm victims continued to register for long term recovery help in rebuilding their lives and homes.

When it is realized that approximately 1 million persons were adversely affected by the hurricane, some conception can be gained of the magnitude of the disaster. The only other natural catastrophe that equals this devastation was the 1937 Ohio-Mississippi River flood, which forced over a million persons from their homes.

In the case of Betsy, over 1,500 homes were destroyed and more than 150,000 damaged. In addition, there were 2,000 trailers that were damaged or destroyed, as well as 1,400 hundred farm buildings and 2,600 small businesses.

I join with my colleagues in complimenting the members of the Public Works Committee in taking immediate action. A special subcommittee of the full committee was sent to the area to inspect the damage and to meet with Federal, State and local officials. The subcommittee held hearings on September 25 and 26, 1965, in New Orleans and Baton Rouge, to determine what the Federal Government and Congress could do to provide additional relief to the area affected by Hurricane Betsy.

On October 13, 1965, the Committee on Public Works held hearings on H.R. 11539, and related bills, in Washington, and testimony was received from Members of Congress and representatives of the executive branch of the Government.

The bill has been ably described by the chairman of the subcommittee, ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, and I shall not repeat the provisions of the bill. However, it does provide for assistance in the way of cancellation of a portion of loans or waivers of interest, in addition to other financial aid. It is my opinion that it is a forward step in providing for assistance by the United States to the residents of an area so severely devastated, and one of the most far-reaching steps it has been my fortune to experience in the workings of the Federal Government. I am tremendously impressed by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive favorable action by the House.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. FALLON; to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JONES of Alabama; and indeed to the entire committee for the consideration they have given to those who have suffered so much because of Hurricane Betsy. The people of Louisiana appreciate what you are doing I assure you.

I express the hope that from this legislation will come new recommendations or legislation which will be long standing and corrective in nature, and will assist others, as time goes by, who find themselves in similar conditions. Perhaps from this will come flood control insurance which will be meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11539, a bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for damages caused by the unforgettable Hurricane Betsy.

Hurricane disaster has been frequent to the people of Louisiana, as well as to other Gulf States. Because of such frequency, and consequential damage to life and property, it is entirely appropriate that the Congress of the United States act to provide assistance to the people of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi in their time of emergency need.

The unprecedented and unequaled extent of financial loss caused by Hurricane Betsy sustains and cogently advances the idea that individuals alone cannot shoulder the loss inflicted upon them by the elements. It is, therefore, the duty of this Congress to enact appropriate legislation to bridge the gap in the rebuilding of affected areas. This bill will provide that assistance and I strongly urge its final passage.

I am extremely grateful to the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES of Alabama, and his Subcommittee on Flood Control for their visit to Louisiana; and to Chairman FALLON of the Public Works Committee, my colleagues from Louisiana, and other Members of this body, who have worked so hard to develop H.R. 11539.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the gulf shore States have suffered severely at the hands of hurricanes many times in the past as have all of the littoral Atlantic States. However, this past September, Louisiana and nearby Mississippi suffered the worst blow of all time when Hurricane Betsy struck after having hit Florida where it caused severe damages.

Damages in Florida have been estimated at over $100 million, and that in Louisiana and adjoining Mississippi has been estimated variously from $1 to $2 billion, and many precious lives were lost.

Under Public Law 875 many Federal agencies rushed in with food, temporary shelter, clothing, undertaking protective and preventive health measures, repair crews for roads, communications utilities, and levees.

Countless lives were saved and much good has been accomplished, but, as in the past, there is the inevitable aftermath which leaves thousands still homeless, without jobs and saddled with debts for property which has been destroyed or damaged so as to require extensive costly repair. Many businesses have been wiped out—resulting in unemployment for many and bankruptcy for the owners and operators. Numerous communities still lack functioning public facilities, schools, churches, and other institutions remain closed or were destroyed.

Assistance under Public Law 875 is unable to cope with a disaster of the caliber attained by Hurricane Betsy.

H.R. 11539, which is identical to my bill, H.R. 11574, is directed toward mending this situation.

Trailers brought in to house victims are still needed. Construction of permanent housing in the ordinary sense will require years to replace the homes wrecked by Betsy. The bill would authorize the sale of these trailers to the present occupants at a fair price.

The bill would assist small business to assume activities and again give useful employment by permitting cancellation of part of existing Small Business Administration loans, or waiving interest payments for a period. This would in many cases enable small shops and service establishments and the like to resume a useful life, serving the community by meeting their needs and by giving employment.

Provision is made for loans on generous terms to private educational institutions which suffered grievously at the hands of Hurricane Betsy. These three States have a high proportion of such institutions and many now have limited resources.

Inevitably much agricultural loss is suffered in a disaster of this type. Entire crops were destroyed leaving farmers with no income, but in many instances saddled with debts incurred for purchase of seed and fertilizer, and for labor. This bill would provide relief for these unfortunates so that they may resume activities.

The act would also direct the Housing and Urban Development Department to undertake a long-needed restudy of the overall problem of disaster relief to develop a program of insurance against property loss which might serve to avert the necessity for extensive specialized legislation such as is embodied in H.R. 11539. Americans are willing to stand on their own two feet even after suffering at the hands of mother nature if only given a helping hand.

H.R. 11539 will, by utilization of the $70 million it would authorize, extend this helping hand so that the people of three States who have suffered a crippling blow may once again become productive citizens.

On behalf of the people of the congressional district I represent I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and the distinguished chairman, Mr. FALLON, of Maryland, and the ranking minority member, Mr. CRAMER, of Florida, and all members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works for their prompt response and action to and for the distress and the needs of the people who have been seriously damaged and inconvenienced.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous approval of this legislation.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the highest commendation to the able gentleman from Alabama who is now in the well and who was the chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation and also particularly commend our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking minority member of that great Committee on Public Works, for the promptness and thoroughness with which this splendid committee has investigated and responded to the needs of the people in these three States who have been the victims of this hurricane. I especially wish to commend the committee for their farsightedness in including section 5 which lays the groundwork for the hope that we will be able to enact in the next session of this Congress legislation of far-reaching importance that will meet these situations as they arise and meet them adequately as they come along, without the Congress having to deal with each case individually. I think it is a very significant piece of legislation. For my people and myself I wish to commend the able gentleman and his colleagues for the great work they have done.

Hurricane Betsy struck a vicious blow to the people in the heavily populated south Florida area. In Dade County alone, the county manager of our metropolitan county government has estimated the damage to private property totaled $111,284,500 and the additional damage to public property $5,103,000.

Much of this damage was water damage for which the victims of the hurricane cannot obtain compensation under existing insurance policies. These losses must be sustained by the individual homeowner and the small businessman, unless a compassionate Federal Government sees fits to help these homeowners and businessmen, to compensate them for losses against which they can obtain no other protection, to extend to them the heartfelt sympathy of the American

people to those who have suffered, through no fault of their own, a serious misfortune.

The provisions of this bill, which I have cosponsored, would permit the Small Business Administration to recognize the individual hardships of those who obtain SBA disaster loans by waiving part of the interest due on the loan or by canceling part of the loan in excess of the first $500. This will give a greater flexibility to the administration of the present disaster loan program and relieve to a greater degree the hardship imposed by these property losses.

I am happy to be a sponsor of this legislation with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Representative DANTE FASCELL, also from Dade County, and with the distinguished Members of the Louisiana and Mississippi delegations in this body.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for bringing this particular piece of legislation to the floor of the House. I hope it will pass unanimously. I am especially grateful to the gentleman for undertaking hearings on the omnibus disaster legislation. Many of us who have lived through one of these disasters, as we have in my district, know that there is a need for a complete overhaul of the existing acts which presently are on the statute books. There have been over 40 disasters declared as such since January 1964 in the United States. There are presently some 30 of these still existing as disaster areas. I would hope that this would point up to the House the need for an overhaul of our disaster legislation so that it would not be necessary for us to come to the House each time we have a natural disaster. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I now yield to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of this legislation, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by those who have preceded me in the discussion of this bill. Hurricane Betsy was one of the most erratic and damaging of all the hurricanes which have visited their wrath upon the coastal lines of the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi. It even exceeded the damage wrought by the 1947 hurricane which caused much damage to my own beautiful coast of Mississippi. Betsy, after an erratic course in both the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, was aimed directly at the Mississippi gulf coast. Fortunately for my people, its course again was changed and its full fury hit the city of New Orleans and the adjoining areas of Louisiana. Even so, my own area along the Mississippi coast did not escape unscathed. Much damage was done to that area. While the damage there was not comparable to the New Orleans area some 50 miles to the west, the damage was nevertheless substantial. The seawalls constructed at a cost to the taxpayers of the Mississippi coast were substantially damaged. The fishing industry which means so much to the economy of that section also suffered substantial damage. Likewise, many private homes and property felt the fury with resultant damage of this hurricane.

The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to assist the people and the local governments of these three States to rehabilitate themselves and assist in the recovery from the losses substained in this severe storm. This is a humanitarian effort which I am sure will receive the support of the people of all of the States of the Union and, therefore, I am glad to have a small part in relieving the suffering and the losses incurred by this hurricane.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am particularly cognizant of the impact of a great natural catastrophe because of my memory of the Alaskan earthquake. I am proud to be on the full Committee on Public Works and worked very closely with the subcommittee in drafting this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Alaska gave us valuable information based on the experience he has had with such things in Alaska. He was quite helpful in the draftsmanship of this legislation.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in full support of this legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks, generally, of the gentleman from Alabama, my distinguished colleague, who has held many conferences with many of the department heads in the executive branch of the Government, trying to get together a bill that makes sense, that the House will accept, that will do some real, substantial good, and that will give some needed help to the people in the areas affected.

Hurricane Betsy was one of the most devastating hurricanes in recent history. The estimated damage of that hurricane is $2.5 billion, the largest portion of which, in excess of $2 billion, was in the State of Louisiana; about one-quarter billion dollars in the State of Mississippi; and about $119 million in the State of Florida.

We knew that legislation was contemplated, after the damage took place. We knew that the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 had been acted upon in this session of Congress, and we realized further that the relief contained therein, being partially regional in character, did not provide adequate relief for the rest of the Nation and, in this instance, to the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida.

Discussions started about the type of legislation that would be proper at this late date in the session. Could we possibly get to the consideration of general legislation relating to disaster relief throughout the Nation? I wholeheartedly subscribe to the basic thesis, as I am sure the gentleman from Alabama and other members of the committee do, that this is a subject that must be treated as soon as possible on a nationwide basis. For that reason the committee last week started hearings on this subject matter.

This bill does bring within the existing program the present administrative agencies, and requires no new administrative agencies, no additional personnel except, perhaps, for study purposes, as to what the permanent solution should be. It is within the framework of what I believe at this late date should be done by our committee, taking the existing programs and thoroughly exploring the possibilities with the executive agencies as to what could be done at this late hour that would give immediate relief to those persons who suffered from this terrible disaster.

This is one of the toughest bills we have gotten into. It is one of the toughest problems that we have to meet. I say unequivocally, so far as this Member is concerned, that it will be my intention and it appears to be the intention of the majority likewise, to take this matter up in detail, with continuing hearings early next year and studying the matter during the recess period. We all realize the importance of treating the problem of any future disasters that may strike any community, because the people of these communities in this Nation should know what relief is available and what relief should be made available through State and local communities, as well as through the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the intent and will be the intent of the committee, to address itself to that problem and to make suitable studies of the legislative requirements to meet these hazardous circumstances once they arise. I can assure the gentleman from Florida that it will not go without attention.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that back in 1928 when I had just gone to Florida we had one of the worst storms in the history of this Nation. It almost knocked our roof off; it was almost blown off. I know what it is to go through one of these terrible storms. So I am not unsympathetic to the problem involved so far as Florida is concerned.

In Florida we suffered an estimated damage of $119,060,000 of which $9,100,000 was public property damage. Under the present law, passed in 1950 and amended subsequently, only $1,546,000 is eligible for Federal assistance. Under the present program, Public Law 875, which I think is one of the best indications of the situation, only $1,500,000 out of nearly $120 million is eligible for Federal assistance. The severity of the situation even in the State of Florida is demonstrated by the Red Cross reports which indicate that there were thousands of homes that were either destroyed or

suffered major and minor damage. One hundred and ninety-three trailers were destroyed and 955 were damaged. A total of over 5,000 families suffered some loss as a result of the disaster.

It is estimated that there will be 50,000 claims by the insurance industry which will be filed resulting in payments of between $25 and $28 million.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is nothing in this legislation nor is it intended to discourage in any way, but rather to encourage the private property owners to insure against losses which are insurable; as a matter of fact insurable losses—not only insured losses, but insurable losses, meaning nonwater damage risks and that those insurable losses are not covered by this legislation. I believe it is important to note that only uninsurable losses are specifically spelled out in section 4.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] whether or not my understanding is correct, having helped draft the legislation, that it is the intention of the committee that section 3 likewise should cover as a matter of administrative procedure uninsurable losses?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is exactly correct. Most of section 4 items were in the sugarcane operation and therefore they were covered under the existing law at 80 percent. Therefore, the gentleman from Florida in writing up the provisions to which he has just referred did not think it was necessary to write it into section 4.

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad the gentleman concurs, because I personally was of the opinion that we ought to write it into section 3 the same as we wrote it in section 4, that loss or damage from flood, high waters, or wind-driven water or uninsurable crop loss would be subject to the provisions of this bill.

But, it is understood, I hope, in the debate that that is what is intended in section 3 as well as under the Small Business Administration disaster relief program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman wrote that provision into section 3 it was my understanding that since the uninsurable losses occurred under the existing law, in section 4 it would not be necessary and so the gentleman from Florida has stated what was intended to be arrived at through the language of the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and I hope in administering the program it will be so administered.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama—and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]—relating to a needs test. As the legislation is drafted, there is under the present program of the Small Business Administration disaster relief, under the consolidated Farmers Home Administration disaster relief, the ASCA disaster relief, and there is written into those laws, or in the alternative by administrative action, a needs test so that those persons who have an economic need can qualify. In other words, millionaires cannot get the $1,800 benefit either in waived interest or waived principal? Does the gentleman from Alabama agree with that statement?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I not only agree to that but I would expect that there will be a continuation of the needs test as contained in existing law, with those exceptions that are waived in titles III and IV. So I believe we could not neglect in the administration of this act some type of needs test or examination.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman on that point.

Of course, the gentleman and I concurred in the paragraph on page 3 relating to where in administering the act someone who makes the request for the full $1,800, either waiver of an existing loan or $1,800 payoff in interest or principal on a new loan, that the administration will have discretion to determine not only and how come or whether the act should be approved, but certainly whether the full $1,800 should be granted.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, not only that but the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, along with the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, gave assurances to the committee that once they received a loan of approximately $2,300, they would, of course, look with careful examination at that proposal.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, $2,300 is the most favorable consideration a person could have, meaning $1,800 over the initial $500 minimum?

In other words, if you made application for $2,300 you might get the maximum of $1,800 in waivers, and thus only be liable for $500. I hope that will be looked at with serious reservation because it is a maximum benefit situation.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret to note that this is the second consecutive bill that comes before the House this afternoon accompanied by a report which gives no indication of any departmental or agency views. While I do not mean to say I am bound by agency and departmental views, I think it is well to have them, and I regret again this bill is accompanied by a report which gives no indication that any agency or department is interested in the legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say that the testimony of the agencies is contained in the hearings. Generally the agencies favor this kind of legislation. I will say to the gentleman further, so far as I am concerned, this House can consider itself fortunate that the price tag brought before this House on a $2.5 billion loss situation is only $70 million. It was estimated in view of the lateness of the hour and in view of inability to get departmental and agency suggestions it would end up with a price tag double that. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman in the well is one who unequivocally told the executive branch of the Government he would not support new programs at this time, and new administrations of those programs and, secondly, would not support substantial direct grants to provide property owners compensation for loss of real and personal property, which was the proposal initially under discussion.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the position he took in that respect.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. With reference to section 5, which has to do with a study of insurance, this philosophy was supported in S. 408, presented before the Senate. Senate 408 is substantially the same as the bill that I filed in April of this year providing for a study comparable to that which has been authorized in this legislation. I would like to say to the House that the nature and extent of this recent disaster is unique only because our memories are short. I can recall one day while serving at a place called Indianola Beach, when a flood and hurricane came in and overcame an entire railroad train. I can recall in 1938 we had a hurricane up in Connecticut in which over 3,000 people lost their lives. This is as expensive as others we have had in the past, and I cannot overlook the loss of human life that was suffered in those days in 1938.

Mr. CRAMER. Perhaps the gentleman misconstrues what the committee intends by that language. It means when the amount of property damaged and involved is of such proportions it deserves consideration by separate legislation.

Mr. KEITH. I agree that it does deserve attention. In the absence of a national policy it deserves special attention.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEITH. Section 5 will provide a national policy that will make some of these things unnecessary because in other years hundreds of miles of railroad and other roads, and housing, were involved, many lives were lost, as we all remember. I strongly support section 5, which was passed in effect by the Senate, and which was before us on our calendar 3 weeks ago today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join in the commendations of others for the gentleman in the well and the chairman of the subcommittee. For those who have been hit in areas throughout the country during disasters, certainly it behooves all of us to support this legislation wholeheartedly.

I am particularly interested in section 5 of the act which had been included in this bill. The balance of the legislation certainly will be of immeasurable relief in Florida, Louisiana, and the Mississippi sections of our country. It certainly is regrettable that this great Com-

mittee on Public Works, which is normally recognized for its work to build America and its great resources, has had to spend so much of its time and effort in rebuilding many sections of America that have been so hard hit by disasters this year.

It is to the credit of this committee, the House and the entire Federal system of government that we can develop legislation that will provide assistance to people and property damaged beyond their ability to recover through normal means.

Mr. CRAMER. In closing I would just like to make this comment.

Section 5 I think is one of the most valuable aspects of the legislation. No. 1, the 1956 insurance act has not been implemented. They have a study that has been begun on what can be done to implement it. It appears that this actually is the long-range answer to the problem. How can these people who cannot get insurance today at reasonable rates to protect themselves against these inordinate risks and who do not have insurance available if a disaster strikes, get protection without direct appropriations from the Federal Government to cover these disasters?

I am confident that some program can be evolved. Also, of course, section 5 includes a general study relating to all available programs and all programs that might be recommended in addition to hurricane insurance. I am confident we can come up with a workable, sound and substantial contribution in this field next year. After all, we need something to be left for next year to be acted on anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out for the benefit of my colleagues in the House that there is a decided role that the private insurance industry can play in meeting the problem that we are dealing with here today, and that is primarily in the field of hurricane insurance. We can buy insurance against windstorms. But we cannot buy insurance against abnormal high tides, and that is where our real problem comes up. We are not concerned with hurricanes as such. There are reasonable rates for that readily available, but we are concerned with the abnormal high tides accompanying these disastrous hurricanes. Practically the only place that you can get insurance against high tides is with Lloyds of London, but the premiums are prohibitive.

We are going to have a cooperative effort, I am sure, as a result of this study which will be made by the Federal Government. The State and local governments and private industry in general and the insurance industry in particular will know what their responsibilities are. I trust the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will approach this constructively and when the report is rendered in 9 months time we will have some legislation that we can enact in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and to congratulate the committee on bringing this measure to us for action. Florida is grateful for the generous and needed provisions of this bill. I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, the need for the studies here authorized to lay the basis for a broad program of insurance for the future. I worked for the 1956 measure which was intended to accomplish this same objective; and I sincerely hope that the new studies will reveal a practical method of prompt relief, preferably on an insurance basis.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to support H.R. 11539, the Southeastern Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

This legislation is certainly necessary for the victims of Hurricane Betsy in Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

I wish, however, to take this opportunity to speak out very strongly on behalf of favorable action by Congress at the earliest possible time on omnibus disaster relief legislation.

The omnibus disaster relief bill, S. 1861, has already been passed by the Senate on a voice vote on July 22, 1965. I have introduced an omnibus disaster relief bill, as have my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] and other Members of the House.

This omnibus bill provides relief for the unfortunate victims of natural disasters like the devastating series of tornadoes which swept through northern Indiana last Palm Sunday and left death and destruction in their wake. The loss to my district alone, with 54 dead, 242 injured, and property damage in the millions, was catastrophic. Hardest hit was the little unincorporated community of Dunlap, near Elkhart, where the desolation in some places was total and the individual suffering was and remains beyond total measurement or relief.

Three days after the holocaust, President Johnson, my colleagues Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, Indiana Governor Roger Branigan, Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and I visited the stricken area. The crippling effects of the storm were overwhelming. The evidence of personal and community tragedy, on all sides, stunned and moved us all.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support Federal action for the victims of Hurricane Betsy in the Southeastern States but I speak as well for those who have suffered from disasters in other parts of the United States during recent months and I also speak for the victims of tomorrow's natural disasters.

Can we possibly be satisfied with piecemeal and after-the-fact legislation each time natural disaster strikes? The omnibus bill which several of us have introduced authorizes Federal agencies to provide a number of forms of immediate and long-term assistance when natural disaster strikes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that if it is not possible for Congress to act during this session on omnibus disaster relief legislation, we shall do so as early as possible in the second session.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed to assist local and State governments in Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and the estimated million citizens adversely affected by Hurricane Betsy, in the long road of rebuilding their homes, businesses, and public facilities. In his report to the President on the activities of the Weather Bureau during the hurricane, the Secretary of Commerce indicated Betsy was the most erratic and destructive hurricane of this century. Much damage was prevented by both the Weather Bureau and the Coast Guard, through their warning and rescue operations, but the destruction in many areas reached unbelievable proportions. Certainly the Federal Government must be in a position to grant special consideration to those who suffered losses from this natural disaster. This legislation seeks to implement existing programs, and reduce some of the restrictions not contemplated in circumstances of this sort. In urging adoption of H.R. 11539, prudence and commonsense are also urged, so that those in actual need are able to secure help, and those who may seek to take advantage of the situation although suffering no hurricane damage are prevented from doing so. Our experiences in this year of destructive weather may serve as the emphasis for more study of the role of the Federal Government in disasters, so that emergency situations can be better met with machinery set up for this purpose, rather than for the necessity of special legislation for each succeeding event of weather on the rampage.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is, Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11539?

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9424) to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes, with amendments as printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress finds and declares that one of the unfortunate consequences of economic growth in the United States has been the extermination of some native species of fish and wildlife; that serious losses in other species of native wild animals with educational, historical, recreational, and scientific value have occurred and are occurring; and that the United States has an obligation pursuant to international agreements, such as the Migratory Bird Treaties and the Inter-American Treaty on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation, 1940, with Canada and Mexico and other countries to conserve and protect, where practicable, the various species of native fish and wildlife, including game and nongame migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction. The purposes of this Act are to provide a program for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction, and to consolidate, restate, and modify the present authorities relating to administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

(b) A species or subspecies of native fish and wildlife shall be regarded as threatened with extinction whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds, after consultation with the States, that its existence is endangered because its habitat is threatened with destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or because of overexploitation, disease, predation, or because of other factors, and that its survival requires assistance.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall utilize the land acquisition and other authorities of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, as amended, the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to carry out a program in the United States of conserving, protecting, restoring, and propagating selected species of native fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction.

(b) In addition to the land acquisition authorities in such Acts, the Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise, lands or interests therein needed to carry out the purpose of this Act relating to the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of selected species of native fish that are threatened with extinction.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) may be used for the purpose of acquiring lands, waters, or interests therein pursuant to this section that are needed for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, and propagating selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction.

(d) The Secretary shall review other programs administered by him and, to the extent practicable, utilize such programs in furtherance of the purpose of this Act. The Secretary shall also encourage other Federal agencies to utilize, where practicable, their authorities in furtherance of the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate to the maximum extent practicable with the several States, and he may enter into agreements with the States for the administration and management of any area established under this program for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of threatened species of native fish and wildlife. Any revenues derived from the administration of such areas under these agreements will continue to be subject to the provisions of section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s).

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of consolidating the authorities relating to the various categories of areas that are administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the conservation of fish and wildlife, including species that are threatened with extinction, all lands, waters, and interests therein administered by the Secretary as wildlife refuges, areas for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction, wildlife ranges, game ranges, wildlife management areas, or waterfowl production areas are hereby designated as the "National Wildlife Refuge System" (referred to herein as the "System"), which shall be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing contained in this Act shall restrict the authority of the Secretary to modify or revoke public land withdrawals affecting lands in the System as presently constituted, or as it may be constituted, whenever he determines that such action is consistent with the public interest.

(b) In administering the System, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to enter into contracts with any person or public or private agency through negotiation for the provision of public accommodations.

(2) to accept donations of funds and to use such funds to acquire or manage lands or interests therein, and

(3) to acquire lands or interests therein by exchange (a) for acquired lands or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition, or (b) for the right to remove, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, products from the acquired or public lands within the System: *Provided,* That the lands or interests therein so exchanged shall involve approximately equal values, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) No person shall knowingly disturb, injure, cut, burn, remove, destroy, or possess any real or personal property of the United States, including natural growth, in any area of the System; or take or possess any fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or nest or egg thereof within any such area; or enter, use, or otherwise occupy any such area for any purpose; unless such activities are performed by persons authorized to manage such area, or unless such activities are permitted either under subsection (d) of this section or by express provision of the law, proclamation, Executive order, or public land order establishing the area, or amendment thereof: *Provided,* the United States mining and mineral leasing laws shall continue to apply to any lands within the System to the same extent they apply prior to the effective date of this Act unless subsequently withdrawn under other authority of law. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to control or regulate hunting or fishing of resident fish and wildlife, including endangered species thereof, on lands not within the System. The regulations permitting hunting and fishing of resident fish and wildlife within the System shall be, to the extent practicable, consistent with State fish and wildlife laws and regulations.

(d) The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to—

(1) permit the use of any area within the System for any purpose, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, public recreation and accommodations, and access whenever he determines that such uses are compatible with the major purposes for which such areas were established: *Provided,* That not to exceed 40 per centum at any one time of any area that has been, or hereafter may be acquired, reserved, or set apart as an inviolate sanctuary for migratory birds, under any law, proclamation, Executive order, or public land order may be administered by the Secretary as an area within which the taking of migratory game birds may be permitted under such regulations as he may prescribe; and

(2) permit the use of, or grant easements in, over, across, upon, through, or under any areas within the System for purposes such as but not necessarily limited to, powerlines, telephone lines, canals, ditches, pipelines, and roads, including the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof, whenever he determines that such uses are compatible with the purposes for which these areas are established.

(e) Any person who violates or fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder shall be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

(f) Any person authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder, may, without a warrant, arrest any person violating this Act or regulations in his presence or view, and may execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this Act or regulations, and may with a search warrant search for and seize any property, fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or nest or egg thereof, taken or possessed in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any property, fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or egg thereof seized with or without a search warrant shall be held by such person or by a United States marshal, and upon conviction, shall be forfeited to the United States and disposed of by the court.

(g) Regulations applicable to areas of the System that are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in effect until modified or rescinded.

(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, repeal, or otherwise modify the provision of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653; 16 U.S.C. 460K—460K–4) which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to administer the areas within the System for public recreation. The provisions of this section relating to recreation shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of said Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The term "person" as used in this Act means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(b) The terms "take" or "taking" or "taken" as used in this Act mean to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, kill, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, or kill.

(c) The terms "State" and the "United States" as used in this Act mean the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

SEC. 6. Section 4(b) of the Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended (16 U.S.C. 718d(b)), is further amended by changing the colon after the word "areas" to a period and striking the provisos, which relate to hunting at certain wildlife refuges and which are now covered by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 7. (a) Sections 4 and 12 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715c and 715k), are further amended by deleting the word "game" wherever it appears.

(b) Section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1224), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715i), which relates to the administration of certain wildlife refuges, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Areas of lands, waters, or interests therein acquired or reserved pursuant to this Act shall, unless otherwise provided by law, be administered by the Secretary of

the Interior under rules and regulations prescribed by him to conserve and protect migratory birds in accordance with treaty obligations with Mexico and Canada, and other species of wildlife found thereon, including species that are threatened with extinction, and to restore or develop adequate wildlife habitat.

"(b) In administering such areas, the Secretary is authorized to manage timber, range, and agricultural crops; to manage other species of animals, including but not limited to fenced range animals, with the objectives of perpetuating, distributing, and utilizing the resources; and to enter into agreements with public and private agencies."

(c) Section 11 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1224) (16 U.S.C. 715j) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "(39 Stat. 1702) and the treaty between the United States and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals concluded February 7, 1936 (50 Stat. 1311)."

(d) Sections 13 and 14 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1225), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715l and 715m), which provide for the enforcement of said Act and for penalties for violations thereof and which are covered by section 4 of this Act, are repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) Sections 302 and 303 of title III of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 382), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715d–1 and 715d–2), which authorize exchanges at wildlife refuges and which are covered by section 4 of this Act, are repealed.

(b) The last sentence of section 401(a) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s), is amended by inserting after the term "wildlife refuges", the following: "lands acquired or reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction,".

SEC. 9. The first clause in section 1 of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653), is amended by deleting the words "national wildlife refuges, game ranges," and inserting therein "areas within the National Wildlife Refuge System,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and honor for me to explain to the Members of the House, H.R. 9424.

This legislation was introduced by our former beloved colleague, the immediate past chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the late T. Ashton Thompson. The bill was introduced on June 23 of this year and probably was the last one introduced by T. A. before his tragic death on the weekend of July 4. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been considered by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation for many Congresses and I think it most appropriate that the House pay tribute to a truly faithful public servant, the late T. A. Thompson, by passing H.R. 9424 in his honor as a living memorial.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate results of economic growth in the United States over the years has been the extermination of some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico. These animals are gone forever from the face of the earth and soon will be joined by some 35 kinds of mammals and 30 to 40 birds unless special conservation efforts to acquire and maintain sufficient habitat for them are initiated.

This legislation would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate and carry out a comprehensive program to conserve, protect, restore, and propagate selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction. In carrying out the program, the Secretary would be directed to use existing broad authorities under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for among other things, as research, studies, and land acquisitions. In addition, new land acquisitions would be authorized and the bill would consolidate and in some cases expand the authorities of the Secretary relating to the management and administration of the national wildlife refuge system as a means toward affording protection to fish and wildlife in all areas of the system. The legislation would also afford some protection to all species of fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has studied the problem of vanishing fish and wildlife for many Congresses but we sincerely believe that H.R. 9424 would provide that needed protection and assistance which will preserve such species for future generations.

This legislation came down to the committee in the form of an executive communication from the Interior Department, its importance warranted the testimony of Secretary Udall at the hearings, it has the endorsement of all the other departments reporting on the legislation, and the unanimous support of all national and international fish and wildlife conservation organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the passage of H.R. 9424.

As I had assured the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, I insert into the RECORD two letters from me to him. These letters make it clear it is not the intent of the committee to amend, alter, or otherwise affect the land and water conservation fund by this legislation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1965.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: This is a formal acknowledgement of your letter of July 14 to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER regarding H.R. 9424.

As I advised you in regard to that letter, the language to which you referred at page 3, line 14, regarding the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, is simply enunciative of the language already included in that statute and provides no new authority to the Secretary of the Interior, nor does it in any way amend, change, or alter the provisions of that statute.

This point was attested to in the hearings by witnesses on behalf of the Department of the Interior who stated this same point and, when published, I am sure you will find that the hearings buttress this statement to your full satisfaction.

I would be derelict in my defense of jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation if I did not point out that legislation dealing with the refuge system for fish and wildlife is properly a matter of concern to that subcommittee, and under the rules of the Congress is given to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which the subcommittee is a duly constituted part.

While I am anxious always to be cooperative and helpful whenever possible, I do wish you to know that it is my responsibility as acting chairman of that subcommittee, to preserve the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and to protect as fully as I am able, in cooperation with our distinguished chairman, the jurisdiction of the full committee.

With warm good wishes.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you very much for your letter on H.R. 9424 dated September 20, 1965, regarding the provisions of that legislation in subsection 2(c) dealing with Land and Water Conservation Fund Act moneys being made available for acquisition of land for preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction.

This matter was discussed at considerable length in the subcommittee, both in the open public hearings and in the executive session, and it was the attitude and intention of the Department of the Interior, which drafted the legislation, and the members of the subcommittee, including myself, that this is simply annunciative of the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and it adds nor detracts nothing from the provisions thereof. A notation to this effect will appear in the report of the committee and, of course, I will be happy to make similar comments on the floor at the time this matter is resolved.

I am happy to learn of your views in our subsequent telephone conversation that this meets with your approval.

With warm good wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging favorable consideration of H.R. 9424. This bill was introduced by the late Honorable T. A. Thompson, a former distinguished member of our committee and former

chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

The purpose of H.R. 9424 is to provide an overall program for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife which are threatened with extinction.

It is unfortunate, but true, that the economic growth of our country has been at the expense of exterminating some wildlife. The U.S. Department of Interior has advised that since the settlement of the 50 States, some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico have become extinct. These animals are gone forever from the face of the earth. Unless remedial action, such as proposed in H.R. 9424, is taken now, another 35 kinds of mammals and 30 to 40 birds face a similar fate of extinction.

True, in the past we have made special efforts to save specified species which have been threatened with extinction. But, this former approach carries with it the weakness of ineffective and piecemeal remedies. What is now required is a coordinated program providing for special conservation efforts to protect all such endangered species. H.R. 9424 provides the vehicle to attain this commendable goal.

In conclusion, I should like to bring to your attention a portion of one of the recommendations on endangered wildlife of the First World Conference on National Parks held in Seattle in 1962. That Conference noted, and I quote, that:

> Any species so threatened which is not accorded such official sanctuary proclaims the failure of the Government concerned to recognize its responsibility to future generations of mankind.

It is my firm and personal belief that the United States now has such a responsibility. It is a responsibility which can be discharged through the legislation which is now before you for consideration, H.R. 9424. Accordingly, I strongly urge that H.R. 9424 be considered favorably and passed by the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in memory of a beloved friend and colleague, T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, I consider it an honor to recommend passage of H.R. 9424.

I had the pleasure of serving with T. A. as fellow members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the past 13 years. His term as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation produced an outstanding record of important legislation considered and enacted. Unquestionably, the most important piece of legislation to come before the subcommittee in many years has been H.R. 9424, introduced by T. A. only a few days before his tragic death. As a memorial to a truly faithful public servant, I think it very fitting that H.R. 9424 be passed in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, over the years some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico have disappeared from the face of our earth. There are a number of other rare and endangered native fish and wildlife which will become extinct in the not too distant future unless sufficient habitat is soon acquired. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has considered the problem of species threatened with extinction many times before and has passed special legislation to save such species as the key deer, fur seal, sea otter, and many others. H.R. 9424 would eliminate this need to come to the Congress each time a species of fish and wildlife is threatened.

The main purpose of this legislation would be to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate and carry out a program designed to conserve, protect, restore, and propagate selected species of endangered fish and wildlife.

In addition, the bill would afford protection to migratory birds which would assist us in meeting our international commitments to Canada and Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the passage of this vitally important legislation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in tribute to the late T. A. Thompson, the original sponsor of this legislation, and I commend our subcommittee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, who is doing such an outstanding job in his efforts to fill the shoes of Mr. Thompson in this respect.

As a Representative of Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, I have had firsthand knowledge of the problem which faces our Nation's wildlife. For example, the last heath hen died early in this century down on Martha's Vineyard. This was a game bird which furnished food for the tables of our early settlers.

I believe the legislation goes a long way toward resisting and reversing the trend which has decimated so much of our wonderful wildlife.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend my good friend from Washington [Mr. PELLY], and also my good friend from Massachusetts, for their help on this bill, and indeed all the members of the subcommittee and the committee.

I yield at this time to my good friend the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

I commend the gentleman for the excellent job he has done in such a short time since he has taken over the work of our late beloved colleague, Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

To establish a legislative history, I should like to pose a question to the gentleman from Michigan.

Do the provisions of H.R. 9424 include the nene goose of Hawaii?

Mr. DINGELL. I refer the gentleman to page 2, line 16, subsection (b) and the language which follows, wherein the Secretary can designate. The language is:

> A species or subspecies of native fish and wildlife shall be regarded as threatened with extinction whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds, after consultation with the States, that its existence is endangered because its habitat is threatened with destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or because of overexploitation, disease, predation, or because of other factors, and that its survival requires assistance.

It is my interpretation of the language, as I am sure it would be the interpretation of the subcommittee and of the House, that that language would cover the nene goose of Hawaii to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. As the gentleman knows, the nene is the official State bird of Hawaii, and indeed one of the world's most beautiful and distinguished looking species. Unfortunately, it is one of the world's rarest and most endangered species. Its preservation is truly a matter of interest not only to the State of Hawaii but also to the entire Nation. For this reason I introduced a bill, H.R. 505, on January 4 of this year, and appeared before the gentleman's subcommittee to testify in support of my bill. It is my understanding that my bill has been incorporated into the bill now before us, and the purpose of my bill is fully covered by the measure under consideration. The program provided by the bill raises the hope that the nene will become another conservation achievement in which all Americans can take pride. Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 9424.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Congressman from the South Bronx, a densely populated urban area, in support of this bill.

I say to my colleague from Massachusetts that I have spent many happy childhood and adult hours on the beaches of Martha's Vineyard, on the sandy windswept dunes of Menemsha Pond and King's Beach, and I rejoice in the imminent passage of this legislation.

I rejoice not only for my colleague for the preservation of the glorious wildlife and eerie beauty of his rural district but also, as a Member representing a densely populated New York City district, I rejoice for urban America, as well.

The advent of the airplane and the omnipresent automobile have largely eliminated space and time in our society. And the increase in our per family spending money and in our vacation periods, as well as in the proliferating automobile population and the ever-spreading network of concrete ribbons crisscrossing our lands, pose the question: Where shall we go in our family car for the breath of pure natural beauty which refreshes the body and rekindles the spirit?

For too long we have ravaged and despoiled our great wildlife heritage and the pristine open spaces, golden plains, verdant valleys, marshland oases, majestic coastlands.

A reversal of this shameful lack of national program and national purpose is long overdue.

So, on behalf of urban America, speaking for the great majority of Americans—the city dwellers across the land who will enjoy the national heritage you are preserving and enhancing—may I be so bold as to rise in enthusiastic support of this bill and commend all of you who have worked so long and hard in bringing it to fruition.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9424, a bill to conserve, protect, and propagate the native species of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction.

It is particularly fitting that we pass this bill as a final tribute to its author, our former colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Thompson. Having served with T.A. on the Public Works Committee, I observed the exceptional abilities of this fine gentleman and heard him express a concern and interest in the conservation objectives contained in this bill. I am pleased to add my support to the bill and ask that the bill be passed unanimously.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 9424 to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out in the United States a comprehensive program for the conservation and protection of species of birds and animals that are threatened with extinction.

This program is urgently needed. Nearly 100 species of birds and animals native to the United States will be wiped out unless a major effort is made. This legislation provides the Secretary with expanded authority to acquire the wildlife habitats and do the research necessary to save threatened native wildlife and migratory birds within our borders. It specifically allows use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to purchase land for this purpose.

High praise is due the Interior Department for submitting this legislation to Congress, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for bringing it before us today.

Enactment of this legislation will constitute a welcome declaration by the United States of the importance of saving threatened species. However, passage of H.R. 9424 is only one of the steps I hope Congress will promptly take.

WILDLIFE IS THREATENED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

It is not only in North America that many species are facing extermination. Indeed the threat to the world's wildlife is even more acute in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—and in the world's oceans.

Even now man is in the process of wiping out the world's largest animal—the blue whale, as well as the rhinoceros, the orangutan, the leopard, and more than 250 other species.

Many of the animals that are now doomed unless something is done have present or potential economic value. Many of them are of scientific, medical, or educational importance.

All of them belong to the web of life with which we tamper at our hazard. And all of them have a claim to survival based on esthetic and ethical considerations.

Wherever they may live, these irreplaceable creatures belong, in a broader sense, to all men. Mankind as a whole will be the loser if these animals go the way of the dodo and the passenger pigeon and the 200 other species that man has senselessly destroyed.

We must do more than conserve the species within this country under the excellent legislation before us today.

We should also take the initiative in cooperative conservation action on a worldwide basis to save the threatened species and the habitats that are indispensable to their survival before it is too late.

As it is now, a number of largely private organizations manned by able and dedicated conservationists are fighting an uneven battle to save the world's threatened wildlife. But the task is beyond the resources available to them.

WORLD GOVERNMENTS MUST TAKE A LARGER ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION

I have long felt that the world's governments must play a much greater role in world conservation of wildlife.

Governments control conservation programs within their own borders. They control the export and import of animals and animal products. The governments of the developed nations have the technical experts, the experience, and the modest funds needed to assist in creating effective conservation programs in the developing countries and, moreover, to do it in a way that will further the economic development of these emerging nations.

Accordingly on June 15, 1965, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 440, calling on the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State to take all necessary steps to convene an intergovernmental conference on the conservation of wildlife under the sponsorship of the United Nations. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] sponsored an identical resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 52, in the other body.

I had in mind a conference attended not merely by conservationists and technicians but by Government leaders on the ministerial and Cabinet level who need to learn and understand the need for worldwide conservation efforts and who are in a position to take the needed governmental actions.

EMINENT CONSERVATIONISTS HAVE PREPARED AN AGENDA

On September 30, and October 1, a special meeting was held in London under the sponsorship of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—the International Council for Bird Preservation, the Fauna Preservation Society, and the World Wildlife Fund to consider such a conference and to prepare an agenda.

More than 50 of the world's leading conservationists attended this meeting. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was represented by Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, Dr. Stanley Cain, accompanied by Samuel E. Jorgensen, Chief of the Foreign Activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. My legislative assistant, Everard Munsey, also attended the meeting.

The meeting was chaired by Peter Scott, chairman of the Survival Service Commission of the IUCN and chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, who is one of the dynamos of the world conservation movement.

Assisting in the conduct of the meeting were Dr. Dillon Ripley, president of the International Council for Bird Preservation and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Francois Bourliere of France, president of the IUCN; and Captain C. R. S. Pitman of the United Kingdom, vice president of the Fauna Preservation Society.

The conservationists strongly backed the idea of holding a world intergovernmental conference under United Nations sponsorship. An agenda was drawn up emphasizing the practical advantages to be derived from wildlife conservation and the steps that can be taken to achieve these benefits.

The emphasis on practicality stemmed from the realization that it is often useless to talk conservation to hungry, aspiring people intent on the economic development of their country, unless conservation can be shown to be of economic benefit by providing foreign earnings from a sustained supply of wild animal products, by providing the basis of a tourist industry, or by providing food through programs of wildlife management and game cropping.

FOUR MAJOR CONSERVATION ACTIONS ARE PLANNED

The agenda is aimed at culminating in an action program under which the nations participating in the conference will step up their efforts to conserve wildlife through such steps by their governments as:

First. Participation in international treaties and conventions to control trade in wildlife and wildlife products.

Second. Preparation of model conservation laws and provision of assistance in enforcement and administration for countries seeking to improve their domestic conservation programs.

Third. Provision of technical assistance and added financial aid to assist developing nations to benefit from the economic potential of their wildlife resources and to preserve their threatened species.

Fourth. Participation in specific international programs to preserve certain threatened species.

In addition, it was hoped that the aid of governments could be enlisted in enhancing public understanding of conservation through education and in combating fashions—such as the fad for

leopard skin coats—and traditions—such as the belief that powdered rhino horn is a sex stimulant—which lead to the destruction of wildlife.

Working under such an agenda with its focus on governmental action and specific goals, an international conference on world wildlife could be of vast importance.

Happily, Assistant Secretary Cain indicated that Secretary Udall is very much in favor of such a conference and that the United States might well be able to be host.

The conservationists are continuing to work to prepare the details of the various items of the agenda. Efforts will be made to bring the developing countries into the planning process.

I would hope and urge that Congress play a part in bringing this proposed conference to reality by passing House Concurrent Resolution 440. The passage of this expression of the sense of Congress would give a powerful impetus to efforts to bring about a conference with the broad participation of high-level Government officials needed at this critical time for the world's wildlife.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the measure to provide against the extinction of rare living species of wildlife. For many years I have been deeply interested in efforts of this type and have from time to time introduced legislation in this field. What God has carefully created, we should surely protect. In so doing we serve ourselves and future generations, as we fulfill what I believe to be an obligation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9424.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHT TO BE REPRESENTED IN MATTERS BEFORE AGENCIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1758) to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1758

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

(a) Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before any agency upon filing with the agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(b) Any person who is duly qualified to practice as a certified public accountant in any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department upon filing with that agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(c) Nothing herein shall be construed (i) to grant or deny to any person who is not qualified as provided by subsection (a) or (b) the right to appear or represent others before any agency or in any agency proceeding; (ii) to authorize or limit the discipline, including disbarment, of persons who appear in a representative capacity before any agency; (iii) to authorize any person who is a former officer or employee of an agency to represent others before an agency where such representation is prohibited by statute or regulation; or (iv) to prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney as a condition to the settlement of any controversy involving the payment of money.

(d) This section shall not be applicable to practice before the Patent Office with respect to patent matters which shall continue to be covered by chapter 3 (sections 31 to 33) of title 35 of the United States Code.

SEC. 2. When any participant in any matter before an agency is represented by a person qualified pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 1, any notice or other written communication required or permitted to be given to such participant in such matter shall be given to such representative in addition to any other service specifically required by statute. If a participant is represented by more than one such qualified representative, service upon any one of such representatives shall be sufficient.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, "agency" shall have the same meaning as it does in section 2(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (60 Stat. 237, as amended).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This measure is designed to abolish special agency requirements imposed on attorneys in good standing who appear for persons in matters before Federal agencies.

The bill provides that an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of his State may represent persons before a Federal agency upon filing a declaration that he is so qualified and that he represents the person for whom he acts.

Second, the bill provides that a certified public accountant who is duly qualified to practice in any State may represent persons before the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department.

However, the bill does not cover practice before the Patent Office in patent matters. This is because the committee is convinced that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by their legal education alone to prepare patent applications and draft specifications and claims. This is why the committee has amended the Senate bill.

The background is that in past years many Federal agencies required application to the agency before attorneys would be deemed acceptable as practitioners. In 1957 the Department of Justice recommended that all agencies discontinue the practice. Most have done so. Today few retain it.

Only two agencies object to discontinuing: the Treasury and the Patent Office.

The Treasury Department's rules and regulations governing the right of attorneys to represent others before its Internal Revenue Service have the purpose of disclosing whether or not the applicant is a person of good moral character. The Treasury assumes that attorneys at law as well as certified public accountants are professionally qualified for tax practice and no further qualifications are imposed on members of these professions with respect to skill, knowledge, or ability. In order to be issued a "Treasury card" for admission to practice an applicant must submit himself to an involved admissions procedure. Applications are made pursuant to Treasury Department Circular No. 230, containing 70 provisions with which the applicant is required to familiarize himself. He must also affirm that he will conduct himself in accordance with the laws, regulations, and rules of the agency. The purpose of the application is to enable agency investigation of the applicant's background to determine whether he is a person of good character and reputation. A director of practice and staff have responsibility for this work. Appeal from an adverse decision lies to the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee knows of no other Federal agency that imposes a comparable burden on professionally qualified prospective practitioners to establish their moral fitness to practice.

The bill would abolish this practice. The committee believes that there is a presumption that members in good standing of the professions of the law and certified public accountancy are of good moral character, and that surveillance by State bar associations and State associations of certified public accountants will sufficiently insure the integrity of practice by such persons before the Internal Revenue Service. The cumbersome admission procedures of the Internal Revenue Service seem unwarranted in their impact on duly qualified attorneys and certified public accountants.

The qualifications imposed by the Patent Office for eligibility to represent persons in patent matters are not directed to moral fitness but to professional competence. The essence of the Patent Office position is that a legal education does not qualify a person to perform the technical and specialized work involved in the preparation of patent applications and their claims and specifications. Accordingly, an examination procedure has been established and an engineering degree or substantial equivalent is normally needed for eligibility to take the examination. The Patent Office informed the committee that past experience in admitting attorneys without further eligibility requirement had been unsatisfactory. The committee found merit in the contention of the Patent Office that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by

their legal education to prepare adequate patent applications, including the drafting of specifications and claims. The committee accordingly recommends that the operations of the Patent Office with respect to patent matters be exempted from the provisions of section 1. Practice in trademark matters, however, would be subject to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the amended bill does not affect the right of persons other than attorneys—or other than certified public accountants before the Treasury—to appear for or represent persons before agencies.

It does not affect the power of agencies to discipline persons who appear before them.

It does not authorize any conflict of interest.

It does not prevent agencies from requiring powers of attorney as a condition to the settlement of matters involving the payment of money.

Agencies would, however, be required to give notices to representatives qualified under the bill.

This legislation is vigorously supported by the American Bar Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants whose letters are attached to the report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment of S. 1758, as amended.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, this is not a lawyer's bill. This is not a certified public accountant's bill. This is not a Government agency bill. This is a private citizen bill.

As the Federal Government grows bigger and bigger, as its laws get more and more complex, and as it touches more and more the lives of more and more citizens, it becomes more and more important that the citizen's rights in any dispute he may have with his Government should be accorded the first priority.

The first protection he must be assured is his right to select his own representative to speak for him. That right he does not fully enjoy today. Some governmental agencies have assumed a power never delegated specifically by statute. They have undertaken to decide who is qualified and who is not qualified to represent his fellow citizens in proceedings before them. At least one agency maintains a staff of 18 and spends over $300,000 per year for this purpose. But the cost involved is not the significant thing. What is significant is that the government, which is a party in interest, substitutes its judgment for the judgment of the client in testing the competence of his counsel. In so doing, some of the agencies, not satisfied with professional competence alone, presume to judge moral fitness as well.

This bill intends to return to the citizen to whom it belongs the right to exercise his own judgment in choosing his own representative. It provides simply that any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court in any State will be eligible to represent those who employ him before any Federal agency. All he has to do is to file a written declaration that he is currently qualified and is authorized by the citizen to represent him. So far as the Internal Revenue Service is concerned, the same authorization is made to any person who has been qualified under the laws of his State to practice as a certified public accountant.

The provisions of this legislation do not extend to practice before the Patent Office. Such practice is already covered by chapter 3 of title 35 of the United States Code. Because the practice of patent law ordinarily involves a need for specialized education and training, such practice must be treated in a special way.

It is important to emphasize that nothing in this bill in any way changes the nature or enlarges the scope of the service that will be performed by certified public accountants in the practice of accountancy before the Internal Revenue Service. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants has registered its full endorsement of this legislation and has indicated repeatedly that it has no desire to practice law or otherwise to trespass upon the proper domain of other professions.

While this bill would allow an attorney to practice before Federal agencies upon his own assertion, any misrepresentation would subject him not only to disbarment, but to penalties for false statements under the criminal section of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. 1001.

The bill in no way modifies the authority of agencies to discipline persons before them, to prescribe qualifications for nonattorneys, or to prevent former employees from representing persons appearing before them in order to avoid conflicts of interest. Furthermore, the bill would in no way prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney as a condition to the settlement of controversies involving the payment of money.

The legislation also has the unequivocal endorsement of the American Bar Association, most individual State bar associations, and the Department of Justice. With such a broad consensus, the 89th Congress should move promptly to lay this troublesome issue at rest and to restore to the citizen his unfettered right to choose those who represent him in disputes with Federal agencies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1758 which would authorize lawyers to practice before Federal agencies without special admission to agency bars. The measure now under consideration is almost identical to H.R. 8207 which I introduced in the 88th Congress.

S. 1758 provides for the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by most Federal agencies, but it should be extended to all agencies. Since some agencies still impose such requirements, a citizen's right to be represented by an attorney of his choice is thus impaired.

I can see no reason why this right of the citizen should not be respected, particularly inasmuch as the attorney has already been determined to be qualified to represent others in his State. By such recognition and licensing of the attorney, the State deems the individual qualified to handle before its courts or tribunals matters similar to those which come before any Federal agency. Why, then, should admission and control of practice be duplicated at the Federal level through a maze of conflicting, multiple regulations of various agencies?

The passage of this bill will do away with these cumbersome admission requirements, thereby recognizing the right of persons and concerns to be represented by counsel of their own choice. This would directly benefit the client whose legal problems in Washington could then be handled by his local attorney.

I have long advocated the simplification and clarification of our administrative procedures. I believe this bill is a step in the right direction. The principles of this legislation have been approved by the American Bar Association and I am sure will be supported by lawyers throughout the country.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker I want to express my full support for S. 1758, the bill providing for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies.

It is gratifying that this bill is coming before us for approval in view of the fact that a substantial number of Members of this body and of the other body have introduced similar legislation. My bill, for example, is H.R. 8433, introduced May 25, 1965.

It is unreasonable that competent lawyers in good standing with State bar associations should be required to undergo time-consuming and sometimes expensive procedures to meet the requirements of Federal agencies.

Members in good standing of the professions of the law, as judged by the continuing surveillance of State bar associations, should be presumed to be competent and of good moral character for practice with regard to Federal agencies.

The Committee on the Judiciary has recommended an exception in the case of operations of the Patent Office with respect to patent matters but not with respect to trademark matters. The decision is that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by their legal education to prepare adequate patent applications.

But in the case of the Internal Revenue Service and other Federal agencies attorneys as judged competent in their States should be allowed to practice in order that citizens have maximum opportunity to defend themselves.

By the same token, certified public accountants who have passed all the proper tests in their own States should be competent to appear before the Internal Revenue Service without being further qualified.

The objectives of this legislation are objectives on which we all can agree. I look forward to its enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1758, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR NEVADA TEST SITE EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10722) to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada test site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10722

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes", approved August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 745; 5 U.S.C. 70c), is amended by inserting after the word "islands" the words "or at the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10722 will provide an allowance to about 100 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Public Health Service who must travel unusually long distances from their homes to their work stations at the Nevada Test Site. As all Members know, this is the continental location where our nuclear devices are developed and tested. It is of the utmost importance to our security and to our role in future exploration in space that this work proceed as rapidly and as efficiently as possible.

There are about 7,000 private contract employees on the site who already receive from their employers the allowances we propose here for the relatively small number of Federal civil servants.

The situation is this: There are no residence quarters on or anywhere near the work station of the employees of the test site suitable for family living. The only accommodations on the site are some barrack-type dwellings owned by the Government used primarily for overnight needs of an emergency nature. Most of the test site personnel, both contractor and Government, live in or near Las Vegas, which is a distance of 66.6 miles from Camp Mercury, and 92.3 miles from the Nuclear Rocket Development Station. The distance is even longer from the areas where underground testing is conducted. These people must travel these distances by car or bus twice each day. Travel time to and from work averages about 4 hours per day. Many of us, of course, are well acquainted with the trials and tribulations of suburban and big city commuting but there can be no comparison with the problems here.

The bill provides an allowance as a form of extra compensation for the unusual circumstances of employment at the test site. AEC and NASA both have been losing scientists, engineers, and technicians because of what seems to them to be a form of discrimination in compensation between the contractor personnel and the Government personnel. Under the circumstances it seemed to be inequitable to the Committee and this bill was supported unanimously.

Legislation is needed because present law does not permit any compensation for travel to and from work stations. We had a similar situation last year involving Navy installations on the California offshore islands. The Congress met that problem with remedial legislation. The present bill is an amendment to that legislation Public Law 88–538.

This bill will provide a ceiling of $10 per day on the allowance but the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies involved expect it to range from $5 to $7.50, comparable to payments made by the private contractors. The total annual cost of the legislation should not exceed $170,000.

The Bureau of the Budget also has informed us that they know of no other comparable situation in the United States where such allowances are needed.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said that under this legislation, if enacted, the Government may pay up to $10 but that it is expected they will pay somewhere between $5 and $7.50 per day for this purpose.

If they go to $10 then they will have set a precedent for private contractors who of course are 100 percent Government contractors in this case; is that not correct?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is obviously correct. The private contractors that pay this added compensation are cost-plus contractors.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that. But if $10 is paid they practically force the private contractors to come up to $10, do they not?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If that were the case, the gentleman is correct. However, the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget have testified, and it appears in both the report and the hearings, indicating that the private contractors are paying on an average of $5 to $7.50. It is the intent of the agencies who appeared before the committee and the Bureau of the Budget to merely meet the level the private contractors have set for individuals which is somewhere between $5 and $7.50. They have not indicated any intention or desire or willingness to go to the $10 figure but, rather than come back this year or next year or the year after for a ceiling which may eventually be necessary, they felt this was the best approach.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I would assume that these contractors are working under cost-plus contracts and perhaps some of them are fixed-fee contractors, but at least cost-plus contracts. Therefore, any increase on the part of the private employer will be paid for by the taxpayers of this country. I am not opposed to it—the travel cost of Government employees—but I would hope whatever it is they will keep them comparable and I would hope that the figure of somewhere between $5 and $7.50 will be ample.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10722, a bill to amend Public Law 88–538. This bill would provide authority for the payment of an allowance to employees of the U.S Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies who are duty stationed at the remote areas of the Atomic Energy Commission's Nevada test site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station.

As you know, I have a real personal interest in this matter, as I have introduced similar legislation pending in another committee. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this legislation to the people involved; namely, the Government employees at the Nevada test site.

Nuclear devices are not being tested in Nevada by accident; it is by design.

When our nuclear program began it was necessary for our scientists to locate a remote and isolated area where nuclear testing could be conducted in privacy and in safety. Particularly, safety as applied to the general public.

Southern Nevada fulfilled these requirements.

Today, there are two important programs going forth in southern Nevada, one is the underground testing of nuclear weapons and the other is the development of the nuclear-powered engine for space flight.

I have personally visited the Nevada test site and the nuclear rocket development stations on numerous occasions and believe me, gentlemen, they are remote isolated areas in the dry uninhabited regions of of southern Nevada.

Traditionally, contractor and laboratory personnel have been compensated for inconvenience and time associated with their employment there. As programs have increased and stabilized it

became essential in the name of sound management and economy that Government personnel be assigned to permanent duty at these two testing locations.

Las Vegas, Nev., is the nearest established community suitable for family living for the professional, scientific, and other employees of the Government who work at the test site. Therefore, most employees who are duty stationed at the Nevada test site are required to commute long distances from their home to the remote work locations. The distances from the Clark County courthouse in Las Vegas to the test site are 66.6 miles to Camp Mercury which is at the entrance of the test site, and it is 95 miles to the Nuclear Rocket Development Station at Jackass Flats, and even longer mileage to certain remote areas where underground weapons testing is conducted. Because of the lack of adequate living facilities closer to the locations of duty, most employees presently have no alternative but to spend up to 4 hours per day traveling to and from work, depending upon the particular duty station involved. This combination of commuting time and distances without reasonable alternatives creates a highly unusual situation that most other employees of the Government do not normally face in going to and from work. Complicating this situation for Government employees is the fact that the employees of private contractors working at the site, side by side with Government employees, are receiving an allowance of from $5 to $7.50 to offset the inconveniences, hardships, and expenses associated with travel to and from their homes and duty at the remote work locations. To attract and retain competent employees an allowance for such a work situation is deemed necessary.

The almost unique circumstances at the Nevada Test Site have created substantial hardships and inequities for the employees, and problems for the Government agencies involved in carrying out the vital activities at this location. The long hours employees are forced to spend away from home each day because of the lengthy commuting time required, coupled with the absence of any commuting allowance, has created problems in recruiting and retaining professional, technical, and clerical employees.

This legislation that we are considering here today, H.R. 10772, is in my opinion justifiable and long overdue.

Mr. HOLIFIELD recognized the problem in Nevada during hearings on the Navy's offshore legislation—(Public Law 88–538)—a little more than 1 year ago. The Atomic Energy Commission has recognized this problem for a similar period of time.

The number of Government employees permanently stationed at the site is small, presently consisting of approximately 100 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Public Health Service. Although the bill will permit a maximum of $10 per day it is expected that the allowances will range from $5 to $7.50 as is being paid by Government contractors to their own personnel there. The total cost of this legislation for fiscal year 1966 is estimated at $172,000.

The bill has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and regulations governing these payments will be prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, which has been delegated by the President.

I urge passage of H.R. 10277 to correct this inequity between Government and contractor employees and to compensate faithful employees for the inconvenience and additional expense associated with their jobs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has very ably explained this legislation. In the hearings before our subcommittee there was no opposition to this bill. The unusual circumstances under which these employees work were explained.

I think a little explanation on the maximum allowance of $10 is possibly in order. It was explained that from time to time the worksite on the test area may be at some remote location. Ordinarily the employees may work at a particular worksite which is 65 or 70 or 80 miles from their place of residence. At other times they may work at remote areas on the testing ground which might be considerably farther. So the allowance may vary according to the place on the testing grounds where the employees are employed from time to time.

As has already been explained, there is good precedent for this legislation in a bill that was passed last year for the California offshore islands. I believe the report has received unanimous support from the committee, including agencies whose reports are printed with the report accompanying the bill.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are these employees presently transported by bus, or by some form of mass transportation, or do they drive their own cars, or is it a combination of both?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It is a combination of both. It was explained that there is bus transportation made available to these employees, but some elect to drive their own private vehicles. It was also explained that at times it is necessary for them to stay on the testing site overnight. There are accommodations available to them out there; however, they must pay the cost of these accommodations. In other words, they must rent a room.

Mr. GROSS. The $10 might be considered in the nature of a combination both for quarters and transportation?

Mr. ERLENBORN. That is correct. The $10 limitation would be applicable to the combination of the cost and the extra time involved, as well as the use of their private automobiles if they so select; and it represents the cost of accommodations if they stay overnight at the worksite.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10722.

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

DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2150) to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following reporting requirements, which relate to the submission of certain reports to Congress or other Government authority, are hereby repealed, as follows:

REPORTS UNDER EACH EXECUTIVE AGENCY

(1) The annual report to Congress of the administrative adjustment of tort claims of $2,500 or less, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim (28 U.S.C. 2673).

REPORTS UNDER TWO OR MORE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

(2) The semiannual report to the Congress of purchases and contracts with respect to experimental, developmental, or research work with the name of each contractor, the amount of the contract, and description of the work required (63 Stat. 393; 41 U.S.C. 252(c)).

(3) The quarterly reports to Congress by the Department of the Treasury, Housing and Home Finance Agency, General Services Administration, and the annual report to the President and to Congress by the Small Business Administration of progress in liquidating the assets and winding up the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as required by section 106(b) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act (67 Stat. 231; 15 U.S.C. 609, note), by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, and by Public Law 87–305, section 5(a) (75 Stat. 666; 15 U.S.C. 639(a)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(4) The annual report to Congress of activities relating to the Puerto Rico hurricane relief loans (45 Stat. 1067; 70 Stat. 525).

(5) The report of the estimates of national farm housing needs and of progress made toward meeting such needs (63 Stat. 435; 42 U.S.C. 1476(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(6) The quarterly report of contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and general progress with respect to aviation war risk insurance activities (72 Stat. 805; 49 U.S.C. 1539).

(7) The quarterly report of contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and general progress with respect to war risk insurance activities under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (64 Stat. 776; 46 U.S.C. 1291).

(8) The annual report of the names of contractors and subcontractors for scientific equipment used for communication and navigation and of the names of persons entering into contracts or other arrangements by the terms of which the United States undertakes to pay only for national-defense features, together with the applicable contracts and amounts (49 Stat. 1998; 46 U.S.C. 1155(b)).

(9) The annual report covering each case and the reasons therefor in which an exception is made to the prohibition against payment of an operating-differential subsidy for the operation of a vessel beyond its economic life (49 Stat. 2003; 46 U.S.C. 1175(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(10) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of the Navy of all vessels used for experimental purposes which have been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register (10 U.S.C. 7306(b)).

(11) The requirement that the Secretary of the Navy shall communicate to Congress all or a portion of the annual report submitted to the Secretary by the Naval Sea Cadet Corps with respect to its proceedings and activities (76 Stat. 534).

(12) The requirement that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the details of the proposed participation by members of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction in international amateur sports competition (10 U.S.C. 717(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(13) The annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the use of the separate fund created for the promotion of the free flow of domestically produced fishery products (68 Stat. 376; 15 U.S.C. 713c–3(f)).

(14) The annual report to the Congress giving detailed information with respect to the establishment of fish restoration and management projects and expenditures therefor (64 Stat. 434; 16 U.S.C. 777j).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(15) The annual report of the Secretary of Labor to Congress of the administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from the funds established by the Act (14 Stat. 444; 33 U.S.C. 943).

(16) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of Labor of the work of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation including a detailed statement of appropriations and expenditures and a detailed statement showing receipts of and expenditures from the employees' compensation fund (39 Stat. 749; 5 U.S.C. 784).

REPORTS UNDER THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(17) The inclusion in the annual report of operations of the postal savings system of the names of post offices receiving deposits, the number of depositors in each and the amount on deposit (39 U.S.C. 5205).

(18) The inclusion in the annual report to the President by the Postmaster General of activities with respect to the Postal Modernization Fund (39 U.S.C. 2332).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

(19) The report to the Congress by the President with respect to operations under the Lend-Lease Act (55 Stat. 32; 22 U.S.C. 414(b)).

(20) The report to the Congress by the President not less than once each year on the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and on the participation of the United States therein (71 Stat. 453; 22 U.S.C. 2022).

(21) The annual report to Congress by the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation and the Secretary of State of the receipts and expenditures of funds and bequests received and disbursed in connection with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (72 Stat. 273; 22 U.S.C. 287q).

(22) The annual report by the Secretary of State to the Congress and to the President on the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund and of estimates of appropriations necessary to continue the system in effect (60 Stat. 1024; 22 U.S.C. 1102).

REPORT UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

(23) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury on the financial condition of the Postal Modernization Fund (39 U.S.C. 2234).

REPORT UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SEC. 2. The following reporting requirements, which relate to the submission of certain reports to Congress or other Government authority, are hereby modified as follows:

(1) From quarterly to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of a report with respect to all activities or transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 50; 50 U.S.C. App. 1746).

(2) Beginning January 1, 1967, from semiannual to annual submission to the President and to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of a report with respect to activities under the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2125).

(3) From quarterly to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of the Air Force of a report of the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force and the justification therefor (10 U.S.C. 8031(c)).

(4) From quarterly to semiannual submission to the Senate and the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of a report with respect to personal property donations to State surplus property agencies and real property disposals to public health and educational institutions (66 Stat. 593; 40 U.S.C. 484(o)).

(5) From semiannual submission through the President to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior of a report of the operations of programs to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its territories and possessions together with recommendations regarding the need for such programs (72 Stat. 701; 30 U.S.C. 645).

(6) Beginning January 1, 1967, from semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States of a report concerning its operations under the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C. App. 2008).

(7) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States of a report concerning its operations under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 13; 22 U.S.C. 1622(c)).

(8) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the President of a report of each transaction entered into by any agency of the United States Government pursuant to section 302 or 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, together with the basis for determining the probable ultimate net cost to the United State thereunder (64 Stat. 789; 74 Stat. 282; 50 U.S.C. App. 2094(b)).

(9) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Export-Import Bank of Washington of a report concerning its operations under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529; 12 U.S.C. 635g).

(10) From quarterly to annual submission to the Congress by the Attorney General of a report concerning certain voluntary agreements and programs pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 818, as amended; 50 U.S.C. App. 2153).

(11) From quarterly to annual submission to the Congress by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission of a report pursuant to section 710(b)(7) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 819, as amended; 50 U.S.C. App. 2160).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill will authorize the elimination of certain reports that various departments and agencies of the Federal Government are required by statute to make to Congress at periodic intervals and to change the frequency of certain other reports which are to be continued.

Over the years, numerous bills enacted by the Congress have properly required the preparation and submission of reports on a wide variety of programs so that the Congress can be kept informed on developments of importance, thereby enabling it to effectively carry out its constitutional function. From time to time these reports have been reviewed to determine if they still carry out the purposes intended and if they have been rendered unneeded by later developments. In 1954 and in 1958 a number of reports were eliminated by the Congress after such reviews by the Bureau of the Budget and the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. Seven years having elapsed, a further review has been made and the pending bill has resulted.

Sixty-five reports were originally recommended for elimination by the Bureau of the Budget. Twenty of these were dropped from the original list by the Senate and we had for consideration 45 reports listed for elimination in the Senate bill. The frequency of submission of 11 other reports was also altered in the Senate bill—in most instances from quarterly or semiannual submissions to annual submissions. The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations then addressed a letter to the chairmen of each committee of the House inquiring whether or not the chairmen desired any of the listed reports to be retained. Whenever any chairman in response to this letter indicated that his committee desired any of the reports in the Senate bill continued, those reports were deleted from the bill. Subsequently, the ranking minority members of each committee were contacted by a member of the Government Operations Committee minority. We believe, therefore, the committee has checked with every logical source on this matter. Additional deletions were made by the committee itself on the basis of recommendations by its own members.

The committee's consideration of the Senate bill has resulted in the removal of a total of 22 reports from the Senate bill and 2 changes in dates in those reports whose frequency is being altered.

Twenty-three reports remain in the pending bill and the committee, believ-

ing that a consensus exists that these are no longer required, recommends that they be eliminated. This will be accomplished by the passage of this bill as amended.

The committee submits this bill as an economy measure, though as the bill is amended the savings will be greatly reduced from those estimated by the Bureau of the Budget accompanying its original recommendation. Officials of the Bureau of the Budget estimated a saving each year of $100,000 if all of the 65 reports they listed were dropped.

On the other hand, we wish to make clear that this committee does not favor curtailing information which should be available to the Congress and only supports this measure because it appears that the listed reports have lost their usefulness. The committee thoroughly endorses the expression of one of its members [Mr. RUMSFELD] "that this bill is not intended to permit or authorize the withholding of any of the information that will hereafter be exempted from the report, but simply is to avoid duplication and to avoid the necessity of an affirmative act on the part of the agency."

The amendments proposed remove from the bill reports which the committee feels should be continued; change the enumeration of the items in the bill; and modify the dates in two of the items in section 2.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join with the gentleman in stating approval of this legislation. However, I do not want the House ever to discontinue reports that are essential to our right to know and our ability to know what is going on in Government.

I would say to the gentleman, I have only one criticism and that is that the report does not contain the views of the Comptroller General who I am sure is vitally interested in reports from all agencies. I could wish this report contained his views on the specific reports that are to be dropped or minimized under the terms of this legislation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his excellent description of this bill. I also want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] on the way that this bill was handled in the subcommittee and in the full committee. As was explained, before the bill was considered by the subcommittee, each chairman of a standing committee of the House was contacted by the committee for his feeling as to the elimination of any of these reports. In every instance when a committee chairman expressed a desire to have a report continued, that report was eliminated from this bill so that the report would be continued.

At the time of the hearing, it was suggested that the ranking minority member of each committee should also likewise be contacted. Through the generosity of the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee [Mr. DAWSON], time was given for us to make such a contact, and the ranking minority member of each of the House committees was contacted and their views were likewise taken into consideration.

At the hearing of the full committee on this bill, additional sections were deleted at the request of Members.

I call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who I know is interested in the subject, that at my request, on page 2 of the bill, lines 13 through 18, we struck the section which would eliminate reports as to the number of grants for scientific research—the dollar amounts—in institutions in equipment purchased with such funds invested. I think he, I, and other Members of the House have enjoyed reading this report about some of the interesting scientific experiments that are conducted with these research funds. At my request, that provision was stricken from the bill, and so we shall continue to receive those reports.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his interest in that respect. We certainly need to continue to scrutinize at every opportunity the awarding of research contracts, because this has become a multibillion dollar annual bill to the Federal Government. It needs to be scrutinized very carefully.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I also wish to commend the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] who suggested and contacted the committee about language which was adopted and made a part of the legislative history of this bill, making clear that it is not our intention by the passage of the bill in any way to make it more difficult for Members of the Congress or the general public to obtain information from any agency of the Government. We are only trying to save money by eliminating duplication and unnecessary reports, but in no way are we trying to make it more difficult for anyone to obtain information that they desire.

I believe that this bill should receive the unanimous support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2150 with amendments.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO MAKE TITLE III THEREOF DIRECTLY APPLICABLE TO PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1004

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. (a) Executive agencies shall make purchases and contracts for property and services in accordance with the provisions of this title and implementing regulations of the Administrator; but this title does not apply—

"(1) to the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

"(2) when this title is made inapplicable pursuant to section 602(d) of this Act or any other law, but when this title is made inapplicable by any such provision of law sections 3709 and 3710 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall be applicable in the absence of authority conferred by statute to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 302 of said Act is amended by revising paragraph (15) to read:

"(15) otherwise authorized by law, except that section 304 shall apply to purchases and contracts made without advertising under this paragraph."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 307 of said Act is amended by inserting immediately after "section," the following: "and except as provided in section 205(d) with respect to the Administrator,".

SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 307 of said Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

SEC. 5. Section 310 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 310. Sections 3709, 3710, and 3735 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5, 8, and 13), shall not apply to the procurement of property or services made by an executive agency pursuant to this title. Any provision of law which authorizes an executive agency (other than an executive agency which is exempted from the provisions of this title by section 302(a) of this Act), to procure any property or services without advertising or without regard to said section 3709 shall be construed to authorize the procurement of such property or services pursuant to section 302(c)(15) of this Act without regard to the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) and 303 of this Act."

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 602 of said Act is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and the leasing and acquisition of real property, as authorized by law;".

(b) By striking out the word "or" where it appears at the end of paragraph (18).

(c) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or".

(d) By adding at the end of that subsection the following new paragraph:

"(20) The Secretary of the Interior with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville Project Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, there are three separate and distinct statutory procurement procedures within the Federal Government. First, we have the procedures in the Armed Services Procurement Act applicable to the Defense Department, NASA, and the Coast Guard. Second, we have the procedure provided in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, applicable to procurement by the General Services Administration. And, third, we have the antiquated procedure set forth in Revised Statute 3709 which dates back to the 1860's, generally applicable to the other civil agencies of government.

At the time Congress enacted the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the modern code of procurement procedures provided in title III of that act was not extended to the various civil agencies. However, in 1958, the act was amended making it permissive for the civil agencies to utilize this modern code of procurement in lieu of Revised Statute 3709 by delegation of the Administrator of GSA.

The primary purpose of this act is to funnel civilian agency procurement, with certain statutory exceptions, directly through title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act rather than the 100-year-old provisions in Revised Statute 3709.

Title III requires that purchases and contracts for property and services shall be made by advertising except in certain situations enumerated in considerable detail in section 302(c). Requirements for advertising for bids, opening of the bids, and notice of the award are spelled out. Also, the agencies are prohibited under title III from using cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts in which the fee exceeds 10 percent of the estimated cost with a few exceptions. Comparable safeguards are not provided in Revised Statute 3709.

The Bureau of the Budget and the various civil agencies involved approve of this legislation. Essentially, this statute replaces an obsolete procurement code no longer needed by the agencies. The bill, which has been approved by the Senate, thus clarifies existing procurement requirements and permits the development of more uniform procurement regulations.

The committee amendments are technical in nature. Evaluation of the language of the Senate-approved bill suggested the possibility that the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by this legislation, could be interpreted so as to exclude procurement of personal services from the safeguards provided in the act. The Government Operations Committee amended the bill to avoid this consequence.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, S. 1004 was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and by the Committee on Government Operations. Its primary purpose is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered, except the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and agencies otherwise excluded by law.

At the present time, use of this modern code by executive agencies is entirely on a permissive, delegated basis. A common statutory code of procurement authority will enhance the development of uniform procurement practices for the benefit of both the Government and the businessmen contracting with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the present title III is directly applicable only to procurement practices of the General Services Administration, the civilian agency primarily responsible for property procurement. The Administrator of GSA has discretionary authority to delegate the use of title III procedures to other executive agencies, but this bill would make it explicit that title III should pertain.

Similar procedures have already been made applicable by the Congress in the Armed Services Procurement Act to procurement by the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and NASA.

Executive agencies not now covered by title III procedures or the Armed Services Procurement Act are required to follow the directives set forth in a statute dating back to 1861. This is a very limited provision, requiring only formal advertising for procurement and permitting four situations in which contracts may be negotiated.

Title III contains several additional safeguards and directives which protect both the Government's interest and the procurement official; specifically, a more detailed enumeration of the situation in which contracts may be negotiated as well as the spelling out of the requirements for advertising of bids, opening of bids, and notice of the award.

Agencies are prohibited from using a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contract and a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract in which the fee exceeds 10 percent of the estimated cost. All negotiated contracts under title III must contain a provision permitting the Controller General to examine the books of the contractor for 3 years after final payment.

I believe that S. 1004 is desirable. It will result in uniform procurement safeguards and practices, and it will promote the efficient operation of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note that the report carries a letter from the Comptroller General, in support of the legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier this afternon I criticized the fact that other bills dealing with revisions of policy in the operation of the Federal Government contained no views of the Comptroller General.

At this time I wish to commend the committee for having obtained the views of the Comptroller General in respect to a policy matter which I am sure is of vital interest to the Comptroller General.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his usual objective analysis of reports and constructive help on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1004 as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WONDERFUL YEAR FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, now that the first session of the 89th Congress is about to adjourn, I would like to commend you and my colleagues for a job well done. In all my years of service in the Congress of the United States, I can

truthfully say I have never witnessed a more productive session.

As Representatives of the people of this wonderful Nation, it is our duty to care for them and to protect them. The legislative proposals that have been passed by the House this year will benefit every man, woman, and child in the city of Philadelphia now and in the future.

During this session of the Congress—month after month—bills have been introduced and passed by the House to improve our Great Society.

For the elderly, this session has provided increased social security benefits; more and better housing; and a fine medical care program.

For our children, we have provided additional educational facilities as well as programs to financially assist worthy students through college.

For the unemployed, programs like the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and on-the-job training have been enacted.

For our men and women serving in the armed services, bills have been passed by the House to grant them basic pay increases and life insurance coverage.

For our Federal employees, the House of Representatives has approved legislation to grant a much needed pay raise.

For the Federal retirees, the House has approved a bill to grant them increased monthly benefits, which are sorely needed to meet the present high cost of living.

To stimulate and improve the national economy, the House reduced certain excise taxes in order that you and I—the consumer—may save money.

In addition and of national importance, public works programs have been established to help distressed communities and provide jobs for the unemployed. A law has been placed on the statute books to provide funds for our small businessmen in order that they may continue to compete with big business. Federal moneys have been provided for finer and safer highways, which will create additional jobs.

Water and air pollution control programs have been approved. Our immigration system has been updated and revised. Those entitled to vote have been guaranteed this right. An effective drug control act is now law. Today we have a Commission on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a wonderful year for the American people. We have shown by our deed and our laws that our first concern is for our people and our Nation.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the past weekend saw demonstrations against American participation in the Vietnam conflict. There were speeches, picketing of draft boards—even burning of draft-cards. I will not attempt to ascertain the causes of these demonstrations, but I would like to read a letter from Capt. Robert Ainsworth, a young Army officer serving in Vietnam. It gives some answers to those who question our presence there:

JULY 6, 1965.

The Reverend HARVEY LORD,
Bozrah Center Congregational Church,
Fitchville, Conn.

DEAR REVEREND LORD: I have just finished reading your letter in the July 5 issue of Newsweek magazine. It was particularly disturbing to me because I felt that as a man of God you, above all, should know the facts before using your title in publicly expressing your views. I am sure you do not realize the impact that a man in your position has on the morale of those who daily risk their lives in the belief that their efforts here are in keeping with the Christian principles of brotherly love and respect for the dignity of man. Your rhetoric as exemplified by the statement "It is a tragedy that the embattled farmers of 1965 are being attacked and bombed by the descendants of the embattled farmers of 1776," was quite clever, but I hope that before you preach your next sermon or write your next article, you will consider some of the pertinent facts about just one of the many advisory teams in this country; one small group of the "decendants of the embattled farmers of 1776."

Our five-man team lives and works in the district of Hoc Mon (similar to a county in the United States), an area approximately 120 square kilometers, and located some 25 kilometers northwest of Saigon. There are more than 120,000 inhabitants living in the 12 villages and 59 hamlets of the Hoc Mon district. The primary source of income is derived from agriculture, and these people could certainly be considered as the "embattled farmers of 1965." About 30 percent of the total population are Catholics, most of whom are refugees who left their homes and belongings in 1954 and fled to the south.

Except for our small team, there are no American units in the area. The security of our district lies in the hands of a group of 800 volunteers from the villages, who are known as Popular Forces, and are organized into "self-defense" units scattered throughout the district. In the past, these men worked the fields during the day and manned watch posts at night. Now, because of the Vietcong pressure, they work full-time as security forces while their families work the fields. Their pay is pitiful, their living standards austere, but they never complain. Their courage and sacrifice in trying to maintain those things which we take for granted are an inspiration, to say the least.

But what of those poor unfortunate souls whom you seem to classify with the "embattled farmers of 1965," the Vietcong? In our area there are no Vietcong units as such. This is primarily because they have received no support from the populace. However, just across the canal from our district in a heavily vegetated area, there is a band of Vietcong, about 300 men strong. We have recently received reports that a larger force from North Vietnam has joined forces with this unit. I have seen that face before in my own country—the face of misguided youth enjoying the thrill of a "Robin Hood existence," the hoodlums of the streets raised in an atmosphere of poverty and despair, the men who have decided that working in a rice paddy is drudgery, or that group of disenchanted men who simply feel that communism is the only way of life and is to be attained at all costs. It is pure folly to pretend that these men are actively engaged in any vocation other than subversion. In the past 30 days some of their "farming" activities included kidnapping five youths fishing for frogs along the canal; throwing a grenade in a marketplace, wounding three people; infiltrating a village on the outer perimeter and executing the young brother of one of the popular forces, and setting off two mines in a residential area, injuring several persons. They are neither selective nor charitable in choosing their victims. A good example you must have read about was the detonating of two mines in a waterfront playground next to My Canh Restaurant in Saigon recently, killing 42 persons of all nationalities and ages.

Last week our popular forces captured 21 suspects who had infiltrated into one of the hamlets during the night. There was no doubt that they were not paying a social call, but they had been careful to hide their weapons, probably burying them in a nearby field. They had to be released for lack of evidence; released to fight another day. Frustrating? Yes, but that's the rule book we are trying to follow, and must follow if we are to win.

I only wish that you could walk through the villages, talk to these people, and get to know them as I do, day after day. I believe that certain facts would become immediately apparent. First, you would be amazed at how knowledgeable and perceptive they are as to their present situation, what they are fighting for and what the Americans are trying to do here. Second, you would find that the American soldier is received with an appreciation unmatched anywhere in the world, including our own country. I am not referring to just the village chiefs and school teachers. I am talking about the man in the rice paddy, walking behind his oxen. Third, you would see that, contrary to all of the publicity that our news media gives to the "glamor" of the battlefield, the majority of our efforts here are expended in civic action programs. This is not to sell our military role short, for without security and an area free of enemy combat units, the civic action program is not possible. Security is a prerequisite for area improvement, but I would say that 80 percent of our teams' efforts are taken up in this program. We have supervised the building of 39 new schools in the past year; rural electrification is expanding; numerous road and bridge projects have been completed, with more in the planning stages, and 12 medical-aid stations have been established. These are but few of the many projects being paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

I would be the first to admit that there are many seemingly convincing arguments opposing our presence in Vietnam, to wit: "This is a civil war to be fought to its ultimate conclusion by the Vietnamese without our interference"; "We can never win a land war in Asia"; "We are killing helpless women and children", or "Life is meaningless to these people and it's not worth the sacrifice of one American life." How easy it would be to follow these lines of reasoning, to go home to our loved ones and to say "to hell with this place." But, would this be a realistic solution to our problem? Would things improve? I am convinced that not 5 percent of the 120,000 people in our district would be willing to live under communism. Certainly, the Catholics wouldn't. I am equally convinced that without our assistance they could not last 2 months against an enemy supported from the north who would gobble up the villages one by one until there was nothing left. What would be the solution for these people? Should we repartition the partition established in the Geneva Convention of 1954? Should we tell everyone who wishes to live in a democracy to move south of Saigon and then in a few years, as bands of Vietcong resume their subversion and terrorism, repartition again, and then again, until those millions of people who don't wish to live under communism have been pushed into the sea?

And how would you suggest that we inform these people who believe in us and look to us for assistance in this struggle? Should I go to the village fathers and tell them that I am very sorry but the Americans have decided that "we are the true aggressors in this local war; that we have discovered that every time we send planes to the North to bomb the bridges and roads that are used to bring men, ammunition, and weapons used to attack their villages that we risk the chance of killing and maiming innocent victims; that we have discovered that every time our armed helicopters are called to assist one of their beseiged villages, we end up killing the attacking 'farmers'; that we have found that we are taking unfair advantage of the Vietcong's lack of sophisticated weaponry; that we are gunning down in cold blood an ill-equipped, underfed guerrilla foot soldier with our sleek, push button supersonic jets when he is attacking their village with an outmoded Russian gun, and that we have determined that this is not in keeping with the American tradition of fairplay and good sportsmanship"?

In conclusion, I would say that our ancestors might be quite proud of our efforts here in Vietnam, and perhaps even prouder of the true "embattled farmers of 1965" in their fight for freedom. It is a discouraging war and the closer you get to it, the more you realize what a senseless and tragic lesson in futility war can be as an attempt to solve man's problems. I only hope that the strength of our convictions and our determination to see this war to a just conclusion will convince our adversaries that they have selected the wrong course of action. This, in turn, might direct them toward the conference table, our only hope for peace in Vietnam.

I would entreat a gracious and loving God in His infinite wisdom to impart a sense of prudence and rational thinking to all those in positions of responsibility and authority. Without the support of those we respect and believe in, our cause here is meaningless and futile. I also ask your prayers for those who carry out our country's policies, whether you agree with those policies or not. It is not exactly enjoyable to be the man with the finger on the trigger or on the bombsight, but we cannot falter before the challenge that faces us, we cannot turn our back on choosing between right and wrong, and we cannot avoid our obligation to our fellow man.

I realize that this letter is a one-sided opinion of one man, and I would welcome hearing from you or anyone else on the subject. If you would be interested, I would be more than willing to ask some of our Vietnamese friends to write to you and express their views.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. AINSWORTH.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have been extremely disturbed and disgusted by the demonstrations staged over the past several days to protest our policy in Vietnam.

I was even more disturbed to learn from press reports that the nationwide series of demonstrations this weekend was planned and coordinated by an organization based in my own State of Wisconsin at Madison, our capital.

The right of free speech and free assembly is basic to our system and these students and others are certainly free to express their views on this subject. With this freedom, however, comes the responsibility of knowing the true facts on Vietnam and of realizing the consequences of their action.

Already the Chinese Communists and the Communist press in China, North Vietnam, and other areas are pointing to these demonstrations as an indication of widespread American dissatisfaction with U.S. policy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We all know that these demonstrators are a vocal but small minority of our people. Unfortunately, however, this fact may not be apparent to the rest of the world.

The effects of these demonstrations can only be a hardening of the Communist line on a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Therefore, the demonstrations are self-defeating for they postpone the day when a peaceful settlement can be reached. Beyond that they condemn the United States to extended involvement in Vietnam with subsequent loss of American lives. It should be clear by now that those who really want peace in Vietnam are supporting the policies of President Johnson. The harmful effects of these demonstrations have been vividly pointed out in an article by James Reston in the New York Times of Sunday, October 17. In order to bring this fine statement to the attention of my colleagues I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The article 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 inadverently 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.

THE WATTS MANIFESTO

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, with penetrating insight, Bayard Rustin has written an account of the rioting in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Everyone concerned with the meaning of this explosion will find his article revealing, informative, and moving. It is not a chronology of events. It is, rather, a documentary of emotion and reaction. It could be written only by one who has both a deep understanding of the currents of feeling which generated the rioting and the ability to translate this into articulate thought.

For these reasons I urge that this article be read by my collegues and by everyone who seeks to understand the relationship between what happened in Watts and what is happening in civil rights across America. "The Watts Manifesto" by Bayard Rustin follows:

[From the New America, Sept. 17, 1965]

THE WATTS "MANIFESTO"

(By Bayard Rustin)

After Dr. King and I went to the Watts area to work with community people to find a creative solution to the conflict and to present demands to the public officials, many sympathetic and troubled white people asked me why Negroes, at a time when they are achieving freedom, would revolt. But to raise such a question in innocence is almost to answer it.

Too many Americans still do not understand what it means to be a Negro in the United States—not one of the narrow strata of middle class Negroes but what it means to be an "average" Negro. I am talking about the millions of Negroes earning less than what is considered necessary by the U.S. Government to stay above the poverty line, jobless or facing possible joblessness, and stuck at the very bottom of the economic ladder.

According to the State of California, over 30 percent of the Negroes in Watts are unemployed. Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," puts the figure at closer to 42 percent, because Government figures do not include the thousands who have stopped looking for work after months of fruitless search and those who work part time or only intermittently. For the Negro of Watts and other black ghettos across the land conditions have not improved, they find unemployment deepening and quality integrated schools far from realization.

These are the cold facts behind the flaming ruins in Watts. They remain so even after so many other things have changed as a result of the civil rights revolution. The historic Supreme Court decisions have brought more justice before the law to Negroes particularly in the South. President Johnson has spoken out as no President has ever spoken in our history in his Howard University speech and "We Shall Overcome" address on the eve of the march on Selma, Ala. But the new civil rights legislation passed by Congress, except for the FEPC section of the 1965 civil rights bill, which did not go into operation until this July, did not have any effect on the North. Even the antipoverty program and the social welfare measures, while ameliorating some of the misery, have not yet frontally attacked the basic economic problems.

NOT UNDERSTOOD

What these economic facts mean in human terms is still not understood because they are not experienced by the observer. How else would it be possible that a writer as knowledgeable and perceptive as Walter Lippmann, after pondering the implications of the Watts riots and acknowledging America's failure "to make free men of the great mass of the descendants of the emancipated slaves" could conclude:

"The young rioters are very close to being past saving, and we have to face the grim question of how they can be induced to remain quiet while the necessary reforms for the benefit of other Negroes are worked out in the slow process of political democracy * * *."

The riots themselves refute Lippmann's conclusions.

One of the first lessons of Watts is that Negro ghetto youths cannot be "induced to remain quiet." When I talked to young people in Watts many of them referred to their "manifesto." I asked a young girl what they meant by the "manifesto." Who wrote it? She said, "We wrote it." When I asked to see a copy she burst into laughter and said, "Daddy, we're not talking about nothing you write, we're talking about the blood. We're talking about the fires. That's our manifesto. Now, you write something, you don't know who's to read it. But, baby, all over the world they know about our manifesto cause we wrote it in blood."

Another young boy said to me, "What we are trying to teach those white folks is to render to Caesar what is his, but give us what's ours."

If we can't read their "manifesto" in the burnt buildings and the smashed store windows in Watts, if things don't change, these young people were saying they would do it again. They wanted more than anything to be heard, to be recognized, to be listened to. At a meeting that Dr. King and I attended, a young man got up and said, "Dr. King we're happy, you've come, but you're not what we really want to hear. You go tell the Governor and the mayor to come down here and hear our grievances, and tell the goddamned chief of police we want to talk to him and tell them what's been happening down here." But too many people are still not listening.

DIGNITY

A second point is that these desperate youth cannot be bought off with the dole. They want jobs, decent houses and, above all, dignity. A dramatic illustration of their great hunger for pride and dignity occurred when the city authorities brought food into Watts. Many food stores had been destroyed and others remained closed. There was nowhere to buy food and many residents who had been kept away from work did not have any money even should food have been available for purchase.

But when the relief groups came in and started throwing bread and other food off trucks to the crowds in the street, the people refused to pick the food up. They said, "Man, don't treat us like that, we don't want your goddamn food." Hungry men, some of whom had not eaten for days, refused the food.

When the authorities turned the distribution over to more sensitive community volunteers, the people took the food. But they still refused to take the milk unless it came out of glasses, bottles, or cartons. They would not take it out of cans. They refused to take bread and other staples that were not properly wrapped.

And all this reveals to me that there is something far greater than hunger and that is the hunger for dignity. And when that basic human desire for dignity is frustrated, when hopes are smashed as they have been for the masses of Negroes, their desires are channeled into a destructive direction.

A young boy, who had been involved in a number of situations of arson, told me that he enjoyed it. "You mean you enjoyed seeing buildings going up in fire?" I asked. "I did," he replied, "because it gave me a feeling of being powerful, of being somebody. And if I can't go downtown and be a man, at least up here I can set something on fire." These youths, blocked from asserting their manhood in constructive ways, turn to violence. And this is a society in which violence has come to be related to manhood.

Mr. Lippmann should recognize that these young people cannot be bought off with relief checks or bread lines. This generation of ghetto youth will not accept being consigned to the American scrap heap as past generations have been. They have peered over the ghetto wall, they watch television and they have observed America's affluence. They want what most other young Americans have—a decent life, and an opportunity to better their existence—things that all America's children deserve.

HOPES

The families of these young people came to Watts seeking these opportunities. Over half of the inhabitants of Watts have come from the South over the past 25 years. The attraction was not the relief doles as some would have it. They came to California mainly during the Second and Korean wars, seeking jobs in the burgeoning defense industry and an expanding economy. They are still pouring into Watts as more Negroes are being displaced in Southern agriculture by machines. Like the European immigrants they were fleeing from misery and oppression. They came with many of the same kinds of hopes and illusions about "the gold in the pay envelopes."

But the difference is that today unskilled and uneducated hands are no longer needed to tend automated production. Their hopes were dashed. They hear speeches about the new opportunities opening up for Negroes but there are no jobs to fulfill their expectations. The result is resentment and bitterness.

TURN TO NATIONALISM

When no aid seemed forthcoming from outside the ghettoes to help them to constructively and creatively tear down the walls that imprison them, they tried to burn them down. Feeling alone and unwanted they are turning to black nationalism.

I don't mean that they join the Muslims of Black Nationalists, only a small number do this. They develop a kind of nationalistic pride. They cannot identify with America, because this conception only emphasizes the lowliness of their position as compared to other Americans. Many of them identify psychologically with the new African nations where black men are assuming the positions of leadership and dignity that have been denied Negro Americans. Thus their skin color becomes transformed into a badge of honor rather than one of shame.

Is it so surprising that people deprived of the economic and social necessities for dignity find that the only things they have to take pride in, are the color of their skin and their hatred? It is a similar phenomenon to what occurs in the thinking of the whites in Mississippi. But this is a sicker form of race pride because it can only be maintained through constant acts of oppression. The "poor white trash" also turn to violence—they have for more than a century—to maintain a feeling of worth and dignity. And I saw this craving for dignity, for nationalistic pride among the youth and adults in Watts in a much stronger form than I ever saw before. As a response to the hostility and indifference they felt from the white world, the black people of Watts grew closer together. It was common to see children, young people, and often adults, exchange a new kind of greeting: one puts his

thumb over his little finger, holds out the three middle fingers, and says "brother."

Paradoxically the communal bonds had grown stronger during and after the riots. The strangeness and loneliness which are the experience of those who have newly entered the northern ghettoes from the South, gave way to a feeling of community and relatedness. Many responded to this much more than to the violence. The fraternity of combatants—that is one of the few admirable qualities of war.

Ironically for all those who advocate that Negroes should band together like other national groups—the Italians, Jews, and Irish—for self-help programs, this was precisely what happened. But the organizations and programs were much more extreme because the problems were more extreme.

In Watts these relationships were developed on a class basis perhaps even more than on a racial basis. This is natural because the problem of the Negro in America is one of class as well as race. The majority of Negroes, together with the white poor—separate but equal—make up what Gunnar Myrdal has so aptly called, the American "underclass,"

During the riots there was almost as much hatred and bitterness toward the Negro middle class "who had made it" as toward the whites. An illustration of this occurred at a meeting held shortly after the riots. It was proposed that all the community and civil rights leaders join together to present their demands to the authorities. This was refused by those local leaders—block and gang leaders, heads of nationalist sects and the others most closely related to the poor. In private they said if they joined with the civil rights groups, churchmen, and middle-class community leaders they would be rejected by their people and replaced by extremists.

Here the civil rights movement is faced with profound difficulties. Divisions are growing wider in the Negro community as new opportunities open up to the middle class as a result of progress in social integration but the great masses of Negroes remain economically segregrated and impoverished.

The civil rights movement must develop an effective economic program that responds to this problem in order to bridge the gulf emerging between the Negro leadership at the grass roots and the national level. The major civil rights organizations, from SNCC to the Urban League, have not moved fast enough toward developing and pressing for necessary programs although stronger efforts are now being made in this direction. And too often, also, the grass-roots leadership has offered only nationalistic slogans to solve complicated economic and social problems.

But, essentially this is not the fault of the Negro leadership. Negro poverty and unemployment is built into our present economic structure. It will require a major national effort to redirect and transform our economic and political institutions to resolve the basic conflict.

In this kind of a situation, one should think carefully before concluding, as Mr. Lippman does, about how "the young rioters are close to being past saving." This kind of attitude in itself could be considered an "incitment to riot" by those being cast out of our society, by those who in fact have never been given the opportunity to enter it.

In one sense the criminals in the Negro community can be compared to the youth who rioted—but certainly not in the way the chief of police made this comparison. Springing from the poor, the uneducated, and the unskilled, many of the criminal types are among those most able at surviving the harsh rigors of the ghetto. Neither the Negro criminals nor the rioting youth are simple phenomena to be dealt with or dismissed easily.

The response to Government training and job programs is amazing. Many more young Negroes turned up to apply for these OEO projects than the openings provided for. If American society cannot offer a decent and humane solution to the awesome problems of the Negro youth then it is our society that is hopeless and not these young people.

COMMUNITY INVOLVED

It should be clear that what we are dealing with here is the problems of the entire Negro community, not just the criminal elements, delinquent adolescents, and the hopelessly disintegrated. The riots were a warning and an appeal, not from the narrow section of the Watts community, but from the masses of Negroes.

I could not count heads but reports I have received and my experiences with the people leads me to believe that a large percentage of the people living in the Watts area participated. Most of them did not themselves loot and burn but they were on the streets at one time or other. The idea that most of the people caught up in the rioting were criminals, as Chief Parker would have it, is belied even by the type of looting that took place. Most of the people involved were stealing things they thought they would never otherwise have, and a great number of touching stories can be told of this. There was a husband and wife, both over 60, carrying a couch about 8 blocks to their home. They got so tired with this enormous couch that they just plopped down in the middle of the street and rested on the couch until they could carry it further. These were hardly criminal types—they were people caught in a kind of carnival atmosphere of stealing.

A large number of people were arrested trying to match up furniture. One of them was a woman who had gone out with her children to get a kitchen set. But when she got home she added up and discovered that they needed another chair in order to feed the whole family around the table. They went back to get the additional chair and they all got arrested. There was an amusing, tragically amusing, side to the manner in which people who are not used to theft can get caught up in a mob situation where these things are going on. And the greatest number of arrests were for looting, not arson or shooting.

As a person who deplores violence I want to say something that may sound shocking if it is not carefully understood. The violence in the Watts area was a relatively healthy reaction to the situation. The conditions in the Negro ghetto generate enormous amounts of violence, but heretofore it has almost always been Negroes who have suffered from that violence and were its victims.

Frustrated black men beat up their women and abused their children, they knifed other black men in barroom brawls. The number of murders last year in Watts was extraordinarily high. It is well known that the police care little and do little about the violence Negroes inflict on each other. But this time Negro violence was expressed outwardly toward hated objects, belonging to the white world. Psychologists would say this was a healthier expression of anger than the usual self-destruction. Even so, more Negroes than whites were killed.

But in a sense, Negroes were willing to pay this price. In some families Negro men who had participated in the riots were treated with awe and respect by the wives and children. They were no longer the passive victims of the ghetto, to be either pitied or hated, often both, by their families. Now they were—if even for a moment—men who had asserted themselves through action. A jobless young man of eighteen who already had a number of common law marriages and six children by different women, told me that the first time he felt like a man was when he saw the building he set on fire, burn to the ground.

Family counseling and psychotherapy can't solve the Negro family problem. These can only help in some cases and under certain conditions. But without a program that provides jobs at decent wages counseling and therapy are impotent. It should be clear that we can't solve the Negro family problem without solving the unemployment problem.

I have described the feelings and attitudes of the people who rioted—the nationalism, the anger, the class and economic nature of the problem. All of these factors were reflected in the events. Now I want to describe the riots. The events almost speak for themselves and they refute two theories presented about the riots. The riots were neither a plot nor a totally irrational outburst of madness, although there were many irrational aspects.

While a ghetto riot doesn't have a head it does roll on with a kind of logic. Violence was not indiscriminate in Watts. Where Negro storekeepers put up signs, "I am a poor working Negro trying to make a business," they were not touched. Where a sign said "blood brother" the mobs passed it by. Even where there were white-owned businesses which had given the community people a break—allowed them credit or purchases on time, even at relatively high prices—some stores were spared. But where merchants were known to be gougers they were looted and destroyed.

That the direction the rioters took was not entirely antisocial is demonstrated by their treatment of the liquor stores. All the liquor stores were broken into and burned. But I was told by a number of reliable observers that many more bottles of liquor were destroyed than were stolen to be drunk. I think this happened because although on one hand the people needed liquor to make their lives bearable, they revolted against the idea that they have to live on it. I think they demonstrated a kind of logic by which people turn against the things that destroy them.

No simple-minded conclusions that the riots were instigated by "malcontents or subversives" fit the facts. From information I got from trusted observers and participants, and from my own personal experience during the Harlem riots, the two events follow a similar pattern.

First, both were spontaneous, sparked by an incident involving the police. Second, as the situation began to get out of hand the police became frightened and used excessive violence. More people joined the rioters and then criminal gangs took over, looted and encouraged others to loot, sometimes justifying the action with civil rights and nationalistic arguments. And lastly, some political elements tried to take advantage of the situation by making themselves visible through leaflets and speeches to the crowds.

Of course there was much that was irrational in the riots. But the irrationality of people forced by society to live in insane conditions is far different from the irrationality of the police chief and mayor of Los Angeles. They denounced the Negro leadership, and refused to meet with them early enough. It was the mayor who acted irresponsibly by contributing to blocking the poverty program. He had attempted to control it to strengthen his own political machine by excluding other political factions and representatives from the Negro community. As a result, Los Angeles was one of the few cities in the United States that had no poverty program, and this made the situation even more desperate.

The mayor and the chief of police, by their statements and actions before and

during the riots, put the community leaders in an untenable position, limiting their influence over the rioters and preventing them from turning the violence into constructive protest action. The rioters' response to the appeals of the Negro leadership was that only one thing could affect the mayor and the police chief—violence. And I must say that Parker and Yorty are themselves convincing arguments that the people on the street were right. But, as I pointed out earlier, the situation was one in which, even if these public officials had been angels, it is doubtful that violence could have been wholly averted.

HARLEM AND WATTS COMPARED

During the Harlem riots we urged rioters to stop the violence and organize nonviolent protest, but we met with very slight success. This is understandable, because when we tell them to go home, they feel we are asking them to accept the conditions of their lives. Dr. King and I were not surprised when we were booed in Watts.

The situation in Watts was more difficult than in Harlem for a number of reasons. Time had passed and the situation for the ghetto Negro had not improved. A number of gangs existed whose activities, though mainly petty crime and violence, had begun to develop a nationalistic strain. The fact that Dick Gregory was shot when he tried to calm the crowd was an indication that the situation had gotten worse.

I have witnessed a number of riots and there is another important difference between past riots and the explosion in Watts. Almost all of these other riots turned back toward some programmatic aspect of the civil rights struggle.

I remember the Harlem riot in 1942 which started out as a protest against the OPA's not watching and controlling prices in Harlem. It ended with the destruction of A. Philip Randolph's march on the Washington office. The crowd was saying, "Randolph, why don't you march?" A short time before, Mr. Randolph had planned to march unless President Roosevelt established a Fair Employment Practices Commission. Roosevelt gave in to the pressure and the march was called off. But the Negro community wanted to go further.

The situation subsequently improved. At the time war production was expanding rapidly and there were soon jobs for Negroes in the full employment war economy. Today the job situation is much worse, and while there were still programmatic aspects to the riots in Watts recently, and in Harlem last summer, the ideological basis this time was predominantly nationalistic and narrow in its implications. The rioters were saying, "You white folks won't help us and we black people in the ghetto will have to do it ourselves. If we can't have what you have we're going to destroy what you have. We are going to turn this country upside down." There was a stronger element of despair than ever before.

The heightened aspirations and expectations inspired by the civil rights revolution have not been fulfilled for the masses of Negroes. And as a result, not only was the extent of violence and destruction greater than in Harlem last summer but the psychological attitude of the rioters was different. In Harlem the youths and adults on the streets screamed at the police, "You want to kill a nigger? kill me." But in Watts, the cry of the crowd was "burn baby, burn."

TAX SHARING

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, tax sharing between Federal and local governmental units was suggested in 1961 as a means of meeting the increasing needs of State and local governments by the then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Prof. Walter Heller. More recently, it was the subject of a study by a special task force headed by Dr. Joseph Peckman, director of economics at the Brookings Institution. The details of this study have not yet been released. The principle of tax sharing has recently been endorsed by a number of Governors at their conference. In my opinion, this proposal has a great deal of merit and should be considered by the Congress in its next session. It has much to recommend it:

Those of us who are familiar with millage battles at home know how hard it is to raise the funds needed for our local school systems and how the millage is never voted until 2 or 3 years after the crisis has occurred. We know of the person living on a fixed income or annuity whose increased property tax comes out of their food allowance and who justifiably complains that property taxes can go no higher. We know of the businessman who may be taxed 5 percent on his inventory, even though he may be in a business, such as food sales, in which he realizes a profit of only 1 or 2 percent on his inventory. We know of the farmer who doesn't buy a machine he needs or cannot store his grain on his farm because the property tax is too high. We know that property taxes, which provide 37 percent of the State and local revenues, cannot substantially be increased.

In States such as my own, the sales tax is already at its upper limit, and might even appropriately be reduced on certain necessities of life. In addition, a variety of other taxes—business activities, nuisance and intangibles provide a hodgepodge of revenues which cannot be expanded without driving business into other States. City and State income taxes, if in existence, cannot readily be extended without tending to drive businesses and citizens into other cities and States where these taxes do not exist.

One of the communities in my district, at this very moment, is deciding on whether or not to impose a city income tax. This city has a problem shared by many of this Nation's smaller and larger communities alike—it is a core city, surrounded by residential and light industrial city and township governments. The core city is expected to provide most of the needs of the entire metropolitan area, with only a portion of the metropolitan tax base within its borders. In addition, it is being asked to provide social and welfare services which benefit the surrounding communities, without their substantial financial involvement.

Some say a city income tax appears to provide a means of securing the needed revenue—but will it, in fact, do so? If a city income tax is imposed, will industry settle and expand within the city or instead move outside the city—either near or far away—to avoid the tax? Certainly the presence of the tax will tend to keep out potential new industries. Will industries already in the city prefer discontinuing their operations by shifting them to other plants in other parts of the country? Certainly they must seriously consider doing so, for if they are selling in competitive markets, without Government subsidies, they cannot absorb the city income tax increases if their competitors in other cities do not have the same increases imposed on them.

This city, like many others in our land, must face the hard decision: whether to impose a new tax to increase revenue to pay for needed services and thereby take the substantial risk of driving industries and citizens away or to neglect the needs of the community and leave taxes at their present levels. Both courses of action are, in a very real sense, self-defeating. There is no obviously preferable course.

In short, local units of government are going to have a hard time expanding their sources of revenue. Although tax revision and reform may be undertaken by the more courageous State legislatures, it will not necessarily entail a needed expansion in State revenues, because States and their tax structure still remain in competition with each other.

It is also obvious that the needs of State and local governments will grow rapidly. During the period 1953 to 1963, State and local governments increased their expenditures by 132 percent. Their expenditure on education increased by 155 percent to a total of $24 billion. Their expenditures on public welfare, and on health and hospitals doubled. It is expected that State and local expenditures must rise at a rate of at least 7 percent a year if they are to satisfy local needs.

If we make the bold assertion that State and local revenues from existing taxes grow as fast as the national product—5 percent per year—there will still be a gap of 2 percent between their revenue and their expenditures. This will be of a magnitude of $2 to $3 billion per year by 1970.

If we look ahead, then, the options are clear: States and local governments will have to increase the types of taxes which are already at their upper limit; or they will have to receive Federal grants in aid for specific programs; or they will fail to meet service needs of their communities; or they will have to receive a share of Federal tax revenues. Of all these options, the last is clearly the most acceptable.

It is estimated by a number of students on the subject that Federal tax revenues will continue to grow at a rate of $4 to $7 billion per year. In the absence of an armed conflict—which will severely tighten our belts—we can anticipate the possibility of further tax reductions, further increases in Federal nondefense programs, and/or a reallocation of some of this growing Federal revenue to the States and communities. I would favor a combination of tax reduction and of tax sharing with the local units of government.

I am, accordingly, introducing today a bill which provides a mechanism of sharing Federal tax revenues with the States and local units of government. In many respects, this bill is similar to S. 2619, introduced on October 11 by Senators JAVITS and HARTKE and to H.R. 11535 in the House introduced by Representative REID of New York. But it is dissimilar in that it shares tax revenues with the States without tying strings on fund use. Whereas the Senate bill says that the funds must be used only for purposes of health, education, and welfare, I prefer to allow the local governmental units to use the funds in any manner they desire, except highway construction. I see no wisdom in telling a State, county, city, or village, that they need to spend money on this activity and not that. In fact, they need to spend money on all the activities for which they are held accountable, in the best judgment of their citizens. And I respect the judgment of these citizens, as well as differences of opinion which may exist from one community to another. If we in Congress see other needs—transportation, education, recreation, or conservation—which cannot be met by State action, we can make use of existing programs of grants in aid.

My bill, like the Senate proposal, limits revenue sharing to Federal personal income tax receipts, since these are among the least volatile of Federal revenues.

My bill distributes this shared Federal tax on the basis of a State's population. It makes no provision for adjusting the allocation up or down on the basis of the State's per capita income or its own effort to raise revenues. If we wish to redistribute income further than my bill would do it, I believe we should use the technique of grants-in-aid, so that we know just what we are doing and how much it is costing. There is enough hidden redistribution going on right now.

I believe this approach is consistent with the proposition that our citizens are best able to determine their needs for themselves, and that governmental decisions should be as decentralized as possible. It accepts the traditional belief that the needs of our citizens for health and education and comfort can best be met at the local level. It will arrest the tendency to transfer some of these responsibilities to the Federal Government just because the local governments do not have funds to provide for them.

Although my bill is merely an early proposal, I hope to discuss its ideas, merits, and imperfections with my constituents during the recess, and to make further contributions to this dialog when Congress reconvenes in January.

The problem is pressing, the need is great. I believe the Congress has a responsibility to seriously consider this and other proposals right away. Our State and local governments are now facing a severe crisis. They are facing demands in the present—particularly with regard to water and air pollution, overcrowded and substandard schools, insufficient recreation facilities, and even inadequate health care. But their sources of revenue are years out of date and available taxes have been pushed about as high as they can go.

I believe the bill will help strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens more effectively and more responsibly.

RED COMMUNISTS INSTIGATE PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the peace demonstrations and riots over the weekend were instigated and prepared by the Communist leaders of the worldwide Communist demonstrations against our Vietnam policy.

It is incredible that some students and professors in this country would join hands with the ruthless, bloody Vietcong aggressor in South Vietnam in timing and coordinating these anti-American demonstrations. We are at war against the Red aggressor in South Vietnam. Our Armed Forces are actively engaged in a death struggle to preserve freedom. Demonstrations in the United States are designed to weaken our military position and undermine the morale of our people. These demonstrations are an attack upon this country no less than the Communist attacks upon our men by the aggressor in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to launch an immediate and thorough investigation of these peace demonstrations and teach-ins. Their sinister objectives should be exposed. These demonstrations have duped and hoodwinked some innocent people. These demonstrations have by design and false propaganda enlisted the support of some well-meaning people. We should expose now the connection between these demonstrations in our country and the worldwide demonstrations called by the Communists to force a withdrawal from South Vietnam. These demonstrations are carefully designed with the ending of the monsoon season in the hope of preventing a complete free world victory in southeast Asia. These demonstrations are a frantic, desperate Communist effort to slow down progress being made by our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act of 1965 is one of the most important elements of the legislative program of the 89th Congress. It contains a brilliant new concept by which master teachers and apprentices will be subsidized by the Federal Government and sent to those local areas most in need of teachers.

This concept, formally entitled the National Teacher Corps, is now under fire by a small minority of my colleagues who claim that it injects an element of Federal influence into local school administration. I do not see the truth or logic in this.

The Teacher Corps members would be assigned at the request of local school authorities and would serve under local control. The teachers would be paid according to the prevailing local salaries. They would teach whatever subjects the employing school assigned them to teach. They would be hired, paid, administered and, if necessary, fired by local authorities.

The need for more teachers is well-known. Last year, nearly 400,000 of our children went to school for less than a full school day because there simply were not enough teachers to go around. There are now nearly 50 million youngsters in our public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. The average teacher-pupil ratio in elementary schools is 28 to 1. In some schools it is as much as 40 to 1. Thus, far too many children are denied the benefits of close contact with the teacher; the individual needs, and talents of these children go unnoticed; the needs unmet; the talents undeveloped.

President Harry S. Truman had a sign on his desk when he was in the White House, which read: "The buck stops here." Hundreds of thousands of our children are carrying similar signs: "The buck stopped here." And they will carry that blight—educational impoverishment—for the rest of their lives.

Last month, when schools opened across the country, there was a need for about 250,000 new teachers. This need was not met. Only about 100,000 teachers were recruited. Thus, the children of this Nation were denied the educational opportunities to which they are entitled, by the laws of the land, by our traditions, and by our frequently mouthed commitment to the principle of a first class education for every American child.

Worse, the children from the families with the lowest incomes were the ones who were hardest hit. If we ever hope to carry out successfully our declared war on poverty we will have to eject these children from their subgroup status and break the cycle of poverty which has choked off the hopes, aspirations, and capabilities of the poor for generations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that we pass the Higher Education Act of 1965 and leave intact the provision for the National Teachers Corps. It will be a major step in tackling the problems of substandard educational opportunity for the poor which must be solved if we ever are to remove the national stigma of the one-fifth of America who live in poverty.

A trenchant and perceptive analysis of the poverty problem by Joseph Kraft appears in today's Washington Post, and will, I am sure, be of great interest to my colleagues:

IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY

(By Joseph Kraft)

Glowing as they may seem, the latest economic statistics actually express a condition of poverty in the midst of plenty—maybe, even, of growing poverty in the midst of growing plenty. At a minimum, they reinforce the proposition that there are two nearly separate economies in the United States.

One is the economy of affluence, which includes the great majority of Americans. They are well trained, hold stable jobs, and enjoy good health, good housing, and normal family life. They benefit from Government efforts to expand the economy through such measures as the recent tax cuts. Their fortunes rise with every increase in the gross national product.

The other is the economy of poverty. It includes millions of Americans who have sidetracked from the central path of national growth, usually either by reason of color, or because they live in rural backwaters. Inadequately trained, they have trouble finding and holding jobs. In consequence, they have low incomes, poor health, and slum housing. They do not benefit much from measures to expand the economy because, so far at least, these measures have tended to stimulate demand for skills they do not have. While the gross national product has been rising, they have been passing on poverty from generation unto generation.

A finely etched statistical profile of the two Americas can be found in the figures, just now being released, for the third quarter of this year. During the past 3 months, the gross national product jumped by $11 billion to reach a record annual rate of $677 billion. The jump exceeded by more than 20 percent the projections of the Council of Economic Advisers. It expressed an annual growth rate of about 5 percent—double the rate of the Eisenhower years.

What is more, the growth has been balanced. It has affected virtually all sectors of the economy. It has not been accompanied by any rise in wholesale prices. And in general, wage rates have held about even with increases in productivity.

On the employment side, the growth is fully reflected in the figures for white people. During the last quarter the rate of unemployment for white persons averaged 4 percent—the lowest quarterly figure reached since the third quarter of 1957. In July, and again in September, the figure dipped slightly below the 4 percent mark. Unemployment among white teenagers, also on the downgrade, dropped from 12.9 percent in June to 11.4 percent in September.

But nonwhite unemployment in the past quarter actually showed a rise—up from 8 to 8.3 percent. While white unemployment decreased in the months of July and September, nonwhite unemployment rose in each of these months. And the reason it seems to have dropped in August is the employment of some 100,000 teenagers in the Neighborhood Youth Corps of the poverty program.

In September, with that summer program ending, nonwhite teenage unemployment rose by 7 points to 27.5 percent. More than a quarter of the nonwhite teenagers on the job market, in other words, are unemployed. Poverty's next generation is already in sight.

This is not to say that no progress has been made. Total unemployment has dropped from 6 to 4.4 percent in the past 5 years. A million persons newly entering the job market each year have been absorbed. And the poverty program has been launched with special programs for meeting the problems of the poor that are beyond the reach of general economic growth.

Still, the next 5 years will see 1.5 million workers entering the job market annually. While some features of the poverty program, for example the Neighborhood Youth Corps, are largely palliatives, others, for example the effort to provide initiative and confidence through preschool training, cannot possibly pay off for years to come.

In the meantime, it is evident that something more must be done if the end of poverty amidst plenty is to be accomplished. Rosy as things look, there remains a need to raise even higher the rate of growth and cut, even more rapidly, the rate of unemployment.

THE NEW FIFTH COLUMN—THE 5–A MARCHERS

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, in several regions of the country, we witnessed a deplorable spectacle of the new fifth column in America.

I say this column is more than deplorable—it is despicable. Until I find a better name for this column, I shall refer to it as the "5–A Vanguard." This vanguard would aid and abet anyone against America.

In this case the 5–A marchers have chosen to march on the side of aggression—the Communist aggression against the free people of Vietnam who simply seek to enjoy the same kind of freedom we have in America. We intend to give the South Vietnamese a chance for that freedom. That is why we are on their side assisting them against the forces of infiltration and enslavement.

I have defended individual freedom on any and every occasion whenever I felt obliged to speak out upon it. More than that, I served as an infantryman in World War II against the most heinous and destructive threat to freedom we had known up to that time. We had a fifth column then which caused the fall of Europe. Can we now fail to deal with this 5–A column which roams the streets of America.

The 5–A column is not truly a free movement. It is not a positive nor constructive movement.

The Vice President of the United States indicated over this weekend that it is not a movement indigenous to the communities in which it is seen. He stated that there are indications that it is being controlled from without.

As a controlled movement, I would question that it is entitled to the protection that it has thus far enjoyed from civil authority.

As a controlled movement, I believe it merits the thorough and complete investigation by the Congress in order that we may fully explore the control mechanism, we must expose plans and objectives of those who pull the strings of the puppets from New York to Berkeley, all of whom sing the same ragged tune and shout the same hateful slogans.

I have no respect for the card-carrying Communist and I have even less respect for the placard-carrying marcher who seeks to help the Communists.

While investigations of this kind take time to get underway and because this type of organization has a serpentine proclivity for crawling back into the crevices from which it arose, the process will be tedious. In the meantime my concern is not for these unwashed and unwanted people. My concern is for the 125,000 members of the Armed Forces who are defending freedom in Vietnam and who have every right to ask of us:

"What are you Americans back home doing about these whelps who are yapping at the heels of the defenders of freedom?"

This much we can do and do right away:

On November 11 we will mark Veterans Day to pay homage to all the fighting men and women of today and yesterday who never had any doubt about their obligation and responsibility in the defense of freedom. Neither has there ever been any doubt that communism—especially militant, aggressive communism—threatens that freedom and deserves no comfort or consideration in our land.

On that day I feel it would be fitting and appropriate if all veterans' organizations, and, indeed, all Americans who can and want to do so were to join in massive marches and parades in every region of our land in the support of our course in Vietnam and around the world in the defense of freedom.

I am today calling upon the heads of all our national veterans' organizations to join in such a massive march in the support of our policy of assisting the free people of Vietnam. I believe the servicemen and servicewomen who are putting their lives on the line across the world from our safe and secure homeland have a right to expect no less from us.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, has just returned from Vietnam and has stated that the morale of our men and women in that area has been shaken by such demonstrations and for this reason I urge that veterans, and all Americans, march for Vietnam on November 11 under the free and positive auspices of our veterans' organizations so that the 5–A demonstrations will recede into ridiculous insignificance by comparison.

In my years in Congress I have never felt more called upon to deliver a flag-waving speech. I believe the time has come not only to wave the flag but to wash from the toes of America this case of athlete's foot on the march which pretends to be part of the contagion of freedom but is in reality no more than the bacteria of enslavement to aggression.

THE USO AND MR. EUGENE JELESNIK

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two great American institutions: the USO and Mr. Eugene Jelesnik, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The one, the USO, we are all familiar with, though we may have temporarily forgotten that this great organization, which did so much to provide relaxation and entertainment for members of the armed services during World War II and the Korean conflict, is still in business. The role of the USO today in making more bearable the job of the cold war GI's is just as important as it was 20 years ago, and I commend this great institution. America must give it wholehearted support.

The second institution I also commend today, my friend Gene Jelesnik. His life of service embodies the best tradition of the USO. This great American, who came with his mother to the United States when he was 11 years of age, left New York just recently with a troupe of entertainers bound for the USO circuit in Europe and north Africa. This will be Gene's second USO tour of this area, his first having taken place over 20 years ago.

Though the present tour means some financial sacrifice for Gene, he feels that his whole career as an entertainer and entrepreneur should constitute an expression of gratitude for his American citizenship.

When Eugene Jelesnik left Salt Lake City 2 weeks ago to put together the show he will be directing abroad, the Deseret News of September 27 took note of the fact in a short article:

JELESNIK INVITED ON USO TOUR

Eugene Jelesnik, conductor of the Salt Lake philharmonic orchestra, talent scout and violinist, has been invited by the USO to entertain U.S. servicemen on a tour into Spain, Morocco, North Africa, Italy, Germany, and France.

Mr. Jelesnik will be manager of a troupe of performers who will rehearse for a week in New York beginning October 9, then go by jet to Spain. The tour will last 4½ months.

In addition to Mr. Jelesnik, who will entertain with his Amati violin, members of the troupe will include Barbara Stalzle, acrobatic tap dancer from Denver, Colo.; Meri Kayne, singer-guitarist; Sammy King, ventriloquist, and Thomas Cheles and Charles Burgess, who perform on the electric bass and piano.

The tour will be a return engagement for Mr. Jelesnik, who entertained on the Fox Hole Circuit in the Mediterranean theater of operations during World War II. He played in the front lines of Italy before 56,640 soldiers. For this he received the Civilian Service Ribbon award from the War Department.

With his variety artists he also traveled 35,000 miles to entertain U.S. soldiers in Korea, Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and Hawaii. He received a Silver Medal citation for this tour.

Mr. Jelesnik originated the Salt Lake City pops concerts, pays annual visits to entertain shutins and the blind, has brought many star attractions to the community, and presents local talent on a television show.

He also has composed several musical numbers, including the "J. F. K. March," which was dedicated to the late President and played for him in Salt Lake City just 2 months before the assassination.

Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, in giving the Salt Lake artist a sendoff on his tour, dubbed him the Utah ambassador to the Armed Forces, and extended his greetings to all Utah servicemen abroad.

ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago today, in a dingy house on a grimy street in London, a baby girl was born, unknown but to her family and the doctor. Ninety-six years later that girl died in far-off sunny California, mourned by hundreds of thousands. Because she had lived, the world was a better place. Because of her existence, hundreds lived who would otherwise have died, and thousands more lived in health who would otherwise have existed in pain and misery.

She was Ellen Browning Scripps, whose contributions throughout her lifetime to her fellow man are immeasurable.

The fortunate possessor of a large fortune acquired by tireless industry in the newspaper field, Ellen Scripps utilized that fortune to make happier and fuller the lives of others. She moved to California in 1890, and our State is marked with monuments to her generosity. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Scripps Clinic and Research Hospital, the La Jolla public playground and community center, Torrey Pines State Park and the children's pool are but an infinitesimal part of her contributions to her community and to the people of every generation. Benefactions to churches, charities, and individuals are without number, and through them she has had a lasting and beneficial effect on the lives of thousands.

On this, her birthday, these thousands pay tribute to her memory. I join with them in this tribute.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the embarrassing spectacle of student demonstrations we witnessed this weekend does not represent the prevailing thinking of our college campuses.

These young people are actually working against all the things they want, as James Reston so ably put it in the New York Times yesterday. They are in no way influencing the President or the Congress with their outbursts.

This weekend in Memphis, the presidents of the student bodies of the three largest colleges pledged to support the Government's policies in Vietnam and to protest the so-called peace demonstrations. They were joined in their statement by the president of the Memphis AFL–CIO Labor Council and the president of the junior chamber of commerce.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a news item from the Commercial Appeal and call attention to Mr. Reston's column, already inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Oct. 16, 1965]

STUDENTS JOIN JAYCEES, LABOR TO SUPPORT UNITED STATES

Student leaders of Memphis' three largest colleges joined with civic and labor groups yesterday to pledge support of the Government's policies in Vietnam and to protest so-called peace demonstrations elsewhere in the country.

A joint statement declared:

"We feel, as representatives of our respective groups and as concerned American citizens, that it is our privilege and duty to take a stand in support of our Government's position in the Vietnam crisis.

"While we do not profess to be experts * * * we do recognize that our Government must take firm stands in some instances for the sake of freedom in the world.

"Constant appeasement can only lead to war and surrender to our country's enemies. We believe the various irresponsible demonstrations being held in other sections of our country * * * are in no way representative of the youth and workers of our country."

The statement was signed by John Houseal, president of the Student Government Association at Memphis State University; Roderick Diggs, Jr., president of the student council at LeMoyne College; Bill Allen, president of the student body at Southwestern; Thomas E. Powell, president of the Memphis AFL–CIO Labor Council; and Ed Pulliam, regional vice president of the Tennessee Junior Chamber of Commerce.

LOST GOALS IN AFRICA

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a very provocative and thoughtful article entitled "Lost Goals in Africa" has been published in the magazine Foreign Affairs for October 1965. Its author, Mr. Arnold Rivkin of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been a profound student of developments in the Dark Continent for many years. His viewpoint deserves careful consideration. The article follows:

LOST GOALS IN AFRICA

(By Arnold Rivkin)

U.S. policy in Africa has lost much of its credibility for a large part of the African continent. We have held out hope for more than we have, in the event, been able or willing to deliver. Often the promise of brave words was extravagant and unwise; but what is noticed is that it has not been matched by congruent acts. We have seemed to say one thing and do another. For example, to most of Africa the unqualified and warmly welcomed pronouncement of the

U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs—"The United States stands for self-determination in Africa"—appears to have been disregarded, even repudiated, in practice, with respect to what in African eyes is the acid test of our bona fides, the white redoubts in southern Africa. Again, in promising major and growing American aid for a decade of development we declared it to be "a primary necessity, opportunity and responsibility of the United States" to help make "a historic demonstration that economic growth and political democracy can go hand in hand" in building "free, stable, and self-reliant countries." This hope has now been substantially dissipated by the evolution of the U.S. aid syndrome in Africa—initial good intentions, objective standards, policies of rewarding merit, yielding to the pressures of the moment, the putting out of fires, the special concern for bad boys, problem children, and the crisis prone, the needs of containment, the special interest of allies, the U.S. dollar drain, etc.

So too, our promise of uncritical support for African aspirations and goals—as if all of Africa shared the same set of aspirations and goals: "What we want for Africa," said the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, "is what the Africans want for themselves." Its naivete was exposed when it came up against the shattering realities of African diversity and division in the renewed Congo crisis. The inability of the Organization of African Unity to cope with the crisis only served to emphasize the lack of agreement in Africa on aspirations and goals. The aftermath of the Congolese rescue operation in November 1964 brought this message home to the United States. One part of Africa responded with what Ambassador Stevenson called an unprecedented torrent of abuse, verbal violence, hatred and malign accusations against the United States. Another part silently acquiesced or openly approved the Belgian-American action.

There is a prevalent feeling among Africans that after a brief encounter the United States has lost interest and is having second thoughts about Africa. Have we and are we?

Africa more than any other area of the world was to assume a new importance under the Kennedy Administration; Africa was to be a new frontier for U.S. foreign policy. This was the promise of the President's unprecedented action in choosing for his very first appointment to the State Department a prominent political personality to be the Assistant Secretary dealing with African affairs, and of the accompanying announcement that in his administration the new post would be second to none in importance. This initial promise was quickly reinforced.

First, the United States repudiated its apparent acquiescence to the Portuguese position that its African territories are constitutionally integral parts of Portugal, and substituted a policy looking toward self-determination for Angola. Ambassador Stevenson's warm support of the resolution calling for a U.N. investigation of conditions in Angola moved the Liberian representative on the Security Council to declare that Stevenson's words would reverberate throughout Africa.

Then the President, in his first foreign-aid message to Congress, called for a new aid agency, with a mandate to mobilize United States and other free world resources for a decade of development in the underdeveloped southern half of the globe. Significantly, from the point of view of Africa's new importance, within months of his message and before Congress could enact new legislation, President Kennedy dispatched a special mission to Nigeria to study its economy and its new development plan to determine the country's eligibility for a long-term U.S. aid commitment under the new criteria—long-term planning, absorptive capacity, selp-help and social justice. The Nigerian mission, the first anywhere in the world under the new criteria, was soon followed by another to Tunisia. Two unprecedented long-term commitments resulted: $225 million for Nigeria's 6-year plan and $180 million for Tunisia's 3-year plan.

The revolution of rising expectations generated in Africa by these new departures in American policy was relatively shortlived. Early in 1963, the Chairman of the State Department's Advisory Council on African Affairs wrote: "By 1962 numerous African leaders who had welcomed Assistant Secretary Williams' visit in 1961 as a portent of great things to come were beginning to wonder whether the New Frontier was all public relations and no real help." [1]

Disillusion followed disappointment when the administration seemed to contradict its dramatic new policy—self-determination for the people of Angola—by continuing to supply arms to Portugal. Similar feelings were aroused when the administration seemed to hold back from applying its publicly stated policy of self-determination in Africa to the Republic of South Africa, even though the circumstances were different and even though it did eventually support a voluntary prohibition on shipment of arms to South Africa. Disillusion also resulted from the apparent acceptance by the administration of the finding of the President's committee on U.S. foreign aid, the Clay Committee, that, notwithstanding our proclaimed policy of support for the revolutionary transformation underway in Africa from colonial dependency to national independence, Africa was an area of primary interest for the outgoing colonial powers and not for the United States. The Nigerian Ambassador to the United Nations, concerned about the implications of the Committee's finding for his own country and for Africa generally, hurried to Washington seeking assurances that Africa was indeed still a new frontier in U.S. foreign policy. He received assurance only that the administration would continue honoring its pledge of support for Nigeria's 6-year plan; nothing more could be said about future aid.

Nothing has since occurred under the Johnson administration to reverse the downward spiral of African importance in American policy. In Washington, Africa now has the lowest priority of any area. This has always been more or less State Department practice in making foreign policy decisions; now it has become a matter of national policy.

II

Africa has come to be an area of residual interest for the United States. It is not merely that former colonial powers are recognized as having the primary Western interest and responsibility; in principle, this may be a quite defensible position. But in practice the principle has been pushed to extremes. It has meant that the interest of the United States comes into play only as "the court of last resort," when there are no acceptable alternatives available. Thus, it is only where the decolonization process has gone wrong, as in the cases of the Congo (Leopoldville) and Guinea, or where there have been special situations, such as those arising out of the abrupt liquidation of Italy's African empire, or where there has been no colonial relationship, as in Liberia and Ethiopia, or where the needs were obviously beyond the capacity of the outgoing colonial power, as in Nigeria—it is only then that the United States has stepped in to play a major role. As circumstances have permitted, we have encouraged the former colonial power to remain or to come back into the picture.

[1] Vernon McKay, "Africa in World Politics." New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 360.

In short, with the exceptions of Nigeria and Tunisia, where independent assessments of their importance and potential for development were made, the United States has allowed the quirks of history and the policies of other Western powers to impose a crazy quilt of special relations in Africa. As a matter of chance, some of these may coincide with a sound U.S. policy for Africa; others seem highly dubious. The incongruity of our position in Africa has been heightened by our attenuated relations with the many other African states which, not being "special cases," are not thrust into the orbit of active U.S. interest.

In the remaining colonial territories, inevitably and quite naturally, the United States has deferred to the colonial powers, the United Kingdom, and Portugal. The problem, however, has become one of limits. At what juncture do these territories of free world nations become a matter of direct concern, even responsibility, for the leading free world nation? American policy has been equivocal.

In State Department practice as well as policy, the notion of residual interest operates. For the most part, major decisions of African policy are determined, not in the African Bureau of the State Department, but in the European Bureau and, insofar as the United Arab Republic is concerned, in the Near Eastern and South Asian Bureau. Certainly this is true of U.S. policy toward Portuguese Africa and Rhodesia. But more surprising, policies toward independent African States are also shaped in the European Bureau. The sensitivities of President de Gaulle, as judged by the European Bureau, rather than an independent assessment of the U.S. national interest in various French-speaking countries, is likely to be the decisive factor. Thus, for some 3 years the United States severely limited its relationship with Guinea, even though Guinea had broken with France in achieving its independence. Notwithstanding the existence of the very situation which should have triggered active U.S. interest in Guinea, our respect for French primacy and De Gaulle's wishes prevented our taking action. Only after Guinea withdrew from the tightening Soviet embrace in 1962 did we take an active interest there, partly because the containment policy demanded that we take preemptive action to forestall the elements in the Parti Démocratique de Guinée which were seeking a rapprochement with the Soviet Union or an expanding relationship with Communist China, and partly because De Gaulle had relented enough in his attitude toward Guinea to allow the United States to enter the scene.

The policy of containment of the Soviet Union and Communist China is indeed a principal reason for retaining even a residual interest in Africa, so as to avoid the possibility of a "dangerous vacuum" where a colonial power has failed to make a reasonable accommodation with a former colony. The desire to deny, in very different circumstances, the Congo, Guinea, and Somalia to Soviet or Communist Chinese hegemony has certainly been a prime consideration in our policy toward these three countries. Similarly, fear that failure of the colonial power to take adequate steps to void crisis situations which the Communist powers could exploit has influenced us to go as far as we have in our policies toward Rhodesia and Portuguese Africa.

As with any policy depending on the actions of others, the United States has found itself on the horns of more than one dilemma. For example, the policy of residual interest has thrust the United States into support of Ethiopia, and the policies of residual interest and containment into support of Somalia, while the two states are engaged in an undeclared but nonetheless violent war. Similarly, the policy of containment has led us

to provide large-scale agricultural commodity assistance to the United Arab Republic, and the policies of residual interest and containment have led to our principal commitment in Africa, support of the Congo—where the United Arab Republic has long been engaged in attempting to overthrow the central government by one means or another. I cite these cases not because our action in either of them was necessarily wrong, but to underscore the difficulties of relying too much on the policies of third countries in determining our own.

The expansion of the policy of containment by word and action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic has far-reaching implications for Africa. Thus, Castroite Cuba's role in the Zanzibar revolution of January 1964 not only illustrates the varied character of the Communist drive to export revolution to Africa, but also suggests the scope of the "containment" that may be required in Africa. So, too, the abortive but nearly successful Communist attempt in the Sudan to capture control of the revolution which ousted the Abboud military government. If the tougher policies we have been following elsewhere mean that we cannot accept a Communist takeover in Africa either, then we can hardly afford to avoid involvement until the last moment. By an act of self-abnegation, we cannot remain aloof from Africa, except as determined by the actions of other powers, and at the same time be on call to put out fires on a continent where political instability is endemic.

Our unwillingness to take more initiative in Africa is all the more remarkable because it is the one area of the world in which the United States has more freedom of action and fewer constraints on its foreign policy-making than in any other. The administration seems to have accepted as applicable to Africa the Kennan-Lippmann thesis on the limitations of U.S. capacity to influence the direction of affairs in distant areas of the world. Yet, remote as it is from Communist China and the Soviet Union, Africa does not present the geopolitical difficulties we find in dealing with crises in southeast Asia, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. We are not limited by regional (and related bilateral) military alliances comparable to NATO, CENTRO, SEATO, ANZUS and the OAS defense systems. In Africa, also, we should be comparatively free from pressures arising out of commercial interests; Africa accounts for less than 5 percent of our total foreign trade and investment.

One result of our policy of self-abnegation is that the desire of the newly independent states to widen their relations and dilute the influence of their former colonial masters is being ignored, and the conditions for their continuing dependency are being nurtured. This promotes the image of neo-colonialism and African stooge governments ripe for national liberation, as propagated by Communist China and radical nationalist African states such as Ghana. The fewer alternatives the new states are offered to diversify their political and economic relations within the free world, the more they are forced either to preserve old patterns of dependency or to "swing to the left" into Communist orbits. Our experience in Latin America provides some apposite lessons on what can happen when an outworn relationship is persisted in too long.

In conflict with our traditional policies, we are also contributing to the resurrection of the outmoded concept of great-power spheres. Walter Lippmann advanced the view that the French interest in Gabon is comparable to the vital interest hegemony which he concedes to Communist China in southeast Asia and to the United States in Latin America. Interestingly enough, President de Gaulle, while apparently accepting the idea of French and Communist Chinese spheres of influence, does not, judging from his tour of South America and his condemnation of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, seem to accept our sphere in Latin America.

Our overall attitude toward Africa has also limited our relationship with many of the African states whose foreign policies have most often coincided with our own, particularly on the recurring Congo crisis, but also on other issues of special importance to us, such as the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Ever since France's recognition of Communist China, a number of French-speaking African states (Congo-Brazzaville, Dahomey, Senegal, the Central African Republic and Mauritania), which we have recognized as remaining in the French sphere of influence, have also been reversing their position on that issue. Now with half the population of India, Africa has almost one-third of the membership of the United Nations. Reasonable or not, this means that Africa can significantly influence the balance of world political power. In fact, the U.N. vote, which for the last several years has pivoted on the ballots of the African states, will probably go against us this year or next if this new French-inspired trend continues. Only Communist China's ineptitude so far in her relations with the new African states has stemmed the turning tide.

III

What could be done to restore the promise and the credibility of U.S. policy in Africa? The point of departure must be to do away with the principal causes for past contradictions and inconsistencies. First, the United States should abandon the policy of having a merely residual interest in Africa and recognize that with 36 independent states (excluding South Africa) in existence and another 3 or 4 in the offing, the continent can no longer be viewed as of only derivative interest to the United States. We should make it clear that we have a coherent African policy, and not simply improvised positions deriving from our NATO relationships and our cold war involvement.

This means that we must cease to pose African policy questions in terms of a dilemma: pleasing African states or pleasing our NATO allies. Each must be considered, but neither exclusively or even preponderantly. Our NATO allies are no more homogeneous in their policies and interests than the the African states. On a few issues, however, such as independence for the Portuguese territories, there is a consensus among African states. Because the issues on which Africans agree are so few, those issues take on added importance. The question then becomes one of means. If in keeping with our policy of self-determination for Africa we think it right to support steps in that direction in Portuguese Africa, how can we take effective steps with the least damaging effects for Portugal and NATO? Certainly, several of our NATO allies have time and again taken positions and followed policies in conflict with our own with respect to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Communist China, the test-ban treaty, trade with the Soviet bloc, etc., without the United States pulling the NATO house down. So too, in Africa, we have long supported self-determination for African colonies without the United Kingdom, France, or Belgium tearing the alliance apart. Portugal may react differently. That would seem to be the risk we must run—but it is certainly a lesser one than compromising our policy of support for self-determination and alienating much of Africa. In any event, NATO's present disarray, centering as it does on France, is so basic that, although any further dissention in the alliance would be undesirable, the disaffection of Portugal would hardly seem crucial to the alliance's future.

Third, the United States must recognize that on a continent ripe for revolution in the judgment of the world's leading practitioner, the policy of active containment is neither appropriate nor feasible. Intervention of the type practiced in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to forestall Communist-inspired wars of national liberation is obviously out of the question. Yet this is what the containment policy suggests, if France, the United Kingdom or Belgium should falter in their determination or capacity to preclude Soviet or Communist Chinese penetration and takeovers. Our posture in the Congo has not been too far removed from active intervention, and if the situation should deteriorate again, what then?

Africa now has a momentum of its own in world affairs which cannot be disregarded. Withdrawal and then sudden thrust by the United States in response to one crisis or another has all the disadvantages of both policies. Our sudden bursts of energy to counter Communist initiatives simply distort our basic interest in the development of the African states themselves by exaggerating cold-war considerations. They also put in question the credibility of our oftstated interest in the development of politically independent and economically viable states, free to determine their own external policies.

Thus, it is to the positive aspects of policy that we must address ourselves. How can we help the new states to consolidate their independence? This is the best sort of containment and, as a practical matter, the only sort conceivable for most of Africa.

For all new African countries, the achievement of formal international sovereignty is but the beginning of their travail. They all have to build states, nations, market economies, and modern societies. In the words of the Assistant AID Administrator for Africa: "The newly independent countries of Africa are today at a critical stage of development. The courses of action taken now by the United States may profoundly influence their political, economic, and social structures for generations to come. It is clearly in our interest to seize the opportunity to help the relatively new and emerging nations of Africa to develop along constructive lines."[2] The alternative is unacceptable—endemic instability, bush-league arms races, brush-fire wars, Latin American-style militarism, despotism, declining living standards and an ever greater gulf between the developed Western and the underdeveloped African states.

In the broad political arena, we should reassert the basic U.S. interest in the emergence and development of stable and viable independent states in all of Africa, and affirm our intention to help in the process. The United States must also redeem its unqualified pledge of support for self-determination in Africa, making it clear that we do not draw a line at the Zambezi or Limpopo Rivers so as to exclude from this pledge the white-dominated areas in southern Africa. Failure to find an orderly and peaceful route to independence for the remaining colonial territories in Africa, and the inevitably ensuing violence, would be—in fact already is being—attributed to U.S. policy, or lack of it.

Finally, the most intractable problem of all—the Republic of South Africa. Here, a determined white government, with the considerable economic and military resources of a rapidly developing country, has committed itself to a policy which despite its rationale of separate development for Africans does in fact deny the nonwhite majority the right of self-determination. The United States can rescind its pledge of support for self-determination as inapplicable in the context of an already independent country. Lenin's ambivalence on the nationality question, fa-

[2] E. C. Hutchinson, "U.S. Economic Aid to Africa, 1960–64," in "Africa Report," December 1964, p. 8.

voring self-determination in Russia and elsewhere in Europe but denying its applicability once a socialist government comes to power, offers a precedent. Such a tactic on the part of the United States would be viewed as skeptically in Africa as Lenin's reversal is in the United States.

Having condemned apartheid and voluntarily imposed a ban on arms shipments to South Africa, the United States has accepted the need to bring pressure to bear to induce South Africa to change its policy. The basic decision of principle having been taken, what remains is to find that combination of persuasion, inducement, and coercion which would be both effective and acceptable. This will not be an easy or quick task. An opportunity for action may be offered by the World Court in the case now before it, where South Africa is charged with violation of its League of Nations mandate over South West Africa in applying apartheid to the mandated territory. In the event of an adverse ruling, South Africa may be confronted with the dilemma of accepting the decision, with all that would entail for the practice of apartheid in South Africa itself, or defying the Court and laying a new basis for the U.N. to assume jurisdiction and take action. This would leave the United States and other Western countries with considerably less discretion about what their response should be to African pressures for applying sanctions.

Another problem of concern to the United States is the mounting overt and covert flow of arms, munitions, and military missions to Africa—for national armed forces as well as for "liberation forces." Means must be found to achieve "preventive disarmament" in Africa, not only to increase its internal security but to avoid the increasing diversion of local resources from development to military purposes. In practice, much of the flow of arms for "liberation forces" has been diverted to other destinations and other ends. The recent incidents in Kenya involving Chinese Communist arms are illustrative. On two occasions large shipments of arms theoretically destined for Congolese and Mozambique rebel forces were transshipped from Tanzania and found hidden or intercepted in suspicious circumstances in western Kenya. These discoveries carried the unmistakable implication of a threat by disaffected internal factions to overthrow the Kenyan government with outside support. As a result of Kenya's suspicion that her two partners in the East African common market, Tanzania and Uganda, were involved in such a plot, the prospects of maintaining the common market and expanding it into an East African federation, something which the United States greatly favors, is vastly diminished. In another case, the Sudans' willingness to serve as a corridor for Communist arms shipments to rebel forces in neighboring countries came to a sudden halt because too many shipments were falling into the hands of disaffected Sudanese elements, particularly in the rebellious southern provinces.

The increased flow of arms for national forces also presents a danger. Soviet support of a substantial buildup of Somali armed forces has had a direct impact on the two neighboring states with which Somalia has intermittently been warring—Ethiopia, which receives its arms primarily from the United States, and Kenya, which receives its arms primarily from the United Kingdom. Raising the capacity of the three states to make war can only enlarge the already dangerous threat to African peace, drag in cold war issues and divert scarce resources of three of the poorest African states.

Would not Africa be a good place to start arms control and disarmament agreements? It took 6 years for the military regime in the Sudan to be replaced, and then only by extra-constitutional means. The aftermath has been disorder, violence, and political instability reminiscent of the very situation that General Abboud set out to erase with his military coup in 1958. Does Africa have to repeat the Latin American pattern of successive military coups to effect political change?

It seems clear by now that the independent African states are not going to be in a position to liberate by force of arms the Republic of South Africa or Mozambique and Angola. It is also apparent that the Western Powers cannot supply even limited kinds of arms to South Africa and Portugal which would not be useful for internal repressive purposes. Simple realism suggests the need for an explicit moratorium on arms for Africa and the effective policing of it by agreement with the African states. Failure to come to grips with this critical issue makes nonsense of so much external economic aid, which in practice is either directly or indirectly diverted to military ends. Unnecessary arms expenditure also undercuts whatever added political stability might be hoped for as a result of economic development. Moreover, in the context of Africa-wide arms control, a total ban on arms and munitions to South Africa and Portugal would become more acceptable. In view of African insistence on declaring the continent a denuclearized zone and urging disarmament on the major powers, it would seem appropriate for the African states themselves to initiate steps toward achieving a moratorium on arms shipments to Africa, and by doing so to lend credence to their other disarmament policies. This would put pressure on the Western Powers to agree and considerable leverage could then be brought to bear on the Communist powers.

Whatever relevancy schemes for peacekeeping by small nations or regional organizations may have in some areas of the world, it seems clear that in this decade such proposals are largely irrelevant for Africa. Individual African states do not have the capacity in being and it seems of doubtful wisdom deliberately to create it. In any event, whenever the question has arisen, the African States have been unable to agree on the desirability of creating a regional peacekeeping force. Some fear it would mean interference in their internal affairs; others that it would mean support of the status quo and the preclusion of change; and still others that it would mean domination by larger or more aggressive states. And so far, African States have preferred to look elsewhere than to one another for assistance in putting down rebellions—in east Africa, to the United Kingdom, and, in French-speaking Africa, to France.

The Organization of African Unity is structurally incapable of playing such a role at present or in the foreseeable future. With its members deeply divided on fundamental principles, such as the sanctity of inherited boundaries and non-interference in one another's internal affairs, the organization has not been in a position to play any military role at all. In the Congo affair, ever since the withdrawal of the U.N. forces, the OAU has not only been unable to carry out a peacekeeping role; it has also been unable to prevent its minority faction of radical nationalist States and their sometime associates from providing active support and bases for rebel groups. Equally, the OAU has been unable to face up to the problems of guerrilla warfare in the southern Sudan, the Watusi refugees and émigrés and their periodic incursions into Rwanda, the continuing quarrels and intermittent violence between Dahomey and Niger, Ghana and Upper Volta, Ghana and Togo, Somalia and Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya, etc. To wish upon the OAU tasks it is not yet ready to assume is merely to impair further its limited effectiveness. Our expectations for it have been unrealistic—as we should have known from our experience with peacekeeping in Latin America.

IV

In the economic field no less than in the political arena we must do away with the incongruities which have characterized our economic assistance programs in Africa if these are to play a consistent and effective role in support of U.S. policies. At the outset, we need to reassess the size and composition of our economic assistance to Africa. As the continent receiving the smallest segment of our aid (less than 10 percent), Africa deserves more if we are to give credence to our policy of support for African development. A higher proportion of aid for economic development (as opposed to political purposes) needs to be coupled with a renewed attempt to apply the Kennedy aid concepts, including the conscious provision and programing of technical assistance so as to enlarge the capacity of the African States to absorb external aid effectively.

We should also renew our attempts to achieve the mobilization and coordination of aid to Africa from the free world, to make such aid more effective, increase its availability and improve the terms on which it is made available. Free-world aid to Africa, having reached a plateau, has in the last 2 years actually started to decline. Our own economic aid (excluding surplus food) reflects this downward trend. The appropriation requested by the President for the fiscal year 1966 is almost $100 million less than was obligated in 1962, the high water mark of U.S. aid to Africa.

The decline has set in just as Africa has begun to move forward and to increase its capacity to absorb capital. There are signs, too, of growing African interest in rationalizing and coordinating the flow of external aid. At the meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa late in 1964, Mr. Robert Gardiner, the executive secretary, called for "a Marshall plan, Colombo plan, or Alliance for Progress" for Africa, and suggested the possibility of the founding of an African Council for Economic Cooperation. The new African Development Bank, which came into operation this year with a nominal capitalization of $250 million, will also undoubtedly be seeking outside resources. In view of our contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank and our proffered offers to the proposed Asian Development Bank, it is difficult to see how we can refrain from making significant contributions to the African Development Bank.

It would be in the interest of both the United States and Europe if the heavy dependence of their respective "client states" in Latin America and Africa could be progressively diversified and shared. Then, a change in the relationship to a former colonial power would not be felt as a wrenching divorce but as a tolerable if regrettable separation.

We also need to rationalize our aid programs and to adhere to objective criteria, thus eliminating the anomalies which make us seem to reward the troublemakers and take friends for granted. If aid is to flow to the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Guinea and others in the form of surplus agricultural commodities, supporting assistance and emergency aid—without reference to their economic performance and heavy allocation of resources to nondevelopment purposes—then provision should be made to compensate the states deserving of aid by objective economic standards, and to reward, or at any rate not discriminate against, those which are pro-Western in their nonalinement rather than pro-Soviet or pro-Communist Chinese.

From the receiving country's point of view, all American aid, regardless of the particular pocket it comes from, has the effect of enlarging that country's total resources. If a country needs food, it makes little difference whether it receives food or "development dollars" which enable it to buy food—

or, if in budgetary straits, it receives supporting assistance or development dollars. It can always shift its resources around as economic (and political) conditions require. Africans have not been slow to grasp this point. Nigeria, which is frequently cited by American officials as the largest African recipient of U.S. economic aid, has felt compelled to point out that, measured in either aggregate or per capita terms, any number of African countries have received greater assistance if contributions emanating from all U.S. aid pockets are taken into account.

Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Algeria, and the United Arab Republic, all radical nationalist states whose economic performance leaves much to be desired and who are prone to allocate resources to nonproductive prestige purposes and questionable foreign adventures, have each received disproportionately more economic aid than Nigeria, the country we have singled out as one of the two most deserving African countries under the Kennedy economic development criteria. During U.S. fiscal years 1960–64, Ghana, Algeria, and the United Arab Republic, with populations of 7.4, 10.8, and 28.7 million respectively, each received as much or more U.S. economic aid (without regard for which U.S. aid pocket it came from) than Nigeria, whose population of 55.5 million is larger than the combined population of the three. During the same period, Guinea and Mali, with a combined population of 8 million, received about one-half as much economic assistance as Nigeria. In addition, such special cases as Morocco, Ethiopia, Liberia and the Congo, with a combined population considerably smaller than Nigeria's, have each received as much or more U.S. economic aid (to say nothing of military) than Nigeria. Yet none of these states has been singled out by the United States as specially deserving of "development" aid.

The United Arab Republic has received its large share of our economic assistance to Africa in the face of the U.S. Government's own judgment that that country "has followed a number of political policies which are not to our liking and contrary to our interests": for example, diverting its resources to aid the Congolese rebels, maintaining 50,000 troops in Yemen, conducting campaigns to coerce Libya into ousting the U.S. air base, and evidencing hostility toward Tunisia for proposing negotiations in the Arab-Israeli dispute.

In contrast, the 13 original members of the Common Organization of African and Malagasy States (OCAM), which have on the whole been most vigorous in their support of the OAU principle of noninterference and most articulate in condemning external interference in their internal affairs by Ghana "and other states," have received considerably less economic aid than the five most interventionist states. Indeed, since 1960, Ghana alone has received more U.S. aid than the combined total going to all 13 OCAM states. Guinea has received more during this period than the combined total going to the two most important OCAM states, the Ivory Coast, and Senegal. And almost as if to add insult to injury, the United States over the last 2 years has withdrawn its aid missions from the OCAM states and administers aid to them, such as it is, from Washington.

In sum, then, the United States must redress the imbalance in its foreign policies by refocusing its view of American interests in Africa, not by downgrading our traditional interest in Europe or by denying the reality of the cold war, but rather by upgrading the importance of Africa, formulating policies responsive to African realities, and striking a reasonable balance among our multiple national interests. The United States also needs to rationalize its political and economic policies in Africa, to make them consistent and credible and thus responsive to our national interest in the development of stable and viable African states.

STUDENT TESTING PROGRAM PROPOSED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the daily RECORD a letter from a constituent, together with an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, disapproving some of the student testing program proposed by the Federal Government's Office of Education.

Just to impress some people with the "stuff" that is going on, just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the confusion which would be created in the mind of an immature youngster—or most adults, for that matter—if he were faced with the problem of answering the question with a "yes" or "no":

Which is worse, spitting on the Bible or spitting on the American flag?

How would you, Mr. Speaker, answer with a "yes" or "no" the question:

Which is more important, taking the oath of allegiance to the United States or joining a church?

BANK MERGER BILL HEARINGS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had to adjourn a meeting of the House Banking and Currency Committee for lack of a quorum. The meeting was called at the request of three members of the committee to consider bank merger legislation. The failure of a quorum on the committee is a sample of the waning support for this type of legislation.

The proponents of the bank merger bill have made many claims of a majority. However, this morning, not even a majority of the committee was present.

I firmly believe that members of this committee and the public are becoming more aware of the far-reaching and extreme nature of these bills. I am convinced that only a distinct minority of this committee and the public want to do anything to weaken antitrust laws as they relate to the banks. I believe only a minority favors special retroactive excuses for antitrust law violations.

Great pressure has been brought to bear on Congress to pass this legislation. This pressure and lobbying campaign should be thoroughly investigated. We have in the committee records, cases where lobbyists failed to register in compliance with the lobbying laws. The American Bankers Association, the biggest lobbyist in this campaign, completely defies the lobbying laws and does not even register with the Clerk of the House.

I know that many bitter words have been exchanged over this legislation in recent weeks. I hope that the wounds will heal and that this committee can move forward on more productive and more needed legislation.

In the press, there has been much talk of majorities and minorities. I would like to emphasize that throughout the consideration of these bills, a majority of the Democrats have stuck together. All 11 Republicans have consistently voted together as a bloc against the majority of the Democrats. The Republicans have picked up just enough Democratic votes to keep the issue in doubt.

However, I am happy that my own vote has been cast consistently with the majority of the Democrats. In most cases, this has been a 2-to-1 majority on the Democratic side. On most votes, only 6 or 7 of the committee's 22 Democrats have joined the Republican minority.

By its tactics, this Republican-led group has prevented the committee from carefully considering legitimate bank merger bills. The Domestic Finance Subcommittee worked long and hard on legislation to deal with these proposals. As the subcommittee neared completion of its work, Representatives ASHLEY and MOORHEAD, and the Republican members of the committee introduced entirely new bills. They insisted that their measures be considered and that the subcommittee's work be tossed out. We have had no hearings on this Ashley-Moorhead bill. It would have been a shameful thing for this committee to have reported to the floor of the House such far-reaching legislation without hearing a single witness. This is not normal procedure, and so long as I am chairman, I will attempt to stop such high-handed tactics.

If these Members had followed committee procedures, I believe it would have been possible to have had a reasonable bill on the floor this session. Their attitude and tactics prevented this.

Throughout the consideration of these bills, I have insisted on full and open hearings. I again call for full and open hearings.

I suggest that the House Banking and Currency Committee meet while the Congress is out of session for the purpose of holding complete hearings on the new proposals that have been proposed to deal with bank mergers. I believe such hearings will require about 3 weeks of steady work by the committee.

The Ashley-Moorhead bill creates an entirely new set of problems for the so-called bank supervisory agencies. The bill also virtually eliminates the Justice Department role in controlling mergers and concentration of power in the banking industry.

Therefore, I suggest that the committee call Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach; Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon; Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation Chairman, K. A. Randall; and all members of the Federal Reserve Board. I suggest that all members of the Federal Reserve be called because of a severe division of opinion on bank mergers within that agency. At least three members of the Federal Reserve Board have appeared before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee and testified against retroactive exemptions from antitrust laws. The chairman of the Federal Reserve, William McChesney Martin, fully endorsed the idea of giving the big banks freedom from antitrust laws including those already prosecuted.

No impartial observer could claim that the House Banking and Currency Committee yet has all the facts on this legislation. This is a major step, and the committee simply must have all the facts before it acts. To do otherwise would be highly irresponsible.

The hearings before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee have revealed part of the tremendous pressure and lobbying campaign carried on to pass this legislation. I know that all my colleagues here realize that this pressure has been some of the heaviest in the history of the Congress. We have found cases where lobbyists have not complied with the registration laws. Therefore, as part of the hearings on these new bills, I strongly urge that the committee conduct a full investigation into the lobbying activities. These activities bear on this legislation and they must be brought out into the open.

SERVICEMEN'S LOAN FUNDS ON THE WAY TO RIGHTFUL OWNERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, some 6 weeks ago I addressed this body concerning funds of unlocated servicemen that were on deposit at Suburban Trust Co., a Hyattsville, Md., commercial bank.

At that time, more than $86,000 was on deposit at the bank belonging to more than 1,000 servicemen. The funds were deposited in the bank for the purpose of repaying loans from Federal Services Finance Corp., but for several reasons the funds were not turned over to the finance company nor were they returned to the servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that through the efforts of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, the Department of Defense, and the bank more than 600 of those servicemen have been located and nearly $30,000 has been returned to them.

The subcommittee is continuing its investigation of the practices which led to this withholding of funds from servicemen, but it is gratifying to know that our investigation has already begun to bear fruit.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD FLIP-FLOPS ON VITAL CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST QUESTION OF COMMERCIAL BANKS OPERATING SECURITIES BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1933 the Congress, shocked by disclosure of a long, sorry record of abuses, fraud, and outright thievery, passed a law separating commercial and investment banking. The law was framed to apply to the prevailing custom of bank-affiliated securities operations controlled through interlocking management. Congress has wisely retained this statutory safeguard against conflicts of interest and unfair competition with nonbank businesses.

Only recently the Federal Reserve Board, which has the responsibility to administer this prohibition against affiliations between banking and securities dealings, testified strongly before the Banking and Currency Committee against a proposal to expand the securities operations of banks. I refer to H.R. 7539, which would alter the very narrow authority of banks to underwrite Federal, State, and local general obligation bonds.

Just recently, First National City Bank, New York, has taken steps to enter the mutual fund business in competition with the independents. At present no other member bank is engaging in this business. The First National City Bank has an application pending before the Securities and Exchange Commission for an exemption from the conflict-of-interest prohibitions contained in section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as a prelude to a full-scale commercial operation, separate and distinct from investment management in their trust department.

Now all this is not too surprising, Mr. Speaker, except for one factor that stands out like a sore thumb. In an opinion to First National City Bank kept secret by the Federal Reserve for over 6 months, the agency concluded that section 32 of the Banking Act would not prohibit the bank from engaging in the business of issuing securities. The Federal Reserve bases this finding on the ground that the fund is part and parcel of the bank and thus no interlocking management prohibited by section 32 is found to exist. Since the securities operation will be carried out by the bank itself and not by an affiliate, then everything is A–OK—no violation of the law, the Board argues.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this decision by the Federal Reserve Board ranks along with many of Comptroller Saxon's astounding rulings as an outstanding example of the perversion of clear, legislative intent of the Congress in order to please a $14 billion Wall Street institution. What the Board is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that under their tortured and twisted interpretation of the law—12 U.S.C. 377—First National City Bank can engage in directly a securities operation they cannot engage in indirectly.

This is a lot of bureaucratic nonsense, absolute rubbish, and I can foresee a full investigation of this matter unless the agencies can reasonably show a legal basis for the green light to First National City Bank. If the agencies succeed in accommodating this important client, then next January would be none too soon for hearings on legislation to plug this glaring loophole in our laws.

NOTED BANKER OPPOSES BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul Jones, a successful Glenview, Ill., banker and businessman, in a letter to all members of the House Banking and Currency Committee dated October 4, strongly opposed legislation forgiving past bank mergers and tying the hands of the Department of Justice concerning future bank mergers.

The thrust of Mr. Jones' earnest plea is that big banks created by merger forget the needs of the small businessman when tight money periods come. The big banks squeeze out the little man to serve the credit needs of the large corporations only. He states that during 1959 he was barely able to survive the lack of bank financing and that some other small companies were squeezed out completely.

Mr. Jones also admits a distrust of the bank supervisory agencies in stemming the bank merger tide and that there is no substitute for the Federal courts to make the final decision. He closes by saying, and I quote:

> Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

Due to Republican-led pressures, the subcommittee was forced to cut off public hearings on these vital bills, and many excellent witnesses—such as Mr. Jones, a dedicated free enterpriser—were not permitted to appear in person before the subcommittee.

Mr. Jones' letter and statement follow:

CUMMINS-AMERICAN CORP.,
Glenview, Ill., October 4, 1965.

To Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

GENTLEMEN: I have been active in the finance business for 43 years. Throughout those years in that business I have borrowed money from banks, both large and small, in many States. For the last 5 years I have had the major investment in and have been the chief executive officer of a small bank in one of the Chicago suburbs.

I have followed the progress of S. 1698 in the newspapers and trade papers. It has

seemed to me that the reasons why S. 1698 should be defeated have been obscured by emotional arguments advanced by its proponents. The proponents insist that banks which have merged with the approval of one of the regulatory agencies will have difficulty unscrambling, that it is unfair to make them unscramble after the merger was approved by the regulatory agency, and that the solution is to pass legislation which vests the sole authority to approve or disapprove bank mergers in the agencies which already approved their merger.

Those banks are in no position to complain. They knew the risks they were taking when they merged. Moreover, their plight is not as bad as they make it out to be. Unscrambling a bank merger poses less of a problem than unscrambling most mergers does. But even if the merged banks were in a position to complain, that does not warrant passing legislation which is ill-advised and which will adversely affect the public for years to come.

I have set out the reasons why I believe S. 1698 should be defeated in a short statement enclosed.

S. 1698 vests the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers in persons who are not able by reason of their orientation to view the effect of bank mergers on competition impartially.

It invites the acceptance of bank mergers at the expense of competition in the banking industry instead of demanding that the management of banks in economic trouble be improved and competition preserved.

Those who will suffer the most from S. 1698 are small businesses and individuals.

I hope you will give the enclosed statement your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL JONES,
President.

S. 1698 SHOULD BE DEFEATED AND THE BANK MERGER ACT OF 1960 REPEALED

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 vested authority in the Comptroller of Currency as to national banks, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as to State banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as to insured banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System to prohibit bank mergers. It directed them to consider, in determining whether or not to permit a bank merger, (1) the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, (2) the adequacy of its capital structure, (3) its future earnings prospects, (4) the general character of its management, (5) the convenience and needs of the community to be served, (6) whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal banking laws, and (7) the effect of the transaction on competition, and directed them not to permit the merger unless they found it to be in the public interest.

S. 1698 goes one step further. It does what the Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Philadelphia National Bank,* and *United States* v. *First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington* that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 did not do. It vests the sole authority to approve or prohibit bank mergers in the three Federal regulatory agencies, and exempts an approved merger from the operation of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

S. 1698 is special privilege legislation. In vesting in the banking supervisory agencies the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers, it affords to banks a privilege which is not accorded to most other American businesses. The mergers of most other American businesses are subject to review by the Federal courts.

There is no justification for granting banks such a special privilege, for treating banks differently than other American businesses. The granting of that special privilege cannot be justified on the theory that the men who are in charge of the three Federal regulatory agencies are better qualified than Federal judges to pass upon bank mergers. In fact, if the public interest is to be served, they are less qualified to do so.

The background, experience, and orientation of those men are attuned to the interests of the banks whose mergers they are asked to evaluate. For example, the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James Saxon (who approved the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington merger, after receiving adverse reports from the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Attorney General), was on the legal staff of the First National Bank of Chicago and before that was on the legal staff of the American Bankers Association. Mr. Randall, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, was formerly President of a bank in Provo, Utah. Many of the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are oriented to the banks through many years of service in the Federal Reserve System, the stock of which is owned by the banks which are members of it. In contrast, the background, experience and orientation of Federal judges is typically attuned to the interests of the public as a whole, rather than a particular segment of the business community.

The tenure of office of those in charge of the three regulatory agencies is normally short. At the expiration of their terms of office, they can be expected to seek employment from the banking industry whose mergers they are empowered to approve or disapprove. In contrast, Federal judges are appointed for life and need not consider the effect of their decisions upon their future employment prospects.

The American Bankers Association is controlled by the giant banks of this country. Naturally, it has endorsed S. 1698. (In contrast, the Independent Bankers Association, which reflects the views of the small banks in the United States, adopted a resolution at the last annual meeting of its members in opposition to S. 1698.) In doing so, it has argued that the "control of bank mergers should be in the hands of the appropriate banking supervisory agencies" because these agencies are "equipped with the special knowledge necessary to regulate intelligently the American Banking System." This is to suggest that Federal judges do not have enough knowledge or intelligence to determine whether or not a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or Clayton Act, although their knowledge and intelligence is adequate to make the same determination as to mergers of other businesses. It is to suggest that only those who are drawn from the banking fraternity have sufficient knowledge and intelligence to pass upon bank mergers.

No doubt all industries would like men drawn from their own ranks to have the sole power to review their mergers. No doubt, too, foxes would like all chicken coops entrusted to their care.

Nor does the fact that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 directs the banking supervisory agencies to consider six factors in addition to the effect of a bank merger on competition justify affording banks the special privilege of having their mergers beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to consider.

Instead of promoting and protecting competition within the banking industry, consideration of the six additional factors tends to invite a lessening of competition.

Referring to the first four of those factors as set out above, if the financial history and condition of one of the banks is only fair or even bad, then its capital structure will be impaired, and its future earnings prospects dim. The cause of this condition will more often than not be that the general character of its management is not good.

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 lists these considerations in advance of the effect of the transaction on competition and does not say that the banking supervisory agencies shall prohibit a bank merger which tends to substantially lessen competition or is in restraint of trade irrespective of whether the financial condition of one of the banks is bad, its capital structure impaired, its future earnings prospect dim and its management weak. The Bank Merger Act, thus, invites as a solution to such a bank's predicament, one which lessens competition—the merger of the bank with one which is economically strong. It does not insist that at least an attempt be made to achieve a solution which would preserve competition—the bringing in of new management to revitalize the bank.

Nor does the fact that banks are otherwise subject to supervision and regulation under the Federal banking laws justify affording banks the special privilege of having their mergers beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to consider. Many of those regulations restrain competition rather than promote it. If competition in the banking industry is to be protected and preserved, and if the public interest is to be served, the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers should not be vested in agencies whose regulations tend to restrain competition.

Among the regulations of the banking supervisory agencies which restrain competition are these: (a) The power of banks to compete in the loan market is restrained by regulations requiring them to maintain a substantial amount of their assets in cash, short-term Government bonds and Government bills; (b) banks are restrained from competing for risk investments by regulations limiting the ratio of risk assets to capital; (c) regulations increasing the amount of capital required to enter the banking business limit competition within the banking industry; in fact, any time one of the agencies exercises its power to deny a bank charter, it limits competition within the industry.

It stands to reason that S. 1698, by divesting the Federal courts of jurisdiction to consider bank mergers under the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and by vesting the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers in the regulatory agencies, will increase the number of bank mergers that are ultimately condoned. Under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 as construed by the U.S. Supreme Court, bank mergers could be prohibited by the regulatory agencies or by Federal courts. S. 1698 in eliminating the possibility of the prohibition of bank mergers by the Federal courts will certainly increase the number of bank mergers that are ultimately approved.

Small companies and individuals will be the ones who will suffer from this. Bank mergers create bigger banks. In a tight money market, the bigger banks will prefer their large corporate customers to their small business and individual customers.

During the tight money market of 1959, I learned, as a borrowing officer of substantial amounts for a small automobile sales finance company, that big banks had granted unsolicited lines of credit to large corporations prior to 1959 in order to attract their accounts. When the tight money market arrived, these corporations began, for the first time, to use their lines of credit. I was warned by bank officers that we might get squeezed out to make room for the large corporations. I was able to hold on to our credit by the skin of my teeth, but only after taking the regular rise in interest costs which occurred at that time and an additional cost of 25 percent penalty. Some other small companies were squeezed out completely. During this same period, we had much less trouble from small banks. Small banks have no choice, they must, in but ex-

ceptional cases, do business with smaller companies and people.

Every bank merger eliminates at least one bank from the banking industry. Every time that a bank is eliminated the public has one less bank to which it can present a loan request. This does not affect large corporations, but for smaller businesses and individuals, it may mean the difference between obtaining a loan on the one hand and going under on the other hand.

S. 1698 should be defeated.

Congress should not, however, stop there. It should also repeal the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, the sponsor of S. 1698, has stated: "The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases imposed on bank mergers the strict standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act and what apparently have become the equally strict standards of the Sherman Act. Clearly, these decisions have changed the situation on which the Bank Merger Act was based. If these cases had been decided before 1959, the Bank Merger Act would have been considered unnecessary."

Now that those cases have been decided, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is as unnecessary today as it would have been in 1960 had those cases been decided before 1959.

Bank mergers should be measured by the same standards that mergers in other industries are measured by. It should be left to the Justice Department to determine initially whether a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act and, upon the institution of suit by the Justice Department, to enjoin a bank merger or to divest banks which have already merged, it should be left to the Federal courts to decide whether the merger should be permitted or prohibited. Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in our land of abundance, it seems strange that customers in New York restaurants are not served water unless they ask for it.

This brings home to all of us, however, the need for conservation of our natural resources.

We are now taking two important steps: we are going to clean up this Nation's polluted streams, and we are going to make desalting feasible.

A recent article in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, hails these advances and notes the President's admonition that "aggressive conservation measures" are needed and must be taken. Because the editorial will be of general interest, I insert it in the RECORD:

WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS: WASHINGTON TAKES A HAND

The hearings on Hudson River pollution which opened Tuesday emphasize the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in water policy. U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner in announcing the hearings called the fouling of the Hudson "a shocking example of the destruction of resources that are vital to the health and welfare of our people." The U.S. Public Health Service said that the river now carries pollution from the equivalent of 10 million people.

The Federal Government's growing water role is largely a matter of lack of local responsibility and inability of States and localities to settle their differences over water use. By historical accident, great river systems of the continental United States are boundaries between various States, between the United States and Mexico, and in part between the United States and Canada. These rivers are thus subject to Federal jurisdiction, in whole or in part, under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The Potomac River Basin, for example, runs into four States. Federal, State, and local officials are now working together toward a plan for rescuing the river from pollution and siltation. The planners, incidentally, oppose major reservoirs proposed by the Army Engineers, but encourage development of a network of small headwater impoundments.

The recent drought may prove to be not an unmixed disaster. For one thing, it gave urgency to the search for a cheap way to desalt water. Congress completed action last month on a bill to enlarge and extend the saline water program through fiscal 1972. President Johnson at the same time told Federal officials concerned with the research to proceed "as if you knew that you were going to run out of drinking water in the next 6 months."

The drought also made cooperation among States, localities, and the Federal Government more urgent. Congress took a modest step recently toward formulating a national water policy. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, approved by the President in July, gave statutory authority to the existing ad hoc water resources council created by President Kennedy 4 years ago.

President Johnson has outlined an emergency water program for the New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania area. This effort will not provide a permanent solution to the problems of the Delaware and Hudson basins, of course; to succeed at all it must be accompanied, the President said, by "aggressive conservation measures."

VIETNAM: THE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam which were held in several cities across our country this last weekend, including my own district in California, have generated feelings ranging from fervent support to outright hostility. They have stirred many comments and raised many questions. But let us take a minute to put the issue in perspective.

The right of protest, dissent, and free speech is, of course, a tradition of our society and a guarantee of our Constitution. Of no less importance is our traditional respect for and our reliance on a system of law and order. It seems almost needless to say, but perhaps it bears repeating at this time, that both have contributed to make our country what it is today; that neither can be compromised at the expense of the other; that both must be respected and sustained.

The war in Vietnam is most certainly a vital national issue. It both deserves and demands public thought and comment. But if this comment and participation is to be constructive it must be conducted in a lawful and a responsible manner. The very values of our form of government and our way of life require no less.

In commenting on the demonstrations, the Washington Post quite correctly stated this morning:

That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety.

But, the terrible irony of the demonstrations this last week is, as the distinguished columnist and associate editor of the New York Times—Mr. James Reston—pointed out yesterday:

They (the demonstrators) are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they most fear. 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.

The awful paradox, as Mr. Reston goes on, is that—

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.

Or as the Washington Post stated it:

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. * * * The demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong.

For the record is quite clear that Hanoi and the Vietcong, despite the American military buildup which has blunted their long-expected monsoon offensive and despite a very recent and intensive 10-week diplomatic effort on our part, have evidenced no interest at all in reducing the fighting or coming to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Reston's thoughtful article along with the Washington Post's timely comment for the careful consideration of our colleagues and all other concerned Americans.

I would also like to take this opportunity once again to state my belief that the United States measured response is the only reasonable alternative to Communist aggression and terror and subversion in Vietnam. I would like to state my strong and continued support for negotiations which can end the war and insure the people of South Vietnam self-determination under United Nations guarantees at the earliest possible time. And I would like to urge, despite the Communist's continued intransigence and the apparent turning of the military tide, that we continue to mount the diplomatic offensive which is absolutely essential if peace is to be secured, independent choice guaranteed and the great task of building and rebuilding begun.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

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.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

THE DEMONSTRATORS

The meaning of the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam will be understood in this country. The pressure groups mobilized by the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam are familiar here. All the expected elements were included, from Communists whose purpose is to destroy this country to earnest pacifists motivated by patriotic impulses.

The demonstrations revealed what the polls have long shown, that the determined popular opposition to the policy of the Government of the United States in South Vietnam has diminished to that irreducible dissenting minimum inevitable in a democratic society. That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety. The police, in most cities, seem to have dealt with the demonstrators and spectators with commendable restraint and patience and success. It is gratifying to know that we live in a country where the smallest minorities are free to disclose sentiments against the policies of the Government.

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. The National Liberation Front, for many long months, has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. Its officials have been sustained by the belief that American public opinion will do for them what French public opinion did for the Vietminh. They are bound to see the straggling marchers, the ineffectual protest meetings, and the feeble demonstrations through prisms made out of their own narrow and restricted experience. They imagine that the United States is governed by a ruling elite or clique ruling as precariously as did Diem or the colonial puppets of France. And they fancy that such a government can be toppled by a handful of pickets and marchers.

So the demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong. The Communists who marched on Saturday, of course, will be delighted to have this happen. But it must be confusing to the liberals and real pacifists who sincerely desire the end of the war to realize that demonstrations such as theirs are the chief hope of the National Liberation Front for prolonging the war. It probably will take a few more months of fighting than it otherwise would have taken to bring the NLF to the conference table. This cannot be what most of the unsophisticated young people wish to accomplish.

VIETNAM PROTESTS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning that President Johnson's pastor, the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, in his sermon yesterday, strongly criticized Saturday's demonstrations in protest to the United States helping defend South Vietnam.

I am sure that most Americans, although they must defend the right of petition and peaceful assembly, will agree with Dr. Davis, or will at least consider these demonstrators as doing a great disservice to the cause of freedom. Meanwhile, as Dr. Davis pointed out, to uphold democracy, some free Nation has got to stand—as he said—at the ramparts.

Speaking as a Republican who supports the administration's policy, I abhor war—as does everyone else—but right now, we must put freedom first. I think that military assistance to South Vietnam is the shortest way and the best hope of lasting world peace.

THE COMMUNISTS GAIN: FREEDOM LOSES IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—ANOTHER LAOS IN THE MAKING?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many Latin American editors meeting in San Diego apparently confirmed what I have been saying for some time about the results of the United States yielding to Communist demands after military intervention in the Dominican Republic, that is, that the strength of the Communists is greater now that it was prior to our intervention.

I quote from the following article contained in the Washington Post of October 18, 1965, written by Robert H. Estabrook:

Many (Latin American editors) believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Dominican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

Likewise, the editors apparently also "are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it—Communist subversion—throughout Latin America."

This is an amazing exposé of the shortcomings of our Alliance for Progress program.

It appears obvious that our entire Latin American policies need a thorough review and a complete shakeup. Likewise, it is obvious that our intervention in the Dominican Republic has been a complete failure based upon the announced purpose of the intervention, that is, to stop a Communist takeover. The result instead has been that the Communists have a voice in the government, that the anti-Communist military leaders have been forced out of the country as a part of a secret deal, that the strong anti-Communist press has not been permitted to start publication, although a pro-Communist paper "Patria" is flourishing, and equally reprehensibly former President Juan Bosch has returned triumphantly to the country. Also the pro-Communists have apparently organized as Murder Incorporated as evidenced by the killing of Angel Severo Cabral, one of the outstanding conservative leaders. The Communists and the rebels are also trying to take over the university.

Is a Latin American Laos in the making as the result of our policies?

I insert the articles which I would suggest that all Members of Congress heed:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

TENSION UP AGAIN AFTER DOMINICAN RIGHTIST'S SLAYING

(By Clyde Sanger, Manchester Guardian)

SANTO DOMINGO, October 17.—Just when many people here were welcoming a significant relaxation after 6 months of strife, the murder of a leading rightwing politician has filled the Dominican situation with new tension.

Angel Severo Cabral, killed yesterday, was secretary general of the National Civic Union, whose candidate ran a poor second to Juan Bosch in the December 1962 presidential elections. Severo Cabral became Minister of the Interior when Bosch was overthrown 2 years ago and some people had recently spoken of him as a possible presidential candidate in the elections due next summer.

Relaxation had come with the rebel agreement to move the 1,400 troops which had held the 500-acre downtown section of this city in Bosch's name since the revolution began in April.

On Thursday these forces moved into a suburban barracks ready to be reintegrated into their old units. The next day the barricades were removed in the divided city and soldiers of the inter-American peace force—now reduced to 10,200 men—were being withdrawn to less conspicuous positions.

Ironically Severo Cabral's murder was a result of this unfreezing of the situation. On Friday his 26-year-old daughter visited the family apartment downtown to see what had happened to the furniture during the 6 months the area had been cut off. She found a revolutionary living there who said he had been given the furniture by orders of Montes Arache, a rebel military leader.

Yesterday against the pleading of the rest of the family Severo Cabral went there to claim his property. An ugly quarrel began, aggravated by a large crowd which swarmed over from a week-long hunger strike demonstration against a peanut oil manufacturer in the main square.

When Severo Cabral decided to leave by a back alley he was shot in the shoulder by a machinegunner. While lying wounded in the back of a van, which was to have taken him to a hospital, he was killed by another man with a pistol. His daughter, who twice threw herself over his body to shield him, was slightly wounded, as was his wife.

(Cabral was buried in a brief service at Santo Domingo's national cemetery, according to news dispatches. Dominican authorities were reported to have ordered the arrest of persons believed implicated in the assassination of Cabral, a distant relative of deposed triumvirate President Donald Reid Cabral.)

(Cabral followers burned a jeep belonging to Radio Santo Domingo and shouted "down with communism." Meanwhile, the headquarters of another radio station, Radio Cristal, was machinegunned from a passing car, presumably by rightwing sympathizers, according to the dispatches.)

The fear of reprisals hangs heavy here today. There may even be danger to the life of Juan Bosch, who returned from exile 3 weeks ago and has been working in a small downtown office guarded by "constitutionalist" supporters.

Another incident that has raised tension is the struggle for control of the semiautonomous University of Santo Domingo. During the heated days of the revolution some professors combined with most of the students to repudiate the university council and occupy the university site in the name of the revolution.

In attempting a comeback, the legal rector called a council meeting last weekend but it failed to gather a quorum. On Thursday, he announced he was charging the revolutionary group before the public prosecutor with usurpation of functions and illegal occupation.

Yesterday, at a second gathering of his council his supporters claimed there was the necessary 60 percent quorum while his opponents denied it. The building where the council met was patrolled by armed vigilante groups of rightwing support.

The provisional government of Hector Garcia Godoy, although in general sympathy with Bosch's constitutionality movement, has been tacitly supporting the old group at the university against the majority of the students.

Yesterday's council meeting could spark off action by students against Garcia Godoy's government. Until now the 5,000 students have been quietly attending classes. The campus is widely decorated with anti-American placards. What may restrain action is realization that rightwing tempers are also rising after the murder of Severo Cabral.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

EDITORS SEE LATIN RED PROBLEM

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

SAN DIEGO.—Latin American editors view Communist subversion as the biggest problem in the Western Hemisphere, but they are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it.

Many also believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Republican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

These are the principal conclusions invited by the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association just completed here. Some 190 editors from North and South America were among the 400 participants.

EFFECTS OF U.S. POLICY

Talks with editors of many nationalities also lead to several other conclusions about the effect of American policy:

There is a consensus that the Dominican intervention was necessary to forestall another Cuba, although some are critical of the method and others blame the United States for not finishing the job.

There is a general feeling that the recent critical speech by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, raised unnecessary questions and had a mischievous effect because of his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One Panamanian, however, commented that "FULBRIGHT agreed with me."

Opinion is sharply divided about the Selden resolution passed by the House of Representatives, which appeared to sanction unilateral military intervention to deal with Communist subversion. Some think that the effect of the resolution was exaggerated. Individual editors from Argentina, Honduras, and Mexico reported no special concern in their localities. But the resolution caused impassioned reactions in Chile, Colombia, Panama, and Peru, among other places.

VIEWS ON DOMINICAN ACTION

With respect to the Dominican intervention, one Ecuadoran editor remarked that many of the complaints could have been avoided "if President Johnson had just picked up the telephone and told a couple of Latin American Presidents what he was doing and why. He would not even have needed to ask them. Or he could have done the same thing by calling in a few ambassadors."

Others, however, feel that the United States has been too apologetic and should not have stopped short. They shrug off Latin American criticism as often motivated by domestic political concerns, noting the tendency of some officials to talk one way in private and another in public.

Dominican editors in particular complained that the Communists had used the truce period to consolidate forces and train saboteurs. Three newspapers closed by the rebels last April—El Caribe, Listin Diario, and Prensa Libre—have not yet been enabled to reopen under the provisional government although an overtly Communist organ, Patria, is flourishing.

Whether the preoccupation with Communist subversion rather than with reform is representative of general public opinion in Latin America is open to question.

CONSERVATIVE EDITORS

The IAPA includes such respected figures as Alberto Gainza Paz, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Buenos Aires which was closed by Peron, and Pedro Beltran, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Lima and former Prime Minister of Peru.

Nevertheless, Latin American editors who attended such conferences tend to be a pretty conservative lot. They vigorously applaud a speech by retired American Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs denouncing the emphasis on tax and land reform in the original concept of the Alliance for Progress as revolutionary and dangerous.

Some, however, may have been shy about expressing dissent. "If the man in the street gets the idea that the only people interested in helping him with his problems are the Communists," said one editor privately, "he will want to take their aid and Communist influence will be enhanced."

AGRICULTURAL NEED SEEN

A slightly different slant also came from Roberto Campos, Brazil's energetic Minister of Planning, who contended that "Fidelismo" has lost some of its menace. The great challenge to the Alliance for Progress, he

asserted, is to improve agricultural productivity, to absorb rural masses becoming urbanized into national political life, and to supplement economic aid with trade opportunities including higher prices for primary products.

But a tough speech by Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann was right in line with fears of Communist subversion. Mann also was applauded, although a few found him defensive or "not simpatico." The extraordinary lengths to which he went to reply to FULBRIGHT attested how really nettled the administration was by the criticisms, including those from sectors of the American press.

In effect, Mann denied that American policy on nonintervention has changed or that there is such a thing as the Johnson Doctrine. But he left dangling how the problem of subversion is to be countered speedily by collective means.

DANGER OF SUBVERSION

More emphatically, he insisted that the danger of subversion is real in "fragile" societies, and that any cooperation with the Communists is perilous. He quoted from President Kennedy to this effect.

What Mann really seemed to be saying is that reliance on reform through the democratic left is a mere slogan and is not enough to avoid subversion. The hemisphere must look for leadership to strong anti-Communists such as former President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela or to new forces emerging from the military, the church, and organized labor.

How well such an essentially ideological prescription will capture public imagination is another question. At any rate it did not satisfy a Texas guest who described himself as a cousin of Mann and who provided one of the few notes of levity by charging that both his cousin and Campos had their speeches written for them.

HOUSE MUST STAND FIRM AGAINST DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems as though a Federal power project has more lives than an alley cat. Our colleagues in the House clearly expressed themselves on September 22 by voting 207 to 185 to approve the amendment by my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] providing for a brief respite so that the Secretary of the Army might make a survey of the St. John River in Maine separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy project. This seemed reasonable to most of us because of the hasty and poorly conceived proposal which had been perpetuated upon the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

Now we see the sad spectacle of the proponents of this questionable project attempting to run roughshod over the will of the House of Representatives in the conference report on S. 2300 and force this first step toward Passamaquoddy down our collective throats. To accomplish that end, those proponents have been running around admitting that several of our votes will have to be switched. The Assistant Interior Secretary Kenneth Holum told a dinner group last Saturday night that the Interior Department is "determined to see the Dickey hydroelectric power project on the St. John River become a reality." He said that he believed that some votes have been switched in the House.

Mr. Speaker, let us assure the Assistant Secretary that it is not up to the Department of the Interior to be determined but rather it is up to the Congress to determine whether a project will become a reality.

Several other proponents of this project attempted to tell some of us that the Dickey-Lincoln School project has been thoroughly studied; and, therefore, it is unnecessary to delay its approval any longer. Such a flagrant misuse of the truth I have not seen in my many years as a Member of this body. And, I might say, I am used to the Department of the Interior bending the truth because of my service on the Interior Committee. The Secretary of the Interior admitted during the testimony before the Public Works Committee that the Department of the Interior had not even discussed the possibility of marketing power from this project with any utility in New England. The whole benefit-cost ratio hangs or falls on the ability of the nonexistent power marketing agency in New England to sell this block of power at the allocated price. This issue, obviously, needs more study.

Various witnesses before the committee question the data used by the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers on the study of alternative methods of generation. These data, obviously, need more study.

The combined electric companies of New England have an alternative proposal to supply the power needs of that region more cheaply and more efficiently than the Federal proposal. The companies' proposal was not given sufficient serious consideration. This proposition, obviously, needs more study.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report to the Congress, said the Passamaquoddy project, which has been studied for half a century, needs more study. Therefore, it is much more reasonable to take the position that the hastily dissected appendage of Passamaquoddy, known as the Dickey-Lincoln School obviously, needs more study.

A recent issue of the magazine, Electric Light and Power, carried a very interesting article on this project. The title of this article is "Federal Power Casts Its Dark Shadow Over New England." So that each of our colleagues may have an opportunity to read this interesting statement, I am incorporating it in my remarks at this point:

If the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine is rammed through Congress, then the love-thirsty, benevolent and politically saturated Great Society leadership in Washington will have planted a seed calculated to sprout deep Federal intrusion into the local affairs of New England and probably additional Eastern States.

The Dickey project is perhaps less needed and more vulnerable to sound economic criticism than any Federal hydro project ever proposed, with the obvious exception of its lately sidetracked twin, the Passamaquoddy tidal project. So the fact that a project as potentially wasteful of the people's money as Dickey should become the vehicle for getting the Federal power foot in the New England door clearly attests to the administration's appraisal of its arm-twisting power in Congress.

Easy justification for pushing Dickey, it might be added, was handed the administration in the form of unwary prodding by New England politicians, particularly those from Maine. In their persistent fretting that it was the Northeast's turn to get a Federal resource development project, these clamor boys tripped over the pitifully shortsighted view that Federal deficit spending for a development such as Dickey would somehow boost the area's economy.

A bit of background is needed to put Dickey in correct perspective. What study and planning the project underwent was in connection with Passamaquoddy, where its prime purpose originally was to provide pumping power to the Federal project. In conformity with established procedure, Interior Department last year submitted a report on the dual Quoddy-Dickey project to the affected Federal agencies and States for comment. Critical comments from agencies still displaying some professional integrity caved the roof in on Quoddy.

But extension of the Government's power realm and (coincidentally) New England's cry for a big Federal project were not to be denied. Deftly unhitched from Quoddy, Dickey was plunked on the President's desk last July by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, with a recommendation for independent development. No detailed studies had been made of the project to operate as a single unit, and no report on the revised proposal had been sent to affected Federal agencies and States for comment, as required by law. Yet the President immediately approved Mr. Udall's recommendation and submitted Dickey, appropriately blessed, to Congress. There it was tacked onto the already well-advanced omnibus rivers and harbors bill and was whisked through the Senate without even a hearing.

During a subsequent hearing before the House Public Works Committee, however, New England power company witnesses undressed Dickey for those who wanted to see. It was shown that this $300-million, 794-megawatt development on the St. John River in the northern wilds of Maine would be an outright power project, with power accounting for nearly 98 percent of its benefits. It was shown, too, that Dickey power will not be low-cost power because if the project is kept within even the most liberal payout schedule, its output must bring a price higher than power produced by investor utilities in the area.

These New England utilities, incidentally, estimated they will achieve rate reductions of at least 30 percent by 1980 through current and future development of atomic power and pumped storage. Moreover, the companies' plans call for addition by 1969 of modern low-cost thermal plant, conventional and nuclear, which will provide an increase in generating capacity of more than 40 percent and will materially lower power costs in the area. Thus, it was shown that Dickey would be obsolete long before the earliest operational date (1971).

An astounding line of testimony came from Interior witnesses, who admitted that no power marketing plans for the project had been developed, and that the possibility of the sale of the power had not been discussed with any utility people in New England. Nor had any plan been drawn up for the location of transmission lines. Strange pro-

cedure, indeed, considering that some 90 percent of the power would have to be marketed outside of Maine.

What should have been a clinching factor against Dickey was the offer by a group of New England utilities to furnish a far cheaper alternative. This would be a combination nuclear-power pumped storage development estimated to cost approximately $71 million including transmission facilities, compared with Dickey's $300 million price tag. Annual cost of producing power at the alternate facility would be approximately 27 percent less, including taxes, and nearly 50 percent less, excluding taxes, than the estimated annual cost for Dickey.

Another dismal facet of Dickey's economic image is that the project would get the usual substantial, taxpayer-borne interest subsidy and would contribute nothing in the way of national or regional taxes.

If Dickey required the approval of some expert and objective licensing authority, it doubtless wouldn't have a shadow of a chance. But, authorization by a body ruled largely by politics, not statesmanship, is quite another thing. The project was included in the rivers and harbors bill reported favorably last month, on a close vote, by the House Public Works Committee. Prompt approval is expected, provided logrolling legislation does not get snarled up in the Rules Committee.

Construction of Dickey would be a first step toward almost endless possibilities for Federal power activity in the East. Certain to be formed would be a Northeastern Power Administration to take over the so-called marketing. (And if the power couldn't be peddled at cost, it would in all likelihood go for less than cost, as has been the case at Bonneville.) The full import of such a setup shows clearly in the light of Interior's intention to launch a study of an EHV grid for New England, looking to the possibility of tying in with other area power systems and maybe Canadian systems. Interior's plan also includes continued study and possible redesign of Quoddy to give further consideration to the project's economic benefits "associated with recreation, economic development, and elimination of poverty in the region."

It is no secret, either, that Interior is interested in pumped storage in New England and has far more than a passing interest in the power that may be brought down from Labrador's Churchill Falls.

Should the Government get a solid power foothold in this yet unfederalized area, it would not be beyond reason to expect that its tie-ins eventually would extend from New England to the Tennessee Valley Authority and beyond. And it's a safe bet that somewhere in the process the taxpayer will be shoved between the proverbial irresistible force and immovable object.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the question of the Dickey-Lincoln School project will be before this body again tomorrow in the conference report on S. 2300. At that time, it is my sincere hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will again stand firm in their resolve that the project must be further studied. It seems to me to be in rather poor legislative taste to have Members of the other body, where this project was not even considered in open hearing nor discussed in open debate before its approval, attempt to force their will on the Members of this body, where, after thorough discussion in open hearings, and extended debate on the floor of this Chamber, the decision was made that further study was required. We must stand firm.

THE 129TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that today is the 129th anniversary of the birth of Ellen Browning Scripps. Mrs. Scripps was born in London, England, and came to this country early in life. She was associated with the Detroit Tribune, the Detroit News, and was one of the founders of the Cleveland Penny Press. Miss Scripps was an outstanding newspaperwoman and her column, "Miss Ellen's Miscellany" was the beginning of what is now known as newspaper features.

She and her brother, Edward Willis Scripps, amassed a great fortune in the newspaper field and, in 1890, Miss Scripps moved to southern California and established her home, in 1897, in La Jolla, Calif. At that time, she was 61 years of age and she dedicated the rest of her life to philanthropy.

Many of the institutions which she founded and endowed are of international reputation. Among these are the La Jolla Scripps Metabolic Clinic, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation, and the Scripps Memorial Hospital. Other public contributions included the Torrey Pines State Park, the La Jolla Public Playground and Community Center, the La Jolla Woman's Club House, the children's pool, Scripps Field, the tower and carillon, and the La Jolla Public Library. She also established the Bishop's School.

Here let me interject a personal note. The Bishop's School is always referred to as the Bishop's School for Girls. One of my nieces attended this school. When I came to Washington, D.C., in 1953, one of my first acquaintances was Congressman FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio. He knew that I came from southern California and he said, "I attended the Bishop's School," and I replied, "FRANK, that is a school for girls. How did you get in?" He informed me that, when he was a boy, the Bishop's School was coeducational and he was a student. When it changed from coeducational to a girl's school, I do not know.

The city of San Diego, of which La Jolla is a part, did, by resolution, designate today as "Ellen Browning Scripps Day" in recognition of her outstanding philanthropy, which included much more than I have narrated above. I know of no other woman in history who has contributed so much of herself or of her substance to the betterment of mankind.

Miss Scripps died in La Jolla on August 3, 1932, at the age of 96 years. Her name will long live in the memory of man, and especially in the memory of La Jollans. I am happy to join in the tribute to her.

THE XB–70A HITS MACH 3

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, history was made last week at Edwards Air Force Base in California. The world's most advanced aircraft, the XB–70A, made its 17th flight, and in the process compiled some staggering statistics.

With a gross weight of over 500,000 pounds, the XB–70A climbed to an altitude of 70,000 feet— and attained a speed of mach 3, or three times the speed of sound. In this 1 hour and 47 minute-flight, which began last Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 12:07 p.m., e.d.s.t., the huge XB–70A research plane was piloted by North American Aviation Chief Pilot Alvin S. White and Col. Joseph Cotton, chief XB–70 project pilot for the U.S. Air Force.

Last Thursday's flight was the first time that this magnificent aircraft attained its designed cruise speed of over 2,000 miles per hour, and this achievement is of great significance in aviation, for it is this same cruise speed that our supersonic transports will someday attain.

About 70 percent of the XB–70A, which was built by North American Aviation, is made of stainless steel honeycomb— the first time such a form of steel has ever been used. The entire forward section of the craft is made of titanium, a metal which can withstand temperatures much higher than those which can be tolerated by aluminum. Featured in the airplane are the most sophisticated hydraulic and electrical systems ever devised—an electrical system that can withstand temperatures of 600° and the first 4,000-pound-per-square-inch hydraulic system. The cabin environmental system will allow the crew to fly in the comfort of 70° and 8,000-foot cabin pressure, even though the actual altitude is about 70,000 feet and the skin temperature of the aircraft is above 630°.

Mr. Speaker, this plane has been flying for exactly 1 year, and the officials and employees of North American Aviation, Inc., are to be congratulated for this remarkable contribution to America's future. The research data gathered is the most significant information applicable to the U.S. supersonic transport program which is so vital to our Nation.

The pilots of this aircraft, and all of those who have worked on the important XB–70 program, deserve the praise of a Nation which is grateful for the contributions these people have made toward the advancement of aeronautical science.

In view of the remarkable achievements of the XB–70A, it seems incredible that this aircraft will not go into production. Two of these planes have been built, but the Secretary of Defense has not seen fit to put this aircraft into use,

and it was only after a long, hard struggle that authority was given for the construction of these two experimental models. The more this aircraft flies, the more conquests it makes—and the more Secretary McNamara's decision seems unexplainable.

THEY ARE NOT ALL "PEACENIKS"

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the whistles could be heard from New York to California this past weekend as police tried to keep protesting "peaceniks" in line and prevent riots. It is getting to be a weekend thing to do—staging demonstrations and marches against our involvement in Vietnam's struggle with the Communists.

Whether you live in the big city, in a small town, or even out in the wide open country, you are never far from a lively demonstration. There is no admission charge. All one has to do to join the crowd is to abuse some of the great privileges he has as an American citizen.

As thousands of would-be rioters waged protests in the streets and public squares of our Nation, a quiet dignified group of over 700 young students in Knoxville, Tenn., were also speaking their opinions and backing their Government. They are for freedom. They are against communism. They respect and love their country. They are proud to say: "I am an American." They are not just followers of the crowd. They are not just "out for kicks." They realize the sorrows of families who have members serving in Vietnam. They are supporting these soldiers. They themselves are willing to fight for freedom and against hunger and communism or any other threat to happy and productive lives for all.

There is a great contrast here—between those protesting our service in Vietnam and those who speak out in favor of our fight against communism. I would like to point to specific incidents to show you this vast difference between these two groups of our young society. I think the thousands who marched throughout our Nation, from east to west, in protest of our policy in Vietnam should be ashamed of their actions. But, I am very proud of the young people, their teachers, and ministers who, in dignified ceremony, paid respect to our Nation and thanked the brave men who are making great sacrifices in Vietnam.

The students at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, led by their student president and other campus leaders, let their fellow citizens know that they were for peace and behind their Nation's efforts in Vietnam. Their ceremony was quiet, reverent, dignified, patriotic. This large student gathering on October 14 opened with a solemn pledge of allegiance to the flag as Old Glory unfurled from many directions, displayed by proud Army and Air Force color guards.

The students' leader, David White, president of the student government association, introduced the program:

> This is a memorial to our men who have been killed and others who are serving there for each of us.

After short talks and prayers, the University of Tennessee students and many University of Tennessee administrators stood in hushed silence for meditation as the sound of taps was heard across the campus.

The University of Tennessee vote of confidence for the U.S. fight against Communist aggressors was echoed by other groups this weekend. Perhaps the one drawing the largest representation was the reverse teach-in held in our Nation's Capital. Six University of Tennessee students joined college students from throughout the country for a peaceful program in support of the war against the Vietcong.

Let us look at some other scenes of this past weekend. For example, in New York, our largest, most bustling city, an estimated 10,000 marchers protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam swept down famous Fifth Avenue. Unapproving and irritated lookers-on threw red paint at the demonstrators, and even tried to attack them. In Berkeley, Calif., scene of repeated demonstrations, a march was staged. Broken up just as it reached the Oakland city limits, it already had resulted in injury to several of the participants who engaged in scuffles with nondemonstrators, and one police officer was carried away with a broken leg.

But wherever they marched—New York, California, or even in Trafalgar Square, London—the demonstrators met opposition from Americans who are supporting their Nation and who are not afraid to say so. Above the roar of the crowds can be heard such disturbed shouts as "back our troops in Vietnam, you traitors."

Americans have always stood by their Nation through bad times as well as the good times. There has always been thankfulness for our great heritage and for our many freedoms. It is encouraging now to know that the loud, protesting youth are in the minority. They make a lot of noise and they cause a lot of damage to persons and property, but what they say and do cannot override the patriotism of proud Americans.

I am a proud American, happy to represent such dignified young people as those who attend the University of Tennessee. Their demonstration in Knoxville will not win our struggle in Vietnam, but multiply it a few times, and it will be a tremendous boost to our Nation's policy and most of all to the brave Americans who are serving there for each of us.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order previously granted to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CROPLAND RESTORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago a Washington newsletter described a "new policy on agriculture" being quietly developed, the scope of which would include: first, the gradual abolishment of production controls; second, the encouragement of greater production; and, third, a vast food bank for the underfed.

I think all would agree that our so-called omnibus farm bill finally approved by the Congress a few days ago will not achieve any of these ends, but that bill does include a title and provision, which, if properly expanded and modified, can bring us closer to the goal of a workable farm policy that will not only benefit the farmer but the consumer human beings throughout the world who depend on him—that farmer—for their food and fiber.

One of the titles of the omnibus farm bill entitled "cropland adjustment" calls for conversion of so-called unneeded cropland to vegetative cover, water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses with a peak participation of 40 million acres envisioned by 1970. The only word with which I strongly disagree is the word "unneeded." In view of the so-called population explosion, we will not only desperately need this acreage; we will need to convert much of it from marginal land to highly productive land, land capable of producing an abundant quantity of food and fiber at reasonable prices and of high nutritive value to consumers, and above all with a fair return for the farmer. This is important domestically if we are to continue to survive. It is paramount internationally if we are to continue the Public Law 480 program and others and be our brother's keepers around the world.

Towards the general principle of constructive farm legislation I have introduced H.R. 7184, whose dominant theme is not cropland adjustment but, rather, cropland restoration. If the small farmer is given the chance to increase the fertility of his low, inefficient acres through a second market for soil restoration, he is at once placed on the same level with the large commercial farm. In addition, he has the advantage of lower labor costs and bargaining power at a level which will keep him in business. Large commercial farms may also take advantage of this second market, but their costs of labor, management, and capital will perhaps be higher. There is an additional advantage, Mr. Speaker. The farmer will have multiple options at the time the Government assayer comes around to review the cover crop and cut a swath and measure the value he will assign to the farmer for a short ton of coverage crop plowed under each year. He may plow it under, and

accept the estimated base of $25 per ton from a grateful Government for a restorative practice. He may say, "No, I will use it for the fertility of my own soil" and benefit therefrom in a second crop this year. He may say, "No, I will plow it under for next year." Or, finally, he may harvest it for a seed crop, which will itself be invaluable in this expanded program. And different cover crops could be used in different areas of the Nation. But suffice it to say on a voluntary basis, on carefully analyzed scientific surveys made to date, over 60 million acres would immediately be placed in this cropland restoration.

Now, we cannot and should not stop a trend to more efficiency, but the Federal Government can and should protect a resource, our soil, which is literally "our margin of life," that is being mined on about a 7-to-1 ratio of essential replacements.

The bill I submitted offers an incentive for doing it on a voluntary basis, in place of force; steadily increasing population will justify the effort either now or later, and later would be at a much greater cost. All land-grant colleges of agriculture already know, and have proof positive, that the productive capacity of the soil will go down as more plant food is taken from it than has been returned, even in fertilizers. We have in the past and are now using 3 to 7 times, as I have stated above, as much soil plant food as we are returning in fertilizers, manures, legumes, and other restoratives.

In addition, the soil body, which is our Nation's basic natural resource, is washing away in silt down the rivers, into the gulfs, into the oceans. Thus more fertility is lost. Thirty years of work by the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture conservation practices, Public Law 566, and other agencies, helpful as they have been, is still a long way from being nationally implemented by all.

Government programs have rewarded farmers for growing more from less acres, by fixing prices above the consumer demand and thus creating surpluses. This is the opposite of soil conservation. It is soil destruction, subsidized by consumer taxes.

In a sound soil restoration program, the same tax money rewards farmers for returning fertility at a minimum-wage level, that gives the consumer a chance to influence the price of agricultural products. And all through this treatise today I hope you will realize that we are trying to raise the productive income of the farmer, establish a farmer-urban relationship and still protect the consumer in the metropolitan areas. Both bids—government or consumer—encourage the use of more soil plant food, because it is profitable for the farmer to return less than he takes.

In H.R. 7184, the Government bids against the consumer for "land use." His use of land, necessary and vital though it is, is also destructive in the sense that it removes nutrients from the soil and converts them into food and fiber for consumption by the consumer. In a true cropland restoration program, the Government bids for restoring the soil, so that a balance will result; that is restoration versus destruction.

The needs of the present generation are weighed in the marketplace against the needs of succeeding generations. The market price which the Government sets for soil restoration for future generations competes against the market price which the present generation is willing to offer for farm production. Thus, we would have a constant soil bank of marginal land being restored to active duty, and a constant bank of good soil being used for present production needs. Contrariwise the present system produces surpluses and related expense on the taxpayers. Our plan automatically eliminates them.

When the Government bid is made at the land-use level, as it is in the second market described in this bill, the values of abundance, better quality, and local economic adjustment can be included for the consumer—something that cannot be accomplished by present legislation.

I submit that it takes no concept of, and gives no recourse to the consumer in the omnibus bill.

My bill reaches down into the land which is in dire trouble, which the plow, the rubber-tired tractor and the hybrids, under man's control have exploited and which acres only the farmer can find and control on the basis of his local costs and markets.

If, indeed, a new agricultural policy is to be developed, as the editorial I referred to in the beginning states and as, indeed, I believe it must, then a cropland restoration program, offering a second market to lower the marginal farmer's cost of production, must be considered.

Such a program must protect our potential to produce, must give the farmer a chance to adjust his costs against the price the Government will pay, and give the family farm a chance to compete in the restoration of land, with the corporation and others looking for income tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the favorable consideration of this principle, under any Member's name, in the next session of the 89th Congress.

THE ADOPTION OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 of this year I introduced a bill called the Adoption Opportunity Act. Its purpose is to allow a taxpayer who adopts a child to deduct from his gross income the medical, legal, and other expenses incurred in the adoption process.

I sponsored this legislation in the belief that some tax relief is due those couples who choose to adopt a child. Under present law adoption expenses are not deductible.

It is my belief that the situation should be remedied for two principal reasons: First, adoptive parents should, in justice, be given tax treatment at least equal to natural parents who are allowed a deduction on all medical expenses involved in having a baby that are not covered by medical insurance.

Second, the deduction would have the social benefit of encouraging adoptions. Today the number of adoptions is only barely keeping pace with the large number of children available. Many public and private social services report they must carry on active recruitment programs to make sure that the number of applicants do not lag.

Often, it seems, the most desirable adoptive couples are those for whom the extraordinary expenses of an adoption are prohibitive. Young and establishing a household, they may have many other financial obligations. A tax deduction for their expenses might mean the difference between being able to take a child and not being able to.

After introducing this bill, I sent it and my introductory remarks to several hundred public and private adoption and child service agencies, asking for comments.

The response to this proposal, Mr. Speaker, has been truly overwhelming. From all across the United States letters have poured into my office expressing support of the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258.

At this point I request permission to include excerpts from some of these letters at the end of my remarks. Coming as they do from persons intimately connected with placing children for adoption, these letters speak more eloquently than ever I could about the need for new legislation allowing a tax deduction for adoption expenses.

Although the letters which I have received on the Adoption Opportunity Act have been favorable almost without exception, some contained suggestions for changes and improvements in the wording of the proposal.

The most common suggestion was that the words "social agency fees" or similar language be added to the definition of adoption expenses in the legislation. Although it seems clear that the bill now would cover such costs, I believe there should be no room for doubt. Therefore, it is my intention to suggest this amendment when the House Ways and Means Committee considers the bill.

Should hearings not be held in the near future, I plan to revise the proposal to reflect this and other suggested changes that have been made to me by persons interested in, and directly connected with, the adoption of children.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to reemphasize the need for early passage of the Adoption Opportunity Act. It will go far toward bringing fair tax treatment to adoptive parents and fostering still more adoptions.

At this point, I insert excerpts from letters which I have received on this proposal, and earnestly request the attention of my colleagues to them:

I would hope that the House Ways and Means Committee would give favorable consideration to this piece of legislation when it seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code.

As license officer for all of the private child-placement and adoption agencies in the District of Columbia, I am well aware of the great need to encourage couples to adopt and also of the financial burden upon them of the necessary expenses incurred. Therefore, it seems to me that your bill would give great and justifiable assistance to couples seeking to provide a home for infants and children in need of adoptive placement.

Mrs. ELIZABETH J. ALEXANDER,
License Officer, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare.

You may be assured that this Office is in favor of your bill and that we will support its passage in any possible way.

Mr. NICHOLAS STEVENSON,
Graham, Stevenson & Griffith.
CHICAGO.

The members of my staff and myself, as well as a number of the members of my board, are pleased to see the introduction of this particular piece of legislation. * * *

It is already difficult enough to compete with the apparent [sic] unlimited resources available to (public) child welfare service. If, however, our fee were tax deductible, it would make it possible for a larger number of people to continue to use our service. While we are convinced that many people find this a preferable service, we must also face the fact that the cost differential between our own fee and the lack of a fee in most public agencies tends to create a problem for us. * * *

May I * * * state that we are impressed wtih the intent and purpose of your bill for the very reasons that you give as its basis.

Mr. JAMES J. MALLON,
Director, the Children's Bureau of Indianapolis.

I agree that adoptive parents should be given the same consideration as natural parents.

MARY M. WAGNER,
Acting Director, Division of Child Welfare Services, Montana Department of Public Welfare.

We believe that the idea is a very commendable one, and the statement which you made in support of it expresses a philosophy and a purpose with which we are very much in accord.

We * * * believe with you that people who adopt children should be able to deduct from taxable income the expenses connected with adoption.

Mr. FRANK NEWGENT,
Director, Division for Children and Youth, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare.

The philosophy upon which your proposal is based seems sound, and from the point of view of the needs of children available for adoption, I think the publicizing of this legislation would attract the attention of additional adoptive applicants.

Mr. ROBERT M. MYERS,
Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and Family Service, Northampton, Mass.

We do agree in principle that fees for adoption service should be made deductible by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. * * *

I would like to see (the bill) discussed in our local papers. It merits more publicity. * * *

Most of our local agencies are in great need of more adoptive homes. The ratio of adoptive applicants is declining. Active recruitment programs are needed. Publicity about your bill, and about adoption services, may be a great help in our recruitment efforts.

The Reverend ELDRED B. LESNIEWSKI,
Assistant Director, Milwaukee Archdiocese, Catholic Social Services.

We believe that your bill is very sound. There is a sizable expense involved in an adoption and we would believe that this should encourage people to adopt who have small incomes.

ESTHER LAZARUS,
Director, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore, Md.

We have reviewed (the Adoption Opportunity Act and statement upon introduction) carefully. We believe your points in favor of the act [sic] are sound and that adopting parents should be allowed the tax deductions you propose.

We hope the Congress will see fit to enact this legislation.

Mrs. ALICE R. SMITH,
Chief, District of Columbia Child Welfare Division.

Your introduction and work for the passage of the Adoption Opportunity Act * * * is appreciated by this Department.

The legal and other expenses involved are deterrents to some couples within the lower economic gorup. * * *

The enactment of H.R. 8258 would be helpful in meeting the problem of an increasing number of children needing adoption.

Mr. ROY S. NICKS,
Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Public Welfare.

As the director of an adoption agency, I wish to commend you for your interest in this matter and the action you are taking. We have felt that there should be an opportunity for persons who adopt children to be allowed tax deductions for the expenses of the adoption.

Mr. CHARLES B. OLDS,
Executive Director, Children's Home Society of Minnesota.

We are very much pleased that your bill gives consideration, for income tax purposes, to adoptive parents for expenses connected with adoptions.

Mr. ROGER GORHAM,
President, Child and Family Services, Portland, Maine.

Thank you very much for introducing the Adoption Opportunity Act. The many thousands of parents who are adopting children every year in this country would welcome the appropriate tax relief provided in the act.

Mr. C. ROLLIN ZANE,
Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut.

I am personally in favor of this bill * * *

We find, as you point out, that adopting parents feel discriminated against in not being allowed tax deductions for the expenses of adoption. They further point out that natural parents can secure insurance to meet medical costs. We have found some couples failing to apply for a second child because of the expense. Tax deductions would help, especially with the young couples who face a promising future but are still in the process of buying homes and furnishings.

Mr. ROLLO A. BARNES,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Service of Lancaster County, Pa.

May I commend you on your support of such legislation as those of us who have had considerable experience in the field of adoptive practice have advocated such legislation for years.

In my experience I would concur * * * that adoptive parents should be given at least equal tax treatment as natural parents. My experience includes 25 years of adoptive work in three different States. I feel strongly that by not giving equal tax treatment to adoptive parents we treat the adoptive child differently than we do the natural child. There should be no differential treatment of children, regardless of whether they are natural or adopted.

Tax relief to adoptive applicants would not only encourage all adoptive applicants but would be particularly helpful to agencies in recruitment of the hard-to-place child. In this category are children of mixed racial background, physically handicapped, and Negroes.

Mr. ROBERT I. BEERS,
Executive Director, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass.

We are very much in favor of your proposal and wish you success.

Mrs. LAURENCE A. JANNEY,
Executive Director, Adoption Service of Westchester, Inc., White Plains, N.Y.

We think the bill an excellent idea and hope that it will be enacted.

Mr. FRANK M. CRAFT,
Florida State Welfare Director.

The legislation is timely and indeed overdue. As you stated in your speech, it will correct an injustice which is now done to adoptive parents and will encourage adoptions, something which is very necessary at this time.

As it stands now, it is a sound and comprehensive proposal.

Mr. GEORGE M. PIKSER,
Executive Director, Jewish Social Service Agency and Jewish Foster Home, Washington, D.C.

I believe this particular measure is long overdue to afford equitable treatment to adoptive parents as well as to stimulate the number of people who might apply to adopt children. In a number of localities of which Florida is a prime example, it is becoming increasingly more difficult for sufficient homes to be found for the increasing numbers of children coming to agencies for adoption placement.

We greatly appreciate your interest in this problem and your concern for the children and families who would be affected.

Mr. WESLEY W. JENKINS,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Service, St. Petersburg, Fla.

I appreciate your efforts to help adoptive couples secure a more equalized financial status with natural parents as far as income tax is concerned. One big factor we often forget is that adoptive parents, in addition to the expenses they must bear in order to adopt a child, have frequently spent several thousands of dollars for personal medical care in attempting to have children of their own.

The need for good adoptive parents is so great that we must find ways of encouraging childless couples to take on the responsibilities of adopting a child. I feel that your bill is one good way of encouraging these couples.

Mr. PERRY J. GANGLOFF,
Executive Director, the Family and Children's Society of Broome County, Inc., Binghamton, N.Y.

We want to thank you for your interest in this matter. We are always grateful to learn of any legislative action that pertains to our work and the services offered by this agency.

Mr. LEONARD R. JAGELS,
Executive Secretary, Catholic Social Services of Oakland County, Mich.

We feel the Adoption Opportunity Act very timely for the many reasons you so ably pointed out in your speech to the House.

We have great respect for your interest in the welfare of children and it is our sincere hope that you will be successful in your effort to get this bill passed.

Mr. RALEIGH C. HOBSON,
Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Maryland.

I am in complete agreement with your proposed legislation to allow adoptive couples to deduct expenses associated with adoption.

Mr. RENALD J. NAGELKIRK,
Executive Director, D. A. Blodgett Homes for Children, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Your suggestion regarding legislation to provide tax exemption for adoptive parents is timely, fair, and, above all, very, very helpful. You don't know how much pressure is being brought to bear upon adoption agencies on the part of adoptive parents who go through a great deal of expenses in giving a homeless child a home—why not treat an adoptive child as it is being legally treated: like a natural child, after adoption procedures are concluded?

Thank you again. Good luck, and if there is anything that we can do to encourage and support you further, let us know.

Mr. ALFRED M. NEUMANN, J.D.,
Executive Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, Colo.

As a child welfare agency, involved in placing children for adoption, we would certainly give our support to your bill. In light of the recent national decrease in adoptive applicants and increase of children available for adoption, a bill intending to encourage adoptions seems most timely.

MARJORIE CONNORS,
Assistant Supervisor, Adoption Service Department, Children's Aid and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Buffalo, N.Y.

As a professional social worker who has had considerable experience in the area of adoptions, I concur with your bill and also the remarks which were entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish to thank you for the concern you have shown by introduction of this bill.

Mr. LOWELL A. GROTTVEIT.
MADISON, WIS.

I heartily endorse the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258, and sincerely hope that the bill will have no trouble in becoming legislation.

Adoption expenses can be considerable, and I admit that adoptive couples have had no tax break on the amount they have had to pay. More important, however, I feel that this bill will serve as an incentive to other people to apply as adoptive couples. As you perhaps know, the trend throughout the country is a decrease in the number of adoptive couples, while the number of available children is going up. While the financial consideration has not been the only one which has been limiting the number of adoptive couples, I feel being given this opportunity to deduct adoptive expenses will make more and more couples available to us. For this reason, I am in favor of the bill and hope for its passage.

Mr. JOSEPH W. GRANATA,
Chief and Family Service of Springfield, Inc., Springfield, Mass.

We who work closely with adoptions appreciate and strongly back the aims of the Adoption Opportunity Act.

If we can do anything to further its passage, we will be ready to do so.

MRS. MARY LOU WING,
Adoption Supervisor, Child and Family Services, Knoxville, Tenn.

Thank you for the information about your bill. It certainly makes good sense to me. Let me know of anything that might be of help to you.

Mr. WILLIAM L. GALBRAITH,
Executive Director, Child and Family Services, Knoxville, Tenn.

Your legislation, H.R. 8258, has my wholehearted support.

As a board member of the Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, serving in the capacity of secretary, treasurer, and now vice president of this worthy organization involved in the placement of children for adoption the writer is fully aware of the importance of receiving support to encourage passage of this bill, which is sorely needed to remove any barriers for adoption as there is a shortage of homes now for these children.

You are commended for your efforts in the introduction of the bill and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. R. L. SIEBERT,
President, Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.

Your reasoning for support of this measure is, in our opinion, quite sound, and it is my opinion that H.R. 8258 is highly desirable. I am glad indeed that you have proposed it.

Mr. CALLMAN RAWLEY,
Executive Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, Minn.

I am strongly in favor of such legislation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI is correct in stating that there is a lag in adoption applications. At the present time the five adoption agencies of the La Crosse area are conducting a joint publicity campaign to interest new applicants.

In our area we are placing white children only. In the southeastern part of the State, whenever children of mixed race must be placed, a serious problem exists.

Tax relief will not solve the problem, but it will be one factor that can help relieve some of the difficulties that can arise from financial pressures.

Mr. ZABLOCKI is to be congratulated on his insight in introducing this legislation.

Mr. GREGORY SPELTZ,
Administrative Assistant, Catholic Social Service, Inc., La Crosse, Wis.

I am very pleased to learn that you have introduced H.R. 8258. The measure appears to me to be drawn with great care and I want you to know that Lutheran Welfare will take whatever action it can to rouse support for this fine measure.

Again, may I commend you for your social concern and farsightedness in preparing and introducing this significant legislation.

Rev. BENJAMIN A. GJENVICK,
Executive Director, Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, Milwaukee, Wis.

As an agency which places over 250 children a year for adoption, Louise Wise Services knows that such legislation as you propose is needed to cover a gap in the present law and that it would provide for a fair and equitable allowance to adoptive families for expenses incurred by them.

Mr. SHAD POLIER.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

We would like to express ourselves in favor of such legislation as would provide recognition to adoptive parents and some consideration for the financial burdens they assume.

BERNARD G. and MARY A. STARKS.
MADISON, WIS.

I think your recommendation of a tax deduction for expenses related to adoption would be a particular boon to those couples whose incomes are somewhat limited but who otherwise are fine adoptive prospects.

While the voluntary agencies do not ordinarily turn down good adoptive prospects simply because they might be unable to pay the fee, the exemption would encourage families with limited income to consider this means of increasing their family.

Mr. JOHN KELLEHER,
Executive Secretary, the Catholic Service League of Akron, Ohio.

The Children's Home Society is very much interested in your bill, the Adoption Opportunity Act.

The society wishes to be on record as in favor of the bill. I shall write to our representatives in the Congress and give them our recommendation of it.

Mr. RICHARD H. CATLETT,
President, Children's Home Society of Virginia, Richmond, Va.

Our agency is quite interested in your proposed Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258. We frequently have inquiries from adoptive applicants regarding whether or not the adoption fee is tax deductible. We would favor giving tax relief to these families.

We will be following the progress of your bill with interest.

Miss JOYCE GREATHOUSE,
Casework Supervisor, Children's Aid Society of Jefferson County, Birmingham, Ala.

Certainly there are some real values in this proposal.

Mr. GEORGE P. SPARTZ,
Director, Division of Public Welfare, State of Alaska.

Your introduction of H.R. 8258 was so splendid that we are reprinting it in full, in our "National Adoptalk," for our membership and for the 500 agencies on our mailing list.

Mr. ARTHUR GLICKMAN,
President, National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations, Teaneck, N.J.

The National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations shares your views 100 percent concerning the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. Your speech introducing bill H.R. 8258 explains the conditions most accurately. Our legislative representative, Niha Savitz, will be in Washington June 6. She will call you. Will work to support bill.

Mr. ATHUR GLICKMAN,
President, National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations.

I believe that this is an area which needs remedying in the manner in which you propose. The need for adoptive homes is increasing every year because of the numbers of children who need this kind of permanent planning. Because of medical advances in infertility problems some couples who previously were not able to be helped medically to produce a family naturally are now becoming fertile and these advances while helpful to the individual couples compound the problem of finding adequate adoptive applicants for every child.

Any step in the direction of your bill would seem to help to encourage some families who might otherwise not feel financially able to adopt a child.

Mr. ROBERT G. HINTZ,
Casework Supervisor, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Madison, Wis.

As a child welfare agency active in adoption we are greatly interested in this bill. Your comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicate considerable research in this matter. I want to commend your concern for the adoptive parents and children.

Certainly it is not good for children to grow up in an institution or a series of foster

homes. The interests of good citizenship will be better served through adoption, to say nothing of the children's welfare and the happiness of the adoptive parents.

Pastor MENTOR KUJATH,
Associate Director of Public Relations, Lutheran Children's Friend Society of Wisconsin, Wauwatosa, Wis.

My wife and I have recently adopted a baby daughter through Lutheran Welfare Agency. As I am sure you are aware, most agencies charge a fee for the adoption service which is based on the income of the adoptive parents. I was amazed to discover that at the present time no part of this fee is deductible on either the Federal or State tax return. I am, therefore, obviously pleased to hear of your interest in legislation in this area.

Mr. LARRY J. EGGERS.
BELOIT, WIS.

I read with great interest your introduction of the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. Having recently adopted a child in the District of Columbia, and having paid an $880 fee, I hope that other Members of the House of Representatives will agree with your well-reasoned statement which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 18, 1965.

Your efforts to afford tax relief to adoptive parents will be applauded by many Americans.

Mr. ROBERT C. ZIMMER.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

We feel that the Adoption Opportunity Act would help some of our low-income families who are financially able to carry the care of the child but find some of the initial costs difficult to handle. Sometimes these costs prevent a family who otherwise would give a child love and security and share their name with them from adopting a child.

Miss M. BEATRICE PRYOR,
Director, Wicomico County Welfare Board, Salisbury, Md.

Children's Home Society of California is very much interested in H.R. 8258 and believes that it will be very helpful. We hope, therefore, that it will receive favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. CLYDE GETZ,
Executive Director, Children's Home Society of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

My clinical experience has given me an insight that makes it most difficult to tolerate programs that continue to keep children in group care that could use family care. I think that your explanation is excellent and that your bill, H.R. 8258, is entirely fair and warranted. I want to congratulate you on your insight, your courage, and your interest in the welfare of children. Unfortunately the general public does not know enough about the subject, and until we have your kind of leadership, many children will continue to be deprived of having their four basic needs met—physical, educational, emotional, and spiritual.

Thank you again for your interest and concern in the adoption program.

Mrs. RUBY LEE PIESTER,
Executive Director, the Edna Gladney Home, Fort Worth, Tex.

Although this matter has not been acted upon by our board of managers, I want to assure you of my personal support of this bill. I think it is sound in every respect and provides a tax deduction to which our adoptive parents are certainly entitled.

Mr. CLARK L. MOCK,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Society, Baltimore, Md.

The board of trustees of the Children's Home Society of Washington is very much in sympathy with the purposes of H.R. 8258, the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. We commend and thank you for taking the initiative to introduce this bill in the Congress.

Today with the growing numbers of children needing adoption and a relative undersupply of prospective adopters, the lack of an allowable tax deduction has two effects: (1) It deters many good families of modest means from adopting a child, and (2) it sends others to nonfee charging public agencies where the total cost of the social service must then be met from Federal, State, and local tax funds.

The present inequities, which your bill and our suggestions are designed to correct, are a serious deterrent to the movement of children needing adoption into good homes of modest means.

Mr. ANDY HESS,
President, Board of Trustees, Children's Home Society of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

I wish to congratulate you upon H.R. 8258 itself and upon your accompanying remarks.

I am delighted by your efforts to encourage adoption through licensed child-placing agencies, believing this method to be the one offering greatest protection to the child, to his natural parents, and to his adoptive parents.

Miss JEAN GRIGG,
Casework Supervisor, the Lutheran Inner Mission Society, Washington, D.C.

It is possible that your proposed legislation could provide some benefit to prospective adoptive parents who have sufficient income to adequately provide for a child, but who are not able to easily pay all the costs involved in adopting a child that arise within the period of time necessary to complete the adoption process.

For these reasons we feel that your proposed legislation could benefit this group of people.

Mr. G. THOMAS RITI,
Chief, New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Bureau of Children's Services, Trenton, N.J.

We are pleased to note that this equitable revision of the Internal Revenue Code is being proposed. We as an agency feel your proposal has much merit, and that your reasons for introducing it are sound. You have our full support in your efforts.

I would disagree, however, with your statement that "adoptions are currently keeping pace with the number of children available," at least as far as private agencies are concerned. Many agencies have experienced a decline in recent years in the number of couples seeking adoption, while at the same time the number of children needing adoptive homes has been steadily increasing. The situation in many places throughout the country has become acute, although in North Dakota we are just beginning to feel the pinch. This, of course, only makes your proposal more valid and needed.

Mr. JOHN A. REX,
Chief Social Workers, Adoption Unit, Lutheran Welfare Society of North Dakota, Fargo, N. Dak.

We were pleased with the proposal of providing tax relief for adoptive parents.

We certainly wish to support the principle of providing tax relief for adoptive parents.

Miss MARY C. DALY,
Director, Department of Children, Catholic Charities of St. Louis, Mo.

Your comments at its introduction were quite eloquent in providing justification for the bill's consideration.

We heartily support your bill. We believe it would be of great benefit, not only in providing more equitable treatment for adoptive parents, but also in encouraging adoption for many children who need permanent homes. It would, we believe, particularly encourage adoption by families in the middle- and low-income levels and by minority families. Adoptive homes are particularly needed for children of minority background.

We believe quite strongly that adoption should be encouraged and we believe your bill would be a great step forward in encouraging adoption now and in the future.

Miss LUCILE KENNEDY,
Chief, Family and Children Division, Department of Social Welfare, Sacramento, Calif.

I would like to heartily endorse the provisions contained in the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258.

BERNICE ERWIN,
Senior Case Workers, Lake Bluff, Ill., Children's Home.

The purpose of this letter is to thank you for introduction of H.R. 8258, the Adoption Opportunity Act, and to express our wholehearted support thereof.

I am attaching a copy of a letter which we have written to each of the California Congressmen.

I will appreciate it if you will keep me posted regarding the progress of this bill.

Best regards.

Mr. DONALD H. FIBUSH,
President, California Association of Adoption Agencies, Lafayette, Calif.

I am very much for the bill to help adoptive parents today, as many cannot go into adoption because of expenses. The Volunteers of America did not have a reimbursement until 1950, and since 1958 our maximum amount of reimbursement is $725, plus $150 legal expenses.

We want to commend you for your thoughtful and timely bill. This bill would enable more young couples to become parents without feeling the financial "pressure" so much. Their potential is often great, but they just have not had time to become financially secure.

Since there is a need for more fine couples to adopt children today, they need much encouragement and help in regard to finances. We have tried our best not to increase the reimbursement during the past few years for the best interest of having more qualified couples.

Lt. Col. RACHEL SPARKS,
Executive Director, the Volunteers of America, Fort Worth, Tex.

The president of our organization, who is an attorney, and I have reviewed the bill and believe that it has much merit. We hope that the bill has a successful passage through committees and will be favorably acted upon by the Congress.

Miss HARRIET L. TYNES,
Executive Director, the Children's Home Society of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C.

I am writing in support of H.R. 8258. I have noted with interest and approval the speech which you addressed to the House of Representatives on May 18, 1965.

Rev. J. FRANCIS STAFFORD,
Associate Director, Archdiocese of Baltimore Catholic Center, Baltimore, Md., Associated Catholic Charities.

Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County has long been advocating permitting adoptive parents to take a tax deduction for the expenses involved in the adoption procedure.

I am writing on behalf of the board and staff of this agency to let you know we appreciate and support your efforts to provide tax relief for our adoptive parents.

Mr. LIONEL C. LANE,
Executive Director, the Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County, Syracuse, N.Y.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PRESSURE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a very discerning column by James J. Kilpatrick titled "Highway Bill Leaves Resentments" I believe deserves being called to the attention of the Congress because it highlights the travesty which occurred on Thursday, October 7, 1965, when the House was forced to be in session from 11:00 a.m., October 7, 1965, until 12:51 a.m. on October 8.

I particularly call attention to the last paragraph which says:

All this could have been avoided if the deliberative process had been left to do its patient work, but this has not been a Congress of patience and deliberation. This has been a Congress of the bullwhip and the bulldozer; and those who were bullied along on the night of October 7 will nurse a long memory of a "present" they gave unwisely in the form of a hasty highway bill.

So far as this Member is concerned, there is certainly no resentment on my part although it became obvious that under the pressures existing on Thursday it was not possible to get fair and adequate consideration of the needed amendments. The pressure asserted was wholly unjustified for many reasons, including the fact that the billboards and junkyards do not have to be moved or screened until 1970. Any program that is to be effective 5 years in the future hardly needs emergency consideration nor should it be subjected to such pressure tactics that results in many amendments being considered without any discussion.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Oct. 15, 1965]

HIGHWAY BILL LEAVES RESENTMENTS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Johnson administration reached a new peak of arrogance in the House of Representatives on the evening of Thursday, October 7. Tempers have cooled since then, and Members have gone on to other matters; all animosities within 660 feet of the Capital have been screened and prettied up; but no man should mistake the bitterness left behind.

For the record, the chronology began on Wednesday, October 6, when the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 came up briefly in the House. Maryland's GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of Public Works, advised his colleagues of the schedule "On tomorrow," he said, "this body will begin to consider the bill." That was the way the Republican leaders understood it, too. The bill itself presented some serious questions; a number of major amendments deserved consideration. Thus the House would convene at 11, go as far as it reasonably could go by late afternoon on Thursday, and then vote on Friday.

So Thursday's debate began. About 2 o'clock the word came down. The President did not want the House merely to begin to consider the bill. He wanted the bill passed. Mrs. Johnson was to be hostess that evening at a gala dinner. As chief patron of the beautification bill, she would be grateful for a chance to announce its enactment. As for the President, he was to enter the hospital Friday morning; and he would be grateful too.

Johnson's proconsuls in the House cranked up their juggernaut and set the machine in motion. In the degrading spectacle that followed, Democrats trotted down the aisle in a dozen teller votes. They stumbled and shuffled through their paces, so many dutiful sheep, and the Republican amendments fell in windrows. At one point in the travesty, the House voted 121 to 84 to allow but 8 minutes of debate on 5 separate amendments.

Finally, a little after midnight, the bloody work was done. JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr., of Fort Worth, speaking for the committee, pleaded with his colleagues to reject a motion to recommit.

"We ask all of you," he said, "to accept the will of the House, and present the bill tonight as a deserved present to a great President and a magnificent First Lady."

So the present was passed and packaged up and tied in a pretty bow, 245 to 138; and at 12:51 a.m., the House adjourned.

If the bill were a carefully drafted bill, prudently weighed in committee, perhaps the Republican rebellion could be brushed aside as no more than the petulance of a resentful minority. But the debate, such as it was, made it evident that the bill suffers from serious flaws.

As Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, pointed out in the other body, the bill is woefully underfinanced. No one really knows what it may cost, in State and Federal funds, to compensate landowners, sign owners, and junkyard owners for the property and rights to be condemned. Everyone does know, however, that $40 million a year is the merest token authorization.

No one knows, either, what effect the bill may have in those States that presumably must amend their constitutions to meet the bill's requirements. Some profound legal questions are presented under the law of police power and the law of eminent domain. Such States as California, Washington, Oregon, and Missouri could lose millions in Federal highway aid if they fail to revise their basic laws by January 1968.

Actually, no one imagines that this will happen. The act that was passed in such haste will be amended at leisure. In the end, a great many billboards doubtless will come down, and a number of eyesores will disappear. In the process of this compulsory beautification, the lawyers will be singing like larks and small businessmen along the primary highways will be crying for relief.

All this could have been avoided if the deliberative process had been left to do its patient work, but this has not been a Congress of patience and deliberation. This has been a Congress of the bullwhip and the bulldozer; and those who were bullied along on the night of October 7 will nurse a long memory of a "present" they gave unwisely in the form of a hasty highway bill.

SOUTHEAST DISASTER RELIEF BILLS, H.R. 11539 AND H.R. 11540; FLORIDA DAMAGES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just been furnished, pursuant to my request on H.R. 11539 and H.R. 11540, the latter of which I introduced to give consideration to devastating damage by Hurricane Betsy in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana, specific information on Florida damage.

I requested more specific figures on damage in Florida. The Office of Emergency Planning—Buford Ellington, Director—has provided such information, which I place in the RECORD.

The bill which I introduced provides for some relief in addition to the relief already obtained under Public Law 81–875.

This relief is in the form of authorizing the sale of trailers that have been made available for occupancy by damage sufferers, which is the customary procedure to take care of persons who are forced out of their homes by a natural disaster. The bill for the first time provides that the occupants and those who were damaged are permitted to purchase such trailers. Likewise, some $1,800 in forgiveness on SBA disaster relief loans is provided in the bill. The bills before Congress provide for an immediate study of all possible relief for natural disasters that should be made available through State, local, and Federal programs, as well as the possibility of activating existing hurricane insurance acts. It appears that some 6,404 families are eligible for relief under this bill according to this report. The bill covers uninsured claims. There have been some 50,000 claims for insurance payments ranging from $25 to $28 million.

This disaster again points up the need for general legislation relating to disasters, which is now under consideration by the Public Works Committee and which I hope will be acted upon early next session.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: In accordance with your request at yesterday's hearing on H.R. 11539, enclosed for the record is a summary of Hurricane Betsy damages in Florida. When we review the transcript, we will insert it in the proper place.

Sincerely,

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director.

Enclosure.

Estimate of eligible damage, Florida

County	Debris clearance	Protective health and sanitation measures	Streets, roads and bridges	Dikes, levees, drainage facilities	Public buildings	Public utilities	Total
Broward	$150,000	$10,000	$128,000	$50,000	$28,000	$95,000	$461,000
Collier			1,000	4,000			5,000
Dade	254,000	50,000	142,000	10,000	75,000	195,000	726,000
Glades			2,000	10,000			12,000
Hendry			3,000	15,000			18,000
Lee			1,000	3,000			4,000
Martin		16,000					16,000
Monroe	40,000	80,000	50,000	5,000	20,000	80,000	275,000
Palm Beach	2,000	18,000					20,000
St. Lucie		9,000					9,000
Total	446,000	183,000	327,000	97,000	123,000	370,000	1,546,000

Hurricane Betsy, Florida

"Major disaster" declared September 4, 1965.

Summary of damage:

Public property damage	$9,100,000
Private property damage	102,460,000
Agricultural damage	7,500,000
Total	109,960,000
Total damage	119,060,000
Estimate of eligible work (Public Law 81-875)	1,546,000

A breakdown of the work, by county and category, is attached.

The Red Cross reports that 27 homes were destroyed, 355 suffered major damage and 3,901 minor damage. In addition, 193 trailers were destroyed and 955 were damaged. A total of 6,404 families suffered some loss as a result of this disaster.

Florida State officials have estimated 25 percent wind damage and 75 percent water damage as result of Hurricane Betsy.

The insurance industry has estimated about 50,000 claims, with insurance payments of from $25 to $28 million.

ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 the many San Diegans, Californians, and others will give observance to the memory of one of this Nation's foremost historic figures, Ellen Browning Scripps. She was one of our most brilliant and generous early residents of San Diego, whose drive and generosity created many prominent philanthropies. Of the public facilities she is responsible for organizing, one of the most outstanding is the famed Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Her foresight in realizing that such a facility was needed in order to make America internationally prominent in ocean sciences is particularly worthy of mention because of its establishment at the turn of the century.

It is significant that the city of San Diego is officially proclaiming October 18, the birthdate of this fabulous lady, as Ellen Browning Scripps Day and I ask permission to include their proclamation as a portion of my remarks.

PROCLAMATION BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Whereas on October 18, 129 years ago, Ellen Browning Scripps was born in modest circumstances in London, England; and

Whereas her unusual intelligence, character, and energy resulted in the founding of a successful newspaper empire; and

Whereas she became one of San Diego's most illustrious early residents and through her constant efforts and talents, she established great and enduring philanthropies, not only for the benefit of her adopted city of San Diego, but for the entire Nation; and

Whereas many of our city's most valued public facilities such as the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; the Scripps Metabolic Clinic, now the Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation; the Scripps Memorial Hospital; the Torrey Pines State Park and the Bishop's School, as well as public playgrounds, community centers, the children's pool, the zoological garden and research laboratory in Balboa Park and many many more still serve the interests of our people; and

Whereas the Ellen Browning Scripps Foundation continues her philanthropies for the enduring benefit of citizens of the far future:

Now, therefore, I, Frank Curran, the 28th mayor of the city of San Diego, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 18, 1965, to be "Ellen Browning Scripps Day" in San Diego in recognition of her good works and do urge our citizenry to take note of her remarkable career and participate in this observance of the 129th anniversary of her birth.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, this 18th day of October 1965, and have caused the seal to be affixed hereto:

[SEAL] FRANK CURRAN,
Mayor.

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT AND THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Watershed Development of the Committee on Public Works, I have had the privilege this session to participate in the approval of 30 watershed projects which were transmitted to the Congress and referred to the committee for appropriate action.

The Congress has heard much about water resource development problems in this Nation during the past years, and the Congress has acted substantially on meeting these water resource development problems this session. The Congress has enacted the Water Resource Planning Act of 1965 and the Water Quality Act of 1965. The omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill is now awaiting the signature of the President. With the enactment of these three pieces of legislation, Congress has expressed the need for water supply, water purity, and waterway development.

In addition to the action of the Congress, the President called a White House conference on the water supply problems of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware this summer. As a member of this body from the State of New York, I am vitally interested in the development of water resources in the East, and I will watch with interest the developments which result from this White House conference and programs launched pursuant to its recommendations.

In an attempt to act on major water resource programs, however, the Congress should not lose sight of the many smaller programs, not the least of which is the small watershed protection and flood prevention program established under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, known as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When this law was enacted, it was expressed that the sense of Congress was that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and their political subdivisions, soil or water conservation districts, flood prevention or control districts, and other local public agencies for the purpose of preventing erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources.

The small watershed program, administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, has moved forward considerably since 1954. Since the enactment of Public Law 550, 149 watershed projects have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of this body, and 272 watershed projects have been approved by the Committee on Agriculture of this body. The law establishes that the watershed project is to go to the Committee on Public Works, if the plan involves any single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity. The approval of these 421 watershed projects and the subsequent construction on many of them have aided greatly in preventing floods where they begin—in the upper reaches of the streams and tributaries.

A nationwide program of construction of small watershed dams to retard the flow of water in the tributaries, rather

than trying to prevent floods exclusively with the larger dams on the main rivers, will do much to prevent disastrous floods. The soil conservation benefits of stopping floodwaters in the upper reaches of the streams goes without comment, for everyone knows the effect of rushing water on land.

The officials of the Department of Agriculture have been most cooperative in working with the committee. Their dedication to the watershed program is obvious every time they appear before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a list of the watershed projects, with appropriate information pertaining to Federal costs and the drainage area encompassed in each watershed project approved, which were favorably acted upon by the Committee on Public Works during this session:

State	Project	Drainage area (acres)	Federal cost
Alabama	Ketchepedrakee Creek	35,110	$882,740
Indiana	Twin Rush Creek	28,099	1,234,620
Iowa	Badger Creek (supplement)	----------	212,965
Do	Walter's Creek	31,560	1,074,920
Georgia and Alabama	Little Tallapoosa River	133,218	3,725,322
Oklahoma	Uncle John Creek	99,584	1,822,313
Tennessee	Wilson Spring Creek	40,040	733,523
Texas	Attoyac Bayou	213,440	4,142,822
Do	Castleman Creek	29,850	816,148
Do	Donahoe Creek	98,285	1,362,609
Arkansas	Cooper Creek	40,128	1,274,008
Maine	Limestone Stream	31,542	791,349
Mississippi	Long Creek	40,306	1,181,041
Mississippi and Tennessee	Tuscumbia River	223,146	4,710,602
Missouri	Grindstone-Lost-Muddy Creek	209,100	2,744,306
North Carolina and Virginia	Stewarts Creek-Lovills Creek	72,000	1,519,200
Oklahoma	Upper Elk Creek	248,340	3,386,105
Utah	Ferron	191,000	3,892,100
Delaware and Maryland	Upper Choptank River	57,000	3,045,300
Indiana	Little Raccoon Creek	98,306	2,521,448
Kansas	Timber Creek	101,700	3,489,300
Minnesota	Tamarac River	234,700	1,177,486
Oklahoma	Quapaw Creek	98,560	3,364,699
Do	Rock Creek	37,997	1,224,703
Texas	Duck Creek	133,120	1,810,207
Virginia	Cherrystone	29,400	581,145
Louisiana	Bayou Boeuf	187,974	3,235,327
Pennsylvania	Mauch Chunk Creek	5,790	444,067
Do	Middle Creek	84,096	2,076,135
Do	Oil Creek	112,000	2,241,580
Total		2,945,381	61,174,090

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development has been most active in insuring the continuation of a comprehensive small watershed program, and I commend him for his attention and dedication to improving the water resources of this Nation.

The Committee on Public Works has shown itself to be most responsive to the water resource needs of our Nation during this session. The committee has acted on the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965, and a number of other legislative items, but the committee's attention to small water resource programs is indeed commendable also.

SOME THOUGHTS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after hearing discussion from all elements of the political and economic spectra about the need for international monetary reform, it is refreshing to encounter a clear, comprehensive, unemotional exposition of the subject. Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co. of New York, delivered a speech last June which surveys the subject of international monetary reform from all sides, considering the present international monetary system, the role of the dollar and various proposals for reform. He comes to the conclusion that there is cause for concern but not for panic; that any changes in the present system will be gradual, and that the dollar will continue to play a large role in the world's monetary affairs.

I commend this article to the attention of all those interested in the future of the international monetary system and the dollar and ask unanimous consent that Dr. Reierson's speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

SOME THOUGHTS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

(Address by Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist, Bankers Trust Co., New York, delivered at the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, the American Bankers Association, June 23, 1965)

The international monetary situation has in recent years become a matter of growing concern to Government officials and academicians as well as to bankers, businessmen and investors not only in the United States but also abroad. There is widespread agreement that the present system has various deficiencies, but reform proposals range from unrealistically futuristic plans to the equally extreme espousal of a return to the practices of bygone days. At the same time, some observers fear that the present system may already be laboring under tensions greater than can long be endured and visualize the world engulfed in a monetary crisis reminiscent of the 1930's.

The international monetary machinery is admittedly complex and delicate; a case can be made for alarm as well as for reassurance. If one attempt to maintain perspective, to sort out the basic forces that determine the system's viability, and to appraise both its strengths and its weaknesses, one arrives at three general conclusions. The first is that the system is functioning better than is credited by its more vehement critics; there is cause for solicitude but not for panic. The second is that major reform is not in sight now and perhaps for years ahead; changes may be expected as a result of the gradual evolution which is continuously underway, but the system of the foreseeable future is unlikely to be radically different from that of today. This leads to the third conclusion—that the dollar will continue to play a leading role in the world's monetary affairs and that the American balance-of-payments position necessarily provides the key to the future of the international money-and-credit system as a whole. If these conclusions are neither novel nor spectacular, it is hoped that they have the redeeming virtue of being more consistent with underlying realities and prospects.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

For the past 20 years, the monetary system has served the world far better than could have been anticipated at Bretton Woods in 1944, when the blueprint of the postwar payments structure was formulated. Under this system, the major industrial nations overseas have rebuilt their war-torn economies, stabilized their domestic currencies, and generally registered impressive economic gains. International trade and finance has been reconstituted and strengthened. Moreover, all of this was achieved much sooner than could reasonably have been foreseen at the end of World War II.

To be sure, there have been stresses and strains. Since 1958, when currency convertibility throughout continental Western Europe was substantially restored, a few currencies have encountered strong, and in some cases, repeated adverse pressures—sterling in 1961 and again recently, the Canadian dollar in 1962, and the Italian lira in 1964—and even the U.S. dollar has been pressured on occasion. However, these developments were attributable to the balance-of-payments problems of the individual countries rather than to shortcomings of the international monetary system as such.

More surprising than that such problems have occurred is that they have been met as rapidly and as effectively as was actually the case. Cooperation among the monetary authorities has over the years reached new peaks of smoothness and efficacy, individual countries have found that they could rely upon the system for prompt action to deal with emergencies, and the system as a whole has weathered occasional squalls without serious jeopardy. These accomplishments are in striking contrast to monetary developments in the two decades after World War I; they should not be taken lightly.

International monetary reserves

A cardinal feature of the present system, and one which has been under some attack, is that the monetary reserves of the member countries of the international financial community as a whole include not only some $41 billion of gold but also about $24 billion of national currencies, principally U.S. dollars and to a lesser extent pounds sterling and other currencies. In addition, each country has "automatic" drawing rights upon the International Monetary Fund; the unused portions of these rights, aggregating about $4 billion, are counted as part of the available reserves.

The distribution of gold and currency, however, is by no means even. The two reserve currency countries—the United States and the United Kingdom—hold over 90 percent of their owned reserves in gold, as does Switzerland. Among other major industrial countries, the percentage of gold varies from almost 80 percent for France to less than 20 percent for Sweden and Japan, with the bulk of the remainder consisting of short-term dollar balances, such as bank deposits, Treasury bills and other liquid paper. The industrially less developed countries as a rule hold relatively small amounts in bullion and prefer to keep greater proportions of their usually limited reserves in interest-bearing dollar or sterling balances.

Over the years, there has been a gradual but substantial shift of monetary reserves internationally. Since the start of 1958 alone, the United States has lost some $7 billion of its gold reserves to the rest of the world; except for the United Kingdom, all other major industrial countries as a group, on the other hand, have about doubled their reserves, having increased their holdings both of gold and of foreign exchange. The additions to the latter have consisted largely of U.S. dollars.

Fixed parities

As media for making international payments, monetary reserves provide the means for holding exchange rates at the fixed parities upon which the present monetary system is founded. Member nations of the IMF are committed to keep the quotations of their currencies in the foreign exchange markets within a narrow range of par; as a country's currency moves into excessive supply or demand in the world's markets, the monetary authorities maintain its parity against other currencies through sales or purchases of gold or convertible exchange.

The parity of each currency is usually expressed either in terms of gold—for the U.S. dollar, at $35 an ounce—or in terms of the U.S. dollar as a currency tied to gold; for the Canadian dollar, for example, parity is expressed as United States $.92½. The U.S. dollar is in turn held at its stated gold value by the legal commitment of the U.S. Treasury to buy gold from, and to sell gold to, foreign official agencies for monetary purposes at the fixed price of $35 an ounce, plus or minus a slight charge.

This commitment to maintain stable exchange relationships is an essential feature of the existing monetary order. Within regional blocs, such as the Common Market, it is an obvious prerequisite to the progress of economic integration; more widely, the existence of fixed exchange parities among leading currencies is basic to the efficient conduct of international trade and investment. Since 1958, adjustments of exchange parities among the leading financial countries have been few and relatively minor—an upward revaluation of the German mark and the Dutch guilder by 5 percent, and a devaluation of the Canadian dollar by about 10 percent in connection with that country's abandonment of a floating exchange rate in favor of a fixed parity.

International cooperation

Another salient feature of today's monetary system is the highly developed degree of international cooperation among the monetary authorities of the leading countries. This cooperation has been of signal importance in strengthening the system's ability to withstand pressure and to come to the aid of individual countries in trouble. Moreover, cooperation has tended to become closer in recent years and has added several innovations to established monetary practices; it has been reflected not only in the expansion of the lending resources of the IMF, but also in the founding in 1961 of the Paris Club—a group of major financial powers which have agreed to make resources available for the support of currencies that come under pressure, and which have worked together in various ways to stabilize the system.

The leading central banks in recent years have repeatedly operated in the foreign exchange markets to protect a temporarily weak currency against speculative attack. Moreover, to moderate potentially unsettling fluctuations in the foreign exchange markets, "swap" arrangements have been introduced whereby central banks extend credits to each other in order to obtain the short-term use of foreign currencies in the marketplace; the United States has been the heaviest user of these facilities, although several other countries have also benefited from these arrangements from time to time.

On the other hand, the United States has on several occasions contributed massive credits, together with others, to bolster the Canadian dollar, the Italian lira and, recently, the British pound. Another facet of international cooperation, finally, is the gold pool, under which the participating central banks seek to maintain orderly conditions in the London gold market and to reduce the drain on gold reserves by jointly providing bullion if needed and sharing equitably in any net gold offerings that may become available.

Cooperation on day-to-day problems has by no means inhibited differences on policy matters, and it would be presumptuous to take international cooperation for granted under any and all conditions. Yet the fact that assistance has never been denied and that the cooperative techniques employed have proven effective does highlight the common interest of all leading member nations in preserving the stability of the international money and credit system.

Position of the dollar

It is evident that the key role of the U.S. dollar runs like a red thread through the fabric of the international monetary community. It is the dollar which, second only to gold, serves the rest of the world as a source of monetary reserves and international liquidity; it is the dollar which provides the common denominator in maintaining stable exchange rates and which is widely utilized in support of other major currencies in times of stress. Over and above its role in official reserves and settlements, the dollar is widely employed in international commercial and financial transactions; huge amounts of dollars are held also by foreign bankers, trading firms, and other for working purposes or as liquid resources. Indeed, the great bulk of the world's trade is denominated in dollars and to a lesser degree in sterling, including trade to which neither the United States nor the United Kingdom is a party.

This overriding role of the dollar in the world's financial affairs is not fortuitous nor is it a matter of official decision. Rather, it is the natural and inevitable result of the succession of the United States to the dominant position once held by Britain in world trade and finance. As the world's largest trader, the United States provides a ready market in which foreigners may exchange merchandise for currency and convert currency into goods; likewise, the size of the American money and capital markets permits foreigners to raise or invest funds in larger amounts and with greater ease than elsewhere. A final consideration is that the United States is committed and able to maintain the convertibility of dollars into gold for international monetary purposes.

Quest for reform

This structure of the world's monetary society assuredly falls short of technical perfection. As is true of every credit edifice built upon fractional reserves, the present system is vulnerable to crises of confidence, especially if the dollar or the pound come under attack. Also, the provision of international liquidity by the payments deficits of the reserve currency countries is not necessarily in harmony with the actual growth in the world's needs for such liquidity. The quest for improvement has been virtually continuous, and the system itself has been altered, strengthened and expanded in gradual fashion over the years.

Criticism, however, has become more searching in recent years. The chronic deficits in the U.S. balance of payments, coupled with the recurring weakness of sterling, have created growing doubts as to whether the key currencies can continue to perform their present functions. Also, the point has been made that the reserve currency status of the dollar has been abused in that the United States has acquired profitable long-term investments abroad by the expedient of increasing its short-term indebtedness to foreigners. At the same time, the dollar is so clearly the keystone of the present system that it seems virtually impossible, as a practical matter, to deal effectively with accruing international monetary problems until the American balance-of-payments situation is solidly and convincingly redressed. Thus, paradoxically, the long weakness of the U.S. balance of payments has been both an incentive and at the same time an impediment to major change in the international monetary system.

TOP PRIORITY: THE DOLLAR

The problems of today's international monetary system are largely synonymous with the problems besetting the U.S. balance of payments. The international liquidity position of the United States—the size of the monetary gold reserve relative to the amount of foreign short-term claims—has been deteriorating steadily over the years, and the monetary authorities abroad have long been critical of the continuously rising short-term dollar debt being pumped into foreign hands by our chronic payments deficit. Until relatively recently, this criticism was generally muted, and the central bankers overseas continued to hold a rising volume of dollar balances in their reserves. Within the past 12 months, however, the climate has changed.

Major central banks have become less inclined to continue financing the chain of American deficits by adding further to their dollar holdings; they are converting dollars into gold on a more aggressive scale than in the past. These gold losses must be expected to continue for some time independently of any near-term improvement in the American balance of payments, but if the improvement turns out to be substantial and sustainable, withdrawals of gold are less likely to assume either the proportions or the persistence that would jeopardize the stability of the system at large.

Basic considerations

For a long time, there has been a tendency to belittle the urgency of the dollar problem by referring to a host of extenuating circumstances indicative of the dollar's underlying strength. Included here is the favorable U.S. position on merchandise exports and on services, as well as the large net surplus on total current account, which consistently and materially exceeds the outflow of dollars under the Government's military and economic programs. It is also emphasized that the American payments deficits and gold losses have been accompanied by the substantial growth of American income-producing investment abroad, thus strengthening the balance of payments in the long run. Finally, it is contended that the conventional measurement of our payments deficit overstates the magnitude of the problem; the proposal has been made to exclude from the deficit increases in American short-term indebtedness to other than foreign official agencies.

These lines of reasoning assuredly have some validity. They support the point that the dollar is not overvalued in world trade and finance, and that the United States has strong resources in the world economy. However, they are irrelevant to the present problem, which is that the total outflow of dollars from all sources has exceeded the total inflow by an intolerably wide margin, that this has diminished the country's liquidity, and that the volume of short-term dollars in foreign hands, for the time being at least, exceeds even the large amounts that are ordinarily required to finance international transactions. In fact, were it not for the function of the dollar as an international reserve currency, foreign central banks would long since have begun converting dollars into gold and the United States would have had to face up to its balance-of-payments problem far earlier.

Some policy implications

Since strong corrective pressures have so long been held in abeyance as a result of the dollar's unique status in the world's money and credit system, the United States has been able for the past 5 years to pursue expansionary credit policies which have been inconsistent with the large and recurring payments deficits. Money rates were raised in 1963 and again in 1964 for balance-of-payments reasons, but the Federal Reserve has nevertheless continued to provide reserves to the banks in amounts that have permitted a record growth of bank credit. This ready availability of financing in turn has certainly encouraged and facilitated the large outflow of funds which brought the dollar to the brink of crisis a few months ago. No country other than the United States could for so long have withstood this combination of huge balance-of-payments deficits and aggressive credit expansion without becoming embroiled in serious trouble internationally. Now, however, even the United States has had to take action.

In February of this year, yet another program was introduced to bring the American balance of payments back into equilibrium. In large part, it reemphasized goals and approaches which had repeatedly been set forth on other occasions, such as the need to hold wages and prices in line, to expand exports, to restrain American tourist spending abroad, and to curb the dollar drain posed by the Government's foreign aid programs. One important new feature, however, was to discourage American banks, institutional investors, and business corporations from lending and investing abroad. This was achieved not through resort to credit policy but through a call for voluntary restraint which appears to be producing results; bank lending to foreigners has been slowed drastically, many business concerns are reportedly conserving dollars by financing their overseas operations in foreign markets, and—very importantly—corporate balances abroad are being repatriated. Nevertheless, even with this cooperation, another substantial payments deficit is in prospect for 1965 as a whole.

A continuing problem

The voluntary restraint program is providing temporary relief; since a reduction of the capital outflow from the magnitude that prevailed around the turn of the year was imperative, this result deserves recognition. It is not, however, a cure for the basic problem.

The benefit to the payments position from the return flow of American-held working balances is of a nonrecurring nature and will presumably exhaust itself well before the end of this year. Consequently, as the year wears on, it is likely that net current receipts on trade and services, including net investment income, will again fall short of capital exports and the foreign exchange costs of the Government's military and economic outlays abroad. In that event, complete elimination of the payments deficit in the following year, as held forth by the administration, may once more turn out to be a premature hope; by the same token also, there may be little possibility of abandoning or substantially relaxing the voluntary restraint program in 1966.

Moreover, there are some doubts as to how long the new balance-of-payments program will remain effective. Some observers, harking back to the record of previous voluntary efforts in the field of credit restraint, believe that cooperation in the curtailment of lending and investing abroad will gradually diminish; others believe that the efficacy of this effort will decline as competitive pressures and operating problems compel the administration to countenance exceptions and generally display greater flexibility in its policies.

For other phases of the administration's program, prospects are even more dubious; recent wage and price rises at home do not augur well for the maintenance of the unusually large foreign trade surplus of 1964, and American tourist spending abroad this year is almost certain to set another record. Moreover, public spending abroad—i.e., military and economic aid—is still burdening the balance of payments by close to $3 billion a year, which is an amount substantially equal to our recent annual payments deficits; unless steps are taken to reduce this large gap, the time bought by the voluntary restraint program may expire with the basic problem still unsolved.

Whether in such an event the administration would turn to credit policy to strengthen the American payments situation, introduce additional fiscal or other devices to discourage capital outflows, broaden the base and intensify the pressures of the present voluntary restraint program, or place other curbs upon the use of dollars abroad, is quite conjectural. Much would presumably depend upon the economic climate in the United States and upon conditions in Europe. However, the recent pressure upon the dollar and the continuing losses of gold have apparently had the beneficial result of alerting the administration to the serious nature of the balance-of-payments situation and of hardening the determination of the responsible officials finally to bring the problem under control.

WORLD CRISIS AHEAD?

As if to illustrate the complexities of international monetary affairs, the fact that the United States, after many years, is apparently making at least some effective inroads upon its payments deficit has caused some observers to fear that the Western World now faces the danger of a serious credit crisis. Underlying this fear, however, are two diametrically opposite lines of reasoning.

One view argues that the international liquidity position of the United States has deteriorated beyond repair, that the American payments position cannot be corrected, and that the world hence stands on the edge of a confidence crisis which will lead to a widespread rush into gold, a depletion of the American gold stock, suspension of the dollar's convertibility into gold, and a general devaluation of currencies against gold; this might either spark a general inflation or, if the world should abandon the present gold exchange standard and return to gold as the sole medium of monetary reserves and international settlement, it might actually have widespread deflationary repercussions.

The second point of view is that the American effort to eliminate its payments deficit will be substantially successful; that ending the outflow of dollars will lead to a shortage of international liquidity and a retardation of economic activity abroad; and that the result will be to engulf the world in a wave of deflation and depression. Both positions appear highly extreme.

Specter of a dollar collapse

Confidence is indeed a crucial and at the same time a delicate ingredient in the monetary and credit structure; a collapse of confidence is a risk of which all monetary authorities, but especially those of the reserve currency countries, must remain continuously aware. However, the danger to the dollar from this source would seem to have not increased but diminished in the recent past.

The present balance-of-payments program of the United States indicates that the administration is earnest in its determination to restore equilibrium to its international accounts. There are legitimate questions whether the present program will suffice, but there is little doubt that further measures will be taken if the efforts currently underway fall short of their target.

Given a reasonable degree of equilibrium in the American balance-of-payments situation, a continuation of a moderate gold outflow may be viewed with some equanimity. It would be misleading to suggest that the recent acquisitions of gold especially by European countries are wholly independent of the dollar problem, but it would also be an exaggeration to claim that these actions have been motivated entirely by distrust of the dollar and a selfish desire to strengthen national reserve assets even at the risk of precipitating international catastrophe.

By and large, current shifts in the distribution of monetary gold may be regarded as yet another stage in the long postwar reconstruction of international monetary society. Whereas European monetary reserves at first were replenished largely by increased holdings of American dollars, at present there seems to be a general desire to build gold holdings to a larger proportion of total monetary reserve assets than heretofore. This redistribution of gold among leading countries may well reduce further the share of the world's monetary gold being held by the United States and increase the share of others. However, this need not curtail the role of the dollar as an international currency; to interpret this development as evidence of the repudiation of the dollar as a reserve asset is hardly consistent with the current and prospective realities of the world economy.

Risking a liquidity crisis

Equally unrealistic is the assumption that recent measures of the United States to remedy its payments imbalance may set off a worldwide deflation either by contributing to a shortage of international liquidity or by sharply curtailing the availability of dollar credits from American banks and other lenders and investors. The leading central bankers unanimously agree that international liquidity is completely adequate to meet current and foreseeable needs. Furthermore, the fear of a liquidity or credit shortage being triggered by the United States is effectively rebutted both by the specifics of the American program and by the financial resources available to other major countries.

The heaviest impact of the American balance-of-payments program is presumably being felt now, while short-term funds are being repatriated from foreign financial markets. It has been suggested that this may create a shortage of Euro-dollars and work special hardships upon Canada, the United Kingdom, and Japan, all of which are important borrowers in the Euro-dollar market. Canada, however, is receiving special consideration designed to prevent the American program from impairing the Canadian reserve position; the present problem is to keep Canadian borrowings in the United States from reaching levels that would further add to Canada's official holdings of gold and foreign exchange. Also, withdrawals of American funds from the Canadian market can probably be offset in large measure by reductions of Canadian credits to the United States.

Japan is also receiving favored treatment under the program, while the United Kingdom has access to a $750 million "swap" arrangement with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which could be utilized if Euro-dollar withdrawals should become troublesome. Actually, informed opinion is that the volume of Euro-dollars in the market has not decreased appreciably since the start of the American program; funds withdrawn by American firms have evidently been largely replaced by deposits on the part of foreign central banks.

Moreover, American commercial bank credit to foreigners will certainly increase this year at least by the 5 percent permitted under the program, particularly in view of the large commitments still outstanding. Other American financial institutions will likewise continue to expand their foreign investment portfolio to some extent. Finally, despite the program, the amount of direct foreign investment by American business in 1965 is expected to equal or exceed that of last year.

Looking further ahead, even if the American balance of payments is brought into equilibrium—an event not in sight this year and which may still be difficult to achieve in 1966—total dollars in foreign hands are unlikely to decline. However, should the supply come to be regarded as inadequate to meet private financing requirements abroad, this still need not create a problem, since the major industrial countries can meet these requirements from the dollar holdings of their central banks or through sales of gold to the United States. The conversion of foreign dollar balances into gold in recent years has already withdrawn a far larger amount of dollars from the world supply than is likely to be withheld as a result of the American program.

Some countries that have been relying heavily upon American credit to finance their rapid economic development may, it is true, find American funds less readily available, but since the developing countries are receiving favored treatment, the impact is likely to be limited. Finally, in the major industrial countries, credit requirements formerly satisfied by borrowings from American banks can be met by increased lending by local commercial banks, albeit at a higher interest cost to the borrower. In sum, a shortage of credit or of financial resources for the world at large is highly improbable not only today but for an indefinite time ahead.

MOVING TOWARD REFORM

While concern over a breakdown of the international monetary machinery seems greatly overstated, it is nevertheless symptomatic of the uneasiness with which present international monetary arrangements are viewed in many quarters. This will certainly spur the discussion of change and reform which already has gathered considerable momentum in recent years.

Variety of proposals

One set of proposals, identified largely with the French point of view, would abandon the system of reserve currencies and would restore gold, or currency units based on gold, as the exclusive medium of international reserves and settlements. Presumably this would be accompanied by a substantial increase in the monetary gold price.

A second major line of thinking, represented by the U.S. point of view, advocates improving and extending the present system under which gold and national currencies are held as monetary reserves, with arrangements to supplement owned reserves in case of need by borrowing either from an international agency or from other countries. British opinion apparently would favor an international institution equipping reserve currencies with a gold guarantee in order to make them more acceptable to central banks, which would ease the task of financing protracted payments deficits on the part of the United Kingdom and the United States. The Continental European nations, as creditors, would, on the other hand, generally prefer a system limiting the proportion of reserves held in dollars and sterling, thus placing more effective pressures upon the reserve currency countries to eliminate their payments deficits with reasonable dispatch. Beyond this, there are proposals for the development of some new international reserve medium that would either supplement or supplant the reserve currencies presently in use.

Primarily in academic circles, plans have been launched which reflect the general criticism of the present arrangement under which the amount of international monetary reserves depends essentially upon the payments positions of the reserve currency countries. To remedy this situation, it has been proposed that an international institution, somewhat akin to a central bank, be established with the power to create reserve assets in amounts consistent with the liquidity needs of world trade and finance. Still others, again mainly academicians, would abolish the system of fixed parities in favor of flexible exchange rates. Finally, there are some who would increase or decrease the price of gold by a regular amount each year, or who would have the United States continue to sell gold at its present price but reserve the right to reduce its buying price. Seldom has so much diverse and contradictory advice been offered by so many experts.

Areas of consensus

Although many advocates of these various plans argue their case plausibly and persuasively, a practical obstacle is that the international monetary system cannot be "reformed" unilaterally by one or a small group of countries, including the United States. Rather, any significant changes need to be negotiated and agreed upon by all major members of the world's monetary society; at present, the monetary authorities of the countries directly concerned agree on relatively few fundamental issues.

There is agreement, for instance, that gold will continue as a monetary reserve and as the final medium for settling international accounts. There is also agreement that international liquidity in the form of monetary reserves is adequate for the present and for the foreseeable future; this rules out the need for an increase in the price of gold as a means of increasing monetary reserves and international liquidity. In fact, there is wide concurrence that a change in the price of gold by the United States or by other leading countries would be a source of serious disturbance to the system as a whole and would be a most inappropriate way to meet future needs for international monetary reserves. By the same token, the principle of fixed exchange rates is accepted as a basic premise, and the leading countries accept the responsibility to hold fluctuations in the exchange value of their currencies within the narrow limits set by the IMF.

Beyond these fundamentals, however, views as to the features of the monetary system of the future differ widely among the major industrial countries. These differences reflect essentially the conflicting interests of creditor and debtor countries; they underscore the conclusion that until the reserve currency countries, and especially the United States, solidly redress their payments situation, proposals for international monetary reform must remain largely academic.

The problem of equilibrium

The crucial and at the same time most troublesome prerequisite to progress in the international monetary sphere, therefore, is to reconcile the conflicting interests of those major countries which have been running sizable balance-of-payments surpluses with those—essentially Great Britain and the United States—which persistently have run large deficits. The monetary authorities are in substantial agreement that both forms of disequilibrium are undesirable: deficits, because they lead to losses of monetary reserves, a decline in the liquidity of the deficit country, and pressures on the country's currency in the exchange markets—surpluses, because they result in the accumulation of monetary reserves which sooner or later provoke inflationary tendencies.

In both cases, appropriate corrective action may clash with domestic policy goals. The deficit countries may be reluctant to apply fiscal and monetary restraint because of the fear that these actions may inhibit economic growth and expansion; the surplus countries may be equally opposed to liberalizing their import policies, increasing their foreign spending or investing, or permitting the price-raising influence of growing liquidity to run its course. It is not surprising, therefore, that the problem of reconciling the conflicting interests of surplus and deficit countries is the greatest obstacle to international monetary reform.

Nevertheless, this problem must be faced. Neither the present system nor any that may evolve in the future can operate successfully if the leading nations run large chronic payments surpluses or deficits, and no reallocation of reserve currency functions or rearrangement of international credit facilities can relieve for long the individual countries of the discipline of their balance of payments. Those who believe that international monetary reform, possibly including the creation of a new reserve unit, will enable the United States or the United Kingdom, for example, indefinitely to incur large payments deficits will be seriously disappointed. On the contrary, to the degree that currencies other than the dollar and sterling gain in use as monetary reserves, the ability of the present key currency countries to finance continuing payments deficits will be correspondingly reduced.

A look at the future

The foregoing suggests that the leading industrial nations cannot reasonably be expected to reach agreement on monetary reform until the currently large gap between the payments deficits of both Britain and the United States—but especially the latter—and the surpluses of the major continental countries is closed, or at least greatly narrowed. And until substantial agreement is reached, there is little prospect of real progress toward monetary reform.

For some time to come, therefore, the Western World will continue to live under the present system, with some gradual changes but without any drastic or radical revisions. This means that the gold price will remain at $35 an ounce, that monetary reserves will be held largely in gold, and that dollars and sterling will continue to provide the bulk of the reserve currencies. Moreover, the leading industrial powers, if only in their own self-interest, may be expected to continue whatever cooperative arrangements are required to moderate the reserve losses of Britain and the United States and to provide substantial support if a member currency is beset by adversity.

Meanwhile, efforts will surely be continued to make the present system stronger and more efficient. Official studies to this end are presently underway, with most of the major financial countries taking part; the debates and the conclusions may help not only to deal with immediate problems but also to widen the areas of agreement and thus build a foundation for broader reforms.

Eventually, conditions may become appropriate for the creation of a new international reserve medium, supplementing gold, dollars and other national currencies. However, the amounts of such a new reserve unit that will be issued will in all probability be held within fairly stringent limits; it would be

unrealistic to expect that countries with payments deficits will be granted access to additional reserves except under terms and conditions designed to insure that the borrowers remain under effective pressure to regain equilibrium in their international accounts. In fact, if the adjustment mechanism can be improved so that large and persistent payments disequilibria can be avoided, the system should be able to function with considerably smaller reserves than today.

Farther beyond the horizon may lie a time when the leading nations will be prepared to adopt a common monetary policy, possibly determined by a supranational organization. This, however, is still in the distant future. It presupposes a world of considerably closer economic integration than has so far developed or seems in prospect.

For today and for years to come, the principles governing international monetary arrangements will in all probability be not too dissimilar from those under which the world is presently conducting its international trade and investment. Monetary problems will not be resolved by spectacular innovations or panaceas. On the contrary, it is becoming increasingly necessary for countries to pursue domestic policies designed to preserve the stability of their national currencies and to maintain substantial balance-of-payments equilibrium within the existing framework of international monetary arrangements.

DESCRIPTION OF RIOTS IN WATTS, CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the riots in Watts, California, but recently I received a letter from a very close personal friend of mine, Mr. E. G. Bickel, of Davis, Calif., who happened to be in Watts during part of the riots.

Mr. Bickel wrote me the following letter, which gives a very vivid description of exactly what he saw and actually what occurred. His letter follows:

DAVIS, CALIF.

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ARTHUR: Beyond its real significance, the Watts riot is perhaps being magnified by the press into an ugly and distorted image of what Time magazine, for example, terms "The Plight of the American Negro." In common with others, I think that this is being done with slanted inflammatory and inaccurate reporting.

We all know, of course, that quite a bit of our journalism has become increasingly sensational, shading the real behind the fanciful for headline effect. But how many of us will realize that such distortion of the news concerning upheavals such as Watts is, in effect, incitement to further national disgrace?

I don't know of an honest journalist in the old or indeed the new school today who doesn't look with contempt on some of the highly colored reporting and editing that is inaccurate and in the case of the Watts disaster, largely lurid and untrue.

I was in Watts during the riot, and I myself saw the havoc and the drunken turmoil. And I talked to the Guardsmen and the police officers who saw much more of it than I did.

From this firsthand knowledge, I think I can say with conviction that the word pictures and the factual narratives of many of the newspapers, and in particular Time magazine, was misleading if not actually false.

Deeply disturbed by what I saw that involved my beloved colored people so cheerful, kindly and thoughtful in my own home when I was young, I wrote an angry protest to the offending article in Time. Perhaps because of its worldwide circulation and what I conceive to be its duty to regard its dissemination of the news such as the Watts tragedy as a self-imposed public trust to use extreme care to see that it was true and factual.

Of course, I expected no response and there was none. Except, perhaps, the followup article in the issue of September 24 titled, "Los Angeles—The Far Country." This article had the same slant, calculated or not, to foment a rebellious spirit in the type of Negro who was at the core of the Watts riots.

Knowing you for so many years as I have, and your warmth and deep concern for the public welfare, I'm going to quote for you from a letter I wrote to Time magazine in the heat of my resentment at the tenor of their lead article in the issue of August 27.

Probably in it a legislator at your level serving the public for so many years, as you have, can find some small peephole for perspective on what has now become a sort of national scandal or so-termed in the press.

Anyway, I will quote from my letter as follows:

"I was present in Watts during the rioting, and finally escorted out of it by one of Chief Parker's police officers, not 'cops.' On this journey we saw no sidewalks buried with huge shards of glass and chunks of concrete that filled the air at the riot's height. Nor did we see the glint of sunlight on thousands of brass cartridge casings that gave the eerie look of an abandoned battlefield.

"Or do we believe that, as you say, the 'after image' of these drunken riots, which they were, 'haunted all Americans save in the unilluminated corners of its own big cities,' where it certainly should have. And also filled those same corners with remorse for what was largely a teenage drunken orgy, aided by young adults, who all made their homeland a sorry and distorted spectacle before the world.

"Your report goes on to say the week of these riots had brought the United States almost everywhere else proud success, mentioning our farmlands where crops are ripening. Why didn't you add—and also rotting because no pickers and other labor was available for these farmers who were watching their crops go to ruin? Farmers who want to know what type of political conniving has enabled our Honorable Secretary Wirtz to exclude the conscientious and hard working braceros from Mexico, and not replaced them with equally hard working and conscientious unemployed Negroes? This is the Honorable Mr. Wirtz who has himself photographed with burly Negroes carrying placards purporting to solicit farmers for work formerly done by these honest braceros until they were excluded.

"We read further in your article of 'scenarios of violence' in the ghetto's rubbled streets. Sometime have your reporter cruise around Watts in the shade of the palms, and along streets lined largely with well cropped lawns, and neat and adequate small bungalows that most Russians would cherish and beautify. If this area is a ghetto in the normal sense of the term, then your reporter who described it thus might as accurately be described as an ape.

"If American Negroes, who were once respected and gentle 'Uncle Toms' if you will, but beloved colored people in my own home and time, are now so degraded that this drunken and murderous orgy by a hard core of lawless punks gives them a feeling of potency and has developed in them a sense of pride in drawing world attention to a largely fancied plight, it's long odds that they'll never earn their way to equality with law-abiding whites, or indeed with our law-abiding Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Mexicans, and others. These honorable citizens earned their share of equality on merit alone, and by their devotion to the principles universally admired. We maintain that all good American citizens won their equality that way.

"You go on to record a statement that these rioters, the majority of whom were drunk on stolen liquor, are on the brink of hopelessness, and just had a temper tantrum to get whitey. And to burn, baby, burn. Even including the President, 'who had better be white and black, or he can burn, too.'

"To give your space, which with your great circulation should be a voluntary public trust, to such hipster hogwash, is in itself an incitement to further violence by the lower elements of an emotional people who are fascinated by their own frightening image, verbal or otherwise. To quote, or give credence, specious or otherwise, in your mag or your sister mag, Life, to the outbursts of such oafs, smacks of a shoddy and venal kind of journalism which has the old dollar sign between the lines, instead of the public interest.

"You end your article with what you say is a statement by a Negro laborer, 'I don't want anyone to give me anything. All I want is a job.' If, by remote chance he should, send him the attached headline appeal by the Dixon Tribune. It begs for workers on our 'boundless farm lands' where record crops are rotting on the ground. He can make around $50 a day if he's honest and will work like the conscientious braceros. The rioting, drunken punks can make at least $2.30 an hour if they'll work. But maybe it's easier to be on relief. Or pillage and steal. Or loiter on street corners and insult passing white women, even rape them.

"You describe Chief Parker, of the Los Angeles police, asserting derisively that he is a 'crusty cop' who is often accused of 'shooting from the lip.' This flippancy in what should be a factual report of a real tragedy is certainly not in good taste, or spirit. If Chief Parker's comments were as impolitic as yours, his truthful description about those drunken rioters being like monkeys in a zoo would have taken on some silly hipster hyperbole such as your man uses. And if he said 'We are on the top and they are on the bottom,' as you report, we feel he spoke the truth, and with the courage to handle for our protection the murderous attacks of such drunken riffraff.

"I have read your publication since it was first published, I believe, in the early twenties. I am now ashamed of you.

"E. G. BICKEL."

RELEASE BY PROFESSOR UPGREN, "UNITED STATES TO GO BUST NOVEMBER 18, 1970"

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently by unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, I inserted excerpts from a speech delivered to the California Commonwealth Club by Prof. Arthur R.

Upgren, director of the bureau of economic studies at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn.

I now have a release by Professor Upgren dated May 9, 1959, together with a release dated July 24, 1965, in which I am sure those who are interested in the financial affairs of our Government, and especially of our banks, will be most interested. These two releases follow:

"UNITED STATES TO GO BUST NOVEMBER 18, 1970"—ARTHUR UPGREEN SETS THE ALARM FOR 10:30 A.M.

(By Arthur Upgren)

Star editorial page readers are certainly entitled to know the methods of economic forecasters—like myself—who foist their predictions on the public. Having done this twice in the past and now being prepared to make a third forecast, I probably should make a statement of methods.

My first forecast, concerning the end of the boom, was given in a talk in Minneapolis in September 1957. I predicted the end of the boom for October 7, 1957, at 2:30 p.m. By just how many hours my prediction was in error I leave to editorial page readers to judge. In retrospect, the prediction seems pretty good.

That estimate was made on the basis of one single, but extremely important fact. For the quarter starting October 1, 1957, the expenditures of American business for new plant and equipment started their speedy 1957–58 recession decline.

After having ascended for a year and three-quarters by $9 billion, these outlays, so important to the upward trend of the business cycle, now started a year's rapid descent. The total decline was $8 billion in a year.

My date of October 7 allowed a week for the news to spread. That's why the decline came October 7, 1 week after the bad news was released.

My second prediction was made more in advance, in the winter of 1957–58. It was that business would turn up with great force on July 21, 1958, at 8 a.m. This prediction proved to be so good that the Federal Reserve Board's research department had to recalculate later (and in an upward direction) its index of industrial production for July 1958 to match the accuracy of my prediction.

I had taken into account the fact that most heavy industries in the United States take massive vacations the first 3 weeks in July. So, of course, business would turn up on July 21 which opened the third week of the month after these massive vacations.

These past predictions were of a short-term character and quickly fulfilled. My new prediction is of a much longer run character, but it is of very much greater importance:

The United States will be ripe for a real end of the boom and, therefore, for a big bust. The date for this bust I now fix at November 18, 1970, at 10:30 a.m.

The hour of 10:30 a.m. is selected because that is the time of day when all checks are presented by banks to each other for payment and the bank clearings take place. So watch the Federal Reserve bank at the corner of Fifth and Marquette on November 18, 1970 for a lot of excitement.

The excitement, of course, will concern the checks going into the bank, not the impregnable fortress Federal Reserve bank of Minneapolis. Its walls won't fall down on that date, even though, like a modern Joshua, I blow doom on my horn.

November is picked because our serious crises always come in November, the past normal month for crises (except for that of March 1933). One November economic bust that of 1907, was so bad and left the country so short of money that a Boston department store bought the receipts of the Harvard-Yale football game that year so that they could advertise: "We give you change."

The year 1970 is picked for a very specific reason. Our supply of money—currency and bank deposits—must grow about 5 percent a year. Today our financial system is 53 percent liquid. In 1929, in contrast, just before the great bust of that year, our financial structure was only 23 percent liquid. Then came trouble and financial collapse.

Now the growth of our whole money system in the next 11 years will be such that financial liquidity on November 18, 1970, will again be reduced to 23 percent. Even the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) is concerned because in its annual report for 1957 (pp. 65–66) it says:

"There is no question that the present deposit insurance fund would be entirely inadequate should, for example, a situation similar to that of 1930–33 recur."

They then ask:

"To what extent can we expect a situation such as that of 1930–33 to recur? Certainly, we can conceive of the possibility of a severe economic downturn accompanied by large numbers of bank failures. Neither the public confidence engendered by the existence of Federal deposit insurance nor the improvements in banking and bank supervising would be sufficient to prevent these failures which would be a consequence of economic dislocations of a fundamental nature.

"However, because the Federal Government is committed, under the Employment Act of 1946, to follow policies which will stimulate full employment, and in view of the knowledge and authority now possessed by various agencies of the Federal Government, it is reasonable to assume that we will be able to avoid prolongation of a serious depression."

There you have it. Even the FDIC says it can't stem the tide, so we see why the trouble will come and, of course, I have the date worked out for you—November 18, 1970, 10:30 a.m. But sell your stocks about 1968.

Now it will not do to end on this morbid note. What can we say that will be good?

Well, first we have given the country 11 years notice of a serious problem—the maintenance of proper levels of liquidity for our banks. Then we can add that our banks in our upper Midwest are more liquid than in the country as a whole, so we are going to do better.

Next, we can hope the country will do something in response to our warning, though the six deep financial collapses we had from 1873 to 1933 do not encourage us. But, we are doing better.

Then finally, to close on a note of levity, many of us by 1970 shall be retired to Florida and we must leave a few economic problems for handling in later issues of the Minneapolis Star.

A SOLUTION FOR FUTURE FINANCIAL CRISES

(By Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, Frederic R. Bigelow, professor of economics and director of the bureau of economic studies at Macalester College, St. Paul)

When the United States devalued the dollar and increased the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce early in 1934, we thereafter attracted such a large amount of gold to our country that our monetary and banking gold reserves increased from $4 billion in 1934 to almost $24 billion 10 years later, in 1944. There has been no parallel to this large increase in monetary reserves in gold in the world's financial history over the centuries since A.D. 1500.

Monetary reserves were thus greatly enlarged. No inflation whatever was produced, inasmuch as gold by the 1930's was no longer in circulation as money but merely reposed in our central banks as reserves. Banking reserves, of course, became very excessive.

With our entry into World War II in 1941, however, and with large arms spending prior thereto, we ran very large deficits in the Federal budget. In fact, only about 46 percent of the cost of the war was financed out of taxes.

As a result, the Treasury took the easy course of financing a large share of its huge deficit at the commercial banks. This greatly enlarged their liquidity. They bought $100 billion of U.S. securities. Consequently, the total volume of money and usable bank credit in the United States doubled.

TABLE 1.—*The liquidity of all banks in the United States, 1929–45 and 1945–65*

[In billions of dollars]

	June 30, 1929	Dec. 31, 1939	Dec. 31, 1945
LIQUIDITY GOES UP			
Cash and reserves	6.3	23.3	35.3
U.S. Governments	5.5	19.4	101.3
Loans and other securities	41.1	22.2	39.0
Liquidity ratio (percent)	23	63	83
	1929	1939	1945
Total deposits	53.9	68.2	165.6

NOTE.—The "liquidity ratio" is what bankers say it is; namely, the ratio of all cash and reserves plus all U.S. securities to total deposits

The major part of our money supply is the bank deposits which are created and, of course, enlarged by the acquiring of assets by the commercial banks, particularly by acquiring the $100 billion of additional U.S. Government securities acquired by the commercial banks in the course of World War II.

As table 1 shows, bank liquidity was hugely increased from 1929 to 1945.

In the table, the large increase in the cash and reserves of the commercial banking system is accounted for mostly by the huge inflow of gold. Since 1952 we have lost $11 billion of gold. As we have lost this gold, the Federal Reserve banks have acquired equally large amounts of U.S. Government securities. They purchase these securities to enlarge the reserves of the member banks held at the Federal Reserve banks so that there would be no serious shrinkage in the ability of the banks to continue to expand loans and deposits. Of course, then bank liquidity falls.

Bank liquidity is what bankers say it is; namely, the sum of cash and all reserves, plus U.S. Government securities to total deposit liabilities. This liquidity ratio in 1929 was 23 percent, and thereafter we had a complete financial breakdown. In fact, this level of 23 percent has imminently preceded past financial crises, such as the panic of 1873 and other serious financial difficulties in the United States.

With the remarkable record of the commercial banks since the end of the war in expanding their loans from $39 billion at the end of 1945 to $270 billion recently in 1965, we have seen bank liquidity constantly fall. As a result of the great expansion in deposits by this expansion of loans, the bank liquidity ratio in April 1965 had fallen to 33.3 percent.

Table 2 reveals this decline in liquidity which followed the $230 billion expansion in bank loans for 1945–65.

TABLE 2

[In billions of dollars]

	Dec.31, 1945	Dec.31, 1955	Apr. 28, 1965
LIQUIDITY GOES DOWN			
Cash and reserves	35	50	52
U.S. Governments	101	67	64
Loans and other securities	39	111	270
Liquidity ratio (percent)	83	52	33.3
	1945	1955	1965
Total deposits	166	221	348

As banks continue to lend, as they necessarily must if we are to maintain an expanding money supply for an expanding economy, more loans are made and liquidity is reduced. It is the projection of this rate of reduction in bank liquidity by about 2 percentage points a year which brings us to the prediction of financial difficulties about 1970. Bank liquidity then will be 23 percent. We have always had financial crises as that low level (for the United States) is reached.

Can we find a solution for these difficulties?

In the United States prior to 1914 with establishment of the Federal Reserve System in that year, our ability to meet demands at home and abroad depended upon the surplus gold reserves of the banks, primarily the famous "surplus gold reserves of the New York City clearinghouse banks."

In 1907, the panic occurred because these surplus reserves were entirely wiped out and financial stringency resulted producing the panic of 1907.

This led to intense study in the United States of methods whereby we could stop these panics. We spent 3 years of serious study and brought forth the Federal Reserve Act, passed December 23, 1913.

Now the gold reserves of the commercial banks were to be pooled in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. That pool would then be used to stifle any incipient panic. However, though it is not at all widely recognized, the central banks failed us in 1933 with the closing of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. A central bank the world over is defined as a "court of last resort for money." Here we see that a central bank is to provide currency without letup not just when the sun is shining in business generally, but when there are bad times. The closing of the Federal Reserve banks and the issuance at about that time of the emergency currency approved by Congress both contributed to the difficulties we had of having a fully maintained money supply. The supply shrank by about 25 percent.

We tried a new approach. It was necessary because the Federal Reserve Banks themselves, at one time, had about 7,500 member banks and the country had over 20,000 State banks which were not members of the Federal Reserve System. It is obvious in retrospect that the Federal Reserve Banks could hardly be expected "to save" these banks with which it had no visible connection.

So we produced the Federal deposit insurance program in the early 1930's. In brief, this guarantees bank deposits up to stated amounts (now $10,000). The reserves of the FDIC are extremely small in relation to the liabilities it has assumed. So, in its annual report for 1957 (pp. 65–67) the FDIC has this to say about future financial difficulties:

"There is no question that the present deposit insurance fund would be entirely inadequate should, for example, a situation similar to that of 1930–33 recur.

"To what extent can we expect a situation such as that of 1930–33 to recur? Certainly, we can conceive of the possibility of a severe economic downturn accompanied by large numbers of bank failures. Neither the public confidence engendered by the existence of Federal deposit insurance nor the improvements in banking and bank supervising would be sufficient to prevent these failures which would be a consequence of economic dislocations of a fundamental nature.

"However, because the Federal Government is committed, under the Employment Act of 1946, to follow policies which will stimulate full employment, and in view of the knowledge and authority now possessed by various agencies of the Federal Government, it is reasonable to assume that we will be able to avoid prolongation of a serious depression."

A solution might be found along the following lines:

Let all the Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve Banks be taken over and be issued by the U.S. Treasury as U.S. notes. (The Treasury is liable on these Federal Reserve notes anyway, so this would be no momentous change.) As the Federal Reserve Banks are relieved for their liability on their books for $38 billion of Federal Reserve notes, they could return all gold certificates to the Federal Treasury and then return sufficient U.S. securities owned to balance the accounts. (The national debt would be reduced by about $25 billion.)

This would leave the Federal Reserve banks with assets consisting primarily of U.S. securities and in very small amount of rediscounts or borrowings by member banks. Against these two assets the Federal Reserve bank would hold member bank deposits or reserves.

The functions of the Federal Reserve banks would now be limited to the open market purchase and sale of U.S. Government securities as they wish to increase or decrease the reserves of the member banks in order that there should be proper monetary control for the single purpose of avoiding inflation and deflation and supply an adequate growth in the Nations money supply—chiefly bank deposits.

The U.S. Treasury now would own its gold stock free and clear of a reliability upon gold certificates. It would have issued additional U.S. notes to supersede the $36 billion of Federal Reserve notes now retired. If we wish, the 25 percent gold requirement against U.S. notes could continue, as we now have the requirement against the Federal Reserve notes.

The remainder of the solution is extraordinarily simple. The U.S. Treasury would issue U.S. notes against any properly authenticated check on any insured bank in the United States. In this way there could be no banking collapse, no money panic, nor what is the more serious problem: "a collapse of the money supply." It was this collapse which caused a loss in the great depression of the 1930's of at least $200 billion. Were there to be any future recession of similar relative magnitude, such a recession could cause future losses which would be measured by figures ranging from $500 billion to $1 trillion.

We are all aware of the good intentions of all authorities to avoid these difficulties, but the means to do so should be prepared in advance, not patched up in a time of great trouble.

As the Treasury might then cash any bank check, thus carrying out before any damage is done the guarantee of the FDIC, it could clear the check. If the bank upon which the check is drawn could make payment, that would be clearing in the normal manner. If the bank, however, was in difficulty, the Treasury could take a subordinated deposit at the bank to be cleared up when the financial crisis had passed.

While the proposed solution sounds radical, indeed, it is all implicit in the present Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation arrangements for guaranteeing bank deposits. However, the important point is that bank deposits created out of the process of making loans are the Nation's money supply. That money supply cannot be reduced without injury to the economy.

If the collapse of the money supply is to be avoided, some risks must be taken to avoid the immensely greater risk of another one of the financial crises and collapses which have occurred so many times in our Nation's history and which would cost vastly more, at least 50 to 100 times the possible loss under the plan herein proposed.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that if acute illness in my immediate family had not prevented me from being present last Thursday, I would have voted against the Harvey amendment. I am a strong supporter of the rent supplement program and voted for it when the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 was adopted earlier this year. I hope that the damage done by the adoption of this amendment will be repaired this week.

BITTER REACTIONS AS THE RESULT OF PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 560

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent passage of House Resolution 560 has, as some of us expected, set off bitter reactions among our Latin American friends. I think it is misleading to speak of "irreparable damage." The Latin Americans, by now, are accustomed and even resigned to such unexpected behavior from their North American ally. But it is not impossible, I think, that with imagination and effort this country can counteract some of the hostility which followed the passage of the resolution.

I think it should be clear that some very major intellectual house cleaning will be necessary if we are to reinforce our reputation and, by so doing, inject optimism and energy into the presently demoralized inter-American system.

I am quite aware that the principles and procedures of the inter-American alliance are in need of reevaluation and improvement. As is the case with NATO, the conditions in which this collective security system now operates, are fundamentally altered from those in which that system was conceived and established.

I share with many of my colleagues—including, let me say, those who voted for House Resolution 560—a sense of frustration with the current mechanics of the inter-American alliance. I find no reason to believe, however, that the

problems we all feel exist can be resolved by a compulsive flexing of American muscle.

We must learn to distinguished between problems caused by the structural inadequacies of the alliance, and those brought about by more complicated but equally important psychological factors. I suggest outright that until we make some progress in changing the tone of our alliance, we can have no hope for finding necessary improvement in the machinery of that alliance. The former is an absolute prerequisite for the latter. As of now, I believe the current mood of Western Hemisphere relations is one of suspicion, uncertainty, and pronounced nervousness. The inter-American system presently has a very bad case of the jitters. The condition is complex and its causes multiple.

At root, our predicament stems first from deep confusion over Latin American policy in the executive branch, and second from our failure to generate a spirit of open inquiry both here and in the Western Hemisphere. Strictly speaking, we are bound to the principles of the Rio Treaty, the charter of the OAS, and the Alliance for Progress. We are on record as continuing to accept the principle of nonintervention. And the United States, it appears, still intends to promote the idealistic goals of the Alliance for Progress, however tarnished and distant those goals.

Yet the ideals, treaties, and procedures to which we are committed are themselves in need of reexamination. And one cannot establish a consensus and a mood of common enterprise if the foundation for that unanimity is in disrepair. This, it seems to me, is the background for the current demoralization of the Western Hemisphere alliance.

Let me be more specific. Our policy for Latin America is usually stated quite simply: We favor self-determination, democracy, and social progress, and, in that cause, seek to oppose and repel threats to those goals caused by the Communists. On the face of it, this formulation seems wholesome and coherent. In fact, however, its two elements, the good neighbor policy and the demands of the cold war, are far more harmonious in theory than in practice. As many students of Latin American affairs point out, this perspective can often be one of dual vision.

Thus, while an anti-Communist policy would seem to reinforce good neighbor considerations, it can often undercut them. Anyone who doubts the reality of the Communist threat in Latin America is a fool. Yet our own attitude toward communism is different from that of many Latin Americans. We are seen as fighting a global cold war. They want no part of this particular crusade. They regard Communists as fellow Latin Americans with one view of how to run a government. We see them as agents of an undifferentiated global conspiracy. They often believe Communists can be contained within their system. We usually want to refuse Communists such membership, in fear of their powers to subvert and capture the system.

Now these may appear to be marginal differences, matters of stress and emphasis. But in a mood of uncertainty, matters of stress and emphasis harden into distinct positions, and result in very tenacious prejudices and suspicions. So the basis of our Latin American diplomacy can be schizophrenic, and that condition can be more or less pronounced at different points in history.

It simply is insufficient to argue that our goals always correspond to those of Latin America. This is a correspondence to satisfy theoreticians not politicians. In the final consideration, most Latin Americans appear to believe that we are more concerned with being anti-Communists than we are with being good neighbors. But whatever the truth, it does no good to explain repeatedly that both roles serve and reinforce one another. In practice, they often seem to conflict. And if the Latin Americans believe they conflict, then we have to deal rationally with that belief; we have to take it for what it is.

Our first efforts, therefore, have to be in response to the tone and mood of the Alliance and must treat with attention Latin American evaluations of our mutual problems. The sort of action I am talking about is neither very tangible nor very visible. But it is important for just these reasons. How do diplomats behave at meetings with Latin American officials? How much careful attention is given to Latin America at high level foreign policy meetings? How free do Latin American policy planners feel to discuss new and exciting ideas among themselves and with Latin America colleagues? What is the underlying tone of American speeches? And how does the Executive relate to congressional activity? The question, in short, is how to project a diplomacy which communicates a spirit of humility and open-mindedness.

One way not to do this, if you are the Congress, is to pass resolutions like House Resolution 560. One way not to do this, if you are the Executive, is to allow such resolutions to be passed.

I am today submitting a resolution to reaffirm this country's commitment to the procedures of the OAS charter and the Rio Treaty. From one perspective, this is unnecessary. But from another focus, one which emphasizes the need for a new atmosphere of inter-American relations, such a resolution serves an important function. As long as Congress is going to express itself in this area, we ought to seek means to support our friends and communicate our willingness to hear and respect their needs.

In my resolution, I urge that this country "encourage meetings of the Organization of American States to explore means to improve the authority and machinery of the inter-American system for any such collective consultation and action." We have to explore the basis of our commitments, and the procedures for implementing them. We have to reexamine with some honesty the whole complicated problem of intervention. It does no good to issue invocations to the principles of nonintervention or anti-communism. We have to sit down and find out what these principles mean for 1965 and the future.

But let me suggest that these conversations will have little chance of yielding success if they are conducted in the present mood of suspicion and hostility. The principal task for the next several months must be to clear the atmosphere to open some windows and some minds, and to shake some hands instead of our fists. It will be unlikely, for example, that our interest in a permanent OAS peacekeeping force will gain any respect unless we can convince people beforehand that we really and honestly want such a force to be multilateral in the composition of its command as well as in its personnel. And to convince them of that, we have to make our word appear trustworthy and dependable.

Until our basic approach to Latin American diplomacy is purified, its substance will remain ambiguous. Until we demonstrate an openmindedness to all new proposals, such proposals will not flourish. For the early successes of the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress, after all, were measured largely by how they sounded and felt to Latin Americans. Our promises excited our allies in short because the spirit in which they were presented was legitimate and authentic.

I submit that the authenticity of our goals in Latin America is currently subject to wide skepticism. It is time that we awake to this skepticism with behavior which is patient and flexible rather than peevish and proud. Communists in Latin America are unfortunately going to be with us for some time. The problems of subversion and intervention are desperately complex. But we have to demonstrate our willingness to hear and respect whatever positions Latin Americans themselves wish to take on communism in their hemisphere. This is called repect for self-determination. It is also smart politics.

U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of visitors walk through our Capitol Building daily during the peak of the tourist season. I say "walk through" because, under existing circumstances, they are encouraged to do little else. The problem, as I see it, is lack of adequate interpretive facilities.

It is true that the Capitol guides provide a useful—and necessary—service. But, it is also true that their basic concern is with the building itself, not what we as individual legislators do here or what the function of our institution is in the American system. At the same time, most of us do assist visitors as best we can in the hope that they will better understand—and appreciate—what is in-

volved in the business of making laws. But here again we can only scratch the surface; there is a limit to what we and our office staffs can do without jeopardizing our capability to fulfill the other responsibilities that we have.

So I have been extremely pleased in recent weeks to see the increasing interest expressed by my colleagues of both parties and in both Houses of Congress in the establishment of a visitors center on Capitol Hill. And it is in this context that I want to bring Members' attention to a proposal by the American Political Science Association, which hopes to set up and operate such a facility.

Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, this organization has had a good deal of experience with the Congress, in conducting a wide range of public service programs over the past dozen years. Operating on a strictly bipartisan basis, the association currently is sponsor of the following activities involving congressional operations:

Congressional fellowship program: Begun in 1953, this program enables young journalists, political scientists, and Federal executives to spend a year as staff assistants to Members of Congress, providing participants with a better understanding of the legislative process.

Distinguished Service Awards: For each Congress, the association presents an award to an outstanding Democrat and Republican in both the U.S. Senate and House.

Congressional staff fellowship program: The association each year awards a number of 6-month and 1-year fellowships for university study and research to selected House and Senate office and congressional committee staff members. Carried out in consultation with a bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee, the purpose of this program—financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation—is to improve the knowledge and skills of administrators and researchers, encouraging thereby the further development of a permanent and highly professional staff system.

School for freshman Congressmen: In January 1963, the association was cosponsor, with a bipartisan group of eight Members of the House, of a weeklong series of meetings designed to introduce congressional newcomers to the workings of the House of Representatives. A similar program was held under association auspices in January 1965. For this program, the association prepared a 225-page supplementary text, entitled "An Introduction to Legislative Service."

Legislative operations roundtables for executives: Seminars in legislative operations are arranged on a continuing basis by the association—at the request of the Civil Service Commission—for Federal career executives. Sessions of these legislative operations seminars are conducted by political scientists, Members of Congress, and executive branch staff members.

Congressional study project: The association is undertaking a comprehensive study of the problems of congressional organization and operation. Completion of the research and publication of the results are expected soon.

Study of campaign debate broadcasts: The association's Commission on Presidential Campaign Debates made a study of procedures and format for future television and radio debates between presidential candidates. The report incorporates, among others, the views of many Members of Congress.

Senate youth program: The U.S. Senate youth program each year introduces about 100 outstanding high school student leaders—2 from each State and the District of Columbia—to the workings of their National Government. Student participants are selected by State superintendents of education across the land and are brought to Washington, D.C., for a week of internship and study without cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the association is proposing to operate a Capitol Hill Visitor's Center—without cost to the taxpayer—with funds from a private foundation. Under unanimous consent I place their proposal at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to your attention:

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION
PROPOSAL FOR A VISITOR'S CAPITOL HILL ORIENTATION PROGRAM

I. PROPOSAL

To take advantage of a unique educational opportunity; to contribute to public knowledge about the role of Congress in the American system; and to evaluate the potential of tourism in Washington, D.C., for general public affairs education, the American Political Science Association proposes to:

Establish a visitors orientation center, open to the public free of charge, on Capitol Hill.

Develop a lecture and film program explaining the workings of the U.S. Congress and the significance of this institution in our democracy.

Design a system for testing the effectiveness of such programs in expanding knowledge about the legislative process, government, politics and public affairs generally.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Millions of visitors are attracted to the Nation's Capital each year, and their number appears to be increasing steadily. Today, it is estimated that over 20 million—including roughly 1 million high school students in various educational programs—travel to Washington, D.C., annually. By 1970, the number of visitors annually is expected to reach 25 million and by 1980 over 35 million are expected each year. The average stay for visitors is 3 days, and there is no doubt that most are interested in observing governmental operations while in the city. Indeed, the pressure on facilities in the Capitol Building itself presents a serious problem during the peak tour season (hallways become too congested with slow-moving tourists—and the House and Senate cafeterias become too crowded—for use by harried congressional employees).

Despite the educational potential of tourism, however, little has been done to interpret for visitors the various kinds of governmental activities that they observe. There is no central visitor's center (such as that at Williamsburg), nor has provision been made for lectures, exhibits, or films describing governmental structure or processes. Guided tours are available in some agencies and buildings, including the Capitol, but these are limited to description of physical surroundings with only passing attention to historical highlights. No systematic effort has been made—either publicly or privately—to develop and conduct a program that includes a general introduction to the workings of the National Government or to the role of any of its component parts. Finally, the few supplementary textual materials available on a free or nominal cost basis are totally inadequate.

The consequences of this situation extend beyond failure to realize the educational potential of tourism in Washington. Without adequate interpretive materials and program techniques, casual observation of Congress, for example, has a high potential for the creation of misunderstandings. (Senate and House gallery visitors customarily leave the Chamber confused—if not irritated—at the apparent inattention of the few Members who have "bothered" to attend.)

Such misunderstandings, which have implications for civic education and the viability of representative institutions, could be anticipated—and avoided—in the development of an appropriate interpretive program. The American Political Science Association has wide experience in organizing and conducting programs in civic education. The association also has special competence in the general field of congressional operations and organization, and is currently conducting numerous public affairs and public service programs relating to Congress.

It is within this context that the association proposes a series of projects designed to interpret the workings of Congress—and to explain the role of this institution in the American system—for visitors to the Nation's Capital.

III. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The association will establish a Capitol Hill Visitor's Center, will develop and conduct its educational program and will produce supplementary textual and film materials. While overall administrative support will be provided by the association, the program will be carried out in cooperation with a bipartisan Congressional Advisory Committee, headed by the Vice President of the United States. Operation of the center will be the responsibility of a full-time director chosen by the executive director of the association.

It is anticipated that educational programs will include lectures and short talks by Members of Congress, by representatives of the executive branch, by political scientists and other experts in the field of congressional operations. The association will conduct a national competition to select up to 10 advanced political science graduate students—who have demonstrated an interest in the study of Congress—to assist the center's director in conducting and in evaluating the program on a continuing basis. Generally, the center will operate from mid-June to Labor Day; additional schedules may prove desirable during the spring vacation period.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY AT DEDICATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like

to include a speech which I delivered at the dedication of the University of Utah Medical Center, October 16, 1965:

TOMORROW'S MEDICINE IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN WEST

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

President Fletcher, Dean Castleton, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet here in Kingsbury Hall this afternoon in the shadow of the Wasatch Mountains not only to dedicate a new medical center at this university but to inaugurate a new era in intermountain medicine.

Sometimes we can see the outline of history as it unfolds, and today is such an occasion. The past is present, here—the University of Utah is the oldest State university west of the Missouri River—and I read with interest in your college bulletin that its founders were of New England heritage and cherished ambitions for the incorporation of higher learning in their newly founded community. But the University of Utah College of Medicine is one of the youngest medical colleges in the United States—and perhaps this is the reason that it so gladly embraces the future. For the future is present, here, too—in the blending of the teaching hospital with the colleges of medicine and nursing, and in this medical school's extraordinary participation and leadership in community affairs throughout the State.

As the only college of medicine between Denver and the Pacific coast between Canada and Mexico, the University of Utah has risen to meet the demands of an entire geographic region. In this sense—in pioneering in regional medicine—the University of Utah is already in the future. It is setting an example from which the rest of the country can profit. In this area you are, I think, one jump ahead of the Congress.

During my 24 years in Congress I have seen historic moments in health legislation come and go. Sometimes they were capitalized upon, sometimes they were missed. But never have so many forces combined to such advantage for improving the health of our people as have combined this year to make the 89th Congress the "medical care Congress."

Note that I did not say the medicare Congress. Proper medical care for the aged is an important aspect of the comprehensive medical care we must provide for our citizens. But it is only one aspect of a much broader problem with which the Congress has been concerned and that is to insure that the results achieved by our magnificent national research effort over the past 15 years and more, will pay off in the saving of lives, in preventing disease and disabilities, and in diminishing human suffering.

Since I became chairman of the House subcommittee concerned with medical research and health-related matters in 1949, I have taken every opportunity to urge my colleagues in Congress to establish and maintain a national medical research effort that is second to none.

I am well aware that we do not yet have all the answers we are seeking about the causes of the major chronic diseases—heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and the neurological and metabolic diseases. I am well aware that we must continue—and continue to accelerate—our efforts to gain a better understanding of disease. But the time is now also ripe for giving greater attention to the equally urgent problem of applying the research results that have already been achieved.

This was the intent of the 89th Congress in voting overwhelmingly for a measure to intensify the battle against heart disease, cancer, and stroke. That measure was drafted in response to the report of a Presidential Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Michael DeBakey, which said that "Every available fact points to the same conclusion: the toll of heart disease, cancer, and stroke can be sharply reduced—now, in this Nation, at this time."

This historymaking report pointed out, among other things, that:

Two-thirds of all Americans now living will fall victim to cancer, heart disease or stroke;

Forty-eight million American citizens will contract cancer;

Nearly 15 million people suffer from heart disease and this, together with strokes, accounts for more than half of the deaths in the United States each year.

The report went on to emphasize that these tragic figures can be sharply reduced if we only apply existing knowledge to the fullest possible extent. For example:

Most forms of congenital heart defects can now be corrected;

Many strokes can be foreseen and prevented;

Deaths from some forms of cancer, such as cancer of the cervix and uterus, can be virtually eliminated and the chances are greatly improved for the cure of cancer in other accessible sites.

These things can be done—now—without waiting for further research results.

The principal feature of this new legislation is that it provides funds—$340 million over the next 3 years—with which the Federal Government will encourage and assist the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions and hospitals designed to forge a closer link between the centers of scientific and academic medicine, on the one hand, and community health services, on the other.

I have no doubt that your institution has plans—which I would be very interested in hearing—for the implementation of such a regional medical center—a center which will be a pilot project for tomorrow's medicine.

This forthright new program will not interfere with present patterns of patient care and professional practice but it is nonetheless a revolutionary piece of legislation. It holds enormous promise for advancing the quality of medical service available to the people of this country. It marks, I believe, the beginning of a big new step forward in accelerating the pace of progress in medical service to match the pace of medical science.

The support by the Government of a nationwide network of centers to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke will unquestionably add a new dimension to the Government's role in the support of the medical sciences.

But I want to make it abundantly clear that this is not a radical departure from traditional support of research by the Federal Government. It has never been the intent of Congress to build up in this country the greatest medical research organization in the world just for the sake of research. The National Institutes of Health, through which the Federal Government provides most of its support for medical research, have a clear mandate to conduct and support research—and I quote—"relating to the cause, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of physical and mental diseases and impairments of man." Research results which are found in the laboratory but which never reach a patient are of interest to science, but not to humanity.

The problem before us today is to bridge the gap between the laboratory and the patient—and in doing this it is important to remember that we are expanding an effort long underway—and in which the Government has a vital role—to improve the health of the American people.

The implementation of this dramatic piece of legislation demands your most imaginative and foresighted cooperation. There is no Federal blueprint for this program and it is not intended that there should be one. The pattern of grants-in-aid already so well established and so successful in the support of medical research will also be followed in this new program. Grants will be made in response to local initiative, to facilitate local planning, and to assist local execution of the plans.

The most important element in this program—as it has been in Federal support of research, hospital construction, and numerous other programs—is cooperation. The purpose—and, I am happy to say, the effect—of these programs has been to stimulate and assist local activity. The medical center we are dedicating today is an excellent example of this type of cooperation. The Federal Government, by contributing half the cost, has played a significant part in making this center possible. But we can all be proud that you not only supplied the initiative for this progressive development but that the other half of the funds came from non-Federal sources. The university itself and private contributors—in equal measure—combined to match the Federal grant-in-aid.

Those last two words are important. We have fallen into the slovenly habit of talking about Federal grants. Let us remember that they are properly called grants-in-aid. The full phrase conveys a significant attribute of these programs of which we should not lose sight. The role of the Federal Government is to aid, to assist, to stimulate activities that are in the total national interest but for which responsibility and direction must remain with those who will actually conduct them.

The glowing success of our national medical research effort is due in no small measure to the faithful adherence of the National Institutes of Health to this fundamental principle in the relationship between the Federal Government and the biomedical community.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the NIH will administer the new medical centers program as ably as it has administered its many other pioneering research and health programs.

It is natural to think of NIH in connection with the University of Utah. I recall that it was a study in muscular dystrophy at this college of medicine that led to the first extramural project to be sponsored by the NIH. It was an unusual combination of circumstances that made this Utah community ideal for the study of hereditary diseases such as muscular dystrophy.

Your special laboratory for the study of hereditary and metabolic disorders was organized for that project, and I note that the laboratory is still productive. You should take great pride in the record of accomplishments of this laboratory. It was this laboratory that first demonstrated that the effect of PKU—one of the diseases which cause mental retardation in children—is reversible through dietary measures. This laboratory also first discovered that muscular dystrophy includes many diseases—that it is not just one disease—and the laboratory's investigators were among the first to discover a test for detecting the gene for traits of so-called childhood dystrophy in women who are not crippled by the disease but can pass it on to their children.

I recall another early NIH project here—concerned with epilepsy—and which has been successful over the years. Under the leadership of Dr. Louis Goodman, this project has led to a better understanding of the mechanism of action of drugs against epileptic seizures, and I am told that he is currently studying the brain and its functions to increase our understanding of the effect of drugs on that vital organ.

Dr. Goodman's role in the discovery of the effectiveness of nitrogen mustard against one type of cancer brought him early recognition, and he and his coworkers are credited with the innovation of the treatment of cancer

with drugs—with the result that thousands of cancer patients are living longer lives.

The tangible and intangible benefits to be derived by any medical school from the pursuit of research are not only well appreciated here, but have seldom been stated so well as by Dean Castleton in the college of medicine bulletin. Research, he said, enlarges the faculty for classroom teaching in all aspects of modern medicine; increases the worldwide contacts of the faculty; provides student participation in research; and makes possible significant contributions to the advancement of medical knowledge.

The completion of this new medical center now makes it possible to house in one building—at least for the present—the research laboratories, college classrooms, and the teaching hospital. This center—plus the newly reorganized veterans' hospital nearby—provides undergraduate and graduate medical students with the most up-to-date medical teaching facilities.

The stage is now set for an even finer blending of medical research, teaching, and service, here at the University of Utah College of Medicine. This is in keeping with the stated goal of the college—to enable students to become efficient, independent, self-teaching physicians, with the ability and desire to keep abreast of advances in scientific medicine during the years following graduation.

I am particularly impressed with the activities of the division of postgraduate medical education. It is a noteworthy pioneering venture in coordinating the activities of the college of medicine with the various medical and scientific organizations in the whole intermountain area in an effort to provide opportunities for continuing medical education for the practicing physician.

I am impressed by the visits which your faculty members make to practicing physicians in distant, rural communities to help them keep up-to-date without leaving their busy practices. I am interested in the development of your medical TV clinics for practicing physicians—which other medical schools have adopted—and your two-way radio communications system between the University of Utah College of Medicine and hospitals throughout the State.

This is the sort of progressive thinking—the sort of imaginative new development—that we must have at the State and local levels throughout this Nation if we are to provide more and better health care for our people.

Providing more and better health care is, in a sense, an important new frontier. We have not done very well in making the best that medical science has to offer available to all our people, in all parts of the country. There is too long a time lag before the results of research are applied in medical practice throughout the Nation. Too often the quality of medical service available to a patient depends on where he lives—or on how much he can afford to pay.

The amount and effectiveness of the help that a patient receives should be solely dependent on the state of the art—not on the State in which he happens to live.

This will not be an easy goal to achieve and we shall have to face—and overcome—some tough problems.

You have probably seen some of the newspaper and magazine articles that have appeared all across the country worrying about the impact of medicare on our limited health resources. One of the most forceful of these pieces appeared in a national mass circulation magazine which said that medicare was being launched into a shambles. Now, it is not news to most of us that there is a serious shortage of hospitals and of health professional personnel of all kinds in this country. But instead of wringing our hands, we should roll up our sleeves and do more about it. Denying people medical care because we are short of facilities and personnel is not an acceptable solution.

Those of you in university circles—as well as those of us in Congress who are concerned with health legislation—are keenly aware that even to maintain our present inadequate ratio of physicians to population, we shall need 346,000 physicians by 1975. We have less than 290,000 today. Even with the Federal aid possible under current law, we can only increase the number of physicians produced annually from 7,500 to about 9,000 by 1975. At the end of the projected 10-year buildup, the annual shortage will still be 2,000 physicians. We shall be short about 15,000 dentists by 1980. There are fewer public health physicians in this country than there were 15 years ago. To provide for the national deficit in pharmacists and optometrists, the current number of graduates will have to be doubled, just to maintain current ratios. An so on with the other health fields.

This is a continuing problem—and one that some of us in Congress have been wrestling with for the past decade. We have had some success in dealing with it, too.

In the same month that the Congress passed the legislation for the regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer and stroke, it also passed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965 to augment our manpower sources. As many of you know, this act will provide funds for a 4-year program of basic and special improvement grants to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and optometry to enable these schools to increase the scope and quality of their teaching programs. This measure also extends student loan funds and—for the first time—provides a 4-year program from which scholarships up to $2,500 a year may be awarded to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry.

I am confident that this Nation can meet the increasing demands on the part of our citizens for a greater share in the benefits of the most up-to-date medical care. That is their right. I am confident that we can enlarge the base on which such an expansion of services must rest. We have had nearly two decades of progress under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act—which has assisted in the construction of nearly 5,700 health facilities in this country. We have had nearly 10 years experience with the Health Research Facilities Construction Act, which has played a major part in giving us a national medical research establishment that is second to none.

It is time—it is past time—that we take a comparable initiative in making the best in diagnostic and treatment services available to all of our people. We are making a start with a program aimed at the three diseases that are now the leading cause of death. It is the aim of the regional plan to bring the latest medical advances to every American everywhere, including those living in small towns, farm areas, the poorer sections of cities.

Thomas Jefferson said long ago that "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government." Our Government, through cooperative action with the medical community and our academic institutions, has gone a long way to lay a solid foundation for the continuous advancement of the medical sciences which are fundamental to the care of human life and happiness. We must now match this effort with programs for the continuous advancement of medical services—not only in terms of quality but of availability.

That is the major task now before us. That is the task to which this new medical center will help you to address yourselves. You can be proud of the spirited way in which you are rising to today's challenge and I salute you for it.

A PROVEN SUCCESS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will have before us the Conference Report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education bill. I rise in support of the Teacher Corps, a new provision added to the bill in the other body.

The first book of Ecclesiastes tells us that "There is no new thing under the sun." To hear some of my colleagues talk about the National Teacher Corps, I would have to say they are forgetful of their Bible.

They certainly are not mindful of what has been going on in education either. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the idea behind the Teacher Corps is not experimental nor is it revolutionary. It is a respectable idea that has been put to good use for many years by local schools and cooperating universities around the Nation. We are indebted to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts and his colleagues for including the Corps in the higher education bill. What we are discussing today is Federal recognition and assistance to a program that has had great meaning and has given great service to our schools. And yet a few of our colleagues here in the House seem frightened and threatened.

I would like very much to reassure them that the Teachers Corps idea, in particular its teacher intern provisions, are not experimental but tried and tested and found to be of great value.

The teacher intern idea dates back to 1895 when Brown University first tried it with the help of the schools of Providence, R.I. Since that time, 70 years ago, a growing number of colleges and universities have adopted the idea for their own teacher training programs.

Here are but a few: The University of Pittsburgh, Michigan State University, the University of California at four of its major campuses, Yale, Harvard, Berea College, the University of Chicago, Temple University, the University of Wisconsin, and Wesleyan University.

Educators from these and other colleges and universities have stated that, although their intern programs are successful both for the school children and the interns, that they can do no more without considerable financial help. All these schools have backed the idea of a Teacher Corps.

Three years ago a national survey was made and it turned up the interesting fact that 180 teacher-intern programs—similar to the one we are discussing today—were being conducted in public schools with the help of colleges and universities.

They are carrying on these programs with their own funds, often at some sacrifice for other programs—but they do this because they get something out of the program that is truly priceless—a

fine teacher, a teacher who will stay in the profession and remain dedicated to the advancement of education and the development of our youth.

Experience, they say, is the best teacher. These schools, across the country, have had experience with the very kind of thing we are talking about. And they recommend it. They recommend it highly.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, on this matter of experience. We know that 14 percent of first-year teachers—that is, 14 of every 100 college graduates who begin their teaching careers—drop out of the teaching profession before going into their second year on the job.

But a second year makes all the difference. The teacher dropout rate then plunges downward and the retention rate climbs comfortably. And this brings me back to a prime provision of the Teacher Corps as proposed in title V of the Higher Education Act.

Under this title, the Corps teacher would agree to serve for 2 years. In other words, we would be able to carry the beginning teacher over the hurdle of that first year.

We have every reason to believe that such a new teacher would then remain in the teaching profession, be a credit to it, and give to our children the kind of creative dedication they urgently need.

There are many reasons for supporting the Teacher Corps. But what interests me is the unfounded fear on the part of a few colleagues here that this program, for all its acknowledged merits, as some kind of risky experiment. It is not an experiment. It is already a success. It has been tried and verified and used and adopted by schools and colleges and universities great and small across America.

We here will lend our support to an approach to education that is needed and has been proven.

"There is no new thing under the sun," and there is no new thing under discussion now. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to join me in ratifying a proven success.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AS A POTENTIAL RESOURCE FOR HEALTH SERVICE MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most important goals is the protection of the health of its people. In support of this purpose we now have a vast store of information and experience. Through the medium of research, we have access to infinite sources of additional knowledge which will one day complete and perfect our efforts. We can be proud, indeed, of the position of world leadership which our Nation holds in the valuable human services of medical care and their essential supporting operations of medical research and medical education.

These gains have been made by dedicated men and women who have planned carefully and worked diligently to construct the social, economic, legal, and scientific complex upon which our health service professions are established. There is nothing fortuitous about the progress we have made thus far. In these highly technical and keenly competitive fields we can leave nothing to chance or contingency. We must plan to the very limits of intelligent foresight, and we must provide the tangible resources that will assure success.

The record which the Congress has established in the medical field has not been equaled. The actions which the 89th Congress has taken are tremendous and with this advance goes the demand for more facilities and a greatly increased need for medical and related personnel.

To name but a few of these measures, this year:

Public Law 89–105, which authorizes assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health services.

Public Law 89–109, which provides additional money for community health services;

Public Law 89–115 for the construction of health research facilities;

Public Law 89–239, the Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke Amendments of 1965;

H.R. 3141, which is likely to become law before this session adjourns and which has as its purpose the improvement of the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants for such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students and to further provide for student loans and aid in the construction of teaching facilities in such schools, and schools for other health professions; and

H.R. 3142, which seeks to provide adequate medical library services and facilities.

The effects of the medicare law effective next July have yet to be actually determined. From all indications, its impact on our entire medical and hospital system will be of the greatest proportions.

Yet, it seems to me that in all of this, the medical and hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the largest unit in the Federal field in the care of patients, are being ignored or at best not being utilized in the most productive fashion. This situation should not be permitted to continue. Any system which hospitalizes over 112,000 each day, and which is affiliated with 78 medical schools, has a ringside seat, to say the least, in any question involving medical care. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Veterans' Administration should not be on the sidelines in the medical training and education program, but should be one of the most active participants. It is for that reason that I have today introduced this bill, which I will include as a part of my remarks at the end thereof.

We are faced with a serious situation, which demands positive and aggressive action. Here, the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration can make a real and lasting contribution. It is uniquely qualified to do so.

THE HEALTH SERVICE MANPOWER NEED

To maintain our present ratio of 140 physicians for every 100,000 persons, 330,000 physicians will be needed by 1975. This will require the annual production of 11,000 medical school graduates, 3,600 more than the 1959 total. Present estimates indicate that by 1975 our annual graduation rate will be only 9,185. To bridge the gap between essential medical manpower and our present rate of supply, we have relied heavily on the importation of physicians from other countries.

In dentistry there has been a decline in the ratio of active non-Federal dentists for every 1,000 civilians from 49.9 in 1950 to 44.9 in 1963.

The Surgeon General's Consulting Group on Nursing estimated in 1963 a need for 850,000 practicing professional nurses by 1970. This compares to a national supply of 550,000 in 1962, of whom 117,000 were working only part time. To achieve the objective would require the graduation of 100,000 nurses annually by 1969. This year there will be approximately 32,200 graduates of U.S. Schools of Nursing, or a net addition to our national nurse supply of only 10,000, since 23,000 can be expected to leave the profession within the year.

Our national supply of physical therapists is 10,000, as compared to an estimated current need for 15,000. Many of these people, too, work only part time. In occupational therapy the prospects are even less bright. There are at present 7,500 qualified occupational therapists in the country, less than half of whom are professionally active. The national need is estimated at 12,000 with 4,000 new graduates needed annually. The current graduation rate is 400.

There are 38,000 registered medical technologists, of whom only 28,000 work full time. An additional 25,000 are needed. There is a similar shortage of radiological technicians.

Because of the large percentage of persons over 65 who have suffered strokes and who need speech rehabilitation, there is a great need for therapists specializing in speech training. It is estimated that not more than 250 trained persons provide speech rehabilitation for aphasic patients on a full-time basis. More than twice this number is needed to meet the current demand.

To fill existing vacancies, the country needs 15,000 more qualified social workers at the master's degree level. There are now 6,600 students in 56 graduate schools of social work; 2,700 graduate annually.

The American Hospital Association reported last week that 1,887,000 persons were employed in hospitals in 1964. This represents 133 hospital staff members for every 100 patients, as compared to 73 in 1946.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke said:

We must expand the basic resources and facilities for educating and training health personnel. We must develop increased opportunities for education and training leading to careers in the health occupations.

A valuable partial solution to these and other problems may lie in the decision to bring into full use the already existing capacity for health service manpower training in the Veterans' Administration. The magnitude of the existing Veterans' Administration program is shown by the table which follows:

Training program	Number of affiliated medical schools, colleges, and/or universities	Number of trainees	Cost of program fiscal year 1966	Consultant funds
1. Medical residency (noncareer)	78	4,800	$17,723,000	[1] $2,000,000
2. Medical school students (primarily clinical clerkship)	78	9,000	[2]	[3]
3. Dental residents (noncareer)	16	45	237,600	[3]
4. Dental school students	6	400	[3]	[3]
5. Social work	63	520	1,104,840	[3]
6. Psychology	68	810	3,340,800	275,000
7. Pharmacy residents	14	21	91,476	5,000
8. P.M. & R. therapies	133	1,090	241,920	[3]
9. Blind rehabilitation	2	58	[3]	[3]
10. Audiology and speech pathology	31	110	553,248	[3]
11. Hospital administration residency program	4	8	66,073	[3]
12. Hospital librarian	16	16	86,400	[3]
13. Dietetic residents and interns	8	13	29,740	[3]
14. X-ray technician	3	20	[3]	[3]
15. Dental hygienist and dental assistant	15	115	[3]	[3]
16. Medical technology	11	80	105,840	[3]
17. Nurse anesthetist and inhalation therapist	2	25	[3]	[3]
18. Nursing:				
(a) Basic collegiate schools of nursing	67	4,570	[4] 294,057	[3]
(b) Junior colleges	20			
(c) Diploma schools	51			
(d) Graduate	21			

[1] Estimated at 25 percent of time of consultants at total projected cost of approximately $8,000,000 for consultants in VA hospitals in fiscal year 1966.
[2] An undetermined cost is engendered for quarters and food for clinical clerks.
[3] Not available.
[4] An undetermined cost is engendered for quarters, subsistence, and laundry for student nurses in some hospitals

THE HOSPITAL AS THE NATURAL AND ESSENTIAL LOCALE FOR HEALTH SERVICE TRAINING

In the health service field, the general colleges and universities are a valuable and often essential asset, but in themselves universities are usually not complete health service training facilities. The role of the hospital as the essential and proper setting for much of the training in this field has emerged and become preeminent in recent years. The kind of training that was done in classrooms with blackboards, charts, and other inanimate tools of education has quite largely given way to the actual clinical setting in which the trainee is exposed very early to real life situations of patient care and to close associations with the many other technical disciplines that form the patient-care team. The superiority of this approach to medical and ancillary training is now so widely accepted that teaching hospitals find themselves functioning as a kind of multidisciplinary college. In their staffing and architectural facilities, many are quite incompletely prepared for this new role.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TRAINING RECORD

For almost 20 years, hospitals of the Veterans' Administration have been offering hospital-based educational experience in collaboration with most of the Nation's medical schools—78 of the 86 accredited schools—and more than 200 colleges and universities. The success and productivity of this partnership between an agency of the Government and the non-Federal system of higher education has won the confidence and praise of educators, scientists, and political leaders throughout the world.

Although the training record of the Veterans' Administration has been spectacular in its quality, the quantitative output has been severely limited. The Veterans' Administration has no legal mandate to engage broadly in the training of health service personnel. Except for the physician and dental programs, funds and physical facilities have been provided only in support of limited training activities directly related to the agency mission and scaled to agency recruitment needs. Despite the fact that the Veterans' Administration is one of the Nation's largest employers of health service manpower, the agency has never been charged with responsibility or vested with the clear authority to replace its own usage, much less to make a positive contribution to the total health service manpower needs of the Nation. Despite these restrictions the Veterans' Administration hospital system contributes each to the training of more than 15,000 health service personnel in more than 25 different employment categories.

THE POTENTIAL OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN TRAINING

The important point here is this. In no training category are the staff and teaching resources of the Veterans' Administration system used to full capacity, and in all but two or three categories the number of trainees is scarcely more than a token of the total training potential. In a hospital system authorized to operate 125,000 beds, with more than 5 percent of the Nation's medical manpower, and with established working relationships in hundreds of universities and medical schools, the potential training capacity is truly enormous.

It is difficult to know exactly what it would cost to expand the entire spectrum of the Veterans' Administration's capacity to train health service manpower, or just how rapidly this can be accomplished. It is obvious, however, that the cost can be only a fraction of that which would be incurred if we are forced to create an entirely new resource to accomplish this training. It is clear, also, that much less time will be lost if we expand and build on existing plants and functioning organizations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The experience gained during 20 years of voluntary cooperation between Veterans' Administration medical programs and institutions of higher learning clearly indicates what can and should be done at this point. Only minor changes are needed to create the legal environment which will encourage and support the health service training programs of the Veterans' Administration, and give them dignity and proper recognition, and initiate a period of renewed growth and vigor.

My proposal, therefore, is a simple one. First, it would amend section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, which describes the general functions of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery. It would add the function of training and education of health service personnel to the already established functions of a complete medical and hospital service—patient care—and medical research. This action is in full consonance with the basic intent of the law and strengthens its logic by giving recognition to the widely accepted proposition that patient care, first and foremost, and then research and education in medicine are interdependent and essentially inseparable activities.

Second, it would amend section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, which deals with medical advisory groups. Here it would broaden the original concept of advisory liaison between the Veterans' Administration and the academic medical community. In addition to the Special Medical Advisory Group—composed of distinguished physicians from across the country—which meets in Washington once every 3 months, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be empowered to establish local advisory bodies at the individual hospitals where education and training activities exist or can profitably be developed. These advisory bodies would include personnel of the Veterans' Administration and of the medical center or other entity which has agreed to cooperate in the training programs.

The deans' committees which were informally established by administrative policy memorandum have been very largely responsible for the high quality of medical care that has characterized the Veterans' Administration hospital system since World War II. The function of these committees, however, has been limited to the physician training programs and has served as a mechanism of liaison with medical schools only. The advisory bodies proposed in

this amendment would provide supervision for the training of all types of health service personnel to be extended from all elements of a university medical center complex. Thus, the Veterans' Administration training programs can be related to schools of nursing, schools of social work service, university departments of psychology, and so on through a single advisory body. Despite the great success of the deans' committee mechanism, it is generally agreed among medical educators and hospital administrators that a broader and more formalized structure must be set up if we are to realize the full potential of the Veterans' Administration in the training of health service manpower. The local advisory bodies will also serve to maintain a high degree of decentralization which is so essential to experimentation and creativity in the pursuit of education.

I plan to submit this proposal to the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans' Administration, and the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense, with the request that reports and suggestions be placed on an expedited basis. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I plan to submit this bill to medical, academic, and scientific groups for the benefit of their advice and suggestions.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11631

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to more effectively carry out the functions imposed on the Department of Medicine and Surgery by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator, acting in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing; other institutions of higher education; medical centers; hospitals; and such other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Administrator deems appropriate, shall carry out a program of training and education of health service personnel."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by amending the subheading thereof to read "§ 4112. ADVISORY BODIES", (2) by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In each case where the Administrator has a contract or agreement with any school, institution of higher learning, medical center, hospital, or other public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, for the training or education of health service personnel, he shall establish an advisory committee. Such advisory committee shall advise the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director with respect to policy matters arising in connection with, and the operation of, the program with respect to which it was appointed. Members of each such advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrator and shall include personnel of the Veterans' Administration, and of the entity with which the Administrator has entered into such contract or agreement. The number of members and terms of members of each advisory committee shall be prescribed by the Administrator."

(b) The analysis of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Medical Advisory Group" and inserting in lieu thereof "Advisory bodies".

A SENSE OF MISSION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

The brightest, most modern classroom in the country—the best stocked, most highly automated library in the country—as desirable and as fine as these may be—they can never take the place of a dedicated, highly motivated teacher who understands the needs of children, especially the children of poverty.

Only through education can we salvage the lives of these children, Mr. Speaker, and there are 10 million of them in the Nation today. Ten million. Yes, only through education, through fine teachers, can these millions of children be rescued.

We need new teachers who will get special training in the problems that surround poverty—teachers with what President Johnson has called "a sense of mission."

The Teacher Corps will provide such teacher interns with that "sense of mission." I have no doubt of this. It is clear in the record of the hearings held on the proposal. It is clear in the excellent presentation made to us by the conference committee. It can be, Mr. Speaker, a reality.

Underlying every effort to make the Corps a reality is the sure knowledge that it will work. I have no doubts on that score.

Study after study has shown how effective a teacher can be if he is especially trained to work with disadvantaged children. Study after study has shown that special training programs for teachers in low-income areas produces better students who become better adults and better citizens.

But the time for making studies, for evaluating studies, for analyzing studies, and then for making more studies has past. Now is the time to make use of those studies throughout the Nation.

For this is not a radical new program that is being offered to us today. Brown University, one of our finest institutions of higher learning, has had a teacher intern program going since 1895. It has produced teachers of excellence who have served not only in the proud State of Rhode Island but in over half the States of the Nation as well. Wisconsin, Michigan, Harvard, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of California—four of its many campuses—all of these plus many others have been operating teacher intern programs with local schools for many years.

Outside of his own family, a child's teacher is the most important person in his life. An understanding and inspired teacher can influence a child's outlook on life and his whole future.

The Teacher Corps will attract the most talented and dedicated young people graduating from our colleges and universities. They will seize this opportunity for service where they are so critically needed.

When the Teacher Corps is in operation, we will have narrowed a large gap that has handicapped thousands of our children for many years and impeded American progress generally.

Teaching teams set up through the Teacher Corps would go to a school district upon a request from that district itself.

The program is designed to provide for maximum flexibility in making assignments for Corps teachers with special qualifications needed in any particular area. Each local school district will itself control the assignments of the individual teachers within the school system, transfers within the system, the subjects taught by the members of the Corps, and the term and continuance of the Corps member within the school system.

In our society, the Nation's teachers are extremely important people, for we are dedicated to the goal that each child shall have quality in education and full opportunities to reach the top of his abilities, in whatever direction they incline. We seek the best teachers we can develop and the highest possible quality in education for all of our children.

As President Johnson said in his message to this House on July 17:

> The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing today an issue of dedication, of quality in education, of great need by thousands of school districts under terrible pressures, and above all, the issue of 10 million children who are waiting for our help.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join with me in their wholehearted support for this proposed Teacher Corps contained within the Higher Education Act of 1965.

NATIONALIZATION OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES OR SERVICES OR SKILLS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a resolution passed October 8, 1965, by the Mas-

sachusetts State Labor Council, AFL–CIO:

RESOLUTION NATIONALIZATION OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES OR SERVICES OR SKILLS

Whereas the nationalization of industries is an abhorrent to a free enterprise system as we enjoy in these United States; and

Whereas AFL–CIO unions detest the act of government taking over or the threat of taking over our rights as independent working men and women and citizens as we sometimes experience during incipient or actual strike action; and

Whereas we, in the AFL–CIO, abhor compulsions that infringe on our American rights, whether it be compulsory arbitration or other compulsions flowing from rules of regimentation by Government departments; and

Whereas there is no known AFL–CIO union on record as favoring the nationalization of their own specific union or industry; and

Whereas representatives of specific International and Local Unions are elected because they have become more expert concerning matters in their particular industry; therefore, nationalization or governmentalization of industries should not be an AFL–CIO aim unless the advocate's own industry in nationalized first; and

Whereas nationalization of an industry would place such workers under governmental aegis with restrictions on free and open political action as we understand it under COPE because of the restrictions of the Hatch Act; and

Whereas we in the AFL–CIO advocate that our Government not make available cheap clothing, steel, shoes, tools, and all other products of labor by glutting this country with foreign made products which is cheaper because of cheaper wages or standards of these workers; and

Whereas our education under the union label and services program teach us that we should combat cheap goods and services that are a result of cheap labor and low working conditions of nonunion shops in companies and industries; and

Whereas nationalization of industries, particularly electric utilities, rarely make provisions in these laws for unionism through collective bargaining provisions which is the main reason for our own existence as unions; and

Whereas the record shows that barely 3 percent of all electric utilities under government are organized into the legitimate AFL–CIO; and

Whereas the record also shows that whether the electric utility is municipally owned, a public power district or otherwise controlled by government, collective bargaining has been denied and local unions destroyed or prevented; and

Whereas the rates of pay and other working conditions, on the whole, are far inferior and lower than those that bona fide AFL–CIO unions have negotiated; and

Whereas the philosophy of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley is repealed in more than 92 percent of the contracts between AFL–CIO unions and private utilities in permissible States and even in the so-called right-to-work States, AFL–CIO unions have clauses to provide for union security in the event of the repeal of this obnoxious section as opposed to the factual denial of unions, whatsoever, in 97 percent of the so-called public power companies; and

Whereas the AFL–CIO affiliated unions in the private utilities have never advocated that other AFL–CIO affiliates be placed under nationalization conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this eighth constitutional convention of the Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, go on record of supporting the free enterprise system and its principles as practiced in the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose the nationalization or government control of any industry where union-represented companies can and will meet the needs of the country or community adequately.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week of October 18, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period on account of travel outside the United States on official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. CAREY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. BURKE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 317. An act for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 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;

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;

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, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. 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 Earle Davis; and

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his

approval, bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 14, 1965:

H.J. Res. 695. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes;

On October 15, 1965:

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile;

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

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1676. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey," for fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1677. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1678. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1679. A letter from the Treasurer, American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting a copy of the audit report for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1680. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first-preference classification, pursuant to section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of October 14, 1965, the following bills were reported October 15, 1965:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9424. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted October 18, 1965*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee of Conference. S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1170). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11625. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 11626. A bill to amend section 1498 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to actions for compensation for the use or manufacture by or for the United States of a patented invention during the term of the patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 11628. A bill to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 11629. A bill to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11630. A bill to provide certain rights for employees of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11631. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11632. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the termination of pension of certain veterans being furnished hospital treatment or institutional or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 11633. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a velodrome in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res.767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 768. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 769. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 770. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to collective action and joint consultation in response to threats to the integrity and self-determination of any member of the inter-American system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 610. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

372. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, transmitting a copy of Senate Joint Resolution O as passed on October 5, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to Presidential succession, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S.-Flag Lines Adrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, at the annual convention of the Association of Water Transportation Accounting Officials at Hershey, Pa., on October 15, 1965. It is the good fortune of the Congress to have among the New York delegation one like Representative MURPHY who brings to his assignment on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee a fulsome background and experience in the shipping problems of New York and the country and who has been most diligent in the discharge of his duties.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF WATER TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTING OFFICIALS AT HERSHEY, PA., ON OCT. 15, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to be with you here today. You couldn't have chosen a more delightful place to hold your annual convention. In fact, this community and the surrounding countryside are so attractive and pleasant that it is somewhat difficult to bring one's self down to the serious business of discussing our drifting maritime policy.

At the time I commenced preparation of these remarks, rumors were circulating that the interagency maritime task force on maritime policy, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, was about to release a new shipping program which would introduce drastic changes to all existing policy and authority. Soon the press carried stories which seemed to confirm the rumors. Then came official denials. Then came reproduction in the New York Journal of Commerce on September 28 of the full text of the alleged position paper of the task force. Then more official denials. And finally, on October 7, the rumors and the stories were confirmed with the official release and presentation to the Maritime Advisory Committee of a document, entitled "The Merchant Marine in National Defense and Trade: A Policy and a Program."

Release of the long-awaited policy and program, however, did little, if anything, to clarify the picture.

In a reportedly stormy session, the Maritime Advisory Committee, composed of a cross section of all elements of our maritime industry in both labor and management, unanimously adopted a resolution not to accept the task force report, on the grounds that it was contrary to the existing statement of policy contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; contrary to the directive of the President establishing the Maritime Advisory Committee; contrary to the policy adopted by the Committee; and contrary to the statements made by the Secretary of Commerce last May.

Most interesting was the fact that even before the Under Secretary of Commerce started to explain the report, the Secretary of Labor, a member of the task force, announced his disagreement with much of the contents of the report. With this background it will most certainly be interesting to review the President's transportation message to the Congress early next year.

Knowing the interest and involvement which all of you have with regard to the American merchant marine and our shipping policies, I am sure you are familiar with press accounts of the proposed new policy and program.

Among other things, radical changes are proposed in this construction and operating subsidy systems, relating the amounts of merchant marine subsidies solely to national emergency needs for military and urgent civilian shipping. The task force states that adequate Government aid would be provided to insure these national emergency needs but "aid systems would be restructured and funds reprogramed to obtain the maximum capacity per dollar input." In simpler terms, the objective is "more bang for the buck"—and fewer bucks. It is conservatively estimated that by 1975 the gross national product could exceed $880 billion and by 1985 could reach $1¼ trillion. By the clever use of mirrors, the report attempts to show that by 1985 with an annual Federal outlay of approximately $387 million—$29 million less than under present conditions—we can have a merchant marine carrying double the present volume of U.S. foreign commerce. To do this it is proposed that—

Construction and operating subsidy aid would be made available to the bulk carrier segment of the industry.

Cargo preference in all its aspects would be phased out—ultimately eliminated.

Seagoing employment would be reduced by as much as 20,000 jobs, to a level somewhat more than one-half of the present 47,000 jobs.

Passenger shipping would be phased out over the next 10 years or so.

Commercial shipbuilding would be supported up to about the present level upon the joint determination of the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce as to shipbuilding capacity required to meet national security needs. Beyond that, any operator in the offshore bulk or liner trades may build abroad and still be eligible for operating subsidy. Domestic operators may also build abroad without loss of any coastwise privileges.

Operating differential subsidy should be paid on an incentive basis calculated on a percentage of gross revenues, except that no operating differential subsidy will be paid to liners with regard to Government-sponsored cargoes.

The trade route system would be either eliminated or vastly modified.

Though the report contains many fine words to assure the belief that the proposal will lead to less Government participation and interference in shipping than at present, the fine print shows that the heavy hand of big brother will be felt at every turn. There seem to be numerous situations in which Government aid can be summarily reduced or withdrawn. For example, it states the MARAD "Should have authority to decide whether a subsidized operator's participation in a conference, pool and or other agreement inimical to the objection of the subsidy, to require the operator to withdraw from such agreements or lose subsidy."

The report is one big package of controversy and seems to have been prepared in total ignorance or disregard of existing policies and statutory authority. As one shipping official put it—some of the suggestions seem to be in the nature of "burning the house down to get at a leaky roof". I am told that the report was prepared with virtually no consultation or advice from practical shipping people.

I, for one, am glad to see this report brought into the open. Whether one agrees with it or not, it clearly delineates certain areas in which our maritime policy needs reaffirmation or strengthening. By having been formally presented by the Task Force, it defines issues more clearly than the various preceding studies that have come forth with frequency in the postwar years. Now we have something we can sink our teeth into.

Because of the official status of the report, the Congress has a clear and immediate responsibility to review and analyze it in the greatest detail. I anticipate that congressional committee staffs will initiate such analysis during the remaining months of this session and that congressional scrutiny through comprehensive hearings will begin early in the next session. We should, and I feel sure that we will, give the authors of the proposed changed program and policy every opportunity to explain and justify the details of their recommendations.

By the same token, it behooves all segments of our maritime industry to apply their own careful and objective scrutiny to every word in this report so that we in Congress may have the benefit of your views.

While I must confess that the full text of the report has not been available long enough for me to have studied it in fine detail, I can readily see where adoption of some of the recommendations will require the particular attention of you gentlemen in the accounting field. It looks as if there would be a greatly increased proliferation of accounts due to the differing treatments that would be given to the subsidization or nonsubsidization of various types of cargo. As another example, the problem of determining parity for bulk carriers on a worldwide basis will certainly present a challenge.

Before closing, I want to take this opportunity to announce that I intend to join with others who have already done so to introduce legislation which would return the guidance and administration of our maritime policy to independent status. Events over the past 4 years have convinced me that a maritime administration buried deep in the realm of a large department devoted primarily to other things has not been satisfactory. Nor has the creation of a variety of special non-Government advisory committees and interdepartmental committees and task forces permitted the development and exercise of responsible leadership by the agency created for that purpose.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks, you may have noticed that every national leader in the Republican Party has denounced and repudiated the John Birch Society.

I am sure that most people know what my own views on the extremist John Birch Society are. But because we have,

in Kansas, a substantial number of acknowledged members of the Birch Society, plus a large number of people who think and talk and act like Birch Society members, I want to make my own position crystal clear.

My position is that those people have no place in the Republican Party. For that matter, they have no place in Kansas politics, and no place in American politics. They have no program for the Republican Party, they have no program for Kansas, and they have no program for the United States of America. Their major program is fear and hate.

Now, some people have said they know some good people who are members of the Birch Society. Good people? If they are good people, they had better get as far away from the Birch Society and from extremists who think and talk and act like Birchers, as they can. The Birch Society stands for the proposition that Dwight Eisenhower was an agent of the Communist conspiracy; that John Foster Dulles was a Communist involved in treason against America; that America today is 60 to 80 percent Communist controlled and influenced, and they are still putting out the same kinds of stuff. For example, these people—these Birch members and people who act like Birchers—are now helping to foist on the public the book, "None Dare Call It Treason." This is an extremist Birch-type warning of an imminent Communist takeover in the United States, and it ends up by urging its readers to join the Birch Society.

To sum up, because of the substantial Birch membership and Birch-type activity in Kansas, I want to make my position crystal clear. There is no place in the Republican Party either for Birch Society members or for people who act like Birchers. There is no place for these people anywhere in Kansas politics or in American politics. These people have no program for the Republican Party, no program for Kansas, and no program for the United States of America. Their major program is hate and fear; and I, for one, will always be glad to stand up and be counted against hate and fear.

Two and a Half Billion Dollars Gambled on Foreign Lotteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, I have brought to the attention of the Members of this Congress a report on gross receipts and net incomes from government-run lotteries around the world. These nations have wisely discovered that lotteries can make gambling moneys work for rather than against the people. In all of these countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Unfortunately, we, in the United States, stand virtually alone among the nations of the world in our hypocrisy in refusing to recognize and accept the wisdom and advantages of a national lottery.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for our taxpayers to understand our Government's sanctimonious attitude about gambling when we know that gambling in this country is a $100 billion a year tax-free monopoly which is and continues to be the chief source of revenue to the underworld crime syndicates.

If we had a Government-run lottery, like our Latin American, European, and Asian allies do with near unanimity, we would satisfy the American thirst to gamble while at the same time making the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by the underworld work instead for public welfare. I think we could expect an American lottery to bring in gross receipts of $10 billion or so, with commensurate profits.

In 1964, the 84 foreign countries, listed below, took in gross receipts of almost $2½ billion from its legally operated government lotteries. The total income to the governments came to over $850 million which was used for hospitals, schools, housing, welfare, charity, science, medicare, public developments, and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we showed similar wisdom and courage in this country? Is it not time that we remove the blinders and recognized the obvious—that the urge to gamble is a universal human trait that should be regulated and controlled for our own welfare and benefit?

Why can we not profit from the lucrative experience of these 84 foreign countries? I am waiting for us to have the guts to face up to the fiscal facts of life and capitalize on the normal gambling spirit of our American people. I think we ought to profit nationally from the example of the State of New Hampshire, which has already started to enjoy the fiscal advantages of a government-run lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to list below the 84 foreign countries which recognize and accept the fact that gambling is a fact of life and should be made to work for the public good rather than against it:

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
1. Argentina	$37,712,000	$17,164,000	Public works and medical programs.
2. Australia	99,575,000	29,923,000	Hospitals, welfare, and Sydney Opera House.
3. Austria	20,600,000	7,100,000	General purposes.
4. Belgium	21,400,000	7,820,000	Social welfare programs.
5. Bolivia [1]	789,355	347,146	Red Cross, public health, and welfare.
6. Brazil	30,604,000	1,803,000	Public service projects, schools, hospitals, and housing.
7. British Honduras	3,500,000	90,000	Charities.
8. Bulgaria [2]			
9. Burma	5,235,000	2,094,000	Central Treasury.
10. Cambodia	27,400,000	20,200,000	National budget.
11. Cameroon	272,000	126,000	Schools, hospitals.
12. Ceylon	1,393,000	610,000	Economic development.
13. Chile	13,500,000	2,407,000	Colleges, public health, and hospitals.
14. Colombia	40,000,000	4,000,000	Homes for the poor and aged, and charity.
15. Costa Rica	11,056,000	3,602,000	Hospitals and mental institutions.
16. Cyprus	1,190,000	620,000	Development.
17. Czechoslovakia	4,436,000	1,919,000	Hospitals, sports, and culture.
18. Denmark	8,235,000	617,000	General fund.
19. Dominican Republic [3]	12,258,000	2,589,887	Social betterment and public works.
20. Ecuador	4,282,000	1,307,000	Social assistance hospitals.
21. El Salvador	23,020,000	3,500,000	Welfare services.
22. England [4]	245,000,000	143,000,000	Central government expenses.
23. Ethiopia	1,440,000	202,000	Welfare purposes.
24. Finland	6,311,000	2,165,000	Science and fine arts, opera.
25. France	139,000,000	44,000,000	General purposes.
26. Gabon	50,000	25,000	Red Cross, youth.
27. Germany	545,000,000	182,000,000	Youth, sports activities and health.
28. Ghana	3,000,000	1,500,000	General fund.
29. Gibraltar	$1,967,000	$450,000	General revenue and social services.
30. Greece	31,618,000	7,007,000	Welfare agencies.
31. Guatemala	2,486,000	613,000	National theater, arts, and culture.
32. Haiti	2,416,000	1,039,000	Education, social welfare, and assistance.
33. Honduras	19,869,000	2,109,000	Schools, hospitals, and health centers.
34. Hong Kong	1,750,000	700,000	Social welfare.
35. Hungary	48,500,000	19,700,000	General revenue.
36. Iceland [5]	960,000	310,000	Housing for elderly and research.
37. India [6]	5,400,000	4,200,000	General revenue.
38. Indonesia	750,000	450,000	Hospitals, students, and orphanages.
39. Iran	19,100,000	6,950,000	Hospitals and schools.
40. Iraq	956,000	460,000	Hospitals, welfare.
41. Ireland	43,460,000	10,580,000	Hospitals.
42. Israel	26,700,000	8,000,000	Hospitals and schools.
43. Italy [7]	97,450,000	52,565,600	Hospitals, orphanages, and education.
44. Jamaica	714,000	103,000	Hospitals.
45. Japan	14,014,000	5,183,000	Public works, schools, and hospitals.
46. Jordan [8]	54,000	3,000	Hospitals, junior clubs.
47. Laos [9]			
48. Lebanon	4,300,000	1,100,000	Schools and development.
49. Libya	1,200,000	370,000	Poor.
50. Luxembourg [10]	1,562,300	624,920	Charity, welfare, and medicare.
51. Malaysia	16,530,000	4,000,000	Rural development program.
52. Malta	1,271,000	193,000	General purposes.
53. Mexico [11]	60,000,000	11,200,000	Health and welfare.
54. Morocco	2,410,000	600,000	Treasury.
55. Netherlands	10,228,000	1,000,000	General revenue.
56. New Zealand	11,025,000	2,690,000	Aged, welfare, research, medicine.
57. Nicaragua	5,078,000	858,000	Hospitals and social programs.

See footnotes at end of table.

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
58. Nigeria	$393,000	$128,000	Medical services and development programs.
59. Norway	18,900,000	5,860,000	General funds.
60. Panama	47,171,000	8,089,000	Hospitals and public assistance.
61. Pakistan [12]	7,289,909	6,404,031	General development projects.
62. Paraguay	748,000	158,000	Child care and public health.
63. Peru	4,000,000	672,000	Hospital and medical care.
64. Philippines	14,000,000	6,000,000	Hospitals, Red Cross, Boy and Girl Scouts.
65. Poland	3,932,000	933,143	Housing and culture.
66. Portugal	21,347,000	6,998,000	Public assistance.
67. Puerto Rico	60,000,000	11,989,000	Public improvements.
68. Republic of China	5,850,000	2,633,000	General purposes.
69. Republic of Congo	8,000	888	
70. Rumania [13]			50 percent of income used for sports.
71. Russia [14]	113,220,000	56,610,000	Unknown.
72. Sierra Leone	676,000	219,000	Development programs.
73. Southern Rhodesia	$4,580,000	$745,000	
74. Spain	164,900,000	50,000,000	Red Cross and general budget.
75. Sweden	61,084,000	33,978,000	Culture and artistic purposes.
76. Switzerland	11,000,000	3,000,000	Public building and transportation.
77. Syria	1,250,000	450,000	Damascus International Fair.
78. Thailand	38,460,000	10,384,000	General revenue.
79. Turkey	9,400,000	4,300,000	General treasury.
80. Uganda [15]	714,000	678,000	5-year plan.
81. Uruguay	14,924,000	4,952,000	General purposes.
82. Venezuela	18,524,000	1,665,000	Social welfare.
83. Vietnam	26,000,000	9,000,000	Housing and agriculture centers.
84. Yugolsavia	10,189,000	1,509,000	Veterans, deaf, and blind, Red Cross.
Total	2,264,596,000	850,305,000	

[1] Bolivia: 1963 figures only available.
[2] Bulgaria: Figures not available.
[3] Dominican Republic: 1963 figures only available.
[4] England: Premium bond savings lottery.
[5] Iceland: 1963 figures only available.
[6] India: Price bond lottery.
[7] Italy: 1963 figures only available.
[8] Jordan: 1963 figures only available.
[9] Laos: Laotian lottery interrupted by coup d'etat.
[10] Luxembourg: 1963 figures only available.
[11] Mexico: 1963 figures only available.
[12] Pakistan: Prize bond lottery, 1963 figures.
[13] Rumania: Figures not available.
[14] Russia: 1963 figures only available.
[15] Uganda: Prize bond lottery.

Congressman Wright Patman Speaks at Veterans of World War I and Senior Citizens Day Celebration at Texas State Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative of the First Congressional District of Texas, has distinguished himself as a friend of the veteran in his service for 19 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives. As the author of the bonus bill for the veterans of World War I, and in his long service he has continued a long fight for the welfare of our veterans and the senior citizens of this Nation.

It is only fitting that this great Congressman was chosen to speak at the State Fair of Texas on the Veterans of World War I and Senior Citizens Day celebration, as he has been a constant supporter of adequate legislation for these groups.

Congressman PATMAN was the first Congressman to introduce the World War II GI bill of rights in the House and he was the author of the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946. Now, Congressman PATMAN is a leading supporter for the cold war GI bill which is now pending in the House after passing the Senate earlier this session. Congressman PATMAN is an outstanding, devoted Congressman who has brought great benefits to the people of Texas and this Nation in his 36 years as a Congressman.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the State Fair of Texas which is held this year from October 9 through October 24. This annual fair is the largest single celebration in Texas and leads the Nation in annual attendance at State fairs. Founded in 1886, the fair occupies more than 200 acres of ground in Dallas, Tex., and has outstanding historical, educational, and amusement facilities which are attended by more than 2½ million people each year.

I invite all of my colleagues to come to visit this outstanding exhibit in my home State and view its remarkable exhibition.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech which Congressman PATMAN delivered at the State Fair of Texas be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND SENIOR CITIZENS DAY CELEBRATION, TEXAS STATE FAIR, DALLAS, TEX., OCTOBER 13, 1965

It is fitting that the State Fair of Texas set aside a day to honor World War I veterans and senior citizens.

Texas has always contributed heavily to the Nation's Armed Forces. In World War I, some of the finest fighting units were dominated by personnel from the Lone Star State.

Today, the State of Texas has more than 1 million veterans of all wars living within its borders. At least 91,000 are veterans of World War I. When the Nation called, Texans have been ready.

I am happy to see so many of my old comrades out here at the State fair today. You are justifiably proud of your contributions at a time of maximum peril and maximum need for your country. Many of you and your families paid a heavy price, but the world survived because of the sacrifices of you and your fellow countrymen.

All of us who fought in World War I thought we were engaged in a war to end war. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Since that time we have seen World War II, the Korean conflict, and many other smaller engagements involving American servicemen throughout the world.

Most of this century, we have been in war or on the verge of war.

Today, American fighting men once again are scattered around the globe. In Vietnam, thousands of U.S. soldiers and marines are engaged in combat. Many are dying and many are being wounded. It is a tough, bloody, hard war.

None of us in Congress and no one in the Johnson administration wants to see these casualty lists grow. Certainly we are not in this war by choice. But, do we really have any choice?

We have a solemn commitment in South Vietnam and I believe the great majority of this country wants us to keep that commitment. As veterans of a world war, you know well the folly of weakness, retreat, or surrender. If we abandon South Vietnam, what is next? Where do we draw the line?

President Johnson's resolute stand in Vietnam, has, I believe, strengthened the chances for a meaningful peace around the world. His firm position has let the Communist world know that he means business. It has lessened the chances of miscalculation.

At the same time that the President has taken concrete military action, he has consistently held out the offer to negotiate. But the Communists do not want peace, they want domination of all of southeast Asia.

Let me assure you that President Johnson is a man of peace. As a decorated veteran of World War II, President Johnson knows the heartbreak and destruction of war firsthand. His efforts in the foreign field are directed toward preventing a catastrophic third world war. I sincerely hope that you veterans, as individuals and through your organizations, will support the President's efforts in the foreign relations field and give support to his moves for meaningful and lasting world peace.

Until we do have lasting understandings, we must face the prospect of many American young men serving in the country's Armed Forces. The Vietnam war already has required large numbers and the needs seem certain to mount in coming months. I hope that the country will see that this new group of veterans receives benefits comparable to those accorded men who served in some of our most recent conflicts. Today's military man, it must be said truthfully, serves under conditions much better than those which you experienced in the First World War. Many of you served throughout World War I for just about $1 a day. And out of that dollar came allotments, insurance, and incidental expenses.

All of you know the tremendous opposition we faced after the war when we attempted to adjust this situation. That was the famous fight for adjusted service certificates, which eventually became known under the popular title of "soldier's bonus."

I sincerely hope that our current crop of veterans will not have to go through such

a fight for the benefits they have rightfully earned. But, frankly, I am very proud of the fight that I made for this World War I soldier's bonus. As you know—and some of you fought right along beside me in this battle—we had to overcome the big banker's friend, Andrew Mellon, and the vetoes of two Presidents before we got justice on this issue.

Today, I fear too few people remember the machinations of the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, and the banks and their near success in turning the soldier's bonus into a banker's bonus. Mellon falsified the state of the U.S. Treasury to lead the country to believe that it could not pay the face value of these adjusted service certificates. Convincing the country that it faced a Treasury deficit, Mellon gained approval of a plan to make the certificates payable in 1945. In the meantime, under the Mellon plan, you veterans could borrow small sums on the certificates from banks. On the average certificate's face value of $1,000, this meant that the veteran could borrow maybe as much as $250 from banks at interest rates ranging from 6 to 10 percent. By the time the certificates would have become payable in 1945, their value would have been eaten up by interest charges.

When I first took the oath of office as Congressman from the First District of Texas in 1929, I moved to correct this situation and introduced legislation to make these certificates payable at face value. I remember that many of you came to Washington in support of this legislation. I recall that cold January in 1931 when thousands of veterans marched up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol steps and presented me with petitions circulated in every congressional district of the country. I immediately circulated these to the Congressmen and Senators on Capitol Hill and I am convinced this did much to help pass the legislation.

Originally, of course, we had to take a compromise plan, which gave the veterans a 50-percent loan on their certificates. But, finally, in 1936, we gained final victory and some 3 million veterans started receiving more than $2 billion in payments for their Adjusted Service Certificates. This not only helped provide equity to the veterans who had fought for their country in World War I, but it gave a big and much-needed boost to the general economy.

Mellon and his big banker friends were really the obstacles to this legislation. Actually, the big bankers don't change much. If you will notice, they still oppose just about every piece of worthwhile legislation for the people. But they are not at all timid about coming to Congress and asking for favors for their banks, particularly the big banks. As many of you remember, on January 6, 1932, I rose on the floor of the House of Representatives and asked that Secretary of the Treasury Mellon be impeached. I charged that he unlawfully refunded, as Secretary of the Treasury, billions of dollars in income tax payments to himself and to Mellon Companies. I also charged that he owned bank stock in violation of the Code of Laws of the United States. My resolution also contained the charge that Mellon was engaged in the manufacture and sale of distilled whiskey in violation of the law at a time when the Secretary of the Treasury was charged with the enforcement of the prohibition statutes. While we were still holding hearings on the impeachment, Mellon resigned as Secretary and President Hoover hurriedly sent him out of the country as Ambassador to Great Britain. I am convinced that the impeachment would have been upheld if Mellon had remained in the country to face the charges.

Since that struggle with Mellon and the bankers on the bonus bill, veterans' legislation has come easier. I am proud of the fact that I was the first Congressman to introduce the World War II veterans' benefit bill which became the GI bill of rights. I was also happy to author the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 which expedited the production and allocation of material for housing purposes in the immediate postwar era. As you recall, in 1944, when we enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, we provided for a program of 100 percent guaranteed home loans for war-time veterans. That act resulted in more than 6 million home loans to war-time veterans and has been a major source of financing with the growth of our housing industry.

But today there are nearly 2½ million peacetime veterans for whom no special housing terms are available, as well as some 13 million war veterans who have not used their GI housing privileges. A large proportion of these veterans still need better homes.

These represent a large segment of our younger population who have devoted part of their younger life to serving the defense of their country. And today, even peacetime service is, as we all know, vital to the maintenance of our national defense and the peace of the world.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964 gives special consideration to the needs of these younger people when they reenter the peacetime world to build careers and establish homes. It makes available to all veterans, except those who have already obtained GI home loans, 100 percent FHA-insured home loans on homes valued up to $15,000, with a 10-percent downpayment on the value of the home between $15,000 and $20,000, and a 15-percent downpayment on the portion of the value in excess of $20,000—up to $30,000.

This will open the way to good homes for a large number of veterans early in their peacetime life, without the need for waiting to save up substantial downpayments. It will add measurably to the volume of new housing that is built for the people's needs.

Housing, of course, is but one segment of the programs for veterans. With our increasing commitment in Vietnam, I think it is important that the Congress review the various programs and make certain that this new group of veterans is not left out in the cold.

My Texas colleague over in the Senate, RALPH YARBOROUGH, has led a commendable fight to extend the GI bill of rights to the cold war veterans. I believe this is good legislation and I hope the Congress will see fit to act favorably on it in the near future.

Veteran's legislation is good business for the entire country. First and foremost, is the fact that it does compensate the individual veteran for the years that he loses from his education and his field of work. While we have made some adjustments in pay scales, it is still a fact that most servicemen suffer a substantial financial loss while they are in the Armed Forces. This, of course, is in addition to the disruption of their lives and the obvious hazards which such service involves.

Completely aside from the individual veteran, the soldier's bonus, the GI bill of rights, the housing program, and other similar measures have meant much to the general economy. These programs have put billions of dollars into the economy at the consumers' level. The educational programs under the GI bill of rights have enriched the country greatly. Thousands of Texans have gone to college under this program. Today, these college-educated veterans' earning power has been increased many times. As a result, the additional income taxes which they pay have already more than paid for the program.

This is true of the other veterans programs. All of them are repaying the country many times over.

However, the stimulation which these programs provide the economy can be lost if we all do not keep a careful watch on other areas. I am particularly concerned about the monetary policies and their effect on the availability of money and credit. If we allow runaway interest rates, then programs such as these measures for veterans can be, in effect, wiped out or vetoed.

Of course, our monetary policies have a tremendous effect on everyone. That is why the conduct of the banking industry is of such importance to every citizen of this country.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am deeply concerned about the slipshod manner in which so much of this industry is supervised. Frankly, I believe there is great laxity in the so-called bank supervisory agencies. I do not think these agencies are doing their job of protecting the public. I include in this, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

When I talk about the banks, I do not mean to indict every bank and every banker. I firmly support the idea that banks must make a profit in our system. I recognize that there are many, many good banks and conscientious bank executives. But these facts do not alter my concern over the domination of the banking industry by a handful of huge banks. These big banks actually work to the detriment of other financial institutions as well as the rest of the economy.

The whole country, I believe, is appalled by the revelations of infiltration of banks by criminal elements. This infiltration is extremely serious for bank depositors, stockholders, FDIC insurance, and the general public. As you know, our Domestic Finance Subcommittee investigated this area earlier this year. This included a look at the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va., which was closed a year ago. Our investigation showed clearly that over $2 million of this bank's funds were used to finance and facilitate loan sharking, gambling, numbers rackets, fraudulent money order sales, and passing of forged securities. This activity was carried on all down the east coast from New York to Georgia.

This bank's situation is serious enough in itself, but such activities apparently exist in some other banks. During his appearance before our committee, Chairman K. A. Randall of the FDIC, admitted that at the present time, FDIC has 199 banks on its problem list with aggregate deposits of $1.829 billion.

I am also appalled by the apparent cooperation of many banks with loan-shark operations. In investigating the Federal Services Finance Corporation—a loan operation specializing in fast-shuffle deals with military personnel—we discovered that nearly 100 commercial banks had been providing this finance company with substantial lines of credit.

Now these things must be stopped and the Federal banking agencies simply are not doing the job. I do not accuse these officials with wrong-doing or impugn their motives. But, I do say that the decisions of these agencies invariably carry the appearance of a rubberstamp for the positions of the banks. Seldom is the public interest taken into consideration.

The Congress should move now to bring reform to the banking agencies and to include safeguards for the public. First, I think all of these agencies should come to Congress for appropriations annually. This provides an annual review of their activity—or lack of activity. Under present conditions, all three are financed outside of the public domain. The FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency are financed by funds provided by the banks they supervise. This is like having the television networks finance

the Federal Communications Commission or the airlines, the Federal Aviation Agency. This is terrible public policy and the Congress should correct this now. Every taint of banker domination should be removed from these agencies.

Now the Federal Reserve Board, of course, claims to be independent of everyone, the public, the Congress, and the President. They get their funds through interest from Government bonds they hold. They are not audited by any Government agency and they do not have to come to Congress for a dime.

Just how bad this situation has become is plainly illustrated by some recent hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee had been holding hearings on H.R. 7601, providing for cancellation of $30 billion of U.S. bonds held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York for the Federal Open Market Committee. The total open market portfolio is now $38.5 billion, on which the taxpayers are required to pay almost $1.5 billion a year in interest.

In his testimony at the hearing, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that the Federal Reserve had paid for these bonds once with the money and credit of the United States and that they would have to be paid again when due. This is similar to a situation where a houseowner paid off his mortgage and was then required to continue paying interest on it, and then pay it off again when the maturity date comes around. It would be illegal and absurd in the case of an individual, but that is exactly what the Government is required to do under our present banking structure.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, is openly defiant about his ability to ignore public policy. He recently told me in a Joint Economic Committee hearing that "the Federal Reserve Board has the authority to act independently of the President" even "despite the President."

Of course, the problem of the Federal Reserve System is of much greater magnitude than the other two agencies. The Federal Reserve, through its Open Market Committee determines the Nation's supply of money and the interest rates. It has, in effect, near life and death control over economic policy.

In recent months, the Federal Reserve Board, led by its Chairman, has been tightening up on the supply of money, and forcing interest rates up.

The Federal Reserve Board's efforts to reconstruct their tight money line flies in the face of repeated statements by this administration in favor of plentiful credit at reasonable interest. Mr. Martin chooses to ignore these policies.

Once again, we have a prime example of the folly of allowing our monetary policy to be controlled largely by the bankers in disregard of a public policy as enunciated by the President and the Congress.

Through the years, tight money and rising interest rates have cost the American consumer billions of dollars. Tight money and high interest rates serve no useful public purpose. They have been a serious drag on the growth of the country, an out-and-out waste.

For an 11-year period from 1953 to 1963 inclusive, rising interest rates imposed an excess interest cost of $15.7 billion upon the Federal budget; $2.3 billion upon States and localities; and $32.1 billion upon all private borrowers. And the figures keep on growing.

Tight money hurts every housewife who buys a washing machine, every farmer who buys a tractor, every homeowner. Every taxpayer has paid his share of the rising interest costs on the national debt.

So long as the Federal Reserve System remains under banker domination and beyond the reach of executive and legislative control, our welfare is imperiled. In my view, the most important economic and governmental problem facing the Nation today is the need for immediate rehabilitation of the Federal Reserve System, so that it is again subject to the will of the people, acting through their elected representatives.

If the big bankers are able to have their way they will continue to encourage monetary policies that will produce larger and larger public debt and higher and higher interest rates. If they have their way, our national debt will be $600 billion in 15 years, which, at a 6-percent rate of interest, will cost the taxpayers $36 billion a year. This would mean that so much of Federal revenues would be required for debt-carrying charges that insufficient funds, if any at all, would be available for veteran's programs, social welfare, housing, community health, and the many other services needed by our people.

Monetary policy is the public's business and it should not be controlled absolutely by a handful of bureaucrats operating independently of everyone but the big bankers.

You veterans of World War I got a real sampling of the bankers' attitudes when they opposed payment of your Adjusted Service Certificates. You won that fight over great odds.

Now, today, I would like to call on you to lead another fight to gain a permanent reform of our monetary system so that it is responsive to the will and the needs of the people. If we do not gain this reform, then many of our past victories in behalf of the American veteran will be wasted.

Tribute to the Late Oscar A. Eklund, of the Veterans' Administration, a Native of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Oscar A. Eklund, a native of Wisconsin, who served his country in our Armed Forces and later in the construction of veterans hospitals, is being buried today in Arlington Cemetery.

When Oscar Eklund died on October 12, the Government of these United States, and the Veterans' Administration in particular, lost a most capable and respected man. Mr. Eklund was well liked by all with whom he came in contact and I doubt if he had an enemy in the world. He was firm but fair in his dealings with contractors and insisted that the Government receive a workmanlike job on the Veterans' Administration hospital construction projects he supervised. His loss will be keenly felt by the Veterans' Administration Office of Construction, as well as by his many personal friends. Among those who will miss him are his pets, and the racoons, birds, and other wildlife he used to feed around his house in nearby Maryland.

Mr. Eklund was extremely fond of fishing. He was incapacitated by a heart attack about 10 weeks ago and after 4 weeks in the hospital seemed to be making a satisfactory recovery and was anxious to return to work. However, his physician thought that he should wait a little longer before assuming the heavy responsibilities of his position, in which he supervised the construction of half of the new veterans hospitals being constructed throughout the country. Mr. Eklund went to Nags Head, N.C., to indulge in his favorite sport and, apparently, dropped dead while fishing on a causeway over the water near Nags Head.

Mr. Eklund was born in Tomahawk, Wis., March 8, 1899. He graduated from the public schools there and then attended the University of Wisconsin Engineering School. He served as an enlisted man with the Infantry during World War I and received an honorable discharge December 15, 1918. From then until 1922, he was associated with his father in the family business of general contracting. He served as construction foreman and superintendent for Seims Helmars & Schaffner, general contractors for St. Paul, Minn., on heavy construction work of dams and powerhouses in the Wisconsin-Minnesota area.

In 1926, he moved to Washington, D.C., and was a construction foreman for various general contractors erecting office buildings and other large structures. He accepted the position of general superintendent for the Sears Roebuck Home Construction Division, remaining there until 1932, when he entered into partnership with James Doyle. The firm of Doyle & Eklund handled all types of building construction, conducted a real estate department, engaged in rental and financing of property. In 1942, he entered the U.S. Government as project engineer and contracting officer with the Federal Public Housing Authority. During this period, he was responsible for the construction of housing projects in Quantico, Va.; Middle River, Md.; Beltsville, Md.; Oceanside, Calif.; and Fallbrook, Calif.

On January 8, 1946, he transferred to the Veterans' Administration where he conducted studies for the acquisition of real estate properties to serve as sites for Veterans' Administration hospitals, regional offices, and so forth. In May 1950, Mr. Eklund was assigned to the construction service of the Veterans' Administration where he served as personal liaison between central office and the various projects in the field. In this capacity, he was responsible for aiding and guiding the resident engineers in the construction of projects totaling $25 million.

From April of 1954 to the end of 1956, he served as the engineer member of the Veterans' Administration Contract Appeals Board, which acts on appeals from contractors arising out of their contracts for the construction of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

In early 1957, he transferred to construction service, where he served as chief of one of the two project management divisions until his death. In this capacity, he was responsible for the management of construction contracts which, at times, totaled approximately $100 million.

Fittingly enough, the largest of the construction projects of which Mr. Eklund had overall charge was the new

1,264-bed Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, in his and my own State of Wisconsin. This magnificent and completely air conditioned new hospital costing over $28 million, was virtually complete at the time of Mr. Eklund's death. Typical of other large projects constructed under Mr. Eklund's general supervision are the 800-bed, $15 million Veterans' Administration hospital at Cleveland, Ohio, which was completed a year or so ago, and the 480-bed, $10 million Veterans' Administration hospital now under construction at Gainesville, Fla.

Mr. Eklund was highly regarded by all in the Veterans' Administration office of construction and successfully completed many difficult assignments. It will be a long time before anyone else can amass the experience and develop the ability which Mr. Eklund had. Truly, our Nation has lost one of her most capable and dedicated public servants.

Remarks on Dedicating the John F. Kennedy School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be the main speaker at the formal dedication exercises of the newly constructed John F. Kennedy School in Canton, Mass.

I wish to include here my remarks on that occasion, as well as a copy of the program.

Special mention should be made of Mrs. Virginia Chase Earle, resident of Sharon, Mass., who so beautifully executed the portrait of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, which was unveiled at the dedication.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES A. BURKE ON DEDICATING THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL

Today you of the forward looking community of Canton have done me the great honor of asking me to participate in the dedication of a living monument to the memory of a great American and a great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Yes, I say a living monument, because that is really what this fine new school, the John F. Kennedy School, is. For, by honoring this educational institution with his name, the John F. Kennedy School becomes a true and living tribute to a man who valued, perhaps above all, the spirit of learning and the hope of education.

In fact, of all the moving things we might say about education in dedicating the John F. Kennedy School this afternoon, probably none could be more meaningful than those said on the subject of learning by John Kennedy himself. For, his words, as well as his ideas, about education were deeply eloquent.

At this time I think it is particularly appropriate to share some of his thoughts about learning with you. In his education message to Congress in 1963 he said, and I quote:

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education."

In the years since these words were spoken, we in the Congress as all Americans, have continued to be inspired by President Kennedy's deep commitment to education. And we, as you in Canton who built this new elementary school, have been stimulated to work hard to strengthen and improve American learning.

Our efforts on behalf of the education of America's children and youth may not at first seem as concrete and immediate as the building of this impressive school before us. But, I think that if you look with me just a little further at what we in your National Government have done recently, you will see that these accomplishments also promise to do a great deal for American education and to help schools like the John F. Kennedy School all over the country.

What I am talking about is the major achievement your Congress won this year when it passed a massive new program to help American elementary and secondary learning, the well-publicized Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This well-thought out and carefully planned education legislation is something that John Kennedy would have been proud of. I know that we in Congress who passed it, certainly are; for, it promises to strengthen our elementary and secondary education in a number of critical areas of educational concern today.

Consider, for instance, the approximate $1 billion that is to go for the first year of operation for the education of the children of our poor. As you all know, we are working very hard at the national level to find ways to help our disadvantaged youth to break the desperate cycle of poverty and deprivation in which so many of them seem so hopelessly caught, as their fathers before them have been. We think that education is one of the key answers to breaking this cycle. So it is, that we have granted these generous funds to help school districts all over the country give educationally underprivileged pupils the special education and educational services they need if they are to truly conquer their serious socio-economic and cultural barriers to learning.

It may interest you to know that Massachusetts alone is due to receive approximately $16,705,086 for this purpose for the first year of the program's operation. There is no doubt that these funds will help our heavily burdened local school districts to give our State's disadvantaged pupils the extra help they need to become successes in life.

The education of more advantaged students, such as probably many of the fortunate children who will go to John F. Kennedy School, will also benefit substantially from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. For other parts of the act grant funds to improve the educational quality in all schools, regardless to the economic level of their students.

Money will be given to help grade schools and high schools improve their schools' library resources and to acquire textbooks and other instructional materials. This means, for instance, that your children in John F. Kennedy School may have more up-to-date textbooks, fine audiovisual equipment, or have access to an enriched school library in coming years.

Then funds are to be given to help schools establish supplementary educational centers and services such as special instruction in the arts and sciences and in advanced academic courses, guidance and counseling services, remedial instruction, and other such things—all of which are found in our very best schools. This might mean that at John F. Kennedy School your children will benefit from an expanded guidance program or others of these services—and thereby have richer educational opportunities than they might otherwise.

Finally, generous support is granted in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to further educational research in America and to strengthen our State departments of education so they can improve their services to our local schools. Both these sources of help will mean that America's boys and girls will have available to them an increasingly higher quality education.

I think now, that even with this brief description, you can see how your Federal Government is working hand in hand with local and State agencies to bolster American education. Your hard work has resulted in the building of an excellent new learning laboratory—the John F. Kennedy School. And our work, we hope, has resulted in an educational aid program and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, that will help make the education that your children receive at this school—and in schools all over the country—the best that our great Nation has to offer.

In closing, I would urge that you continue your magnificent and energetic efforts on behalf of education in Canton, because this beautiful structure does represent the concern of the citizens of Canton and its civil officials for the mental and physical development of our youth as well as the sacrifice, labor, and love parents devoted to the welfare of their children. For as much support as we, your Federal Government, may give, we never lose sight of the fact that the heart of the progress of American education rests with you in local communities all over the country. With your spirit of dedication to fostering learning in your community there will be no doubt that the John F. Kennedy School will grow into the excellent elementary school for which it has the potential.

Then will the inspiration of John F. Kennedy be fulfilled, and generations of your children will meet the world as the wisely intelligent and well-educated citizens that we would have wanted—and we all earnestly desire them to be.

DEDICATION EXERCISES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL, AT CANTON, MASS., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1965

("For God and for Country")

THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED EFFORT, TALENT, AND UNLIMITED TIME IN MAKING THIS SCHOOL A REALITY

Frederick J. McCabe, chairman; William H. Galvin, secretary; Charles T. Brooks, William A. Flanagan, Daniel T. Galvin, Duncan J. Gillis, Jr., Robert P. Holland, Edward J. Lynch, M. Ruth Ruane, Leo J. Thornton, MacLaren H. MacGregor, John F. Morgan, Leonard P. Graham, Frank Davenport.

THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

William A. Flanagan, chairman; Harold J. Fitzgerald, secretary; Leonard P. Graham, member.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Daniel T. Galvin, chairman; Margaret Brayton, Ph. D., secretary; Albert D'Attanasio, Thomas J. Lane, Edward J. Lynch, William H. Kelleher, John F. Morgan, Leonard F. O'Brien, M. Ruth Ruane.

PERMANENT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE, CANTON, MASS.

William H. Galvin, Daniel T. Galvin, M. Ruth Ruane, Frederick J. McCabe, William A. Flanagan.

Edward J. Lynch, Walter R. Hearn, Ake Goransson, Leo J. Thornton, Charles T. Brooks, Duncan J. Gillis, Jr.

Due to unavoidable absence the picture of vice chairman Robert P. Holland is not shown.

PRESENTATION BY THE PERMANENT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL TO THE TOWN OF CANTON, OCTOBER 17, 1965

Bandology: Ostering; the Canton bands, John J. Judge, leader.

Greetings: Frederick J. McCabe.

Unfurling the Stars and Stripes: Color Guards, American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars; Cmdr. Gus Brown and Cmdr. Ralph O'Neill, Alan Powell, C.H.S., 1966; Noel Rosanquet, C.H.S., 1966.

Invocation: Rev. William A. Morgan, St. John's Church.

Address: Hon. William A. Flanagn, chairman, board of selectmen.

Carnival for Trumpets: Kin yon.

Introduction of invited and distinguished guests.

Finale from water music: Handel.

Prayer for the Nation: Rabbi Howard K. Kummer, Temple Beth Abraham.

Introduction: Members of the school building and school committees.

Address: Daniel T. Galvin, chairman, school committee.

Patriotic fantasy: Cohan.

Prayer for children: Rev. Douglas M. MacIntosh, United Church of Christ.

Oration: Congressman JAMES A. BURKE.

Unveiling: Portrait of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, painted by Virginia Chase Earle of Sharon.

New Colonial: Hall.

Announcements.

Benediction: Rev. Thomas Eifert, St. James Lutheran Church.

Chester: Billings, Charles T. Brooks, presiding.

Color Guards: Edward J. Beatty Post 24 American Legion, Canton Post 3163 Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Music: Canton High School Band—Canton American Legion Band (footnote to American History) William Billings, author of the music to which the Continental troops marched and sang in the American War for Independence was a native of our town and is recognized as the first American composer. The signer, Roger Sherman; the artisan, Revere; the engineer, Gridley; and the tunesmith, Billings—Canton citizens who played a significant role in the birth of our Nation.

Refreshments: Mrs. Marie Holland, dietitian, the cafeteria ladies and the parent teachers association.

THE FACULTY

Alice Lindner, room 1, special class.
Joan Sullivan, room 2, special class.
Cynthia Cornish, room 3, grade 1.
Virginia McGagh, room 4, grade 1.
Ann Resca, room 5, grade 2.
Marie Reilly, room 6, grade 1.
Helen Martis, room 7, grade 2.
Lorraine Reneghan, room 8, grade 2.
Marilyn Scipione, room 9, grade 3.
Patricia Neumann, room 10, grade 3.
Marion Feeney, room 11, grade 3.
Ann O'Malley, room 12, grade 4.
Marjorie Bennett, room 13, grade 4.
Elaine Patsos, room 14, grade 4.
James Lynch, room 16, grade 5.
Jean Sturdy, room 17, grade 5.
Paul Merchant, room 18, grade 5.
Ann Cameron, room 19, grade 5.
Ann Turnbull, room 20, grade 5.
Brenda Herman, room 21, grade 6.
John Coakley, room 22, grade 6.
Edwina Cahill, room 23, grade 6.
Joan Biberthaler, room 24, grade 6.
Marilyn Pinkham, room 25, grade 6.

HEALTH OFFICE

Nelson D. Batchelder, M.D., Mildred M. Gillis, R.N.

THE INDIVIDUALS WHO PLANNED AND BUILT THE SCHOOL

Architects: Thomas F. McDonough, F.A.I.A. (Deceased). Ake G. Goransson, A.I.A. associate of Kilham, Hopkins, Greeley and Brodie.

General Contractor: James S. Kelliher, Inc. of Qunicy.

Clerk of the work: Walter R. Hearn of Randolph.

Description

The first floor area is 34,670 square feet and the second floor is 21,075 square feet for a total area of 55,745 square feet.

Construction

Concrete foundations, concrete first floor on compacted gravel. Outside walls are 12-inch-thick masonry; 4-inch face brick or limestone facing and 8-inch thick cinderblock walls. Inside partitions are made of cinderblocks. Glazed structural facing tiles are used in all corridors, stair halls, toilets, kitchen areas. The second floor is concrete beams and slab construction. Walls on the second floor are similar to first-floor walls. Roofs are constructed of steel joists and light-weight concrete over metal roof decking. Roofs are covered with built-up roofing with pitch to roof drains.

Floors in general are asphalt tile in corridors and classrooms, terrazzo in all toilet areas, and wood in activities rooms and cafetorium platform. Walls are painted cinderblocks or exposed glazed structural facing tiles in classrooms and corridors and wood finish in lobby, activities room walls have a padded dado. Cafetorium has 15 folding in-wall tables and benches. Ceilings in general are made of acoustical plaster on metal lath or hard smooth plaster in storage areas, kitchen areas. The ceiling in the activities room is exposed steel joints.

A typical classroom has a 32-foot-long by 4-foot-high chalkboard, about 15-foot-long tackboard, 11-foot-long counter with sink, 16-foot to 23-foot cupboard space along windows, freestanding teachers' storage and closet and one L-shaped wardrobe unit.

All equipment in kitchen is stainless steel.

Building is heated by hot water radiators, unit heaters, unit ventilators and convectors. Boilers are oil fired. Complete air exchanges are provided as required by the department of public safety. Electric light in general is by fluorescent type lighting fixtures. Fire alarm, sound system and TV systems are provided.

Large outside paved play areas and parking areas are provided. One little league size and one Babe Ruth size baseball field, two enclosed tennis courts and two outside practice basketball courts are included.

First floor contains

Nine regular classrooms, two special classrooms, kitchen area, cafetorium—cafeteria-auditorium—auditorium platform, administration area—health, principal, general office—conference room, library areas, activities room, teachers' room, boiler room electric room, lobby, coat room, corridors, stairhalls, storage rooms, custodians service areas, covered canopies, toilet facilities.

Second floor contains

Thirteen regular classrooms, one remedial reading classroom, toilet facilities, storage areas, custodian service areas, corridors, stairhalls, and so forth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In the name of Canton, the permanent school building committee expresses its sincere appreciation to all who have so generously aided it in accomplishing its work.

FREDERICK J. MCCABE,
Chairman.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1965

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O Thou God of all men, we bow in this hallowed Chamber with a sense of solemn gladness, that so much has been given to us.

We stand within these walls in the remembrance of lives greatly lived whose record is our heritage.

Sensitize our hearts, we pray, in deepened gratitude, as we think of those who here strove for truth, and when they found it, spoke it without fear or favor, for those who could not see evil without crying out against it; for those who in their own hearts felt the pain of injustice done to others; for all those who condemned oppression and fought for liberty.

In the midst of today's continuing struggle, between the true and the false, between love and hatred, grant us by Thy grace new fortitude and reinforcement for the times in which we live until by patience, persistence, and enduring courage we become sufficient for the tasks committed to our hands, until at last we finish our course, having kept the faith.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 18, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 18, 1965,

The following reports of committees were submitted on October 18, 1965:

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

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (Rept. No. 909).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 910).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its